Introduction

Task Force Meeting #8 will be a review of the testing outcomes and community feedback on the draft strategies in Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS), Multi Unit (MU, RO) and Row House (RH, TH) zone districts and review the zoning standards for testing. Each tester that is able to attend will provide a brief presentation on their design outcomes, notes and proposed revisions. Based on testing, staff has proposed some revisions to the tools. Additionally, the community and/or testers have suggested some additional tools for task force consideration. This meeting will also include a discussion about pipeline projects and effective dates.

This will be a PACKED meeting, please review the following documents prior to the meeting on October 19, 2017 from 2-5pm in Webb 4.G.2 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 October 19th meeting in Room 4.G.2 from 2-5pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Revisions to Strategy Options</td>
<td>The table that was provided in the draft Slot Home Strategy Report has been filled in with testing comments and community comments to inform revised standards where necessary. Additional tools for task force consideration are also included in this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Packet Results</td>
<td>The first three pages of the packet is the summary of comments for each district type (Mixed Use, Multi Unit, Row House). The following pages provide the designs and the comments for each specific testing site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Open House Summary</td>
<td>The final summary including all community comments from the September 6th Open House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Meeting #7 Summary</td>
<td>The final summary for Task Force Meeting #7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Objectives:
- Review “pipe line” project impacts and effective date options
- Review testing comments and outcomes
- Review and confirm proposed changes to existing standards
- Review additional tools proposed by testing and/or community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Meeting Kick-Off and Objectives (10 min)</th>
<th>2:00 – 2:10pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Pipeline Projects</td>
<td>2:10 – 2:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (10min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion (10min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Testing Outcomes for Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) Zone Districts</td>
<td>2:30 – 2:50pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tester Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• C-MX-3: 80 S Madison Street (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U-MX-3: 3807 N Tejon Street (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U-MS-2: 1459 S Pearl Street (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Questions/Clarifications (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Testing Outcomes for Multi-Unit (MU, RO) Zone Districts</td>
<td>2:50 - 3:10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tester Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• G-MU-3: 50 S Clarkson (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• G-MU-3: 1714 N Grove Street (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• G-MU-3: 1841 Hooker (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Questions/Clarifications (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Testing Outcomes for Row House (RH/TH) Zone Districts</td>
<td>3:10 – 3:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tester Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U-RH-2.5: 2929 E 23rd (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• G-RH-3: 501 N Steel (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Questions/Clarifications (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Break (5min)</td>
<td>3:25 – 3:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Review Proposed Changes to Original Tools</td>
<td>3:30 - 4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (15min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff will present proposed revisions in response to community feedback and testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion and Confirmation (30min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Review Additional Tools Proposed by Community or Testers</td>
<td>4:15 – 4:55pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (15min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff will present additional tools proposed by community and/or testers for task force consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion and Confirmation (25min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Next Steps (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Task Force Meeting November 16th 2-5pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Tools for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Design Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Realm Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry</td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required. 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>2-story district: 35’</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase minimum primary street setback</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow primary street setback encroachments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build to alternatives</td>
<td>Garden Wall: 25%; Garden Wall with covered seating for pedestrians: 30%; Pergola: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Design Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions* (For developments up to 6 units)</td>
<td>Drive Axle Width: 21’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Tools For Task Force Consideration

- **Explore building from limitations when adjacent to protected district:** Current standards generally pertain to upper story setbacks when adjacent to protected districts. 
- **Explore increasing Transparency Standards:** 10% 
- **Explore introducing side interior setback:** 0’

### Problem Statement Elements Addressed

#### Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Community Comments</th>
<th>Testing Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>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. 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>2-story district: 35’</td>
<td>2-story district: 30’</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Community Comments</th>
<th>Testing Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase minimum primary street setback</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0’/15’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow primary street setback encroachments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>As permitted in MU districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build to alternatives</td>
<td>Garden Wall: 25%; Garden Wall with covered seating for pedestrians: 30%; Pergola: 30%</td>
<td>Eliminate garden wall, garden all with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola. Allow courtyard alternative at 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Comments

- **Support that residential uses to be set back from the street.**
- **Maintain proposed heights of 30’ and 38’**
- **Introduce a minimum canopy depth of 3’ in the definition.**
- **Support for reducing the building height in feet, additional interest in exploring other tools that address mass and scale.**
- **Introduce minimum depth for porch and patio depth of 5’ in the definition.**
- **Introduce a height exception or ROM (Rule of Measurement) to allow for sloped/angled roofs.**
- **Introduce a height exception or ROM (Rule of Measurement) to allow for sloped/angled roofs.**
- **Support for reducing the building height in feet, additional interest in exploring other tools that address mass and scale.**
- **Introduce a height exception or ROM (Rule of Measurement) to allow for sloped/angled roofs.**

### Testing Comments

- **No issues with increasing setback on both primary and side street.**
- **Introduce side street setback of 10’ to ensure appropriate outcome on both street frontages. (This side street setback was used in testing).**
- **No comments.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**

### Additional Tools for Task Force Consideration

- **Explore building from limitations when adjacent to protected district:** Current standards generally pertain to upper story setbacks when adjacent to protected districts. 
- **Explore increasing Transparency Standards:** 10% 
- **Explore introducing side interior setback:** 0’

### PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR DENVER ZONING CODE DRAFT

- **Testing Comments:** Need to address outcomes and requirements for corner lots. When unit orientation is only required on one street or tied to side street build-to, the outcome on the side street was still a slot home and did not solve the problem.
- **Community Comments:** Support for orienting the units to the streets which is a big improvement that is in alignment with neighborhood character. Disallowing side-ways unit orientation in the rear of the lot should be explored.
- **Testing Comments:** Current language might be too flexible, consider introducing minimum dimensions.
- **Community Comments:** Requiring an entry feature is very important. It is important for these features to create usable space that can contribute to the ownership of the space. Minimum size requirements might be appropriate.
- **Testing Comments:** Revisions further limit ability for sloped/angled roofs which might be a desirable outcome.
- **Community Comments:** Strong support for reducing the building height in feet, additional interest in exploring other tools that address mass and scale.
- **Testing Comments:** This will have an impact on building design, but its not problematic.
- **Testing Comments:** No issues with increasing setback on both primary and side street.
- **Community Comments:** Support that residential uses to be set back from the street.
- **No comments.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No changes from original proposal.**
- **No comments.**

### Additional Tools for Task Force Consideration

- **Testing Comments:** Consider exploring limitations on roof top decks in rear 35% when adjacent to protected districts.
- **Community Comments:** There needs to be more standards to break up mass and scale when adjacent to low scale residential.
- **Testing Comments:** Consider increasing transparency standards to further reinforce public realm engagement.
- **Testing Comments:** Side interior setbacks should apply in all districts since the impacts are the same.
- **Testing Comments:** Explore rooftop deck limitations when adjacent to protected districts. When adjacent to protected district, rear setback is 12” when alley is present, 20” when no alley is present. (These are the same setbacks of protected districts)
- **Testing Comments:** Explore increasing transparency standards to 40%
- **Testing Comments:** Explore introducing side interior setback.
### Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tools for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</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>X X X X X</td>
<td>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>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>3-story district: 40'</td>
<td>3-story district: 35'</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>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise block sensitive setback</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>Revise side setback</td>
<td>Side Interior: 7.5' Side Street: 9'</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>Allow side setback encroachments</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>Increase build-to percentage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td>Garden Wall: 25% Garden Wall with covered seating for pedestrians: 30%; 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 X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street parking area dimension (for developments up to 6 units)</td>
<td>Drive Axle Width: 23' Internal Access Drive: 20'</td>
<td>Drive Axle Width: 18' Internal Access Drive Width: 12'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Tools for Task Force Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore building from limitations when adjacent to protected district</td>
<td>Existing standards apply to setbacks and upper story setbacks</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore street level residential use requirements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore increasing transparency standard</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS FOR TESTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tools</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR DENVER ZONING CODE DRAFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed revisions to standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Comments: Need to address outcomes and requirements for corner lots. When unit orientation is only required on one street or tied to side street build-to, the outcome on the side street was still a slot home and did not solve the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Comments: Support for orienting the units to the streets which is a big improvement that is in alignment with neighborhood character. Disallowing side-ways unit orientation in the rear of the lot should be explored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR DENVER ZONING CODE DRAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed revisions to standard</th>
<th>Testing Comments:</th>
<th>Time for testing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing Comments: Need to address outcomes and requirements for corner lots. When unit orientation is only required on one street or tied to side street build-to, the outcome on the side street was still a slot home and did not solve the problem.</td>
<td>Revisit language to the follow to address corner lots and create predictable outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Comments: Support for orienting the units to the streets which is a big improvement that is in alignment with neighborhood character. Disallowing side-ways unit orientation in the rear of the lot should be explored.</td>
<td>When required. Any dwelling unit located within 10' of the primary street setback or side street setback shall be oriented to the corresponding street. For corner unit, the unit need only be oriented to one street. Oriented to the Street: Each unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one dwelling unit 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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Problem Statement Elements Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase courtyard width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Landscaping in Garden Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require dwelling unit facades to bound the garden court on 3 sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Garden Court</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Design Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase courtyard width</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Landscaping in Garden Court</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Minimum of 50% of the area shall be landscaped with live planting material</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require dwelling unit facades to bound the garden court on 3 sides</td>
<td>Bound on 3 sides with related building facades (this can include detached garages)</td>
<td>Bound 3 sides with dwelling unit facades</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments and Analysis

The following is a summary of task force, community and testing comments. For the detailed responses, see the attached summaries.

- **Testing Comments:** Proposed minimum 30' courtyard is not feasible on 62.5' wide lots with side setbacks.

  - **Proposed Standard:**
    - No change from original proposal

- **Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House**

  **Building Design Tools**

  - Require units oriented to the street: When Required: Any dwelling unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature. When Required: Any dwelling 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. 

  - Additional Tools for Task Force Consideration: Expand rescued drive aisle dimensions to Row House form

  **Proposed Standard**

  - Revise language to address corner lots and create predictable outcomes. When Required: Any dwelling unit shall be oriented to the corresponding street. For corner unit, the unit need only be oriented to one street. Oriented to the Street: Each unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth.
**Proposed Tools for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing</strong></th>
<th><strong>OVERALL QUESTIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENT SUMMARY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Design Tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOOL SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do the Tools Address the Problem Statement? If not, what tools might be added?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do the Tools Enable Flexibility of Design? If not, what tools specifically limit flexibility and how might they be modified?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1. Does the proposed standard limit design flexibility in any way that precludes buildings that would meet the design intent? If so, what rule within the standard is the most problematic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How does this standard function on corner lots?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required</td>
<td>3. Is this flexible language sufficient, or do minimum dimensions need to be established for the entry feature (porch, patio, canopy)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Though few projects build sloped roofs, does the proposed standard reduce the ability to design sloped roofs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>2-story district: 35'; 3-story district: 45'</td>
<td>5. Does the reduced height in feet become problematic on sloping lots? If so, what minimum slope?</td>
<td></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>6. Does a the 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design Tools</td>
<td><strong>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</strong></td>
<td><strong>C-MX-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>U-MX-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>80 S Madison Street (Internal)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3708 N Tejon Street (Bill M.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1459 S Pearl Street (Nate J.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Standard</td>
<td>18-unit options</td>
<td>11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)</td>
<td>Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive: 20’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive Width: 18’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive Width: 12’</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Design Tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOOL SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do the Tools Enable Flexibility of Design? If not, what tools specifically limit flexibility and how might they be modified?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do the Tools Address the Problem Statement? If not, what tools might be added?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1. Does the proposed standard limit design flexibility in any way that precludes buildings that would meet the design intent? If so, what rule within the standard is the most problematic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How does this standard function on corner lots?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required</td>
<td>3. Is this flexible language sufficient, or do minimum dimensions need to be established for the entry feature (porch, patio, canopy)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Though few projects build sloped roofs, does the proposed standard reduce the ability to design sloped roofs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>2-story district: 35'; 3-story district: 45'</td>
<td>5. Does the reduced height in feet become problematic on sloping lots? If so, what minimum slope?</td>
<td></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>6. Does a the 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design Tools</td>
<td><strong>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</strong></td>
<td><strong>C-MX-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>U-MX-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>80 S Madison Street (Internal)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3708 N Tejon Street (Bill M.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1459 S Pearl Street (Nate J.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Standard</td>
<td>18-unit options</td>
<td>11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)</td>
<td>Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive: 20’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive Width: 18’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive Width: 12’</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse**

- **Proposed Standard**
- **80 S Madison Street (Internal)**
- **11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)**
- **Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking**

**Current proposed standards cause concerns on corner lots. Need to Build To, then this potentially allows undesired side facing units on side street where no or limited build to exists. Also need with overlapping units on corners if intent is still achieved. Consider requiring all units within 10’ of setback to face corresponding street. Allow overlapping units by requiring minimum 10’ of frontage on street (with entry).**
DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017

COMMENT SUMMARY

- **Decrease off-street parking Design Tools**: N/A
- **Revise parking Design Tools**: N/A
- **Revise block sensitive setback Design Tools**: N/A
- **Build to maximized height in feet Design Tools**: 8.4
- **Revise building height exceptions Design Tools**: N/A
- **Building Design Tools TOOL SPECIFIC QUESTIONS**: N/A
- **Site Design Tools**: N/A
- **Revise side setback Design Tools**: N/A
- **Allow side setback encroachments Design Tools**: N/A
- **Increase build-to percentage Design Tools**: N/A
- **Revise build-to alter-encroachments Design Tools**: N/A
- **Parking Design Tools**: N/A
- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area (up to 6 units)**: N/A

OVERALL QUESTIONS

- **Do the Tools Address the Problem Statement?**: N/A
- **Do the Tools Enable Flexibility of Design?**: N/A

COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

- **G-MU-3 50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C-O)**: If not, what tools specifically limit flexibility and how might they be modified?
- **G-MU-3 1714 N Grove Street (Eric B.)**: 6-unit options with detached parking (Townhouse and Garden Court)
- **Two 4-unit options (one with active use at street)**: (not associated to any specific site or outcome)

---

**Building Design Tools**

**When Required**: Any dwelling 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.

**One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required.**

**Internal Access Drive: 20’**

**Drive Aisle Width: 18’**

**Garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola 50%**

**Single-story porch, patio, canopy, stoop may encroach 7.5’**

**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.**

**One 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts**

**Overall direction facing the sides of other dwellings.**

**The 1:1 stepback should be relatively easy to accomplish, but will limit the orientation and location of the roof access stair.**

---

**Revise block sensitive setback**

**Applies (no min or max setback)**

**Block sensitive setback shall not exceed 20 feet.**

---

**Increase build-to percentage**

**60%**

---

**Revise build-to alter-encroachments**

**Garden wall 25%**

**Garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola 50%**

---

**Parking Design Tools**

**Drive Axle Width: 25’**

**Drive Axle Width: 18’**

**Drive Axle Width: 12’**

---

**CONSIDERATION FOR ENSURING THE USE OF A NON-MOTORIZED STREET:**

With the desire to continue allowing the interior units in the IC and MU districts, reductions are beneficial to allow other proposed requirements to be addressed, while reducing the burden on the interior portion of the site. Interior units would be much more challenging on some of the smaller lots.
## Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing

### Garden Court Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase courtyard width</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require landscaping in Garden Court</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Minimum of 50% of the area shall be landscaped with live planting material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require dwelling unit facades to bound the garden court on 3 sides</td>
<td>Bound on 3 sides with related building facades (this can include detached garages)</td>
<td>Bound 3 sides with dwelling unit facades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 23' Internal Access Drive: 20'</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 18' Internal Access Drive Width: 12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce a vehicle use areas setback</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All at grade and/or unenclosed vehicle use areas are not permitted within the front 80% of the zone lot depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units to be oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling 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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Comments and Assessment

### Garden Court Design Tools

- **G-MU-3 50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C-O.)**
  - 6-unit option with detached parking
  - Proposed minimum 30' courtyard is not feasible on 62.5' wide lots with side setbacks.

### Parking Design Tools

- **Current proposed standards cause concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.**

### Building Design Tools

- **G-RH-3 501 N Steele Street (Internal)**
  - I did not look at corner lots, but my opinion is the proposed and existing rules are acceptable. The side view would be a larger structure, probably a gap and a smaller structure (garage). In any event, the rear 35% is protected with a 19ft. height limit.

- **U-RH-2.5 929-931 E 23rd Avenue (Bob H.)**
  - Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway

- **Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12'/18')**
  - Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:
    - Additional side setback when units face the side
    - Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
    - Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
### PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-MX-3 80 S Madison Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-unit options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Design Tools

- **Require units oriented to the street**: If unit orientation is not required on both streets, the outcome leads to a slot home on the side street. Consider revisions to ensure outcome to the right with regard to unit orientation.

- **Require entry feature for units oriented to the street**

- **Reduce maximum building height in feet**

- **Revise building height exceptions**: The proposed standard ("stories") requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.

#### Site Design Tools

- **Introduce minimum primary street setback**

- **Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback**

- **Allow primary street setback encroachments**: Consider allowing for the drive way backup area to encroach 5’ into setback if screened with garden wall and/or landscaping.

- **Revise build-to alternatives**

#### Parking Design Tools

- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)**: If this site could use the reduced drive way dimensions, a few more (or larger) units could occur on the lot.
# Denver Slot Home Evaluation Testing Results – October 10, 2017

**112’ x 125’, alley, ~3.5% slope down front to back**

## Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-MX-3 3708 N Tejon Street</strong> (Bill M)</td>
<td>11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools

- **Require units oriented to the street**
  - How do you address the corner unit and frontage? Does a narrow side still need to face primary street?

- **Require entry feature for units oriented to the street**

- **Reduce maximum building height in feet**

- **Revise building height exceptions**
  - Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback?

### Site Design Tools

- **Introduce minimum primary street setback**

- **Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback**

- **Allow primary street setback encroachments**

- **Revise build-to alternatives**

### Parking Design Tools

- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)**

---

![Diagram of 3708 N Tejon Street](image-url)

**EXTERNAL TESTING**

**INTERNAL TESTING**

**3708 N Tejon Street**

**Comments**

- Corner unit and frontage. If setback would allow stair to create a roof, would garage on the perimeter if it is above max height but still comply with the build-to rule?

- How do you address the body of the unit? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback?

- Does narrow side still need to face primary street?

- How do you address the primary and meets transparency?

- Can roof access be at the perimeter if it is above landing?

- Does the unit still need to apply the primary roof setback rule?

- Elevations still need to comply with the setback rule of roof.

- **Introduction Unit Elevations still need to comply with the setbacks rule.**

- **Elevation Unit Front Elevation still need to comply with the Setbacks rule.**

**37th Ave**

**19'-6"**

**UNIT A3.4**

**PL I**

**AP 08**

**28'-0"**

**UNIT A6.6**

**PL II**

**AP 08**

**20'-0"**

**UNIT A6.7**

**PL III**

**AP 08**

**3'-0"**

---

**3708 N Tejon Front Elevation Small Unit**

**3708 N Tejon Front Elevation Large Unit**

---

**SLOT HOME TESTING – 3708 N TEJON ST (U-MX-3)**
**PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOL AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>U-MS-2 1459 S Pearl Street (Nate J.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td>Encouragement to break down built form (also look at not allowing the same material for X amount of feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>A reduction to the built form at the rear of the site should be considered (no matter the adjacencies). Establish neighborhood datums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td>No rooftop decks in rear 35% of lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce minimum primary street setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow primary street setback encroachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-MS-2 1459 S Pearl Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools

- **Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse**
  - **Require units oriented to the street**
  - **Require entry feature for units oriented to the street**
  - **Reduce maximum building height in feet**
  - **Revise building height exceptions**

### Site Design Tools

- **Introduce minimum primary street setback**
- **Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback**
- **Allow primary street setback encroachments**
- **Revise build-to alternatives**

### Parking Design Tools

- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)**
# Slot Home Testing – 50 S Clarkson St (G-MU-3)

**62.5’ x 125’, alley, flat with 3’ step-up from sidewalk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</strong></td>
<td>G-MU-3  50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C.-O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-unit options with detached parking  (Urban Townhouse and Garden Court)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building Design Tools

- **Require units oriented to the street**
  - For the Townhouse form, it is imperative that the street-orientation requirement be observed, it makes the design much stronger.
  - Did not try the corner lot scenario.

- **Require entry feature for units oriented to the street**
  - The language is flexible; however, a minimum 3-foot depth porch may be helpful. In the two cases I studied, 5-foot is doable, but 8-foot may be too much.

- **Reduce maximum building height in feet**
  - Townhouse form: it seems that the height is geared toward a three-story structure with a garage in the ground level. What if there was no garage at the ground level? For a developer, this may be better leasable/sellable space.

- **Revise building height exceptions**
  - Didn’t test this feature, but the standard makes sense with the addition of “or stories.”

## Site Design Tools

- **Revise block sensitive setback**
  - In both cases I only tested the 10-foot setback.

- **Revise side setback**
  - Disagree with allowing dwelling units to have front doors facing the sides of other dwellings. The urban design principle is that there is a logic of front-and-back. The Townhouse test I performed turns some fronts to the alley, in my opinion, a better configuration that activates the alley.

- **Allow side setback encroachments**
  - I did not test porches on the side of the zone lot. Townhouse form: I used the zero-lot line allowed for detached garages. Court form: with surface parking, I didn’t need to encroach.

- **Increase build-to percentage**
  - Townhouse form: 70 percent is a better build-to ratio.

- **Revise build-to alternatives**
  - Did not test garden walls or pergolas.

## Parking Design Tools

- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)**
  - Disagree with providing internal driveways that extend onto the fronting 80 percent of a zone lot of this size, in this zone district. The test I performed made the point of leaving parking as close to the alley as possible.
## PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS

### G-MU-3  
50 S Clarkson Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools
- Require units oriented to the street
- Require entry feature for units oriented to the street
- Reduce maximum building height in feet
- Revise building height exceptions

### Site Design Tools
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Revise side setback
- Allow side setback encroachments
- Increase build-to percentage
- Revise build-to alternatives

### Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
### Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>G-MU-3 1714 N Grove Street (Eric B.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two 4-unit options (one with active use at street)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required units oriented to the street**

Entry feature alone will not address the lack of public realm engagement without street-level building activity. Sloped sites may allow the living level to address the street (parking below) but most sites do not allow for this. Consider requiring street level active use to address.

**Required entry feature for units oriented to the street**

Entry feature helps solve human scale. Flexibility should be provided to allow for project-specific design solutions, appropriate for a given project within a given context.

**Reduce maximum building height in feet**

Reduced height makes sloped roofs very difficult. Impact on sloped sites is also challenging, especially those that rise upward front-to-back and side sloping lots. Very relevant in G-MU-3 where base plane is 80% of lot depth.

**Revise building height exceptions**

The 1:1 stepback should be relatively easy to accomplish, but will limit the orientation and location of the roof access stair.

### Site Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revise block sensitive setback</th>
<th>20' is generous enough to meet the design intent and allow context-appropriate yards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise side setback</td>
<td>Benefits residents of the interior units and reduces potential impacts on neighboring properties. Rather than encouraging an entry feature at the interior units through the allowable encroachment, I recommend a requirement for this feature as it helps to break down the scale of the 3-story wall plane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow side setback encroachments</td>
<td>See previous comment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase build-to percentage</td>
<td>Helps address the problem along with the requirement for street-oriented units and still allows reasonable void space along the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td>Increased build-to is an improvement, however, a driveway alternative is necessary on smaller lots of 50' and 62.5' widths. 70% build-to is not possible with setbacks and 12' access drive on this test site. A driveway alternative of 10% of build-to should be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Design Tools

| Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units) | With the desire to continue allowing the interior units in the MX and MU districts, reductions are beneficial to allow other proposed requirements to be addressed, while reducing the burden on the interior portion of the site. Interior units would be much more challenging on some of the smaller lot sizes. |

---

### External Testing

**CURRENT ACTIVE USE STANDARD**

**ACTIVE USE ALTERNATIVE**
### Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-MU-3 1714 N Grove Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Design Tools
- Require units oriented to the street
- Require entry feature for units oriented to the street
- Reduce maximum building height in feet
- Revise building height exceptions

#### Site Design Tools
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Revise side setback
  - Determining when side setback is 7.5 ft or 12.5’ might be difficult to determine on some configurations.
- Allow side setback encroachments
- Increase build-to percentage
- Revise build-to alternatives

#### Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
## Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G-MU-3</strong></td>
<td>1841 &amp; 1849 Hooker Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools
- Require units oriented to the street
- Require entry feature for units oriented to the street
- Reduce maximum building height in feet
- Revise building height exceptions

### Site Design Tools
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Revise side setback
- Allow side setback encroachments
- Increase build-to percentage
- Revise build-to alternatives

### Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
**SLOT HOME TESTING – 501 N STEELE ST (G-RH-3)**

50’ x 125’, alley, flat, corner lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</td>
<td>G-RH-3 501 N Steele Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Design Tools

- **Require units be oriented to the street**

  Current proposed standards with requirement for no unit to be behind street-facing units, causes concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</td>
<td>U-RH-2.5 929-931 E 23rd Avenue (Bob H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Design Tools**

- Require units be oriented to the street
  - I did not look at corner lots, but my opinion is the proposed and existing rules are acceptable. The side view would be a larger structure, probably a gap and a smaller structure (garage). In any event, the rear 35% is protected with a 19ft height limit.

- Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH/TH (12'/18')
  - Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:
    - Additional side setback when units face the side
    - Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
    - Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
### PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-RH-2.5 929-931 E 23rd Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Building Design Tools**

  - Require units be oriented to the street
On the evening of September 7, 2017, the City of Denver hosted a Community Open House to review the proposed solutions to address slot home development for the Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project. The purpose of the open house was to ask the community, “does the proposed solutions solve the problem?” (as described in the problem statement)

Over 40 community members attended the workshop in central Denver, including Councilman Rafael Espinoza and 5 other members of the Slot Home Task Force. The Department of Community Planning and Development promoted the event with a special edition newsletter and notified Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs). The Task Force engaged with their community to invite interested members of the public.

Open house comments generally expressed support for the proposed solutions to address slot home development and generally agreed that the proposed solutions were addressing the problem statement.

The Open House began with a welcome and presentation by City staff. The presentation (online on the project website) addressed:

- Project Scope
- Existing Conditions (definition of slot home, problem identification statement, criteria for successful solutions)
- Proposed solutions for mixed use, multi-unit, and row house zone districts

Following the presentation, the attendees were directed to participate in the open house. The open house consisted of 16 different boards (online on the project website) with content related to the project background, existing and proposed outcome for the different zone districts. Attendees were encouraged to move throughout the room and provide comments and engage in discussion with other attendees and staff members.

In addition to the open house activities, individual worksheets were provided to all open house participants to submit additional comments and feedback. Comments provided via way of the worksheet have been integrated into the comment summary and are provided in the written comments received.

**Key comments and themes are summarized below:**

The majority of comments provided were related to the proposed zoning tools within the proposed solutions.

- Support for **orienting the units to the streets** which is a big improvement that is in alignment with neighborhood character. Disallowing side-ways unit orientation in the rear of the lot should be explored.
- Requiring an **entry feature** is very important. It is important for these features to create usable space that can contribute to the ownership of the space. Minimum size requirements might be appropriate.
- Support for a **primary street setback** with some concern that a 10’ primary street setback was insufficient to create the appropriate transition of public to private space.
- Strong support for reducing the **building height in feet**, additional interest in exploring other tools that address mass and scale.
- Support to **reduce the vehicular drive aisle** width and limit visibility of the vehicle use areas.
- The **increased side setback** was seen as an effective tool to address impact to neighbors. Interest in applying this standard to mixed use districts in addition to multi unit.
- Support to **remove the garden court building form** in the row house districts as the intent and outcome (even with changes proposed in the moratorium) are still inconsistent for the district and neighborhood character.
• Additional tools such as upper story setback, materials, transparency and articulation were noted by the community as topics to explore.

Additional comments were received that related to broader city-wide topics:
• Landscaping standards in the right-of-way
• Accommodating density in a growing city
• Misalignment with existing zone districts (mapping) and existing built form

Following the Open House segment of the meeting, staff, task force members and attendees were provided the opportunity to report back to the entire group of participants. The following are key comments shared to the group during the report back:
• Support for the units oriented to the street
• Some levels of concern about the side-way units and mass still allowed to the rear of the zone lot
• Support for the primary street setback, with interest in exploring a larger dimension
• Support for “meaningful” entry features on the front of the building, concern over allowances on the side interior.

At the conclusion of the meeting, city staff encouraged the public to stay engaged throughout the process moving forward. Methods for continued public engagement include:
• Upcoming open office hours – opportunity for members of the community to talk with staff to provide input and received answers to questions.
• Task Force Meetings – All open to the public, agendas are posted to the website 7 days prior
• RNOs and Community Meetings – City Staff will come to RNO and other community meetings as requested
• Slot Home Website – All meeting summaries and content will be posted to the website
• Slot Home Newsletter – Sign-up to receive updates and notice of upcoming meetings
All written comments received are provided below:

The following comments include those made on sticky-notes on the poster board as well as comments made on the worksheet. Staff comments have been added in **underlined italic.**

**Comments specific to proposed tools:**

Require Unit Orientation to the Street
- Facing the street helps a lot
- Street orientation is good for the neighborhood. It provides the density and additional housing without the negative effect to the street and others.
- This can blend well with single family homes and apartment buildings. (same comments as MX) for pushing the pulling the envelopments.
- Side facing = disruption of street rhythm
- Support for requiring the front entry orientation to the street

Require an entry feature (porch, patio, canopy) for units oriented to the street
- What constitutes an entry feature? How does this not become a judgement call?
- Require some size minimum for stoop/porch entry feature
- Porches should be deep to encourage a chair and should have a roof like a real porch!
- Porch is very important
- Balcony in front setback (encroachment)
- Add in standards for entry feature
- Railing or edging better for people using it, sense of community
- Porches and patios need to be a functional and meaningful size.
- Front porches are artificial solutions to public realm engagement fir front door and porch simply leads to a stairway. Create real townhomes facing streets
- Promote front porches around the city- don’t count it against lot coverage in all zone districts (building coverage is not a proposed standard for the urban townhouse, In other districts where building coverage apply, a front porch is exempt up to 400 sq ft for each dwelling unit)

Primary Street Setback
- Mixed use areas are not all at 0’ setbacks like most slot homes
- Propose 5’ front setback instead of 10’, encourage street interaction
- Is 10’ enough of a setback to be consistent with the character?
- Maybe 10’ setback is not enough
- No tiger pits in front setback (couple examples in Curtis park)
- No more than 4 stairs up to front entrance
- It helps, it improves the presence of the street with requiring street facing front doors and requiring a setback to allow for a more pedestrian scale and a “front yard” landscape look. However, it does not solve for the dramatic shift in height or character imposed on the neighborhood.
- Much better engagement, mass/scale

Reduce Building Height in Feet and Revise Height Exceptions
- Yes to reduced building heights!
- Buildings are still bulky, plus the rooftop “hats” are still as issue
- Building height reductions help al lot with the mass and scale
- Mass and scale is still off
- Reduce height is a good idea
- Limit stair enclosure size
- Roof top access
- Much better engagement/scale/mass
- I think these ideas are headed in the right direction as far as facing the street. Seeing the doghouse/stair enclosure back from the primary street and forcing a setback for the units in the rear of the development.
- Use operable skylights instead of stair enclosures
- Stair enclosure (require) windows

Reduce Drive Aisle Width
- Have you considered reducing the drive aisle width? Yes. The drive aisle width is proposed to reduce from 23’ to 18’.
- Want to make sure that off-street parking is still available. Current off-street parking would still apply
- 23’ is too wide for drive aisle– people just park in it. Its good to reduce it
- Study the encroachment of the drive aisle into the side setback
- I wonder if some of these solutions consider “realistically” sided units and wonder if there is any way of reducing the areas dedicated to vehicular transit, perhaps by reducing the drive aisle width, wish we could rezone more lots for higher density. Drive aisle width is proposed to be reduced form 23’ to 18’.
- Love the no-visible drive lanes.

Increase side interior setback
- Impacts on neighboring properties by site entered units is a big concern and allowing balconies on the side would make it worse. The current proposal would only allow single story (ground floor) porches, canopies and drive aisles to encroach.
- Study the encroachment of the drive aisle into the side setback
- Side setbacks in back units is fabulous for the owners and neighbors
- Side setback is a big help to owners and neighbors, sunlight gets in to each unit
- Side setback for back units is very important, it offers the opportunity to create community
- The setbacks at the side are appropriate.
- Don’t put unit access on the exterior of the lot, consider a garden court type interior access.
- The setbacks at the side are appropriate.
- Side setbacks are important to avoid adverse impacts to adjacent homes

Remove the Garden Court building form in RH/TH zone districts:
- Big improvement, glad garden court is gone.
- Garden court should no longer be allowed in the code!!! The garden courts current in the pipeline are abominations. No gardens, no courts, not even enough parking. Too dense.
- If done right, garden courts could be a good outcome
- Specific intent of the row house district does not include garden court. Completely wrong to have allowed the slot home/garden court
- Support for design and minimum width requirements with the Garden Court moratorium

Additional tools proposed by the community:
- Design standards & Materials
- Building materials are not character appropriate
- Increase transparency on upper levels to show “front of home”
- Architectural standards need to be added. Add quality and type of materials. Need for building articulation and depth and reveals rather than just a material.
- Still not compelling articulation?
- More articulation, don’t want flat surfaces
- Articulation?
- Incentivize the use of similar materials for the rest of the neighborhood
- Articulation and variety of materials, and colors on the façade
- It doesn’t go far enough: delineation of stories, window alignment, parapets should not be uses as railings for rooftop use.
Upper Story setback?
Can there be a reduced upper floor area, or setbacks on the upper floors?
What about setbacks at the street facing upper floors?

Other general Comments:

- Proposed solutions are Big improvement over what is now allowed
- Make sure we have protected district standards. Protected districts standards currently apply and would be maintained in the proposed urban townhouse.
- Can you still have parking here? (point to the first level of the unit) Parking located within the building is limited by the existing active use standard.
- (site drawing) Illustrating site plan with not side facing units
- How does solution work without combining lots? Proposed solution can still occur on small lots (approx. 50’ in width)
- Slot home are not an appropriate building form in MX districts, should be eliminated from the zone district
- This isn’t really an apartment form, shouldn’t there be interior access
- MU district form should be a series of row houses and another series of row houses, not side ways facing
- No more river rock
- Enforcement of exterior landscape maintenance with owners won’t do what is needed
- Good to treat multi-unit differently than mixed use
- I struggle with the contextual vehicular accommodation. In most urban districts, before these building types could encourage alternate means of transportation. I agree with the height restrictions, but disagree with the side loaded units not requiring to be set back (in MX districts)
- On the right track with unit orientation and encroachments
- A mixed use district should not be comprised on only urban townhomes which is 100% residential. This building form works only if there are other buildings/parcels that contain commercial and/or office uses. We are getting blocks of slot homes resulting in single use areas which contradicts the intent of mixed use districts.
- The quality of the construction and fit for the neighboring structures will be a major effect on wither it works.
- Solutions mostly address street side but not the impacts to properties on either side of the slot home lot
- (Developer) my proposed projects are aligned with the options
- Developer rights vest too early. Multiple examples exist where development rights vest and there can be 2,3,or 4 years before construction begins. Creates limbo for neighbors
Meeting Objectives:

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

Task Force Members in Attendance: Nathan Adams, Dave Berton, Enrico Cacciorini, Scott Chomiak, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Jane Crisler, Christine Franck, Heather Noyes, Sarah Kaplan, Councilman Wayne New, Melissa Rummel Not in Attendance: Anna Cawrse Don Elliot, Maggie Miller, Ty Mumford, CPD Staff: Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Morgan Gardner

I. Opening Discussion

At the start of the meeting, the task force members raised a question about timing and effect of the adopted standards with specific concern for existing projects under review. Among the reactions and concerns:

- It’s important to know which projects – started under an assumption that the code as it stands today would govern their project – can be grandfathered
- Developers know, or should know that their projects have to change and should be creating projects that resonate with the problem statement and anticipate the changes we’ve been talking about
- We shouldn’t allow the problem to continue
- Developers who have paid their site development fee and are waiting in line should be able to work under the rules that existed when they filed their plans
- We need to consider those who don’t know that this task force exists or that the rules are going to change
- Should developers withhold new applications until they know what the new rules will be?
- Should we continue to let projects start the process if we don’t know if they are going to meet the requirements?
- Developers have purchased land and invested in plans and processing under the assumption of the current rules; we need to understand the implications for those projects
- We need to understand what the legal standards and the legal ramifications as we set the cut-off for projects that proceed under the existing code
- The task force will return to this question in a future meeting

II. Garden Court Building Form

Staff reminded the task force of the information they presented in the July Task Force meeting about the garden court building form. Staff highlighted the intent statement for the RH and TH zone districts as well as specific plan guidance for the areas where RH zoning has been used to implement plans. The task force discussion included the following:

- It’s good to see this question in the context of the language of the problem statement and in relationship to intent statements
- The true Garden Court building form has lived its day and it’s gone; that kind of design can’t be implemented today
- It may no longer be feasible to build a true garden court except at the edges of the city where land costs could make it possible.
- It may be possible to allow the building form in the row house zone districts but eliminate those parts of the building form standards that allow the garden court to become a slot home
- Not generally in favor of eliminating the diversity of housing options in each zone district – this would mean that RH zones would be limited to single-family homes, duplexes or row houses with no options for apartments to be rented
- Eliminating the Garden Court form in Row House zone districts aligns the intent of the district with the allowable forms.
- This is the right solution for the RH and TH zone districts.
- It’s important to remember that we are talking about a very tiny fraction of the city, on the order of 2% of the residential land
- **The task force agreed to remove garden court from the RH and TH zones**

### III. Row House Building Form

The task force reviewed the definition of a “row house” considering how to interpret the idea that all row house units must face the street and not have units located behind other units. Their discussion included the following:
- Need to increase rear yard setbacks. Secondary problem with the Row House form in districts that typically have back yards is it goes against the neighborhood context
- It is an improvement to go from 4 units that are 15 feet wide to 3 units that are 30 feet wide. Is this an improvement?
- The existing outcome (with units that are behind one another and with entrances that are staggered) is acceptable, and if a builder creates a mirrored set of buildings on the next lot, it creates a Garden Court
- We need to test the zone lot size
- If row houses must all align at the front (with no unit tucked behind any other), we create an incentive for a series of duplex buildings with one unit tucked behind the other
- This is about the definition of the row house – true row houses are next to each other and not staggered forward and back
- Can any portion of one unit be allowed behind any portion of another?
- Can we just set standards for the front door so that the doors all align? The build-to requirement could do this
- **The task force agreed that the standards of the row house building form should align with the expected outcome of side-by-side units oriented to the street.**

- A member of the group noted that the Row House isn’t the only instance of calling something by one name when it is actually something else. For example, townhomes are built under the apartment form despite the fact that they do not have any of the attributes of an apartment building.

### IV. Upcoming Public Meeting

The members of the task force noted that the success of the upcoming public meeting depends on being able to explain the proposed changes carefully but without getting into the potentially confusing intricacies of the code language.
The discussion was as follows:

- We have to remember that the public doesn’t deal with the nuances of the code language that some of us deal with every day
- What we call something, and what can be built under each zone district needs to be readily understood and predictable.
- Staff should select the photographs carefully so that the public meeting doesn’t create any false impression of what the results will be

V. Improvements to the Draft Strategies Prior to Testing

The task force considered whether the strategies employed thus far – requiring that units face the street, increasing the front setback, requiring entry features for entrances, reducing height in feet, increasing a side interior setback, changing the location for ‘dog houses’ and rooftop decks – were sufficient to give the staff and testing group explore through testing. The discussion included the following:

Setback

- By pushing the façade back, you are getting more of a livable, accessible street
- Transition zone needs more space
- The amount of space needed in the transition zone depends on how much space is already part of the public realm
- There is also a measurement question – are we working from the property line or from the street edge? In some cases, there is additional public right-of-way, beyond the curb edge that creates a satisfactory transition zone
- If the city mandates that you have to plant street trees and shrubs, perhaps the setback can be smaller – the quality of the space is important, not just its dimension, and cobble doesn’t cut it
- Staff needs to continue to work with public works and forestry to make these improvements
- 10 feet from the sidewalk is very different from 10 feet from the property line
- **Staff agreed to explore these comments with the testing group.**

Decrease Vehicle Parking area dimensions

- We have not gone far enough – the code would still allow the entire ground floor to be used for parking
- We are still providing a way to build slot houses with the current draft – there are units behind other units in areas where the neighborhood context is far lower density
- Staff is focused on the problem statement and the ways to address the units facing the street because that is what affects the neighborhood character most – density questions are questions for Denveright and the city-wide plan update
- **The task force agreed that reducing the dimensions is the right approach**

Defining a New Form

- We need to know whether we are creating a new building form
- Will our work result in a form called Slot Home?
- Is this a new building form or only an arrangement of forms that already have a definition?
- We need a name for the form of a single building and the arrangement of multiple buildings
- Then, once a form is named and created, we have to go through the zone districts and decide which districts are appropriate for the form
- **Staff are considering whether to create a new form and what it might be called**

**VI. Multi-Unit District - Strategy**

**Revise block-sensitive setback**

- In some areas, the block-sensitive setback is too large and we want more street activation
- 20 feet is too far from the edge of sidewalk
- This is a different context than in MX so a greater setback is still appropriate
- Again, we need to be specific about whether the setback is measured from the sidewalk or the property line
- The task force agreed to accept the staff recommendation that limits the block-sensitive setback to 20' in MU zone districts and to test measuring from the inside edge of the improved sidewalk.

**Revising side setback**

- If we increase the setback on the side where there are building entrances (so that we reduce impact on adjacent neighbors and create more substantial entrances), can we put the drive aisle on the other side in that side setback? We may have to in order to make the buildings work
- Or we can reduce the size of the setback on the other side
- Increasing the setback for entrances on the side is necessary but there should be give and take on the size
- The task force agreed to present the larger side setback in the public meeting and make it part of the testing

**Increase build-to percentage**

- We have to deal with parcels that have no alley and, as a result, have a front drive aisle
- Our draft doesn’t address the problem of the tall, continuous façade
- We haven’t addressed the issue of the impact to the neighbors
- **Staff agreed to explore these comments with the testing group.**

**VII. Testing and Next Steps**

- Public Meeting on September 7th, 5:30, Colorado Health Foundation
- Testing begins now – we need task force members to run tests and explore the questions posed by the task force
- Results in the October 19th meeting from 2-5pm