

**Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment Task Force
Summary – Meeting 5 – June 20, 2017**

Meeting Objectives:

- Review Staff Recommended Strategy for Mixed Use and Main Street districts
- Confirm the Strategy for the Mixed Use and Main Street Districts
- Discuss the Need for Additional Tools

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

I. Staff Presentation

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

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

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

Staff provided an overview of the previously confirmed primary tools:

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

Staff presented the existing outcome for a U-MX-3 zone district in the general building form and then presented four strategy options for review, including the staff recommendation. The staff recommendation included the application of the following tools:

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

II. Task Force Discussion

The Task Force discussion included the following:

- Need to think about how these apply to a corner lot with a primary and secondary street
- Concerns over a dead zone where the vehicle access dead ends
- The staff recommendation is a good option that maintains density
- There are more developments with one car parking which is no longer seen as problematic
- Confirmation that this outcome is compatible with the character of the neighborhood
- It's hard to know if mass and scale is addressed until we get into the specifics of building height
- Pitched roofs should not be excluded when discussing building height
- Need for clarification on the existing active use standards (difference between MX & MS)
Q: Are other standards such as bulk plane still in consideration (more specific to residential districts)? A: Yes, everything in the report 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes will be considered in future meetings.
Q: What is the primary street setback amount? A: A standard dimension is used for all models; however, the specific standard will be detailed in future meetings.

The task force concluded that the staff recommended strategy option was the correct option to pursue further for MX, RX, and MS districts.

III. Overview of Additional Tools

Staff provided an overview to the application of the following additional tools:

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

IV. Break Out Discussion

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

Group 1:

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

Group 2:

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

Group 3:

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

Summary of general consensus:

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

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