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I. INTRODUCTION

The Boulevard Plan outlines a vision, goals and objectives for future development along South Colorado Boulevard between 1st Avenue and Iliff, generally encompassing the commercially zoned land which has frontage along the street (See Figure 1). In addition to establishing an overall vision and goals, the Plan identifies individual projects and actions recommended to achieve them and the next step that should be taken to implement those recommendations.

The development of this plan is recommended in the Comprehensive Plans of both Denver and Glendale. The Boulevard Plan supplements Denver’s and Glendale’s Comprehensive Plans, as well as the Cherry Creek Neighborhood Plan and other adopted sub-area and functional plans. All of these plans address various aspects of future development along Colorado Boulevard--however, the Boulevard Plan focuses on the unique, inter-related problems and opportunities in this area.

The Boulevard Plan has been developed jointly by the cities of Glendale and Denver, with significant input from a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) which included area businesses, neighborhood representatives and elected officials.

The Plan report is organized into six sections. This, the first section, briefly describes the plan context. The second section presents the overall vision and goals which drive the plan and summarizes the key plan recommendations. The third section focuses on transportation. It describes the background for the transportation recommendations, and presents each transportation recommendation in detail. The fourth section describes in general terms how the plan’s land use recommendations were derived and includes a description of them. The fifth section includes development criteria for public and private development along Colorado Boulevard. The six section describes the implementation process.
FIGURE 1
Potential Implementation Study Area Boundaries
II. PLAN SUMMARY

A. Vision
The "vision" statement for the planning area describes its desired role and how it is intended to function.

This portion of South Colorado Boulevard is, and should continue to be, a regionally distinct transportation, business and residential corridor accommodating a wide range of development types and sizes which serve the shopping, business and entertainment needs of nearby residents, as well as providing destination opportunities for a wider community.

While serving as a gateway to the cities of Glendale and Denver and the Cherry Creek area, Colorado Boulevard will provide for functional and efficient traffic flow both within and though the corridor. There will be a growing role for transit and a more friendly and safe environment for pedestrians.

Higher standards of both public and private urban design will create a positive human-scale image and a cohesiveness which will distinguish "the Boulevard" from typical strip commercial areas, while retaining the separate identities of Glendale and Denver. Design considerations will reinforce the integrity of adjacent residential area by enhancing their privacy and livability.

B. Goals
The goals and objectives provide direction for actions that should be taken to realize the vision. Denver and Glendale, as well as private property owners, businesses and community groups should cooperate to achieve this vision by:

a.) Improving traffic flow and safety;
b.) Taking action to retain a broad mix of land uses that are a good neighbor to existing uses;
c.) Defining and reinforcing the unique image of the corridor and ensuring that new development has little or no adverse impacts on adjacent uses.

Each goal addresses a specific area of concern: transportation, land use, and urban design. These three areas of concern were identified early in the process as being the most important ones on which to focus. A variety of individual actions has been recommended to achieve these goals.
C. Recommendations Summary
As noted, the recommendations are organized into three categories. The recommendations in each category are summarized in Table 1. A detailed discussion of each recommendation is presented later in the report.

Table 1. Recommendations and Action Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>NEXT STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intersection Improvement Program</td>
<td>1. Alameda Design in 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Include in Future CIPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Key Bottleneck Studies</td>
<td>1. Monitor Volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pedestrian/Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>1. Accommodate in Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recognize in Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Refer to Bike Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transit</td>
<td>1. Complete Evans, Mississippi, &amp; Alameda Shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Prioritize Other Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Recognize in Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Monitor Use Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Plan for Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>1. Pursue Regional Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation Management Association Task Force</td>
<td>1. Establish in 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Coordinate Transit/Rideshare Promotion in 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NEXT STEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall Development Cap</td>
<td>1. Recognize in Rezoning Application Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Land Use Mix</td>
<td>1. Recognize in Rezoning Application Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Work with Large Project Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On-Site Parking</td>
<td>1. Recognize in Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Update Requirements Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN DESIGN: PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sidewalk Standard</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Street Trees</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continue Glendale Program &amp; Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Street Lighting</td>
<td>1. Develop Lighting Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continue Glendale Program &amp; Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>1. Complete Evans, Mississippi, &amp; Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continue Glendale Program &amp; Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Boulevard Median</td>
<td>1. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Left Turn Demand Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Local Street Medians</td>
<td>1. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Contact/Assist Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NEXT STEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>URBAN DESIGN: PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parking Lot Screening/Entry Medians</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Front Setback and Landscaping</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Building Entrance Orientation</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Upper Level Setback</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develop Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maximum Height Limitation</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Architectural Treatment on All Sides</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NEXT STEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN DESIGN: SIGNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rear Buffers &amp; Screen/Alley Access</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Service Area Screening</td>
<td>1. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Incorporate in New Corridor Development Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Compatible Sign Codes</td>
<td>1. Joint Follow-Up Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Update Zoning Citywide to Require Sign Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ground Mounted Signs</td>
<td>1. Identify Required Implementation Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Building Mounted Signs</td>
<td>1. Identify Required Implementation Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Billboards</td>
<td>1. Identify Required Implementation Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use in Development Review as Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Implementation Overview

A variety of steps will be taken to implement the plan. Many of the land use and urban design recommendations will require amendments to the ordinances and regulations that guide private development. Some of those can be adopted on a corridor-specific basis, others will require changes in requirements that apply on a citywide basis. Additional, more detailed studies may be required in some cases before specific changes can be formulated. Once the development requirements are changed, new projects built along the Boulevard will have to comply with those changes. The specific recommendations will be put in place as individual properties along the Boulevard continue to redevelop. Thus, it will be a long time before all development along the Boulevard is consistent with these recommendations.

The CAC also strongly suggested that any future redevelopment proposals should be encouraged to be submitted as Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning. This would allow the specific applicable elements of this plan to be written into a binding, site specific development plan.

Many of the transportation recommendations will be implemented over time as capital funds become available to make improvements. Adopting the plan does not guarantee that the funds will be available. However, the plan does serve as the basis for funding requests, and projects recommended in formally adopted plans often have priority over those that are not. Funds for transportation projects can be sought from a variety of sources, including local funds from Denver and Glendale, and state and federal funds administered by the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the Denver Regional Council of Governments. Even so, implementation of all of the projects recommended in this plan, even under the most favorable of funding circumstances, is expected to take ten to twenty years.

Finally, though formal adoption of the plan is an expression of the community’s shared vision and goals for this area, many of the recommendations are consistent with, or extensions of, current practice, and will be implemented on that basis. For example, new developments are already required to provide acceleration-deceleration lanes and sidewalks. Also, Denver has successfully sought funding assistance from the Denver Regional Council of Governments to develop a detailed traffic signal retiming program. They have also successfully sought funding from the Colorado Department of Transportation to repave a significant portion of the Boulevard within the study area. However, this plan will only strengthen and broaden the scope of the community wide effort to improve Colorado Boulevard.
III. TRANSPORTATION

The transportation-related goal is to improve traffic flow and safety on the Boulevard. This goal includes several important objectives. They are:

a.) Reduce "pressure" for Colorado Boulevard traffic to divert to parallel streets which cannot and should not be expanded, such as Holly, Monaco and University.

b.) Improve accessibility to commercial development along the street in Denver and Glendale and in the Cherry Creek area.

c.) Support development objectives for other areas, such as the Hale Parkway Hospital District area served by Colorado Boulevard, by improving conditions for through traffic.

There is no single solution for traffic problems on Colorado Boulevard. Even preventing conditions from becoming worse than they are today will require a complex and expensive series of coordinated projects and policies.

A. Current and Future Conditions

South Colorado Boulevard has long been an important transportation artery as well as a magnet for development. It currently experiences significant congestion and there is a concern that, as growth continues, the current situation may become significantly worse.

Traffic congestion can have an adverse effect on air quality, safety and convenience. Growing congestion levels may also force increasing amounts of traffic off of Colorado Boulevard and onto secondary streets in residential areas. At some point, traffic congestion levels may lead to disinvestment in the corridor, with consequent ramifications on individual businesses, tax base and the provision of services to the adjacent residential community, as well as to a decrease in the attractiveness of the area’s residential neighborhoods.

Current Travel Times and Level of Service

Objective traffic congestion level measurements have been developed and are used consistently throughout the country. Congestion is described in terms of Level-of-Service (LOS). There are six LOS letter grades; "A" is the least congested, and "F" the most. LOS "F" represents a level of delay which has been found to be unacceptable to most drivers. Generally, LOS "D" is viewed as acceptable in the peak hour.

Current traffic Levels of Service (LOS) for Colorado Boulevard on an overall basis through the study area are summarized in Table 2. As can be seen, the worst overall condition is southbound in the afternoon rush hour, when LOS is in a D/E range. Conditions in both directions at noontime are LOS D, and are significantly worse than in the morning rush hour.
Table 2. 1990 Travel Speeds and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Direction</th>
<th>AM SB</th>
<th>Peak SB</th>
<th>AM NB</th>
<th>Peak NB</th>
<th>Noon SB</th>
<th>Noon NB</th>
<th>PM SB</th>
<th>Peak SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed (MPH)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/E</td>
<td>C/B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the peak hour delay on Colorado Boulevard is caused by intersection congestion--traffic between the intersections tends to move along well. Levels of Service at the individual intersections are actually worse than the overall Levels of Service described above. The current, estimated Level of Service at major intersections in the corridor is summarized in Table 3. As can be seen, all of the major intersections are currently functioning at or below LOS D.

Table 3. Estimated Intersection Level-of-Service 1990 PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Drive/South</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Drive/North</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayaud</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Sources
Traffic demand levels associated with South Colorado Boulevard area development were calculated for the recent Southeast Quadrant Study, and that basic data was also used for this analysis. As travel demand on Colorado is affected by more than just the immediately adjacent development, the area included in these calculations is bounded by 1st/Alameda on the north, Evans on the south, Monaco on the east and University on the west.

A computer model was used to analyze where traffic on Colorado Boulevard is generally coming from and going to. The largest traffic source is development in the general vicinity of Colorado Boulevard. The computer model indicated that about 75% of the traffic on Colorado Boulevard has either an origin or a destination within the influence area. (This traffic is referred to as external-internal traffic in Figure 2.) However, only about 5% of the traffic on Colorado Boulevard has both an origin and a destination in this area (internal-internal traffic). The balance of the traffic on Colorado Boulevard, about 20%, has both an origin and destination somewhere
outside the study area (external-external traffic), although still generally within sections of southeast Denver. The actual percentage breakdowns from several key sources are summarized below.

FIGURE 2

TRAFFIC DEMAND CATEGORIES PROPORTIONS

These sources indicate that this section of Colorado Blvd. plays a relatively minor role in carrying through-traffic. Most of the traffic is related to destinations along the roadway. This has important implications on the needs for acceleration/deceleration lanes, left turn lanes, and access/curb cuts.

Figure 3 indicates the classification of roadways in the vicinity of the study area as recommended in the Southeast Quadrant Plan.

FIGURE 3

STREET CLASSIFICATIONS

The streets and roadways in the Southeast Quadrant collectively function as a land access and mobility system. Of the estimated 810 miles of street and roadways in the Southeast Quadrant, approximately 105 miles (13%) are primarily devoted to traffic movement or mobility. These facilities are typically referred to as arterials and include both regional freeway facilities such as I-25 and high volume streets such as Broadway, Colorado Boulevard and Hampden Avenue. The remaining street
Table 4. Transportation Demand Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% Change 1985-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>67,900</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Trips</td>
<td>456,000</td>
<td>696,400</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>331,200</td>
<td>484,200</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mileages are primarily devoted to serving direct land access and local traffic movements within neighborhoods and activity centers. These streets are typically referred to as collectors and local streets.

Table 4 summarizes the total amount of travel demand generated by development in the influence area. Of course, not all of this traffic utilizes Colorado Boulevard as the area is also served by other streets. It should also be noted that some traffic that is on Colorado is through traffic.

**Peak and Off-Peak Traffic Levels**

The difference between peak hour conditions and off-peak conditions is much less on South Colorado Boulevard than it is on many arterials. Because of the mixed use, intense character of development along Colorado, and its several traffic-carrying roles, demand is significant throughout the day and the noon-hour is almost as busy as the afternoon rush hour.

Many arterial streets also have a pronounced directional imbalance. This is less true on Colorado Boulevard, although traffic is somewhat heavier northbound in the AM Peak and southbound in the PM Peak. During the noon peak, traffic is more balanced. These characteristics are summarized in Figures 4 and 5 for two representative locations.

**Safety**

Traffic safety issues were examined in detail in a previous study of the Boulevard. That study concluded: "...Colorado Boulevard is fairly typical of urban arterials regarding the rate of accident occurrence." No new specific safety-related problem areas are known to have surfaced since this last study. The previous study found that the highest accident locations were at the intersections of Colorado and Cherry Creek South Drive, Cherry Creek North Drive, Bayaud/Leetsdale, and 1st Avenue. The addition of turn lanes and improved signals at these and other locations were recommended in order to improve safety. These improvements have been made at Cherry Creek North and South Drives.
TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Figure 4
North of Exposition Ave.

Figure 5
North of Mexico Ave.
Largely as a result of that previous study, the Colorado Department of Transportation and the City of Denver have recently initiated a program to rebuild and modernize most traffic signals along Colorado Boulevard in order to improve safety.

**Future Volumes**

It is also helpful to have some sense of how much worse problems may get, and how quickly. Demand has continued to grow on Colorado Boulevard since it was first developed, and all indications are that demand growth will continue. The Southeast Quadrant (SEQ) Study projected that employment in the influence area would increase by about forty-four percent between the mid-1980s and 2010, and the number of households in the area would increase by about one-third.

The SEQ transportation system model was used to do a detailed analysis of possible future traffic levels on Colorado Boulevard in the study area. The model analysis suggests that traffic may grow at an even faster rate in the next twenty years than it has in the past.

Table 5 summarizes current traffic volumes at several locations and the projected likely range of Year 2010 volumes assuming, at the low end, a continuation of past trends and, at the high end, the levels projected by the model.

It should also be noted that the reopening of the Cherry Creek Shopping Center is expected to affect traffic volumes in the area. Actual levels may vary greatly in the initial months, but several months after the center opens, it is expected that traffic generation levels will stabilize to levels that were anticipated in the long range projections, as well as in short range plans for improvements in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Average Daily Traffic*</th>
<th>Projected Year 2010 Daily Traffic Volume Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of Alameda</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52 -- 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Exposition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77 -- 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Mississippi</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67 -- 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Mexico</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86 -- 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of I-25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50 -- 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RRepresents various weekday counts taken in 1988, 1989 or 1990.
B. Transportation Improvement Considerations
A variety of strategies for reducing congestion on Colorado Boulevard were considered and are discussed in general terms. The specific action recommendations are discussed in section III-C.

Transportation System Management Alternatives
Transportation System Management (TSM) actions include lower-cost, shorter-range measures to incrementally improve traffic flow. Much of the traffic congestion along Colorado Boulevard is due to congestion at intersections; the first two strategies apply to intersections. The third strategy is aimed at reducing traffic conflicts between intersections.

Signalization Modifications
Traffic flow can sometimes be improved by revising signal coordination and adjusting individual signal cycles to better reflect current demand patterns. However, at some of the busiest intersections, there may simply be too much traffic relative to the number of lanes, and no amount of signal adjustment will eliminate all delay.

Intersection Modifications
In situations where signal adjustments alone are not sufficient to reduce delay significantly, the addition of lanes can be considered—though there are practical limits to the number of lanes that can be added at a given intersection. Also, along Colorado Boulevard, such projects can be very expensive due to the need to acquire new right-of-way in heavily built-up areas.

Acceleration-Deceleration Lanes and Access Points
Traffic flow between intersections can be inhibited by traffic slowing down to make right turns or speeding up after making a right turn onto Colorado from private driveways or intersecting streets. These conflicts can be reduced by providing a separate acceleration-deceleration lane for turning vehicles.

Long Range Roadway Capacity Alternatives
Longer range, higher cost alternatives for adding capacity or improving traffic flow were also considered.

New Through Lanes
The capacity of Colorado Boulevard, or of parallel facilities, could be increased by adding new through lanes. However, with the exception of I-25, Parker/Leetsdale and sections of Quebec, such alternatives were not recommended in the current, adopted Southeast Quadrant Plan and were therefore not considered in this analysis.

Building Grade-Separated Intersections
When signal timing modifications and turn lane additions are still not sufficient to eliminate excessive intersection congestion, it may be appropriate to consider a
grade-separation, i.e., taking one or more movements over or under the primary surface intersection.

Traffic Demand Management Alternatives
Traffic Demand Management (TDM) actions are aimed at reducing peak period automobile traffic levels. The several different TDM measures that were considered include the following:

Ridesharing
Ridesharing refers to carpooling or vanpooling. Ridesharing can be promoted in different ways, including site-specific measures or areawide programs. A spot check of over 500 vehicles in the corridor indicates that current average vehicle occupancy is about 1.05 persons per car for work trips and 1.3 persons per car for all trips. It is unlikely that significant increases in these occupancy levels can be achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#40/Colorado</td>
<td>Crosstown</td>
<td>Every 10 Minutes (Peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every 15 Minutes (Mid-Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every 30 Minutes (Evening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2/1st Avenue</td>
<td>Hilltop-Cherry Creek-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 30 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3/Alameda</td>
<td>Aurora-Cherry Creek-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 20 Minutes (Peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every 30 Minutes (Off-peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5/Buchtel</td>
<td>U. Hills-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 30 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21/Evans</td>
<td>Aurora-DU-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 30 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46 Limited</td>
<td>Glendale-Cherry Creek-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 20 Minutes (Peak Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#79/83 Limited</td>
<td>Nine Mile-Cherry Creek-Downtown</td>
<td>Every 16 Minutes (Peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every Hour (Off-Peak)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
without "proactive" steps by the public and private sectors working together to continually promote and support carpool programs.

Transit
Colorado Blvd. already enjoys relatively good transit service. (See Table 6.) The average number of people getting on or off buses along Colorado Boulevard in the study area on a weekday in 1990 was about 3,500. A majority of these riders use RTD Route 40, which is the main route serving Colorado Blvd.. The most heavily utilized stops were at Alameda, Mississippi and Evans. As is the case with ridesharing, increases in transit use are unlikely to occur without proactive steps by the public and private sectors to encourage such a trend.

Walking and Bicycling
A small but important portion of the travel demand along Colorado Boulevard can be met by walking. For example, a significant number of lunch-hour trips appear to be taken on foot. In addition, the convenience of making trips on foot is an important part of using transit, as people must walk to and from bus stops.

Only a small number of bicyclists were observed on Colorado Boulevard itself and it appears that, for the most part, bicycling does not play a significant role in meeting travel demand in the corridor. However, it is viewed as important to ensure that bicycle travel in the area generally is as convenient as possible and is safely accommodated.

Trip Reduction
Employers can reduce trips by implementing continuing programs to actively promote and encourage the use of alternatives to the single-occupant automobile. Denver required such a program as a condition for approval of one large project in the corridor.

The evaluation of alternative strategies has led to the proposed recommendations described in detail below.

C. Transportation Recommendations

T-1. Multi-Year Intersection Improvement Program

Description
The multi-year intersection improvement program initially recommended in the 1984 Colorado Boulevard Corridor Study should continue. Only a few of the improvements recommended at that time have been implemented. The improvements generally consist of adding left or right turn lanes at the most congested intersections. Recent analysis suggests that some of the specific improvement recommendations made in 1984 may need to be expanded. The specific needs of each intersection should be determined in a Preliminary Engineering
### Table 7. Recommended Intersection Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY CREEK DR. S.</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Through Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY CREEK DR. N.</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Additional Through Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Through Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAMEDA</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate Right Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYAUD</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Separate Through Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Additional Left Turn Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Analysis for each individual intersection improvement project. The improvements proposed to be considered are identified in Table 7.

The analysis done for this study indicates that the highest priority intersections should be Evans and the Alameda area.

Intended Benefit
Estimated intersection Levels of Service, with and without the improvements and assuming 1990 traffic levels, are summarized in Table 8. If all of the improvements were in place today, the average delay at these intersections would decrease by over 50% and overall peak hour, peak direction travel speed would improve by 20%. However, it will take a number of years to fund and implement these improvements, therefore it may only be possible to more or less keep pace with traffic demand increases—that is, to maintain current overall Levels of Service as traffic continues to increase.

Next Steps
T1-1. Denver, Glendale and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) should continue to program monies to conduct engineering design studies for other identified high-priority locations. Denver Capital Improvement Funds have been designated for design of the Alameda intersection. Denver will request future assistance from the Colorado Department of Transportation for development of a detailed improvement plan for the Colorado and Evans intersection. The design studies should include a community involvement process.

T1-2. On-going funding for this program should be included in the Denver and Glendale Capital Improvement Programs and all possible state and federal funding support should also be sought so that all of the recommended locations can be improved within, at most, the next ten to fifteen years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Intersection LOS, Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated LOS with 1990 PM Peak Volumes, with and without Recommended Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Without Improvements</th>
<th>With Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Drive-South</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Drive-North</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayaud</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-2. Key Bottleneck Studies

Description
The feasibility and desirability of providing grade-separations or similar major improvements in the long-term at Evans and Alameda intersections should also be considered.

The Evans feasibility study should consider the costs and benefits of grade-separations, as well as modifications in the I-25/Colorado and I-25/Evans interchanges.

The feasibility study for Alameda should consider grade separations, as well as the costs and benefits of a new roadway connection from Alameda west of Leetsdale to Cherry Street, in Glendale, as illustrated schematically in Figure 6. Such a connection could relieve demand at several critical bottlenecks along Colorado. The study of this connection must consider the impacts on residential areas east of Colorado Boulevard.

Intended Benefit
The traffic demand projections and future conditions analysis suggest that, even if TSM improvements are made to the Evans and Alameda intersections, congestion could again reach unacceptable levels due to continued demand growth. Specifically, it was found that the recommended first stage improvements at Evans could accommodate a 20-25% increase in traffic over current levels before the Level of Service deteriorates to that which is presently experienced, while the recommended first stage improvements at Alameda could accommodate about a 10-15% increase in traffic. Traffic levels should be monitored at these locations to determine the actual rate of increase that is occurring, but the analysis suggests that growth could approach these levels at both locations in the next ten to fifteen years. The proposed major improvements described above are intended to help preserve the benefits achieved by other projects throughout the corridor.

Next Steps
T2-1. Traffic volumes at Alameda and Evans should be monitored by Denver after the improvements proposed in T-1 are made. At such time as congestion levels, as
measured by average vehicle delay, reach 80% of the "pre-improvement" level, the recommended major improvement feasibility studies should be initiated.

T-3. Traffic Signal Timing Plan

Description
Current signal timing and coordination should be reviewed and revised if warranted. Timing plans should be reviewed periodically on a continuing basis.

Intended Benefit
Analysis done for this plan suggests that adjustments in signal timing and coordination could lead to improved traffic flow at a number of intersections. The overall improvement in intersection Level of Service estimated for T-1, above, assumed that signal timing would be optimized.

Next Steps
T3-1. To determine ideal traffic signal timing it is necessary to take detailed traffic counts at all signalized intersections, analyze timing alternatives and then implement and finetune the preferred plan. Likely modifications include improved signal progression, new signal cycle lengths, addition or deletion of turn arrows, or adjusted green times for individual phases. The detailed study should also take into account pedestrian crossing needs. Denver has already requested the assistance of the Denver Regional Council of Governments in undertaking detailed alternative timing plan analysis. Approved timing plan changes should be implemented upon completion of the study.

T-4. Acceleration-Deceleration/Transit Lane and Curb Cuts

Description
All new development projects along South Colorado Boulevard should continue to be required to provide a right-side acceleration-deceleration (accel./decel.) lane. Dedicated "turn" lanes will also be provided at intersections when they are improved as part of T-1, above. To further minimize traffic conflicts and allow the turn lanes to function as intended, the number of access points to Colorado Boulevard that are allowed with new development should continue to be strictly limited.

The turn lanes can also accommodate buses slowing down or speeding up for bus stops. Bus stops should be located adjacent to accel./decel. lanes to avoid impeding traffic flow in through lanes.

Intended Benefit
These lanes will accommodate traffic slowing down to turn and speeding up after turning onto Colorado from a side street or driveway, so that this lower speed traffic will not unduly impede traffic already on the Boulevard. These lanes are also beneficial because they provide a place for buses to slow down, stop, and speed up
without impeding through traffic. In the long term, as private redevelopment and public intersection improvements projects are undertaken, the turn lane will be continuous, and this could allow a travel time advantage for buses.

**Next Steps**

**T4-1.** Both Denver and Glendale should continue to require dedications of these lanes when new development occurs, and should commit to working closely with individual property owners to develop creative site-design responses to situations in which the requirement to dedicate additional right-of-way significantly increases the complexity of site redevelopment.

**T4-2.** In order to preserve the efficiency of the right turn/transit lane, no increase in the numbers of private access points onto the Boulevard should be allowed. The number of access points associated with new development should be strictly limited.

**T-5. Pedestrian/Bicycle Connections**

**Description**

The construction of sidewalks should continue to be required along S. Colorado Blvd. and intersecting streets as part of all redevelopment projects. Intersection improvement projects should provide a high level of pedestrian protection through the use of highly visible crosswalks (such as "zebra"-style vertical stripes), pedestrian signal indications and appropriate signs. Due to high automobile traffic volumes and limited right-of-way, bicycle travel along Colorado Boulevard itself should not be encouraged, but bike routes should be designated on close-by parallel streets to the east and west. Intersecting bike routes, such as the Cherry Creek bike path, should continue to be improved.

**Intended Benefits**

A small but important proportion of travel demand along Colorado Boulevard can be met by walking and bicycling. For example, a significant number of lunch-hour trips appear to be taken on foot. In addition, the convenience of making trips on foot is an important part of using transit, as people must walk to and from bus stops. The proposed improvements are intended to encourage additional walking and bicycling by enhancing "user" safety and convenience. Combined with the urban design and land use recommendations described below, the opportunities to make a greater number of trips on foot should increase significantly over time.
Next Steps

T5-1. Pedestrian accommodations should be included in the preliminary engineering design studies for intersection improvements recommended in T-1 and at signal reconstruction projects.

T5-2. As part of the development review process, Denver and Glendale should encourage the provision of convenient, direct pedestrian connections between adjacent commercial developments as well as to neighboring residential areas.

T5-3. As part of the development of a Citywide Bike Plan in 1992, Denver’s Bicycle Advisory Committee should, in cooperation with Glendale, designate appropriate bike routes parallel to Colorado Boulevard. Consideration should also be given to projects to widen the sidewalks over Cherry Creek and to provide a new ramp connection between the existing Creek level path and southeast corner of the intersection of Virginia and Colorado Boulevard; and to provide a direct connection between the Cherry Creek and Alameda bikeways. Other possibilities for improving intersecting east-west bike routes may also exist and should be considered.

T-6. Transit

Description
Transit use will be encouraged as an alternative to the single-occupant automobile. The use of the services which already exist should be encouraged, and Denver and Glendale should support plans to provide additional service. Denver and Glendale need to work with the Regional Transportation District (RTD) and others to:

a.) improve accommodations for people getting to and from bus stops,
b.) improve the bus stops themselves,
c.) promote transit use, and
d.) continue to encourage the development of rapid transit in the southeast I-25 corridor, and the provision of upgraded bus service on Colorado Boulevard to complement it.

Intended Benefits
While transit use in the corridor is already significant, comprehensive plans for the area call for doubling existing transit ridership by the Year 2010. Transit use can be encouraged by making access to it more convenient and comfortable. In time, there may be a need to consider the addition of a shuttle bus, running at high frequency between major corridor destinations. In the interim, the Transportation Management Association Task Force recommended below and other appropriate groups should consider the benefits of a comprehensive transit promotion campaign, and/or subsidizing transit use on a on-going or short-term promotional basis. For example, it may be worthwhile for area businesses and retailers to work with RTD to offer free noon-hour transit use to encourage people who work in the corridor to patronize local businesses.
Another way of increasing transit use is to improve the necessary "infrastructure." Currently, many bus stops in the corridor are in areas without sidewalks or with inadequate sidewalks. Observations indicate that many people are uncomfortable about crossing Colorado and some side-streets on foot—which you must do to use transit. Finally, at present there are a minimal number of bus shelters. There are specific recommendations in the urban design section about bus stop area design.

While the level of transit use increase expected as a result of such improvements cannot easily be quantified, these are normal and typical measures which will support public and private efforts to encourage increased transit use by those people who currently do not find it sufficiently comfortable or convenient.

Next Steps-Bus Stop Improvements
T6-1. Denver and Glendale should work with RTD to install bus shelters at the high-volume bus stops at Evans, Mississippi, and Alameda. The Evans and Alameda bus-stop improvements should be coordinated with the recommended intersection improvement projects.

T6-2. Denver and Glendale should work with RTD to program the provision of shelters at other locations meeting RTD’s minimum criteria of 40 boardings/day.

T6-3. Denver and Glendale should encourage development adjacent to existing designated bus stops to provide a seating area and landscaping to serve bus patrons—such improvements should be required as condition of new development.

Next Steps-Transit Use Promotion
T6-4. In 1992, Denver and Glendale should establish a Task Force to work with RTD to conduct a transit promotion campaign for area employees. (Also see T-8, below.)

Next Steps-Longer Range Transit Improvements
T6-5. Currently, RTD’s service standards call for adding service-capacity when demand consistently exceeds the number of seats. Denver and Glendale should work with RTD to monitor ridership levels, and when they reach 80% of seated peak capacity, service improvements should be considered. The improvements considered should include a special corridor shuttle.
T6-6. Denver and Glendale should:
1.) continue to work with RTD, the CDOT, and others to fund and develop a rapid transit line along I-25;
2.) seek to ensure that such a line will have convenient links to bus service on Colorado Boulevard; and
3.) ensure that the levels of bus service planned for Colorado Boulevard are consistent with the planned frequency and capacity of the rapid transit line.

Colorado Boulevard bus service could be upgraded through the implementation of a new shuttle service, by increasing the frequency of existing bus routes, and/or by providing a reserved lane for transit use. The reserved lane could be created by linking individual acceleration/deceleration lanes recommended in T-4, above.

Denver and Glendale should also consider the feasibility of integrating the planned I-25 rapid transit station stop at Colorado Boulevard with a parking garage, both to serve people getting on the system to go to the Tech Center or Downtown, or people working along Colorado Boulevard who could conveniently transfer to high-frequency bus service on Colorado. A parking structure could be developed east of Colorado Boulevard, on air-rights over I-25, or at some other appropriate location.

T-7. Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program

**Description**
Denver and Glendale should encourage the adoption of a regionwide trip reduction program requirement for major employers. Such a program would promote commuting alternatives in order to attain a specified target reduction in the number of people commuting by single-occupant automobile.

**Intended Benefit**
This plan and other plans such as the recently adopted Southeast Quadrant (SEQ) Plan assume that the proportion of transit and ridesharing will at least double over current levels by about the Year 2010. This is unlikely to happen without active promotion by both the public and private sectors. Adoption of a regionwide trip-reduction program should ensure that such promotion occurs uniformly throughout the region.

**Next Steps**
T7-1. It is recommended that both Denver and Glendale work through the Denver Regional Council of Governments, the Regional Air Quality Council and other regional policy forums to promote a regional trip reduction program. If a program is not implemented on a regional level, Denver and Glendale should consider implementing such a requirement on their own. In the meantime, Denver and Glendale should encourage businesses to
implement such programs on a voluntary basis and should help those businesses in organizing trip reduction programs by directing them to available resources and providing information about programs that have been successful in other areas. This effort can be coordinated through the Task Force described in T-8.

T-8. Transportation Management Association Task Force

**Description**

Property owners and businesses, in cooperation with Denver and Glendale, should establish a Task Force to formally consider the establishment of a Transportation Management Association, coordinate a rideshare and transit promotion campaign and monitor implementation of the transportation elements of the Boulevard Plan.

**Intended Benefit**

In many parts of the country, including Denver, businesses have joined together to supplement the efforts of government to meet growing transportation needs. A generic name for such groups is a Transportation Management Association, or TMA.

TMA’s typically undertake activities such as:

- a.) Policy leadership and advocacy designed to affect local transportation decision-making;
- b.) Facilitation of focused ridesharing and transit promotion programs for employees;
- c.) Management and operation of transportation services such as transit shuttles, and raising funds to make capital funding contributions to roadway improvements and transit-use enhancement projects; and
- d.) Fostering a positive mobility outlook to reassure existing and prospective tenants and investors.

In communities in which "trip reduction" ordinances are in effect, TMAs can be instrumental in facilitating compliance. In addition, transit and ridesharing promotional campaigns are generally most effective when focused on a group of employers.

**Next Steps**

**T8-1.** In 1992, the costs and benefits of forming a TMA should be studied in detail by a Task Force composed of representatives of property owners, businesses, the surrounding neighborhoods and public agencies including Denver Transportation, Glendale, RTD, and DRCOG RideArrangers.

First year activities should include:

- a.) Examination of organizational, funding, and mission options;
- b.) Surveying current area employee commuting patterns to determine baseline
habits and evaluate program potential; and
c.) Carrying out a rideshare/transit promotion program.

Denver and Glendale should commit specific staff support to this effort, and should provide seed money for Task Force activities. Staff and in-kind support should be sought from RTD and DRCOG. Property owners and businesses should also be asked to help support first year activities.

T-9. Right-of-Way Maintenance

Description
Denver, Glendale and area businesses should consider ways in which public area maintenance levels can be increased.

Intended Benefit
The image of Colorado Boulevard can be improved through stepped up maintenance activities. In addition, maintaining good pavement condition helps traffic to move efficiently.

Under current practices, Denver is responsible for providing street sweeping services on Colorado Boulevard. Currently, Downtown area streets and streets serving Downtown are given a higher priority than arterial streets such as Colorado Boulevard, although the street is scheduled to be swept once a week in summer and about two to three times per month in the winter. Efforts should be made to ensure that the targets are met.

A more significant problem may be cleaning the median and sidewalk areas. At present, the sidewalk and median are cleaned no more than three times per year. Cleaning is done by Minor Offender crews from the County Jail. It is recommended that the City explore ways in which this frequency could be increased, and that voluntary efforts by area businesses be encouraged through the Transportation Management Association Task Force discussed above, to at least keep sidewalk areas clean. The recommended median improvements (See Urban Design section of this report) should be designed to minimize the costs and difficulty of routine maintenance and cleaning.

The Colorado Department of Transportation is responsible for maintaining the pavement condition on the Boulevard.

Next Steps
T9-1. The TMA Task Force should evaluate ways to encourage private businesses to assume increased responsibility for litter pick-up along the sidewalk and possibly the median and encourage Denver to meet its once a week street sweeping target.

T9-2. Denver and Glendale should continue to place a high priority on their requests to CDOT for pavement maintenance projects, including consideration of concrete pavement.
IV. LAND USE

The general goals with respect to land use are:

1.) Continue an appropriate mix of land uses along the Boulevard; and
2.) New development should be compatible with existing development.

Maintaining an appropriate land use mix will help reinforce the economic vitality of the corridor, and if the corridor remains economically healthy on an overall basis, there will be a stronger likelihood that high-quality neighborhood serving uses will continue to thrive. It also tends to reduce traffic impacts more than if the land uses were more homogeneous.

A. Current and Future Conditions

Table 9 summarizes current development levels in the general study area, i.e., development sites fronting or just behind the Boulevard between 1st and Evans.

Existing zoning and land uses are depicted in Figures 7 and 8, respectively.

The most recent comprehensive analysis of land use trends in the general area was done as part of the Southeast Quadrant Study. The population and employment estimates for the South Colorado Boulevard "influence area" for the mid-1980s, and projections for the year 2010, are also summarized in Table 10. Table 10 also summarizes the development levels which are possible if and when the current approved zoning is built-out. As can be seen, the build-out levels are not greatly different from the projected 2010 levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>6,886,500</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,217,700</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>1,110,400</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi Public/Other</td>
<td>942,500</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
<td>163,900</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>262,500</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,583,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sources: 1986 Denver Assessor’s Office records provided by the Denver Planning Office and current records provided by the Glendale Building and Zoning Department.
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EXISTING ZONING

R-O, R-1 Single Family Detached
Low density

R-2, R-2A Multi-family Residential
Low and Medium Density

R-3 Multi-family Residential
High Density

R-4 Multi-family Residential, Office
Very High Density, Hotels, Limited Retail

B-1 Limited Office
Services

BA-2 Arterial / Tourist Service
Gas, Hotels, Restaurants

B-2 Neighborhood Business

B-3 Shopping Center Retail

BA-3 General Commercial Retail
Theatres, Gas, Nightclubs

B-4 General Business Retail
Consumer and Business Services

I-O Light Industrial
Limited Manufacturing, Retail, Office, Hotel

O-1 Open Space
Parks, Recreation, Cemeteries

R-5 Institutional
Hospital, Schools, Churches

PUD Planned Unit Development

P-1 Off-Street Parking
FIGURE 8
Generalized Land Use
### Table 10. Estimated/Projected Households and Employment
South Colorado Boulevard Influence Area \(^{(1)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBAREA</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>650 / 1100 / 1900</td>
<td>7700 / 12500 / 19000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center West</td>
<td>4250 / 5900 / 6250</td>
<td>11900 / 17100 / 17300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center East</td>
<td>9050 / 10750 / 11200</td>
<td>10450 / 14900 / 16750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>1150 / 3750 / 3750</td>
<td>8600 / 16600 / 16600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/O Evans</td>
<td>2600 / 2600 / 2550</td>
<td>4500 / 6750 / 7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17700 / 24100 / 25650</strong></td>
<td><strong>47200 / 67900 / 77400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change

| AVG. ANN. # | -- / 250 / -- | -- / 850 / -- |
| AVG. ANN. % | 1.5% / -- / -- | 1.8% / -- / -- |


The wide range of different land use types along South Colorado Boulevard contributes to the relatively high traffic levels throughout the day, in contrast to the pattern on arterial streets which serve areas dominated by a single land use type, such as retail, or office, or residential. If all of the commercial development along Colorado Boulevard were used as office, for example, the difference between peak hour and off-peak traffic levels would likely be greater, and peak hour levels would be even higher than they are.

The mix of land uses also serves to make the traffic more manageable in other ways. For example, people employed in the corridor can walk to lunch and shopping errands rather than take a car. In addition, the peak demand is "spread out" by the fact that some people may get to the area early or leave late in order to shop or eat.
B. Alternative Strategies
Several strategies were considered for resolving land-use related problems in the corridor, and/or for reducing the likelihood of future problems.

One concept considered was "downzoning." "Downzoning" involves amending the zoning to decrease allowed densities. However, downzoning was felt to be politically unrealistic.

A second land use alternative considered was the possibility of designating "office development nodes" at each end of the study area. Landowners elsewhere in the corridor would have been able to sell their unused development rights to owners of properties within these nodes. Owners of land within these nodes could then have used these rights to build office space over and above that allowed by the base zoning for those areas. The benefit, in theory, would have been to encourage office space in areas best served by the transportation system, and to make retail development elsewhere in the corridor more economically viable. However, as the idea was considered, concerns were expressed about whether the actual impact would be to discourage retail redevelopment, and whether such an action was necessary to achieve desired development patterns in light of recent economic trends. Finally, the transportation analysis indicated that the intersections in the vicinity of the nodes being considered were actually the most congested in the corridor and encouraging more development in the immediate vicinity could exacerbate that congestion. The office nodes concept has enough potential merit, however, that it should be reconsidered if and when rapid transit is developed along I-25 or parallel corridors intersecting Colorado Boulevard. Reconsideration of this concept may also be warranted if there is a proliferation of large, single building office projects throughout the study area.

The approach recommended at the present time is to focus on specific, achievable responses to specific concerns, such as limiting future development levels, encouraging mixed use developments, and formulating development and site guidelines to ensure that new development will be a good neighbor to existing residential and other development.

Several techniques for implementing these requirements were also considered. They included:

1.) amending each zone district present in the corridor as part of a comprehensive citywide zoning revision;
2.) creating an overlay zone district for the corridor;
3.) creating a new Colorado Boulevard zone district; and,
4.) Using the special development regulation authority available under Denver’s parkway and boulevard ordinance and other sections of the City code.
These implementation alternatives apply to the situation in Denver. In Glendale, special requirements already exist for properties within 600 feet of Colorado Boulevard, and the preferred implementation approach would be to amend the Glendale zoning ordinance to incorporate changes recommended in this Plan, as appropriate.

For Denver, each of the several alternatives has advantages and disadvantages. The first approach is legally straightforward but logistically complex; it would involve amending ten different Denver zone districts. The second approach would create different requirements for the same zone district in different parts of the City. The third approach may be overkill; it has been very difficult to create wholly new zone districts elsewhere in the City, and the changes that are being recommended along the Boulevard are not as extensive as those which needed to be implemented in those other areas. Finally, the authority available under the parkway and boulevard ordinance may not be extensive enough to include all of the recommended development requirements.

Given recent experience, the present recommendation is to combine elements of the first implementation alternative, amending the individual zone districts, and the fourth alternative involving the parkway and boulevard ordinance, and other sections of the City code. The parkway and boulevard ordinance designates certain Denver streets as parkways/boulevards and, within limits, allows the City to regulate the character and placement of development along those streets. Within the study area, that portion of South Colorado Boulevard between I-25 and 44th Avenue has long been designated as a parkway/boulevard, although no special design regulations have previously been developed. It should be noted, though, that the consensus of the CAC was that there are advantages to consolidating the new development requirements into an overlay zone district. The Committee recommended that such an approach should continue to be considered.

The CAC also strongly suggested that any future redevelopment proposals should be encouraged to be submitted as Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning. This would allow the specific applicable elements of this plan to be written into a binding, site specific development plan.

Finally, it was noted that a number of recommendations in this plan could lead to changes in the Denver zoning code, and that Denver is also considering a wholesale revision of its existing codes. If that occurs, there may be alternative ways of accomplishing some of the objectives of this plan. For example, a number of CAC members suggested that some type of performance-based zoning could address some of the concerns for which specific, detailed responses have been proposed in this plan.
The specific land use recommendations are intended to preserve a mix of uses, restrain overall development increases which could lead to excessive traffic demand increases and ensure that spill-over parking problems are minimized.

C. Land Use Recommendations

LU-1. Overall Development Cap

Description
In general, no additional development density should be granted over currently approved levels, unless enforceable commitments are made to limit traffic generation to levels consistent with those that would occur with the original zoning.

For example, if the current zoning on a particular parcel would allow 100,000 square feet of office use it can be calculated that development of that parcel to that level would generate about 150 trips in the PM Peak Hour. If the developer wanted approval to build 125,000 square feet of office, the developer would have to "guarantee" that steps would be taken to limit PM Peak Hour vehicle trip generation levels to about 150 trips, or that which would occur with the original zoning.

Intended Benefit
Analysis done for the Southeast Quadrant Plan indicated that present zoning permits substantially more development than now exists along Colorado Boulevard and elsewhere in the southeast Denver area. In light of the extensive demands that are already placed on the transportation system, and the significant impact and cost of significantly increasing the capacity of the transportation system, overall increases in permitted intensities are not recommended.

While no wholesale increases in overall allowable development seem appropriate, some increase in development intensity may be appropriate for individual projects because of specific site or development proposal issues. In those cases, Denver and Glendale should require enforceable commitments to limit traffic generation to levels no higher than that possible with the prior existing zoning. This will minimize traffic increases on Colorado Boulevard and other area streets.

Next Steps
LU1-1. Denver and Glendale should not approve additional development intensity in the corridor, except under the circumstances noted above. It should be noted that this does not mean that no rezoning should be considered, as some rezoning may be sought for reasons other than an increase in intensity. In addition, Denver and Glendale should seek to reduce maximum intensity levels allowed in Planned Unit Development and Planned Site Developments in return for other allowances.
LU-2. Land Use Mix

Description
Glendale and Denver should seek to retain the diversity of land uses in the corridor. Denver and Glendale should also encourage large office projects to incorporate either retail, residential, entertainment, lodging or restaurant uses in addition to the primary office use.

Intended Benefits
The mixed use character of the area is viewed as an asset for the surrounding community, and helps in reducing total and peak period peak traffic loads—as compared to the same amount of floor space developed entirely as office. The current diversity of zoning in Denver, as well as the actual mix of uses permitted in Denver, promote such diversity and the range of permitted uses should not be substantially altered.

Next Steps
LU2-1. Evaluate any Planned Unit Development (PUD), Planned Site Development (PSD) and other rezoning in terms of the potential impact on land use mix within the corridor.

LU2-2. Encourage developers proposing large office projects to incorporate either retail, residential, entertainment, lodging or restaurant uses in addition to the primary office use.

LU-3. On-Site Parking

Description
All new development should provide sufficient parking to meet 100% of the project’s needs on-site or in shared facilities adjacent to the site.

Intended Benefit
Analysis of Denver and Glendale’s required parking amounts as compared to typically recommended standards showed that the most serious deficiency was the Denver code requirements with respect to office and restaurant uses. Denver requires 1 space for each 500 s.f. of office floor space, and 1 space for each 200 s.f. of restaurant space. Many office and restaurant projects in the corridor most likely provide parking in excess of these minimum required ratios, although overspill parking problems were observed in the vicinity of some fast-food restaurants and some offices. Some overspill parking problems may be exacerbated by building owners and managers who charge tenants for parking spaces. However, such charges act as incentives to the use of alternatives to the single-occupant automobile, therefore they should not be prohibited or discouraged. Instead, if parking overspill problems are related solely to the presence of a fee, they should be dealt with through parking restrictions on affected local streets.

To avoid future problems, minimum parking ratios should be increased for office
and restaurant and possibly other uses. However, the current low minimum requirements are a problem not just in the Colorado Boulevard corridor, but also citywide, and changes in these ratios should preferably be made on a citywide basis.

When they are implemented, variances from updated minimum parking standards could be considered if a developer implements a trip reduction program. The developer should also "guarantee" that no over spill parking will result. If overspill parking does occur, the guarantee could be enforced, for example, by requiring the developer to make contributions to a mitigation fund which would be used to enforce any necessary neighborhood parking restrictions or provide other, off-setting improvements or services.

Next Steps
LU3-1. Consistent with the scope of existing authority, utilize this guideline in the review of all new development proposals in any PUD rezoning in the corridor. Adequate parking requirements are already in effect in Glendale’s PSD district.

LU3-2. Update parking requirements for office, restaurant and any other "problem" uses on a citywide basis in Denver. An enforcement mechanism should be created for controlling overspill parking if variances to minimum standards are permitted in conjunction with a trip reduction program.
V. URBAN DESIGN

The urban design recommendations are intended to help create a distinctive, unifying identity for the area which will help it compete in a growing and increasingly competitive regional economy, while minimizing the adverse impacts of new development on existing development.

The urban design recommendations are divided into three categories:
- Public right-of-way including medians and the sidewalk area;
- Site and building design for private development and public facilities; and
- Commercial signs and billboards.

Objectives have been established for each of these categories and are described below.

Objectives for Public Right-of-Way Improvements
1.) Provide a safe and secure walking environment by providing separation between automobile traffic and sidewalks in order to encourage more people to make trips on foot or by public transportation.
2.) Tie both sides of the street together visually while defining the edges of the street to enhance continuity of character.

Objectives for Private Development
3.) Create lively and visually interesting buildings.
4.) Create a sense of place and enclosure along the street.
5.) Maximize the opportunities to create retail display windows and building signs which will be visible from the street and sidewalk to reinforce the merchandising character of the corridor.
6.) Screen some parking lots by the placement of buildings.
7.) Scale back the mass of buildings to reduce the intrusion into neighborhoods and to avoid "overpowering" the street.
8.) Ensure that adverse impacts of new buildings on adjacent, older buildings and residential development is minimized.

Objectives for Signs
9.) Limit visual confusion and promote consistency.
10.) Equalize the competitive environment for businesses located in Denver and Glendale.
11.) Reduce the intrusiveness into residential neighborhoods and avoid "broadcasting" the commercial nature of the Boulevard into these adjoining areas by the strategic placement of signs.
12.) Integrate all signs into the overall project design through the use of architectural treatments and by incorporating adequate amounts of landscaping around monument signs.

A. Current Conditions
In the past, there has been little
consideration given to the development of a cohesive urban design treatment for the corridor, although there have been a few positive results on a project-by-project basis. Some of the existing, major urban design concerns which were identified in the planning process include:

- The overall image of much of the corridor is that of a sea of asphalt—there are about 20,000 surface parking spaces in the study area adjacent to the Boulevard.

- The wide range of zoning classifications, existing land uses, building types and sizes. The overall pattern of development includes single user, individual small lots for fast food and gas stations; larger integrated shopping centers; individual office buildings; and small office complexes.

- The shallow, half-block parcels which constrain site planning opportunities.

- The disjointed circulation patterns including the incomplete sidewalk network and numerous curb-cutss and access points serving the individual commercial uses directly from a major regional arterial street.

- The lack of landscaping, (in spite of the fact that most of the corridor is a designated Denver "parkway/ boulevard"). The need to accommodate increasing amounts of traffic has had priority over other public right-of-way improvements, and, at the present time the existing Colorado Boulevard right-of-way is all but fully utilized by through-traffic lanes, turning-lanes and sidewalk improvements.

B. Improvement Considerations

Underlying the urban design recommendations are three primary considerations, described below.

The Commercial/Residential Edge

In several areas, including most of the western edge of the commercial development along the corridor, the boundary between the commercial development and the established, smaller-scaled single family residential neighborhoods from Iliff to Cherry Creek Drive South should be emphasized as a distinct edge which separates the two areas. Figure 9, which shows the "footprints" of current buildings, illustrates one aspect of the scale differences between the two types of areas.

The other boundaries are less distinct, and the development along the Boulevard should transition into these areas and sensitively tie the commercial areas back into the neighborhoods.

The Gateway Function

The design of the corridor as a whole should "welcome" motorists and pedestrians into the city's overall urban patterns and forms and specifically to Cherry Creek and the City of Glendale.
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The Image of the Street Itself
The urban design recommendations seek to create an improved, coordinated public right-of-way treatment that is continuous along Colorado Boulevard from I-70 to the southern Denver city limits and are more in keeping with the long-standing designation of much of the Boulevard as an official Denver parkway/boulevard. However, there can and should be "theme and variation" type differences in the design treatments used along the Boulevard that respect local character. For example, there may be differences in treatment of the tree lawn and sidewalks in commercial versus residential areas.

C. Urban Design Recommendations
Figure 10 is a composite sketch illustrating the various urban design recommendations. The recommendations are described in detail below.
PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY
UD-1. Sidewalk Standard

**Description**
There should be sidewalks along both sides of South Colorado Boulevard throughout the corridor. The minimum width of the clear walking surface of the sidewalk area should be 5' in Denver and 8' in Glendale. In Denver, the sidewalk walking area will be separated from traffic by a 6'6" wide buffer zone between the walking area and adjacent traffic lanes. The sidewalk should be connected to any plazas or arcades within private development sites. The pedestrian-crossing zone across driveways should be delineated with a non-asphalt paving material.

In Denver, the buffer zone should be paved with a decorative material and all newspaper boxes, traffic signal control boxes, utility and possibly light poles should be placed in this area. The buffer zone should also include street trees (see UD-2, below.)

**Intended Benefit**
A complete and "inviting" pedestrian circulation system is essential to encouraging the use of transit and walking as alternatives to the automobile. To create a comfortable walking environment adjacent to three or more lanes of moving traffic, there needs to be at least minimal buffering created by width and other street "furniture."

**Next Steps**
UD1-1. Apply the sidewalk standard to all new development fronting the Boulevard in all commercial and R-4 zones, as well as Planned Unit Developments (Denver) and Planned Site Developments (Glendale.)
Developers should be required to dedicate any frontage necessary to create or upgrade the sidewalk.

**UD1-2. The Denver Planning Office will develop detailed guidelines regarding appropriate buffer zone paving materials, concrete scoring patterns, and street tree specifications.**

**UD-2. Street Trees**

**Description**
Provide a row of street trees within the sidewalk buffer zone along the Boulevard in Denver. The buffer zone should be paved with a decorative material and include a row of street trees of at least 3 1/2" caliper in 5' grates or other appropriate settings spaced at 30' intervals, except where safety considerations dictate otherwise. Selection criteria for tree species should recognize the need to maintain visibility of sign bands on retail storefronts and of development entrances.

**Intended Benefit**
With the limited opportunities to create wide landscaped areas which could soften the image of the corridor, vertical design elements become very important. The trees are intended to reflect the Boulevard’s designation as an official Denver parkway/boulevard and create a more comfortable and inviting pedestrian environment. The city of Denver must also ensure that no trees are installed without provisions for on-going maintenance. Maintenance should be the responsibility of the adjacent landowner (or of a special district if one is formed.)

Glendale has an existing streetscape program which is different from the recommended approach in Denver—specifically, there is no requirement for a buffer zone nor for street trees in the buffer zone. Instead, Glendale requires trees spaced 30’ on-center to be planted in the landscaped setback behind the sidewalk. Much of the frontage in Glendale is already developed in this manner, and it is recommended that Glendale continue with this approach. This different approach is consistent with the objective of maintaining some distinction in design treatments between Glendale and Denver.

**Next Steps**
**UD2-1.** Require the provision and maintenance of street trees as part of new development in Denver in all new development fronting the Boulevard in all commercial and R-4 zones, as well as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs).

**UD2-2.** The Denver Planning Office should develop standard tree-planting specifications, including identification of an appropriate palette of species. Existing Denver Parks Department guidelines on irrigation and maintenance should also be followed.

**UD2-3.** Glendale will continue planting street trees at 30’ intervals between the sidewalk walking surface and building and parking lots.
UD-3. Street Lighting

Description
Install new street lighting and distinctive pedestrian lighting fixtures. Fixtures in Denver and Glendale can be different, but their relative placement and their scale should be the same. Maximum height of the pedestrian-scale lighting should be no greater than 14' (unless some strong design concept that relies on a greater height for a particular coordinated effect is desired.) The existing aluminum-colored, "cobra-head" street lights should be replaced with "hockey-puck" style street lights. Parks Department standards for designated parkways, including using the "Federal green" color, should be followed.

Intended Benefit
While street trees can have an effect on the Boulevard’s image—at least during the day—lighting must be used to achieve comparable results during the evening. And, given the high evening traffic and use levels along the Boulevard, as much attention should be paid to the nighttime image as to the daytime image.

Next Steps
UD3-1. The Denver Planning Office should inventory existing corridor lighting and develop a replacement lighting plan which specifies poles, fixtures, type of light, spacing and placement. Replacement lighting should be incorporated in capital programs. In addition, there needs to be an assessment of the financial implications of on-going maintenance and operation of the new lighting, and appropriate arrangements made.

UD3-2. Adjacent landowners seeking redevelopment approvals should be required to provide pedestrian-scale lighting consistent with the above plan. Any street lights that are replaced should also be consistent with the lighting plan. The new lighting standards should be included in the proposed new development requirements.

UD3-3. Glendale should continue the installation of special lighting as part of its already established streetscape program.

UD-4. Bus Stop Improvements

Description
Provide consistent, improved features at all bus stops. There should be two levels of improvements, one for high volume bus stops including stops at which transfers occur, and one for low volume stops. Bus shelters, outside seating and trash receptacles will be provided at high volume stops. Bus benches, either stand-alone or as part of a low wall, and trash receptacles will be provided at low volume stops. As these improvements are made, private bus benches which incorporate advertising will be prohibited.

Lighting, landscaping and paving at all stops should be provided consistent with the
other streetscape standards described above. Information signs will be provided by the Regional Transportation District (RTD) according to their standards. Benches and shelters should be located in the front setback area, behind the sidewalk and away from the Boulevard (see UD-8.) Developers with projects adjacent to designated bus stops should allow bus benches and shelters in the front setback area, and be encouraged to provide the improvements themselves.

**Intended Benefit**
Current bus-service levels are high, and the existing level of ridership is good. By improving the features at bus stops, as well as the sidewalks that serve them, maximum use of transit will be encouraged.

**Next Steps**
**UD4-1.** Assist RTD in completing designs for transfer bus stop improvements at Evans, Mississippi, and Alameda.

**UD4-2.** The Denver Planning Office will develop recommendations for bench types and placement at low volume stops in Denver. Glendale has already developed specifications and will continue to implement their program.

**Create landscape medians, where possible**

**UD-5. Boulevard Median**

**Description**
The existing median should be landscaped in those areas where it is sufficiently wide and long and in those areas in which the median can be extended into unneeded left turn storage space (which may be the case, for example, between Kentucky and Louisiana). Where the median is not wide enough to be landscaped, it should be repaved with a decorative paving material.

A specific design for a median for Colorado Boulevard north of Alameda is now being created by the Denver Parks Department and consultants as part of a 1989 bond project. The design developed for this area can likely serve in the remainder of the study area as well.
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Urban Design
**Intended Benefit**
A landscaped median will break-up the visual impact of the wide street and improve the image of the area.

**Next Steps**
**UD5-1.** The Denver Planning Office and the Denver Parks Dept. will finalize the recommended median design. Estimated cost levels for landscaping and repaving will be identified. Colorado Boulevard project requests will be included in Glendale and Denver streetscape improvement capital programs.

**UD5-2.** Denver Transportation Division will conduct detailed left-turn demand studies between Kentucky and Louisiana to identify median widening/extension opportunities.

**UD-6. Neighborhood Gateways / Local Streets**

**Description**
Small, landscaped medians should be developed in the half block sections of intersecting local residential streets as a physical indication of the boundary between the commercial frontage along Colorado Boulevard and the adjacent residential area.

**Intended Benefit**
The medians will signal a change in the character of the area, and will act to help preserve the separate identity of the residential areas. They may also discourage some short-cutting traffic. The medians should be placed between the alley and the next street paralleling Colorado Boulevard when commercial development extends no further than the alley, and at the first block away when commercial development is a full block deep. The median design could be similar to the one recently installed in the
Country Club neighborhood across from the Cherry Creek North retail area. Complementary street edge treatments may also be appropriate. The local street medians will typically be developed within the existing right-of-way and will require the elimination of on-street parking in that half-block section.

The costs of building numerous small medians, and of maintaining them, could be a problem for the City of Denver, where most if not all of the opportunities for these improvements in the corridor exist. Therefore, neighborhood and homeowners organizations may have to assume primary responsibility for these projects if they are to occur.

**Next Steps**

**UD6-1.** The Denver Planning Office, in cooperation with the Denver Transportation Division, will develop a prototype median design and other design treatments to demarcate commercial/residential boundaries along local streets.

**UD6-2.** The Planning Office will assist those neighborhood organizations which wish to pursue such projects. This will include assistance in the development of maintenance strategies.

---

**PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT**

**UD-7. Parking Lot Screening/Entry Medians**

**Description**

All parking lots along Colorado Blvd. should be screened from the adjacent sidewalks and street by a wall, hedge or berm, placed within a front setback between the sidewalk and the edge of the parking lot. The height of solid walls is to be 30"-36", measured from either side. If, due to topographic differences between the two sides, the maximum height on one side is to be exceeded, the portion of the wall above the maximum height must not be solid; it can be constructed of wrought iron, etc..

Walls can be constructed as planters, and plants may extend above the 36" maximum wall height. For commercial developments which are only one-half block deep, the wall may be placed in a 5' landscape setback in back of the sidewalk. The resulting narrow strip between the sidewalk and the wall can be paved with decorative material or planted with groundcover and vines. For deeper parcels, the wall should be located in a setback at least 10' wide, and should include trees which can be informally clustered or planted in a manner which is similar to the traditional Denver street-tree pattern, at 30' on-center intervals. There should be 3 trees per 1000 square feet of landscaped area. Walls should be constructed of materials similar to or the same as that used for the primary buildings on the site.
Landscaped medians to separate entering and exiting traffic help define traffic patterns and should be required for all new major curb-cuts. However, due to the constraints of the shallow, half-block deep commercial frontage along Colorado, they cannot always be physically provided. Therefore, opportunities for providing such medians should be considered individually.

**Intended Benefit**

Parking lot screening will significantly decrease the image of the corridor as a "sea of asphalt." Screening of parking lots also tends to reduce confusion about where the street ends and the parking lot begins. It helps to identify the location of curb-cuts. Finally, parking lot screen walls will provide additional security for people using Colorado Boulevard sidewalks.

**Next Steps**

UD7-1. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

UD7-2. Include in the proposed new development requirements.
UD7-3. The Denver Planning Office, in cooperation with Glendale, will identify a limited number of equivalent wall/landscaping alternatives from existing examples in the city as well as new solutions for use in the development review process.

UD8. Front Setback and Landscaping

Description
Provide a 10' landscaped setback strip between the street and adjacent buildings (in addition to the sidewalk and sidewalk buffer described in UD-2). This front setback area should include three trees per 1000 square feet. The trees can be placed in informal clusters or can mimic the traditional pattern of Denver street trees and be planted in a 30’ on-center pattern.

If the trees are planted in informal clusters, the area under the trees should be covered in living plant material such as sod or shrubs so as to fully cover the ground under the trees within five years. The area under trees which are planted in a formal pattern can
either be landscaped or paved in the same material as is used for the sidewalk buffer zone—which could be brick or concrete pavers. The use of stamped, patterned concrete as a paving material is strongly discouraged.

**Intended Benefit**
A softer, more appealing image can be created by providing a landscaped buffer between the hard expanse of the street and the hard edge of a building or hard expanse of a parking lot.

**Next Steps**
**UD8-1.** Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

**UD8-2.** Include in the proposed new development requirements.

**UD8-3.** The Denver Planning Office should develop prototypical alternatives for use in the development review process.

**UD-9. Building Placement**

**Description**
Depending on the use and size of the project, new buildings or portions of new buildings should be encouraged to be built up to the proposed landscaped strip adjacent to the sidewalk. All walls facing Colorado Boulevard should be encouraged to have features such as doors (other than service entrances), display windows, arcades and/or plazas.

**Intended Benefit**
Some existing buildings on the Boulevard are built close to the street. The definition and image of the corridor can be improved if some buildings are built up to the front setback edge. This will also help reduce the perceived and actual length of trips on foot between different developments, and reduce the image of continuous parking lots.
Next Steps
UD9-1. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

UD9-2. Include in the proposed new development requirements. The process to create and implement these new requirements will begin in 1991.

UD9-3. The Denver Planning Office should develop prototypical alternatives for use in the development review process.

UD-10. Building Entrance Orientation

Description
Primary building entrances for buildings in developments along Colorado Boulevard should be located in the facade which faces Colorado Boulevard, or in the next connecting facade. All buildings not at the landscaped setback edge should have a landscaped pedestrian connection to the street. Entrances on the sides of buildings should be connected to the street. Larger sites with multiple buildings should have sidewalk-to-building connections for each major tenant and building over 20,000 square feet. Secondary entrances from the rear parking areas should also have a welcoming, public design.

Intended Benefit
This intent is to ensure that development along the corridor will present its front door to the Boulevard, and will also support increased pedestrian activity.

Next Steps
UD10-1. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

UD10-2. Include these guidelines in the proposed new development requirements.

UD-11. Building Facades

Description
Adopt and implement a process and criteria to provide guidance on appropriate architectural treatments of building facades. The guidelines presented below are preliminary and apply more to office than to retail
development. These guidelines should be refined in a follow-up effort.

The building architecture guidelines should:

a.) Promote the articulation of building facades through the expression of the entries, and the columns, bearing walls, etc. that define the structural bays and/or modules of leasable space.

b.) Avoid large expanses of glazing through the use of mullion patterns, entry recesses, creation of individual windows rather than continuous, undifferentiated ribbon windows, or large infill panels, etc.

c.) Avoid building facades composed entirely of undifferentiated, monotonously regular, glass curtain wall construction—at least at lower levels. Large glass curtain wall systems may be appropriate above a building’s third or fourth floor level where pedestrian scale is less important, and where it may be desirable to reduce the apparent bulk of the building.

d.) Encourage the "honest" expression of materials and systems and discourage the use of synthetic materials/cladding systems which imitate natural or traditional materials; e.g., pressed fiber designed to appear as heavily grained wood siding; metal roof tiles that look like wood shake shingles; concrete patterned to look like brick or stone, etc. Cladding systems such as precast concrete or glass reinforced concrete are acceptable as long as their surface does not replicate the appearance of some other material.

Use articulated building surfaces, avoid undifferentiated glazing
**Intended Benefit**
The shallow depth of many parcels along Colorado Boulevard places a great emphasis on the use of high quality architectural treatments to express the image and quality of the area. In general, the recommended guidelines are intended to make the area a more inviting and comfortable environment for pedestrians and help ensure that the commercial development will be more in scale with the adjacent small-scale residential development.

**Next Steps**
**UD11-1.** Explore alternative methods for incorporating an architectural review process and criteria in the proposed new development requirements. Involve business and citizen interests in creation of the guidelines and process.

**UD-12. Upper Level Setback**

**Description**
Adopt and implement a requirement that buildings on parcels fronting Colorado Boulevard and greater than 50' tall have a significant stepback at the third or fourth level along the side of the building facing the Boulevard.

**Intended Benefit**
This recommendation is intended to emphasize the human-scale of the corridor. There are existing requirements regarding the scale and bulk of buildings adjacent to residential areas, although those need to be re-examined in light of specific conditions along Colorado Boulevard. It may be appropriate to ensure transitions in height between low scale retail and similar development and taller buildings, but there may be no need for transitions between adjacent office developments. Therefore, the existing side and rear bulk-planes which apply when commercial development is adjacent to commercial development should also be re-examined.

**Next Steps**
**UD12-1.** Use this guideline in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

**UD12-2.** Include in the proposed new development requirements.

**UD12-3.** In 1992, The Denver Planning Office will examine existing bulk-plane requirements to determine if they are effective in preventing out-of-scale development adjacent to low-scale residential areas along the Boulevard, and whether they are needed for new developments adjacent to commercial development. If modifications are appropriate, they will be incorporated in the proposed new development requirements.

**UD-13. Maximum Height Limitation**

**Description**
Adopt and utilize a guideline that the maximum height of any building in the study area should not exceed the tallest
existing structures, i.e., no more than 300’. The Denver zoning ordinance was amended in 1986 to incorporate special building height limitations for buildings within 175’ of "protected" zone districts such as R-1 and R-2. While these limitations seem to adequately address building heights immediately adjacent to low density residential areas, concerns remain about the potential for building heights outside this 175’ buffer, but within the Colorado Boulevard corridor.

**Intended Benefit**
Since most land parcels adjacent to the Boulevard are relatively small (at least in Denver), existing bulk plane limits make building heights of 300’ or more largely unachievable. However, there are a few parcels large enough that such heights could be achieved. Buildings that exceed 300’ are viewed as being incompatible with the mixed-use, non-downtown image desired for the area and should be prohibited.

**Next Steps**
UD13-1. Use this guideline in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

UD13-2. Include in the proposed new development requirements. The process to create and implement these new requirements will begin in 1991.

**UD-14. Architectural Treatment on all Sides**

**Description**
Adopt and implement a requirement that all sides of commercial buildings along the Boulevard be treated similarly in the use of quality materials and detailing in order to prevent having low quality, poorly designed facades visible from adjoining residential areas. This is not intended to require, however, that all sides have such features as doors and display windows.
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**Intended Benefit**
The dimensions and setting of development in the corridor mean that buildings will be viewed from various sides by motorists, pedestrians and adjacent neighbors. Because of this, all sides of buildings need the same attention and concern as is traditionally given to the front elevation.

**Next Steps**
**UD14-1.** Use this guideline in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

**UD14-2.** Include in the proposed new development requirements. The process to create and implement these new requirements will begin in 1991.

**UD-15. Rear Buffers and Screening/Access to Alleys**

**Description**
Adopt and implement detailed requirements for rear buffers and screening treatments in order to improve the compatibility between non-residential uses and residential uses. There are two sets of standards; one for full-block deep commercial development, and the other for half-block deep commercial development.

For **full-block deep commercial** developments adjacent to residentially zoned areas with an intervening public street:

---

**Setback Buffer Width:** 25’
**Planting Density:** One tree and 8 shrubs per 500 square feet of landscaped area.
**Planting Mix:** At least 60% of the total number of trees should be evergreen. 100% of the area under deciduous trees must be covered with living groundcover or shrubs within 5 years of initial planting.

Alternatively, a berm or low wall may be utilized. If it is, it should have a minimum height of 3’0” and a maximum height of 4’ above sidewalk grade, or a slope of 3:1, and the following standards should apply:
Setback Buffer Width: 15'  
Planting Density: One tree and two shrubs for every 500 sq. ft. of area.  
Planting Mix: At least 50% of trees must be evergreen. 100% of the ground must be covered with living ground cover or shrubs within 5 years of initial planting.

For half-block commercial developments adjacent to residential zones, with no intervening alley or street:

Non-residential uses should be separated from residential uses by a high quality, solid opaque fence or wall along the intervening property line. This fence or wall should be constructed of durable materials and should be at least six (6) feet but not more than eight (8) feet high; provided, however, that if the non-residential zoning permits a building wall within five (5) feet of this property line, the building wall can serve as the separation and can exceed this height, consistent with bulk plane limits. In order for a building wall to qualify as a separation, it must not have doors, windows or service areas.

Parking areas adjacent to residential uses must comply with the parking lot landscaping requirements; provided, however, that when more restrictive requirements are enacted in conjunction with implementation of the Boulevard Plan, those more restrictive requirements shall prevail.

Alternative landscaping treatments buffer between residential and commercial properties.

Direct access from the commercial site to the alley should be discouraged. Alley traffic from commercial developments can have a significant adverse impact on adjacent residential properties and some sites may require additional measures to protect adjacent residential areas from adverse impacts of noise, light, and visual pollution. This is particularly likely to be the case when adequate service or site access cannot be provided except from the alley. Whenever possible, use of service areas near residential development will be restricted to the hours between 6:00 AM and 10:00 PM.

Intended Benefit
Many existing structures impact adjacent residential development by casting glare and/or shadows, by overlooking front and backyards because they are placed too close to property lines, by being out of character with the yards and character of immediate
area, or because of excessive noise which spills over from the commercial area. The recommendations are intended to ensure that these uses can better co-exist.

**Next Steps**

**UD15-1.** Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

![Larger landscaped buffers are provided on full-block developments.](image)

**UD15-2.** Include in the proposed new development requirements.

**UD-16. Service Area Screening**

**Description**

Service areas should be screened on all sides by walls and fences, except where openings are required for access.

The standards reflect two different situations: 1.) when the service area is freestanding, and 2.) when it is attached to the building.

1. **Freestanding Service Areas**

Freestanding service areas would include such things as trash container storage areas and transformers. The service area should be screened by a durable, high quality wall or fence which is at least the same height as the object being screened. When the service area wall is at the edge of a required front setback or side setback visible from a public right-of-way, the exposed side should be landscaped. Generally, trash containers should be placed away from public view, such as from alleys or Colorado Boulevard.

The landscaped area should be a minimum 5’ wide strip, planted with a continuous row of shrubs at a maximum

![Provide landscaping around trash enclosure screen walls.](image)
spacing of 3’ on center for the length of the fence or wall or alternately, one tree per side. This strip can be within any required setback. If the exposed side exceeds 25’ in length, provide a minimum 8’ wide strip with fence or wall and shrubs as specified above, in combination with an average of one tree every 30 linear feet for the length of the planting unless there is a fence or wall at property line.

2. Attached Service Areas

The service area should be screened by a fence or wall of similar quality and materials used on the building. The service area may not intrude into any required building or parking lot setbacks. The wall should be of at least the same height as the object to be screened. Generally, trash containers should be placed away from public view, such as from alleys or Colorado Boulevard.

**Intended Benefit**
Screening will blend service areas into the overall development, and minimize visual blight, odors and noise.

**Next Steps**

**UD16-1.** Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

**UD16-2.** Include in the proposed new development requirements.

---

**SIGNS**

**UD-17. Equalize Sign Requirements in Denver and Glendale**

**Description**
The Denver and Glendale sign codes that apply along S. Colorado Boulevard should be essentially equivalent.

**Intended Benefit**
Preliminary research by staff, and comments from the CAC, suggest that the current sign codes in both cities will, over time, lead to a higher quality image for the corridor as new developments and signs replace older ones. Those signs that are now viewed as problems were generally built before those codes were in their present form. However, staffs should seek to identify appropriate techniques for encouraging high quality sign design, perhaps through increases in allowed sign sizes.

**Next Steps**

**UD17-1.** Prepare a joint report analyzing the two sign and billboard codes and suggesting actions for resolving inconsistencies, incorporating other sign recommendations, and providing incentives for good design.

**UD17-2.** As part of the submittal requirements for rezoning, a sign program should be required for larger, multiple-building projects which indicates on a site plan the sign locations, open space
around monument signs, elevations of each sign by type (i.e. project identification, tenant, wall/building mounted, etc.) and calculations of size, etc.

double faced signs, there should be at least 4 square feet of landscaped open space around the base of the sign. The maximum height of ground mounted signs should not exceed 15 feet unless needed by larger projects with numerous tenants for project identification signs. For these consolidated signs, height can be increased to no more than 20'.

Intended Benefit
This consistent treatment of ground mounted signs is intended to create a unifying, high quality image for the corridor.

Next Steps
UD18-1. Identify required implementing action as part of UD17-1, above.

UD18-2. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.

Sign types and locations help to identify business but should not add to confusing clutter with their number and placement.

Description
No lighted building-mounted signs should be permitted more than 25' above the ground. The entire area of back-lit awnings should be regulated as signs if they include a graphic device or message.

Intended Benefit
Signs are an appropriate and beneficial feature of commercial areas such as Colorado Boulevard. However, without clear guidelines, the number and size of signs can proliferate--to everyone's ultimate disadvantage. Recently, there has been a trend toward the use of brightly colored back-lit awnings that incorporate commercial messages. These must be recognized and treated as signs. In addition, lighted signs which are mounted high on buildings are inappropriate in a commercial area which is so closely surrounded by low-density residential neighborhoods.

Next Steps
UD19-1. Identify required implementing action as part of UD17-1, above.

UD19-2. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zones in the corridor.

UD-20. Billboards

Description
There should be no new billboards along the corridor, and existing ones should be taken down if the site is redeveloped.

Intended Benefit
Over time, billboards along Colorado Boulevard should be eliminated in order to improve the aesthetic character of the Boulevard.

Next Steps
UD20-1. Identify required implementation action as part of UD17-1, above.

UD20-2. Use these guidelines in the review of all new development proposals in commercial, R-4, PUD and PSD zone parcels fronting the Boulevard.
VI. IMPLEMENTATION

Following the approval of the Denver Planning Board and the Glendale Planning Commission the Plan was submitted to the respective city councils. Following its adoption by these bodies, the individual agencies identified in the Next Steps section of the various recommendations are now directly responsible for carrying it out. Indirectly, there will be many additional agencies (e.g., the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, the Regional Transportation District, etc.) as well as neighborhood organizations, businesses and property owners that will need to work closely with the Cities of Denver and Glendale to implement the plan recommendations.

There are four general categories of plan implementation that will be pursued:

1. ordinance revision,
2. development review,
3. follow-up studies, and
4. capital project programming

Ordinance revisions will be needed to serve as the legal and administrative basis for carrying out a number of the land use and urban design recommendations. Even before that, some of the recommendations can be carried out during the development review processes of each city. Once the legal basis is in place, the balance of the recommendations can be incorporated in that process. Some of the recommended Next Steps are for follow-up studies of issues that were too complex or detailed to be resolved in this overall plan development process. Those studies may lead to additional action recommendations.

It was the consensus of the CAC that, regardless of when some of the changes are made in development requirements that apply to projects developed under conventional zoning, all future redevelopment proposals along the Boulevard in Denver be encouraged to be submitted as Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning. This will facilitate the application of the recommendations in this plan to all developments, even before the recommendations are adopted as part of the conventional development and zoning requirements.

Of course, the specific recommendations with respect to private development will only be realized as individual properties along the Boulevard redevelop. Thus, it will be a long time before all development along the Boulevard is consistent with these recommendations.

Many transportation recommendations will be implemented over time as capital funds become available to make improvements. Adopting the plan does not guarantee that the funds will be available. However, the plan does serve as the primary basis for funding requests, and projects recommended in formally adopted plans often have priority over those that are not. Funds for transportation projects can be sought from a variety of sources, including local funds from Denver and Glendale, and
## Figure 14

### IMPLEMENTATION AGENCY(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denver Public Works</th>
<th>Colorado Department of Transportation</th>
<th>Denver Regional Council of Governments</th>
<th>Regional Transportation District</th>
<th>Task Force</th>
<th>Denver Planning Office</th>
<th>Boulder</th>
<th>Glendale</th>
<th>other/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-1 Multi-Year Intersection Improvement Program</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Perform Design Studies and Obtain Construction Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-2 Key Bottleneck Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Study Major Construction Projects if Minor Improvements Become Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3 Traffic Signal Timing Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Comprehensive Corridor Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4 Accel-Decel / Transit lanes and Curb Cuts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Continue to Require Dedication as Redevelopment Occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5 Pedestrian / Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Include in Intersection Projects, Development Review, and Denver 1992 Citywide Bike Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6 Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cities Work with RTD on bus stop improvements; Task Force works with RTD on Promotions; Continue to seek funding for Southeast Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-7 Employer Based Trip Reduction program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Continue support for regional trip reductions initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-8 Transportation management Organization Task Force</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cities Assist in formation of Task Force and Study Transportation Management Association Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-9 Right of Way Maintenance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Task Force Evaluates Property Owners’ role; Denver Assesses Maintenance Prioritization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Figure 15**

**Legend**
1. Primary Implementation Strategy
2. Secondary Improvements Strategy
3. Implementation Whenever Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use:</strong></td>
<td>through PUD and other rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LU-1 Overall Development Cap</td>
<td>through development review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LU-2 Land Use Mix</td>
<td>amendments to Parkway/Blvd. ordinance (Chap 49 Art. II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LU-3 On-site Parking</td>
<td>amendments to building restrictions (Chap. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citywide zoning revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Design:</th>
<th>Implementation by Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- UD-1 Sidewalk Standard</td>
<td>Implementation by Public Works and Zoning (through parking lot landscaping requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-2 Street Trees</td>
<td>Implementation by Public Works and Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-3 Street Lighting</td>
<td>Implementation by Planning Office and RTD; request easements from developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-4 Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>Design by Planning Office and Parks Dept.; locations evaluated by Public Works; CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-5 Boulevard Median</td>
<td>Planning Office to develop prototype; neighborhood organizations to build &amp; maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-6 Local Street Medians</td>
<td>Planning Office will develop prototype site layouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-7a Parking Lot Screening</td>
<td>Architecture review process to be developed by Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-7b Entry Medians</td>
<td>Planning Office will evaluate existing bulk plane limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-8 Front Setback and Landscaping</td>
<td>Interagency and overlapping jurisdictional cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-9 Building Placement</td>
<td>Intergovernmental cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-10 Building Entrance Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-11 Building Facades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-12 Upper Level Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-13 Maximum Height Limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-14 Architectural Treatment on all Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-15 Rear Buffers &amp; Screening/Alleys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-16 Service Area Screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-17 Equalize Applicable sign Requirements, Glendale &amp; Denver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-18 Ground-mounted Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-19 Building-mounted Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UD-20 Billboards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state and federal funds administered by the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Denver Regional Council of Governments. Even so, implementation of all of the projects recommended in this plan, even under the most favorable of funding circumstances, is expected to take ten to twenty years.

Finally, though formal adoption of the plan is an expression of the community's shared vision and goals for this area, many of the recommendations are consistent with, or extensions of, current practice, and will be implemented on that basis. For example, new developments are already required to provide acceleration-deceleration lanes and sidewalks. Also, Denver and Glendale have successfully sought funding assistance from the Denver Regional Council of Governments to develop a detailed traffic signal retiming program. They have also successfully sought funding from the Colorado Department of Transportation to repave a significant portion of the Boulevard within the study area. This plan will only strengthen and broaden the scope of the communitywide effort to improve Colorado Boulevard.

The general implementation process is reflected in Figure 16.

---

**Figure 16**

**Approval / Implementation Process**

- Community Advisory Committee
- Public Review
- Planning Board/Commission
- City Council(s)
- Implementing Agencies
- Ordinance Revision
- Development Review
- Follow-Up Studies
- Capital Programs
A BILL


WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Section 41-18(c) of the Revised Municipal Code, and by Ordinance No. 617, Series of 1989, there has been approved a Comprehensive Plan for the City and County of Denver; and

WHEREAS, said Section of the Revised Municipal Code provides for the amendment of said plan; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 617, Series of 1989, provides for the incorporation of other documents into the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, as a proposed part of the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Director has transmitted to the Mayor and Council for acceptance a proposed development framework for South Colorado Boulevard for the orderly and harmonious development of South Colorado Boulevard between 1st Avenue and Iliff Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor has approved the same; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has approved the same; and

WHEREAS, The Boulevard Plan was prepared with significant involvement of the owners and representatives of the various interests of South Colorado Boulevard between 1st Avenue and Iliff Avenue and has been approved by the same; and

WHEREAS, a member of City Council in whose council district the neighborhood plan is situated has monitored the process whereby said plan was formulated.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER:

Section 1. That the proposed development framework for South Colorado Boulevard for the harmonious development of South Colorado Boulevard between 1st Avenue and Iliff Avenue, consisting of a document entitled "The Boulevard Plan," filed with the City Clerk, Ex-Officio Clerk of the City and County of Denver, on the 29th day of May, 1991, as City Clerk's Filing No. 91-450, is hereby approved as part of the Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to Section 41-18(c) of the Revised Municipal Code, and Ordinance No. 617, Series of 1989.

Section 2. That the approval of The Boulevard Plan, and of any subsequent amendment thereto, is intended to establish the same, in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan, as the official guide for officials of the City and County of Denver and private citizens when making decisions affecting the future character of South Colorado Boulevard between 1st Avenue and Iliff Avenue; provided, however, that such approval shall not preempt the decision making powers vested by law or the administrative directive in the Mayor, the Council or any other official of the City and County of Denver with respect to, but not limited to, a zoning map amendment, a zoning language amendment, a dedication or vacation of a street, alley or other public way, a designation of a park, the issuance of a revocable permit, a conveyance or the acquisition of real property by the City and County of Denver, of an appropriation for or construction of a capital improvement; and provided, further, that it is expressly understood that judgment must be exercised in the application of The Boulevard Plan recommendations in the decision making processes of the Mayor, Council and other officials of the City and County of Denver.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL

__________________________
Cathy O'Dowd, President
June 17, 1991

APPROVED:

__________________________
C. Don Lewis, Mayor
June 18, 1991

ATTEST:

__________________________
Clint A. Green, Clerk and Recorder,
Ex-Officio Clerk of the City and County of Denver
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__________________________
June 7, 1991

__________________________
June 21, 1991
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