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#174

Posted by Jill Michele Hamilton on 03/04/2020 at 4:35pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I just want to say that making smaller living spaces is not a solution for affordable housing. Also, I find the plan to keep the neighborhood character lacking. if all they have to show is creating more units in a single lot requires more structural work, then really what is to stop them from building whatever monstrosity they want to build? Finally, I am against increasing the floor height at 12th and Elizabeth. There is no way to build up from what is already there. Those businesses would have to be closed and the ground torn up. And for what? another unsightly apartment building that does not match the community and will not provide enough parking? No thank you.

#175

Posted by monica plimack on 11/17/2019 at 4:54pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -7

I believe this draft is a wonderful paper BUT until this becomes the final approved plan, all pending rezoning, etc. should be put on moratorium. I know developers are attempting to rezone now and granfather them for later!! I also believe that all depts. have to learn to communicate, ie. rezoning dept., building dept. parks dept. They must all work together at the same time!!!
2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Land Use and Built Form topic covers the basic elements necessary for creating equitable and complete neighborhoods as the East Central area grows and changes over the next 20 years. Land use recommendations describe appropriate locations and intensities for housing, shopping, employment, and entertainment. Built form recommendations describe how new buildings and renovations can promote the desired neighborhood character. These elements set the foundation upon which the other topics in this plan – Mobility, Quality-of-Life Infrastructure, Economy and Housing – build. The appropriate mix of uses and character-enhancing buildings help residents have access to the goods, services, and amenities necessary to thrive.

Future land use and built form guidance is proposed using two organizational systems: Neighborhood Contexts and Future Places. Neighborhood Contexts describe the desired general characteristics of an area, including street and block patterns and intensity of development. Future Places describe more specifically what new uses and building scales are appropriate. Together, these systems articulate how the area is envisioned to look and feel in 2040. East Central currently has a rich mix of places: mixed-use centers and corridors, diverse residential areas, and special-purpose districts, like hospital campuses. However, not all of these places fulfill the community’s aspirations. There are underutilized properties and others with unappealing designs. Some buildings and uses that community members value are being replaced by those that may not contribute to desired neighborhood character. With significant changes expected from increased population and employment growth, to the re-imagining of Colfax Avenue as a bus rapid transit corridor, the recommendations of this section are vital for guiding changes to advance the community’s vision.

Community input throughout the planning process has highlighted the importance of land use and built form. When asked what they are most concerned about, a top issue from participants was the negative impacts of some development and the resulting loss of neighborhood character. When asked what big ideas they had to improve the area, one of the most common themes was to reinvigorate and beautify Colfax Avenue. The community’s vision for land use and built form in the East Central area reflects these concerns and desires.

LONG TERM VISION FOR LAND USE & BUILT FORM

In 2040, East Central is one of the most walkable places in the city. New buildings have pedestrian-friendly designs, such as front porches and balconies, ground floor windows, and have incorporated quality, durable materials that help maintain the area’s distinctive character. Historic streetcar stops are still within a short walk of most homes, providing shops, restaurants, and plazas that make it easy for people to meet their neighbors and join the area’s well-connected community. Each neighborhood has a rich diversity of young people, seniors, and families of a variety of ethnicities and income levels. Neighborhood schools are thriving, as dense areas that once contained few children now have many more families due to the construction of more multi-bedroom units. Older residents have been able to stay in the neighborhoods they love through the addition of smaller duplexes and backyard cottage houses. Historic buildings, including several with mid-20th century designs, are well-preserved, with some renovations facilitated by adaptive reuse as popular shops, cafés and co-working offices. Colfax Avenue, Colorado Boulevard, 17th Avenue, and the other commercial areas have a bustling main street feel with eclectic, engaging buildings and benches, lighting, and public art that create a welcoming and exciting environment. During the day, the sidewalks are filled with residents shopping for daily needs while evenings bring restaurant, bar, and concert goers. More multi-story, mixed use buildings have been woven into Colfax, Broadway, Colorado, and other major transit corridors, which has eased vehicle traffic and development pressure on surrounding neighborhoods by allowing more residents to conveniently access quality, reliable transportation.

MEASURABLE GOALS

To determine whether the vision is being achieved, the city will track three measures related to walkability, strategic growth, and historic preservation.

INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN WALKING OR ROLLING DISTANCE OF JOBS, RETAIL, AND QUALITY TRANSIT TO AT LEAST 50% IN EACH NEIGHBORHOOD

DIRECT 75% OF NEW JOBS AND HOUSEHOLDS THAT LOCATE IN EAST CENTRAL BY 2040 TO CENTERS AND CORRIDORS

AVOID FULL DEMOLITION OF ANY HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT BUILDING
Please remove this goal/measure. This is nonsensical. Almost the entire Congress Park neighborhood is marked as having historical significance, so we'd be saying we can't fully demolish anything in CP. And having this as a measure will encourage property owners to push for more and more historical designations, preventing any density additions, and keeping property values moving higher and higher each year.

Reply by David H. on 02/05/2020 at 10:21am - Link

I echo this completely. What is 'historic' anyway? This ambiguous term will just be used to restrict any change that will help fill the missing-middle housing needs. Just because something is old doesn't make it historic or valuable culturally.

We need to have resources where residents can learn how to do their exterior remodels and pops in historically accurate methods and materials. Use media such as the neighborhood association newsletters, and Life on Capitol Hill to highlight homes that have done a good job at modernization while keeping the correct historic character.

Reply by Joseph Mutter on 02/05/2020 at 1:02pm - Link

Is there a way to bolster up the available resources for the historic property owners, in addition to creating additional partnerships with preservation societies and preservation-minded construction firms?
Q15 – The Congress Park Neighborhood has the highest level of single-family homes being demolish in areas identified by Discover Denver as Architecturally Significant. How can this category be 100%?

#179

A 20 year plan should include provisions for transition to fully electric vehicles. Many homes in this area do not have garages, and a successful transition to lower-carbon transportation will likely include use of charging stations placed in the right-of-way on the street side of neighborhood sidewalks. Plans for sidewalks, bike lanes, and other street improvements should take into account the need for this type of infrastructure.

#180

Why are you allowing current demolition of such units, such as the ones at 11th and Adams, that then turned into 2 modern, non-historical units that sold for over $1 million each?

#181

While I do observe a few more individuals at various bus stops in and around Congress Park - there are far more speeding cars cutting through the neighborhood to avoid snarls on Colorado Blvd, York/Josephine, and each of the one-way streets between 6th and Colfax. Perhaps more CP residents can access shops, etc by means other than car, however, the introduction of shiny new businesses on Colfax, 12th ave, Cherry Creek, and soon to be 9th and Colo all seem to have drawn people from other parts of the city IN THEIR CARS. I really do not think that people visit CP via bus in favor of driving. The increase in unsafe traffic would prove otherwise.
So to use the fact that more business in CP eases vehicle traffic in the neighborhood may be a false or incomplete assumption on which to base much of this plan.

Reply by Kevin on 12/27/2019 at 1:44pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 4, Disagree: -2
Most people in the neighborhoods walk to businesses and restaurants on 12th. The new development on 9th will be more of a regional destination for people outside the neighborhood, which is why the insistence on large parking garages for that development was such a mistake, it will only encourage and increase more congestion. We should be pushing for higher frequency transit along the Colorado corridor to help relieve this.
LAND USE AND BUILT FORM OPPORTUNITY AREAS

LEGEND
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There is a lot of discussion about preserving local businesses on Colfax and 12th, but I hope that also applies to the local businesses on Colorado Boulevard. Swing Thai, Congress Park Taproom, and Mici's, and others, are very popular with the neighborhood and should also be preserved.

Please do not create additional historic designations for this purpose.

Why is Garfield between 13th Avenue and 14th Avenue (and blocks to the east) an Enhanced Residential Design Quality Area? Much of this area has already been converted to apartment buildings. There are very few single family homes remaining.

Limit new building height to 3 stories if a building of 5 stories already exist in the same block.
It's difficult to understand the symbology on this map. It looks like there are three shades of purple on the map, but only two are listed in the Legend.

#186

Posted by Elizabeta Stacishin-Moura on 01/06/2020 at 5:39pm - Link

I'm in favor of protecting beautiful architecture and pleasant neighborhoods, but I believe it can be done WHILE allowing additional density in this neighborhood. Denver's population continues to grow, this area has valuable urban infrastructure (which we all pay for), its very close to downtown - it must do its part in accommodating growth. Having said that, I also believe that this neighborhood should have strict design guidelines, or some mechanism to ensure that new development is consistent with neighborhood character.

#187

Posted by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:19pm - Link

As I mentioned on the related map from the overview, this entire neighborhood being historic is completely unfair to every other neighborhood. Please remove all of this historical designation if it is designed to prevent additional density. Many of the most interesting older buildings in this neighborhood ARE higher density building that would be illegal to build in the current form of this plan. If this whole neighborhood is designated as not allowing change, then we're giving the (already wealthy) property owners in this area additional windfall (by ensuring property values will always rise here, no new supply) and we are forcing all additional density on poorer neighborhoods - even those equally as old and historic, if not always as beautiful (e.g. West colfax).

Reply by BJWilson10 on 01/17/2020 at 2:53pm - Link

Jonathan, good points, but it doesn't mean that it isn't allowing change. For instance, Single-Family Home owners will be able to add an Additional Dwelling Unit (ADU), if they agree to keep the current home. It was explained by Curt Upton at a Neighborhood meeting that the Historic Significance would just add some additional qualifications to the area.
So, I don’t think that this designation necessarily impacts whether or not someone may change the property, just how it is done.

Reply by Rob Carnachan on 02/04/2020 at 11:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
I'm in favor of creating a formal historic district for my portion of Congress Park. I'm opposed to allowing ADUs, which create privacy concerns. We don't want to be guilty of the same sins we regularly castigate the urban "renewal" zealots of the 1950s/60s for - namely, destroying high-functioning intact historical neighborhoods in the name of (vainly) addressing some perceived social ill of today.

Reply by Katie on 02/04/2020 at 7:58pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
But what types of housing would be the "new supply?" It would be smaller dwellings designed for less people. So what would replace the dwindling supply of homes intended for families? This would drive the supply of single family homes even lower thus driving those prices even higher. Dividing up single family homes just ensures that families have even less affordable options.

#188

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:00pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -6
Q16 – In Congress Park on every block Discover Denver has identified architecture with “Good Integrity.” Please review if grey areas should be recategorized as “Area of Historic Interest.”

#189

Posted by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 10:57pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 11, Disagree: -2
How is this entire neighborhood "significant"? Not every bungalow needs to be preserved under glass for all time.
I agree with the "area of Historical Interest", but not in formal historic designations. The balance is how do we protect the integrity of the neighborhood while allowing some changes. To me, the bottom line is that I do not want to become another Wash Park where nice homes are bulldozed to make way for mini-mansions that are better suited for the suburbs. If "historical Interest" allows additional ADU's without destroying the character of the neighborhood, I am all for it.

Q16 – In Congress Park on every block Discover Denver has identified architecture with “Good Integrity.” Please review if grey areas should be recategorized as “Area of Historic Interest.”

I agree that so much of Congress Park is historically significant. It's one of the only neighborhoods in Denver that has such a large area of Victorian and Bungalow homes without intrusions from quickly-built modern homes with no regard for the character of the neighborhood. There are a handful of new homes in the neighborhood, but most of them respect the overarching architectural style of the neighborhood. The few homes that don't are an eyesore that ruin an entire block. I would like to keep the neighborhood's historic architecture preserved.

Completely agree with Mr. Qualls. The pops and scrapes that do not adhere to the historic quality of the neighborhood are a huge concern for us.
I'm worried about such large areas of Congress Park being designated as "areas of historic significance". This is my neighborhood. I worry this could be potentially be misused as a tool of exclusion. It has been pointed out to me that there are areas in the East Area that have similar architecture and building types that have not received a similar designation. Equity is an important concept in BluePrint Denver, so I worry that different areas with different income levels are not being treated equitably. I'd also note that largely the areas of "Historic Significance" are not areas that noted as areas of high risk of involuntary displacement.
LAND USE AND BUILT FORM CONCEPTS

Enhanced Residential Design Quality Area
Character Home Preservation is a concept to preserve traditional neighborhood character by discouraging demolition and encouraging context-sensitive additions instead. Context sensitive design rules are coupled with modifications to code standards to make additions easier. This concept is one tool that can be used to preserve traditional neighborhood character. See Policies L4 & L7. (Photo: Home in Congress Park)

Area of Historic Interest
An Area of Historic Interest is a defined area that has been identified through the neighborhood planning process as needing additional surveying. These areas include unique characteristics that may be worthy of some level of character preservation. See Policy L9. (Photo: Madison Street “Denver Squares”, City Park)

Active Ground Floor Use Area
An area where uses that bring activity to the sidewalk should be required on the ground floor. Areas include existing pedestrian-friendly neighborhood destinations, such as historic streetcar stops, or areas directly adjacent to a transit station. Activity can include retail, patio seating, plazas where people can sit, play or gather, or other activity that enlivens the sidewalk. See Policy L8. (Photo: 12th & Madison, Congress Park)

Commercial Character Building Preservation
A concept to preserve buildings that are not protected by a landmark designation, but contribute to the character of mixed use areas and are desired to be preserved. Candidates are preliminarily identified in this plan, but additional surveying would be completed when implementing this concept. See Policies L3, L6, & L8. (Photo: The Fillmore, North Capitol Hill) (Photo: The Fillmore, North Capitol Hill)

Historic Landmark/District
A Historic Landmark is an individual building whereas a Historic District is a group of buildings identified by a boundary. Both offer an additional layer of protection by restricting demolition and requiring design review to preserve their history and character. See Policies L6 & L8. (Photo: Raymond House, within Wyman Historic District in City Park West (photo credit: Susan Ryan on Twitter))

Historic Preservation Incentive Area
Historic Preservation Incentive Areas would allow for one additional dwelling unit in exchange for the preservation of an existing residential building. The additional unit would be interior to the home, such as an upper floor or a basement unit. If a homeowner decides to add a unit, the entire home must be protected, with demolition restricted and specific rules for modifications. See Policies L5, L7, & L9. (Photo: Duplex plus ADU, City Park)

Enhanced Mixed-Use Design Quality Area
An area where additional standards are recommended in order to better align construction with community goals. Requirements can include guidelines for bulk, massing, building materials, signage, streetscape, open space, landscaping, improved transitions between commercial and residential, or other elements specific to the vision for an area. See Policies L6 & L8. (Photo: Row houses in City Park)

Enhanced Mixed-Use Design Quality Area

Yes!! This is great. People will be using cars less (meaning less traffic on our streets) if they have access to cool shops, restaurants, jobs, healthcare, entertainment, groceries, etc. within walking distance of their residence.

Like like double like

Does this include requiring historical consistency of design and building materials that match with the existing neighborhood?

This might be tricky because of Denver's patchwork historic fabric. There are myriad styles throughout the East Central area that don't quite match with one another, but that is also what is beautiful about Denver. Preserve and promote the weird!
Does this come with widening sidewalks in these areas?

#198

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:03pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -6

Q17 – The Congress Park Neighborhood has homes of Historic Interest on all blocks throughout the neighborhood.

#199

Posted by David H. on 02/05/2020 at 10:24am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

All of these aesthetic restrictions are completely subjective. One man's "traditional character" is another man's old and run-down. The city shouldn't be in the business of regulating taste and aesthetic.

#200

Posted by Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley on 01/25/2020 at 5:59pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

This policy/practice is an absolute must for the plan.

#201

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:07pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

Q18 – At the November 13th ECAP Community Workshop, we were told the additional dwelling unit for home preservation had been removed for the plan. Is the second primary unit still being proposed?

Reply by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:20pm - Link
Type: Answer
I was at this meeting, and I did not hear that they were removing that additional unit. And they should not remove it.

#202

Posted by Jaxson H on 01/10/2020 at 3:38pm - Link
Type: Typo
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
missing numbers

#203

Posted by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:00pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 6, Disagree: -2

Locking down entire blocks and neighborhoods because they’re quote-unquote historical guarantees development will be concentrated elsewhere while a privileged few get city-enforced exclusivity to live in a close-in transit-rich neighborhood.
2.1.2 NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXTS

Neighborhood Contexts reflect established land patterns such as lot and block sizes, era of construction, and existing building heights and density. Neighborhood contexts also reflect future expectations for how new development is expected to occur and how it should respond to existing patterns. The assigned contexts are reflected in the Denver Zoning Code as well. For complete context descriptions, please refer to Blueprint Denver, Chapters 4 and 5.

- **Downtown** – These areas feature tall buildings close to the street, high pedestrian activity and active uses along the ground floor with a mix of uses on upper floors and excellent transit access and mobility options. This context has the tallest buildings and most dense form (i.e. large footprints, buildings take up majority of blocks).

- **Urban Center** – a transition to the urban neighborhoods from the Downtown context. It includes a high mix of uses with buildings close to the street, but the scale of buildings transition down in height from the Downtown context. It also has excellent transit access and mobility options.

- **General Urban** – a mix of residential and office uses and commercial areas, but with higher densities than the Urban contexts. Buildings are generally multi-unit residential or office, although some single and two unit buildings may be mixed in. There is also a high concentration of historic buildings in this context in the East Central area.

- **Urban** – primarily single and two-unit residential areas and mixed-use nodes, although there are many small, multi-unit buildings, especially close to Colfax Avenue. Vehicle access is provided by alleys, so streets are lined with front porches and yards.

- **Districts** – large schools, hospitals, large parks and civic spaces. They may require special rules for building form and height and contrast with the surrounding character. In the East Central area, examples include: the State Capitol grounds, City Park, Cheesman Park, East High School, Morey Middle School, St. John's Cathedral, Carla Madison Recreation Center and the Uptown Medical District.
I agree with the General Urban designation in the northeastern blocks of Congress Park neighborhood. Especially with National Jewish expanding its footprint, and many of the single family homes having converted to apartment buildings, this part of the neighborhood has a more urban context than the interior of the neighborhood.

I would suggest considering that the General Urban designation should extend to 13th Avenue and the west side of Garfield Street. There are 3 and 4-story apartment buildings on both sides of Garfield Street between 13th Ave and 14th Ave. It has a much higher density and more urban feel than blocks to the south and west.

How is low-density residential considered "urban"? Maybe if we could actually build some small apartments and corner stores you could make the argument.

I have the same question. This cannot both be preserved as completely low-density and be considered urban. All urban spaces should allow fourplexes, as is being done in Minneapolis.
The designation of both St Paul and the West side of Steele St as "General Urban" is at odds with the identification of these blocks as of "historic interest" earlier in the plan. As the Historic Interest designation implies, a more precise survey would be helpful. The 1500 and 1600 blocks of Steele and St. Paul - on both sides, currently have fewer multi-story apartments than the "Urban" blocks to the south of colfax. "Urban" rather than "General Urban" would be a more accurate description of the current built environment.

#208

The west side of Steele Street is the same as the East side of Steele St. It should be urban just like the East side. Both sides are zoned TU. See the Denver zoning map.

I would be very upset if the west side of Steele is zoned for greater density than we already have. The east and west sides of Steele should remain as is. thank you.

This map does not reflect the reality of Steele st, St. Paul, or Milwaukee between 16th and 17th. The proposed “urban” classification” does not match the actual character of these streets and is not consistent with the intent or letter of the neighborhood contexts as used by the city. These are residential streets with single family and small multifamily homes and should remain as such. The map needs to be drawn to more precisely reflect the current character of these streets.

#209
Josephine should be the dividing line between urban and general urban here.

#210

Posted by **Bruce ODonnell** on **02/01/2020** at **6:14pm** - Link

Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

The 1290 N. Williams historic Tears McFarlane House is a community center, office building, events center and gathering place that is comprised of all non-residential uses. It aspires to increase the commercial activity to better activate and revitalize and restore the property, become a more vital community center and "get eyes on the park". The building has not been used as a residence and nobody has lived here in over 50 years. Because of all of these facts, a Residential land use designation such as is in the current draft is inappropriate and perhaps even an error in that it does not recognize the use of the property. The land use classification should be changed to reflect the actual uses and provide adopted plan direction for the future use of the 1290 Williams property. Community Corridor would be an excellent choice, or some other mixed use designation as clearly residential is wrong.

#211

Posted by **Ryan Keeney** on **01/15/2020** at **5:20pm** - Link

Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Should we be limiting the growth of neighborhoods to match how they look today? If this philosophy was enforced 100 years ago, there would be few multifamily buildings in much of the east central plan area. None of the wonderful high-rises would have been built around Cheesman Park. This idea of "precedent" has major implications.

#212

Posted by **Laurel S** on **02/05/2020** at **3:20pm** - Link

Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

One reason there may be so many comments about preserving street parking is the current restrictions on garage additions in the urban area. Assuming this entire area has usable vehicle access by alley is incorrect. Many of the existing garages were built in the late 1800s and early 1900s and cannot possibly accommodate a modern day vehicle. Small additions should be allowed onto existing garages on smaller lots without having to adhere to setbacks, to allow...
keeping most of the existing garage footprint while allowing for a small expansion (a few feet) to actually fit a vehicle. This plan assumes everyone can get everywhere they need to be by public transportation. Many people need vehicles for their job, child transportation, elderly transportation, pet transportation, and generally enjoying the recreational activities close to Denver that are ONLY accessible by car.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 7:44pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Buy a smaller car.
To achieve neighborhood planning goals, the plan includes refinements to the future places established in Blueprint Denver, including more specific height guidance, as well as recommendations for residential and commercial design, historic and character preservation, and compatible infill development.

**CITYWIDE PLAN: BLUEPRINT DENVER**

* A truly inclusive city is composed of complete neighborhoods and great places accessible to everyone, regardless of age, ability or income.

As Denver continues to evolve as an inclusive city, we must strive to create complete neighborhoods for everyone. Access to vital community amenities should not be limited to only certain neighborhoods in our city. Although Denver aspires to be a city of complete neighborhoods, this does not mean all neighborhoods should be the same or remain static. Even complete neighborhoods continue to evolve. The completeness of each neighborhood is defined by its distinct and authentic history, culture and character, as well as its access to a variety of housing types, services, green spaces and employment opportunities. The context-appropriate integration of utility infrastructure is also part of a complete neighborhood.

Blueprint Denver establishes a framework to plan and implement complete neighborhoods. Three interrelated elements form the foundation of a complete neighborhood: land use and built form, mobility and quality-of-life infrastructure. How the complete neighborhood elements vary and come together result in the different places and streets found in our city's many neighborhoods. How places and streets interact in turn results in the various neighborhood contexts found across the city.

The ability to calibrate the different elements of a complete neighborhood by neighborhood context, place and street type provides a considerable amount of nuance when mapping our unique and evolving neighborhoods. The East Central Area Plan refines and updates the context, place, and street type designations of Blueprint Denver. This plan also advances the land use and built form, mobility, and quality-of-life infrastructure recommendations of Blueprint Denver and adds a new element of economy and housing. Together, these tools can be used to create the complete neighborhoods necessary to achieve the vision of Blueprint Denver for an equitable and inclusive city.

**Neighborhood Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Places & Street Types**

- **LAND USE & BUILT FORM**
  - DOWNTOWN
  - MAIN STREET
  - MIXED USE
  - INDUSTRIAL
  - COMMERCIAL
  - RESIDENTIAL

- **MOBILITY**
- **QUALITY-OF-LIFE INFRASTRUCTURE**

**The Elements of a Complete Neighborhood**

Centers, Corridors, Residential, Districts

Source: Blueprint Denver 2019
this universal access assumption is completely flawed. rich investors, who are the financial lifeblood of the nation because they pay the majority of the very taxes which support growth and security for all, will never live in a city or a neighborhood where anyone can roam anywhere equally. they want their privacy. they want their gated community. they will build it regardless of a zoning law allowing homeless shelters everywhere. they want to be safe, just as everyone does. to force the rich investor to live next door to a homeless shelter is the ultimate self-destructive socialism. you will drive the rich investor away, when you really need him. we need to allow for neighborhoods to maintain their exclusivities and their social benefits, but we need to allow them to remain separate. the rich investors are our friends and they run the country, so there is no point in offending them with socially inclusive draconian laws intended to remove their autonomy. they have always failed and the result is ghettoization of the neighborhoods they leave behind when they are forced to move away to be safer. allowing up zoning and increased household density in a rich neighborhood will only destroy the character and security of the neighborhood so replace "regardless of income" with "in accordance with income".

hogwash
**PLACES IN EAST CENTRAL**

East Central’s mix of places is one of the most diverse in the city. Each of the six neighborhoods has a center or corridor, a mix of residential areas, and districts. Below are brief descriptions of each context and place combination found in East Central. For complete place descriptions, please refer to Chapters 4 and 5 of *Blueprint Denver*. For details of place subcategories not defined in *Blueprint Denver*, see sidebar on Page 30.

### DOWNTOWN

**Regional Center**
- Office, retail, eating and drinking establishments, commercial services and multi-unit residential uses are found mixed throughout
- High degree of urbanism paired with a strong pedestrian realm

**Community Corridor**
- Provides a mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Buildings have a distinctly linear orientation along the street
- Building footprints are typically larger and exhibit a significant degree of street activation that provides an active public-private interface

**High Residential**
- A high mix of uses throughout, including high density multi-unit residential, commercial, civic and institutional uses
- The downtown residential areas are distinguished from the downtown regional center by their land use mix being slightly more multi-unit residential in nature

### URBAN CENTER

**Community Center**
- Provides a mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Strong degree of urbanism with mostly continuous building frontages and distinct streetscape elements that define the public realm

**Community Corridor**
- Typically provides a mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Buildings have a distinctly linear orientation along the street

**High Residential**
- A high mix of uses throughout, including many large scale multi-unit residential uses
- Commercial uses are prevalent

**High-Medium Residential**
- A mix of uses, including multi-unit residential, but at a slightly lower intensity compared to the high residential areas

### GENERAL URBAN

**Community Center**
- Typically provides some mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Strong degree of urbanism with mostly continuous building frontages to define the public realm

**Local Center**
- Primarily provides options for dining, entertainment and shopping
- May also include some residential and employment uses
- Provides a more intimate, pedestrian scale

**Community Corridor**
- Typically provides some mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Buildings have a distinctly linear orientation along the street

**Local Corridor**
- Primarily provides options for dining, entertainment and shopping
- May also include some residential and employment uses
- Buildings have distinctly linear orientation along the street with very shallow setbacks

### URBAN

**Local Center**
- Primarily provides options for dining, entertainment and shopping
- May also include some residential and employment uses
- Public realm is typically defined by lower-scale buildings with active frontages providing a more intimate, pedestrian scale

**Community Corridor**
- Typically provides some mix of office, commercial and residential uses
- Have a distinctly linear orientation along the street
- Lot coverage is typically higher, with open spaces that are often accommodated by spaces between buildings rather than along the street

**Local Corridor**
- Primarily provides options for dining, entertainment and shopping
- May also include some residential and employment uses
- Buildings have a distinctly linear orientation along the street with very shallow setbacks

**High Residential**
- Predominately multi-unit residential, though compatible commercial uses should be interspersed throughout

**High-Medium Residential**
- A mix of low- to medium-scale multi-unit residential uses with some neighborhood-serving mixed use distributed throughout

**Low-Medium Residential – Multi Unit**
- Primarily residential, with a mix of unit types
- Single- and two-unit homes are interspersed with lower scale multi-unit buildings
- Limited neighborhood serving commercial can be found, particularly at intersections

**Low-Medium Residential – Row House**
- Primarily residential, with a mix of unit types
- Single- and two-unit homes are interspersed with row houses
- Limited neighborhood serving commercial can be found, particularly at intersections
EAST CENTRAL PLAN UPDATES TO BLUEPRINT DENVER PLACES

The East Central Area Plan refines Blueprint Denver’s guidance on future places and updates the Blueprint Denver future places map. For a few residential places, the East Central Area Plan provides more detailed guidance by applying subcategories as summarized below.

- **Residential Low** - these areas are predominantly single- and two-unit uses. Accessory dwelling units are appropriate and should be thoughtfully integrated throughout.
  - **Residential Low: Single-Unit**: This subcategory is recommended in areas that have single-unit homes, but where two-unit homes would not be appropriate except in locations identified where an additional unit is allowed if the house is preserved (see Policy L5).
  - **Residential Low: Two-Unit**: This subcategory is recommended in areas where both single- and two-unit homes area appropriate.

- **Residential Low-Medium** - these places include a mix of low- to mid-scale multi-unit residential options and some single- and two-unit homes.
  - **Residential Low-Medium: Row House**: includes single-unit and two-unit residential in a limited capacity as well as denser housing types such as row houses and small multi-unit buildings. The East Central Area Plan applies the “residential low-medium: row house” subcategory in areas where single-unit, two-unit, row house buildings and accessory dwelling units would be appropriate, but where small multi-unit buildings would not.
  - **Residential Low-Medium: Multi Unit**: A mix of mid-scale multi-unit residential options.

In addition to the above, the East Central Area Plan also provides building height guidance. This height guidance may be greater or less than the ranges identified by Blueprint’s place descriptions. Building heights are also further restricted by existing view planes in some locations.

For more detailed information on these places, and on the future place descriptions not modified by this plan, please refer to Blueprint Denver, Chapters 4 and 5.
There are almost zero instances in the city where a single family home covers its own infrastructure maintenance costs on property taxes alone. There should be no such thing as single-unit restrictions in this entire East Central Area plan. Form restrictions would be fine, but we should leave the use of the building to its owner (could be multiple units in a form that looks like a single family home, or a residential unit and a non-noxious business).

Most of the neighborhoods in the East Central plan are zoned U-TU-A or B depending on lot size. This means that two unit development may occur. I suggest that we rewrite this zoning category to eliminate the detached garage exemption from the plot ratio-ie: house versus yard coverage. At present even large lots can be covered at 37.5 %, BUT the detached garage may add another 700 square feet, to the impermeable surface. Add concrete patios and walk ways, and we are asking for serious flooding as has happened in Houston in the last few years.

I also would like to see lower bulk plane-basically how tall a building can be in order to encourage more solar being used on residential housing. If a new development pops up to the south of many of the craftsman cottages in these neighborhoods, say goodbye to any chance of solar mitigation of your electric bill.

There is no where in the City of Denver where two-unit homes are not appropriate and only single-unit homes are. We should be legalizing two or three-unit homes City-wide, especially in East Central with our great walkability and, hopefully improved, bikeability and transit.
I could not disagree more strenuously. 1) first the present zoning has not yet been built to capacity. 2) why open up neighborhoods to further demolition of 100 year old houses. I personally have no problem with pop tops or extensions but most of us living in these neighborhoods love the atmosphere of these old houses. 3) Permeable surfaces-increasing the units will lead to maximized plot ratio, ie: the house versus the yard. May I remind everyone again that City Park is the lowest point in metro Denver, less soil to drain off rainfall means more runoff. Our wastewater assessments have already gone up this year for “flood mitigation “. 3) who will pay for the increased pressure on sewage, water and electricity? Will these developments pay for themselves in utilities?

Reply by Alison Torvik on 01/31/2020 at 4:32pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
It's specious to say that an addition to a house does not impact the permeable yard but housing does. The biggest impermeable surface is roads. Let's get rid of on-street parking and add green easements to increase permeable space.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 7:49pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Alison Torvik, agreed. On-street parking is city subsidization of car owners at the cost of pollution, space, and safety to everyone else.

Reply by Azar on 12/21/2019 at 11:47am - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 10, Disagree: -2
Agree completely. It is not a sustainable plan for the future of the city to try to preseve entire neighborhoods in amber just because some people liked their house at one time in the past. Denver has always been changing and growing, and it will continue to do so; this plan allows Denver to change and update with the times rather than set an arbitrary date beyond which no building of new houses is possible.

Reply by Kevin on 12/30/2019 at 11:15pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 5, Disagree: -2
Agree, this should be considered a city wide equity measure.
#217

Posted by S on 11/18/2019 at 3:42pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 14, Disagree: -5
The minimum should be two units on any property in East Central area, as a use by right.

#218

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:23pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
Q19 – In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories would help these homes from being replaced with wedding cake type structures.

#219

Posted by jonathan clyburn on 12/28/2019 at 7:16pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1
New units being built should be condos, instead of apartments to stabilize the high rents. Rents go up and up as a mortgage of some kind is stable.

#220

Posted by Elyse on 01/26/2020 at 7:22pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -4
Policies should encourage the adaptive reuse of large single family homes into multiple apartment units. This maintains existing character in the neighborhoods and contributes to a diversity of housing options.

Reply by Katie on 02/04/2020 at 8:02pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
I disagree. This will reduce the supply of options for families, thus driving up prices for this important demographic.
There are currently many brand new apartment buildings being built. There very, very few new single family homes being built.

#221

Posted by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:05pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 7, Disagree: -5
Why limit mixed-use? Let it spring up wherever people think it makes sense. It should naturally flow.

Reply by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 4:19pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -3
I'm concerned about not limiting mixed use in traditional residential areas. The City already has existing allowances for certain types of home businesses but also has been slow and ineffective with enforcement. A high-traffic, all-hours type of business could easily be a nuisance and impair the value of neighboring homes. Would it be OK to operate a gym out of your garage? A massage parlor? What about signage?

#222

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:23pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -4
Q19 – In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories would help these homes from being replaced with wedding cake type structures.

#223

Posted by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:22pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: -6
Mixed use should always be allow. Non-noxious businesses should be able to operate in any residential area to help promote walkability and bikeability.
RECOMMENDATIONS

**L1**

**Policy**

Ensure compatible development on institutional sites within neighborhoods.

Institutional uses, such as schools and places of worship, are typically embedded within residential areas and provide key services to surrounding residents. When these uses leave a neighborhood, it can leave a vacant site that has the potential to provide additional neighborhood services and more diverse housing options without displacing existing residents. In addition, new development on existing large campuses should be designed to complement the surrounding neighborhood.

**Background**

A. Consider zoning code revisions to ensure compatible redevelopment of former institutional sites embedded in low and low-medium residential areas. These sites are appropriate for low-medium residential and neighborhood-serving uses, such as childcare, cafés, community meeting space, and other low impact uses.

1. Preserving and reusing vacant institutional buildings should be required unless a community-informed process is conducted to make an exception.

B. When new development occurs on large campuses, require compatibility with residential areas, pedestrian connections, open space, and activate building frontages on major corridors. (See Policy E1 for additional detail.)

**Strategies**

A. Encourage shared use of space at these types of facilities by creating shared use agreements between schools or churches and the city. Some examples could include:

1. Using playgrounds, gymnasiums, and sports facilities for public use during non-school hours.
2. Using rooms for community uses, such as book clubs, arts and crafts, presentations, and adult learning (see Policy E3 for additional detail).
3. Using church parking to accommodate nearby parking needs for adjacent uses.
4. Using school parking lots for neighborhood events, mobile community gardens or farmer’s markets.
5. Using dedicated areas on school grounds for community gardens.

**L2**

Encourage shared use and activation of institutional and quasi-public buildings and open space during off-peak times.

Some neighborhoods in East Central lack smaller, neighborhood-scaled open space and community facilities. Additionally, children often have limited places to go after school to be active. Allowing shared use of facilities like churches and schools during off-peak hours could provide these community amenities to the neighborhoods without having to build new facilities.

**Background**

A. Consider zoning code revisions to ensure compatible redevelopment of former institutional sites embedded in low and low-medium residential areas. These sites are appropriate for low-medium residential and neighborhood-serving uses, such as childcare, cafés, community meeting space, and other low impact uses.

1. Preserving and reusing vacant institutional buildings should be required unless a community-informed process is conducted to make an exception.

B. When new development occurs on large campuses, require compatibility with residential areas, pedestrian connections, open space, and activate building frontages on major corridors. (See Policy E1 for additional detail.)

**Strategies**

A. Encourage shared use of space at these types of facilities by creating shared use agreements between schools or churches and the city. Some examples could include:

1. Using playgrounds, gymnasiums, and sports facilities for public use during non-school hours.
2. Using rooms for community uses, such as book clubs, arts and crafts, presentations, and adult learning (see Policy E3 for additional detail).
3. Using church parking to accommodate nearby parking needs for adjacent uses.
4. Using school parking lots for neighborhood events, mobile community gardens or farmer’s markets.
5. Using dedicated areas on school grounds for community gardens.

---

*Source: 2017 East Central Kick-off Survey*
We strongly support the off peak hour use of existing institutional buildings.

Would definitely like to see more of this in general to help tie communities together and make full use of the available resources rather than delineating one space for only one purpose.

Q21 – Good idea. Which city departments will be responsible for coordinating these agreements?

In the event that an institutional building and land is sold, with the building’s original use being changed, then the building should first be maintained with its original exterior. For example, the Abbey at 14th and Adams, and the school at Columbine and 12th. Also, if there is new building on the land, the building’s architectural design should match the existing neighborhood. For example, in Congress Park there should be no use of modern design elements (the northwest corner of 11th and Adams is an example of the modern design we do not want in our neighborhood). Also the building and materials used should strongly reflect the Victorian and Craftsman design of the homes in the neighborhood. Multi-unit building must be kept to a minimum in Congress Park.
I am also for aesthetic preservation, but the wholesale limitation of multi-unit buildings (which would include 2 units) in a singular neighborhood is unrealistic as Denver continues to add density.

#228

Q20 - Compatible redevelopment would include height limits not to exceed adjacent residential architecture heights.

Absolute tosh.
#229

Posted by Ben G on 11/13/2019 at 9:11am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 13, Disagree: -1
Zoning so close to two major, high frequency transit corridors should support higher density than just TU zones. Why not go with RH zoning here instead and match the recommendation for south of Colfax?

#230

Posted by Barb Frommell on 01/12/2020 at 10:16pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -4
I would consider extending Low-Medium Residential (Mulit-Unit) to the west side of Garfield. There are already some apartment buildings on the west side. Also, larger buildings will help buffer the neighborhood from the expanding National Jewish. And it will allow more people to live near Colfax, Sprouts, Teller Elementary and high frequency bus routes.

#231

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 11/19/2019 at 3:11pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 20, Disagree: -8
NO MORE SINGLE-FAMILY ONLY ZONING! This is central Denver which should be more mixed in order to accommodate the missing middle!

Reply by Daniel on 01/08/2020 at 11:54pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -5
100% of the land around central Denver doesn't have to mixed zoning. It's ok to preserve a few blocks of historically significant and unique architecture. This is a cultural resource anyone can enjoy on a walk, not just the people who live here.

Reply by Ryan Keeney on 01/15/2020 at 5:33pm - Link
Agree: 6, Disagree: -2
This is much larger than "a few blocks" though. I agree scrapes should be discouraged but this neighborhood needs more flexibility. ADU's should be allowed everywhere, as should additions to and subdivisions of existing structures.

#232

Posted by **Ian Wheat** on **01/14/2020** at **6:08pm** - [Link](#)

*Type: Suggestion*

*Agree: 7, Disagree: -3*

Congress park should not be a single family restricted neighborhood, please allow more dense housing! In this central, urban neighborhood with great transit access where many people desire to live close to work and school, with ample resources, why would we not allow and encourage more density, diversity of housing? Why not allow all of Cheesman, Uptown and Congress Park to become a truly urban neighborhood? The single family housing is exclusionary and has made this and much of the city unaffordable, unattainable to most!

Reply by **Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley** on **02/03/2020** at **10:08pm** - [Link](#)

*Type: Suggestion*

*Agree: 2, Disagree: -1*

Congress Park is much different than Cheesman and Uptown. It is more single, detached historic homes. It is why we purchased our home here over 20 years ago. We do not want it to have more density. If there were slightly more density allowed in Congress Park with more multi-units, then they must adhere to the original historic character of Victorian, Craftsman, and Tudor style architecture. Congress Park is already one of the most dense neighborhoods in Denver. Density does not guarantee affordability or diversity.

#233

Posted by **Morgan Lynch** on **12/27/2019** at **4:06pm** - [Link](#)

*Type: Suggestion*

*Agree: 6, Disagree: -8*

I agree with Congress Park remaining Single Family. I would like to see more architectural requirements on remodels, specifically "pop-tops"

Reply by **Daniel** on **01/08/2020** at **11:55pm** - [Link](#)

*Type: Suggestion*

*Agree: 3, Disagree: 0*
Most "pop-tops" do a good job of building onto a bungalow and keeping in that style, but certainly not all. Once a building has been added onto, it's less likely to be scraped, which is a good thing.

#234

Posted by S on 11/18/2019 at 3:43pm - Link  
Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 24, Disagree: -3  
ADUs should be allowed in the entire Central area.

#235

Posted by Pamela C on 02/05/2020 at 11:45pm - Link  
Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0  
The west side of Steele and St. Paul between Colfax and 16th should not be marked as multi-unit housing areas. As with the east side of Steele, the housing is single family housing with 1 small multi-unit house. These blocks should be described as 2-unit residential blocks, consistent with the areas east of Steele in City Park South.

#236

Posted by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:29pm - Link  
Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 12, Disagree: -6  
This entire area is within spitting distance of downtown and we expect this should remain single family homes only through 2040? That's absurd. Please ensure that duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are permitted (even if architectural standards are required). This area historically contained many multi-unit properties, and those properties are still standing. there's no reason they shouldn't be allowed today.

Reply by Daniel Qualls on 01/08/2020 at 11:52pm - Link  
Type: Suggestion  
Agree: 5, Disagree: -6  
I disagree. There are many areas near downtown that can be developed with increased density, but none of those areas have the architectural significance of Congress Park. It's a special place where you can walk uninterrupted through blocks of century-old homes. If we lose this, we can never get it back. This is worth preserving.
#237

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:33pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -12
Q22 - In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories would help these homes from being demolish and replaced with larger flat roofed wedding cake type structures.

Reply by Ian Wheat on 01/14/2020 at 6:11pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 4, Disagree: -4
Preservation should not be prioritized over allowing and encouraging more dense, diverse, affordable housing and allowing people to have a home they can afford.

#238

Posted by jae on 02/05/2020 at 10:59pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
6th Ave is hardly less of a corridor than Colfax. Limiting development to this extent along this corridor seems at odds with the goals envisioned here

#239

Posted by Will on 02/04/2020 at 10:04pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -1
It's clear this area is being allowed to exclude itself from the neighborhood and using historic homes as the excuse. It is perfectly reasonable to allow some higher density while restricting new development to strict architectural standards.

#240

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 02/28/2020 at 11:10am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
No more single-family only zoning. Duplexes and triplexes can easily be integrated in Congress Park to add density which helps increase affordability but still be in character with the neighborhood.

#241

Posted by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:11pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1
Stop trying to stuff every business within 75 feet of Colfax. We have to let retail, services, and density breath. Trying to constrain it only makes it worse; too dense where it's allowed and not dense enough where it's needed. It destroys walkability and encourages driving. It's the worst of all possible methods.

#242

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 02/28/2020 at 11:14am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
By "mixed" I didn't mean "mixed-use." I meant it should allow zoning that allows for duplexes and triplexes at most. These building types integrate well with existing neighborhoods and add density.

#243

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 02/28/2020 at 11:21am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
Allow at least two unit residential.

#244

Posted by Andrew Rogge on 01/26/2020 at 5:37pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
1290 Williams Street (the Tears-McFarlane property) should be re-designated as "local corridor" in this plan. Due to the Landmark status of this property a "high residential" designation is not appropriate and does not anticipate the future uses that are actually needed to maintain the integrity of this Denver landmark. Further, I would suggest that all Denver
landmarks be identified as such in the Plan. Perhaps they could be identified with their designation number overlaid on their future place type, or they could become their own category which reflects the diversity and flexibility of uses Landmarked properties are able to contain.

#245

Posted by Ryan Keeney on 01/25/2020 at 7:57pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -1
Redesignate 1290 N Williams St (CHUN's Tears McFarlane House) as Local Corridor. This move is supported by Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods. Non-residential uses are present at this site and have been for decades.

#246

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:34pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -6
Q22 - In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories would help these homes from being demolish and replaced with larger flat roofed wedding cake type structures.

#247

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 02/28/2020 at 11:19am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Uptown is really a less dense extension of downtown but should still be high-density across the majority of the neighborhood. There is opportunity here to add a lot more density in an already dense neighborhood without the worry of NIMBYs.

#248

Posted by Logan Meyer on 12/10/2019 at 2:29pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
As you can probably see, the row home designation on our block (800 N Ogden) looks like a weird gerrymandered snake
skipping some blocks and stopping haphazardly on one side of an alley and doing the opposite 10 feet away on
the other side of the alley.

I see that my house 847 N Ogden is currently in the "rowhouse" designation, along with the 5 unit building next door at
853 N Ogden st., the 10+ apartment building directly across the street at 844 N Ogden St., along with probably a dozen
other multi unit buildings that are squeezed into the "rowhome" district of our street that you are proposing. I think we
have at least 8 buildings that actually have more than 1 unit already on our small block and the rowhome limitation simply
isn't consistent with it's current use :/

Would you please consider making my already 2-unit home (according to denver property records), and the multi-unit
houses around us more in line with their current uses by removing the rowhome designation and just give us the multi
unit designation like how they are currently used?

Specifically, I would really like to build an ADU, and it is my understanding that I will have significantly more limitations
under a rowhome designation than I would with a MU designation. Additionally given the existing old carriage house on
our block, an MU designation would allow me to build an ADU more in line with the existing buildings on my alley :)


MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS IN EAST CENTRAL

While Blueprint Denver place categories provide general guidance on building heights, this plan provides detailed height guidance for specific areas. The Maximum Building Heights map depicts the recommended building heights within East Central. These heights may or may not be achievable on specific sites subject to a variety of factors including but not limited to: existing zoning, view plane restrictions, and where achieving maximum heights is linked to the provision of community benefits (such as affordable housing) as recommended in this plan. These height recommendations are to be used along with the place designations above to determine appropriate zone districts and development patterns in East Central.

Building heights in East Central vary, with the tallest buildings concentrated in the neighborhoods within the western portion of the plan area. Taller buildings are also located adjacent to Cheesman and City Parks, in the hospital campuses, and along some of the major streets. A mix of heights is envisioned along Colfax Avenue. Less variation occurs in the eastern portion of the plan area, with most buildings in Congress Park and City Park being 35 feet or less in height.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Neighborhood workshops included an exercise that asked which elements of new construction in single- and two-unit areas were most important to address. In order of priority, the results concluded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass and Scale</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of responses rating each element very or somewhat important (271)
Source: February 2019 workshops
#249

Posted by Kevin on 12/30/2019 at 11:42pm - [Link]
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -4
Building heights should be determined by the number of units. There have been a number of scrapes in CP the last few years with higher building heights and the beginning of seeing MEGA mansions. I'd be more comfortable with this if they were multi family homes and there was a genuine need for the extra height in row house type areas.

#250

Posted by Sandra on 01/05/2020 at 3:17pm - [Link]
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -1
Please define these terms. I don't know what they mean, so these bars are meaningless to me. Additionally, what is the sample size here? If a small enough number of people participated in this survey, then these differences are statistically insignificant and the comparison/ranking here is a total wash.

#251

Posted by Ben G on 11/13/2019 at 9:12am - [Link]
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
This graphic feels misleading. 15% in any one category really isn't that much.

#252

Posted by Sandra on 01/05/2020 at 3:38pm - [Link]
Type: Question
Agree: 3, Disagree: -1
Additionally, who participated in this workshop, and how representative were they of the community? I'm guessing this workshop didn't include a random sample of the full population of the area who were equitably incentivized to show up.
I agree with the designation as Urban. Although some apartment complexes and duplexes are mixed in - the majority of this area is single family homes with alley access. Also recommend limiting heights of buildings to 3 to 5 stories.
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**BUILDING HEIGHTS**

**L3**

Allow taller buildings close to Downtown and along major transit corridors when significant community benefits are provided

The vision for East Central includes pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, a variety of affordable housing options, vibrant activity near major transit stops, quality jobs, community gathering spaces, and thriving locally owned businesses. The vision calls for directing more intense development to centers and corridors, while also encouraging preservation of commercial character buildings along Colfax Avenue. Requiring community benefits ensures new development contributes positively to the area.

**A.** Consistent with citywide policies in Blueprint Denver, develop a robust incentive system near major transit corridors through a community process that provides additional height in exchange for significant community benefits. Affordable (income-restricted) housing should be the primary community benefit achieved.

1. The incentive system should promote a range of income levels ranging from low-income to workforce.
2. The incentive system should promote permanent affordability.
3. The incentive system should provide a range of unit sizes to accommodate individuals and families.

**B.** Additional priority community benefits identified include:

1. Publicly accessible open space especially in low access areas (see open space access map in Section 2.4 Quality-of-Life Infrastructure).
2. Inclusion of affordable commercial space or community-serving uses (see sidebar for definition and Policy E6 for more detail).
3. Preservation of an existing commercial character building.
4. Providing transportation amenities and infrastructure to encourage mode shift (see TDM strategies in Section 2.3 Mobility).

**COMMUNITY BENEFITS**

“Community benefit” is a term used throughout this plan. It is most often associated with Land Use Policy L3 which seeks to attain certain valuable community needs when new development occurs while simultaneously directing growth in a responsible manner. These are elements that intend to benefit the community at-large but are less likely to be provided by or implemented by the city, mainly because they need to occur on private property. Some examples of community benefits for this purpose are listed below:

- **Affordable Housing** – Comprehensive Plan 2040, Blueprint Denver, and Housing an Inclusive Denver all identify affordable housing as a vital need throughout the city. As described in the Economy and Housing section of this plan, the East Central area is in need of 3,100 affordable units for the lowest income residents. Without additional affordable housing, the East Central area cannot be a complete and inclusive neighborhood. Creating affordable housing through incentives is only one of many tools that will be needed to achieve the city’s housing goals.

- **Preserving a Commercial Character Building** – are those that contribute to the character of a neighborhood or corridor. They may or may not be eligible for historic designation, but they are desired to remain in the community because they contribute to the character and history of an area. They also often times provide affordable commercial or residential space because they are older.

- **Affordable Commercial Space or Community-Serving Use** – new buildings are often more expensive to rent. According to community feedback, offering subsidies to community-based non-profits, local artists, existing local tenants that might otherwise be displaced by other community-serving commercial enterprises is desired. Other examples of community-serving uses include grocery stores, childcare, health clinics, senior care, and social services. All community-serving uses should include affordability programs for low income residents.

- **Publicly Accessible Open Space and Parks** – incorporating publicly accessible open space (which may be privately-owned and maintained), such as small pocket parks, courtyards, pedestrian passages or plazas – beyond what is required by code – helps achieve plan goals for increasing tree canopy and improving access to parks and open space.
What brings charm and warmth to our Congress Park neighborhood, and all of Denver, are the buildings from an earlier age when the city was just starting (i.e., Victorian, Craftsman, Tudor, and the turn of the 19th century commercial buildings). This aesthetic is one of the things that brings an enhanced quality of life to this area, especially if these building are allowed to keep their historic exteriors while being repurposed for modern use.

We definitely need to maintain and increase our tree population within the city, including Congress Park. This is important on so many levels. The tree cover provides mental and physical health benefits, the mitigation of increased stress brought with increased density. It also has a positive and vital impact on climate change and on preserving other species.

The City of Denver seems to be unable or unwilling to plant street trees in the downtown area. You can see why the idea of density is so unappealing to most people, when what we have here as an example is so harsh, far from being livable, particularly in the long term. No adequate open space, no greenery or tree canopy cover to speak of.

If TIFs are going to be an incentive, how will our schools and aging infrastructure in the neighborhood thrive? Would encourage other funding sources.
Reply by **Jaxson** on **01/13/2020** at **10:15am** - [Link](#)

Type: Answer  
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0  
TIF is not proposed in this plan

---

**#257**

Posted by **Sarah Craig** on **12/17/2019** at **1:33am** - [Link](#)

Type: **Question**  
Agree: 12, Disagree: 0  
I would like to see a more specific definition of what it means to provide "affordable housing." Will there be subsidies? Rent control? Community housing? Please expand. How long will it be patroled?

It seems like "affordable housing" is being used as a carrot to justify increased development, but if it can't even be defined, how can we be sure it be implemented? Most people want this and will sacrifice to make it happen, but development needs to be held accountable to a defined, long term standard for "affordable housing."

---

**#258**

Posted by **Elyse** on **01/26/2020** at **7:28pm** - [Link](#)

Type: **Suggestion**  
Agree: 3, Disagree: 0  
Preserving spaces for community serving businesses is key to maintaining character in the EC area, as well as supporting the local economy.

---

**#259**

Posted by **Craig Vanderlan** on **02/05/2020** at **4:02pm** - [Link](#)

Type: **Suggestion**  
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0  
An added community benefit when considering the shadow effect on current nearby Victorian structures (transition area near large scale development) that will be generated with 5-8 stories: developer provides solar energy for residents in the “shadow” of the new construction/increased heights. Energy from solar panels on the new large scale development is shared with properties who lose their solar benefit due to the increased height and scale of the new properties.
Q23 – Please clearly explain the process of when and how these details of the incentives will be determined?

Reply by Alison Torvik on 01/31/2020 at 4:40pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
That's not the purpose of this plan.

Affordable housing should be integrated into the development site without separation of separate entrances. If upgraded amenities are available in the building, then a use by payment would be allowed. There should be no more separating the affordable units into another building site specifically for that price range as an option to high rises. This is a diverse neighborhood as a priority.

If a height variance request goes beyond the stated zoning height, then integrated affordable housing and more green space is required (rooftop and ground floor). If the variance is for higher than overlay plane view site lines, then greater demands should be placed on the developer of more open green space, not just tree lawns. Also, the AMI should include more lower categories of 30% AMI. Increased compensations or property allowances to organizations like the St. Francis center would be allowable. These types of organizations are more adept at the building needs of the residents and services for homeless, etc. Also, public outreach on the project must go to all of the residents affected in the site view plane to allow for community input. (See note later for incentives for public transportation in new multifamily
developments).
No changes should be allowed in zoning to downtown designations from Sherman Street to the east. This area should be designated residential with light commercial use. We should correct the ills of the past which create more environmental hazards in living environments. We are not equipped for commuter auto traffic which has not been reduced as office space density increases in the downtown area. Light commercial should include cooperative working space and retail services requested and already prioritized in this document serving residents. Residential areas are expected to have more green space at ground level for health and well-being.

Smart grid systems and newer technology should be considered, when available, as density increases.

#263

Posted by John Michael Watkins on 01/21/2020 at 12:17pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: -5
I am strongly in favor of taller buildings in general, and I would love to see more 10+ floor apartment buildings. My old apartment complex in District 10 is 14 floors, and the building looks good & fits in with the surrounding neighborhood. It also provides very easy access to downtown/Cap Hill & strong transit corridors for at least 500 residents, and the complex doesn't even take up a full city block. If we could have more buildings like this, it would greatly improve density, and it would allow more people to live car-free. The housing supply would also expand, which would help rent prices. Please allow taller buildings WITHOUT developers having to jump through a bunch of hoops.

Reply by Elizabeta Stacishin on 02/04/2020 at 7:54pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -1
I am for density and agree that we need more people living closer into the city center, where transit and other amenities are available. However, there is a significant qualitative difference between high-rise and mid-rise buildings and neighborhoods; high-rise towers generally do not generate pleasant pedestrian environments, they create wind tunnels, long shadows, they are unnecessary to create dense neighborhoods.
The height strategy for East Central takes several factors into account, including heights of existing buildings, maximum heights allowed by existing zoning, and community input on desired development patterns and areas to direct growth. The height incentive areas in the map below show the locations where additional height is allowed if community benefits are provided, in accordance with Policy L3. The map colors and legend indicate maximum heights achievable through incentives. No additional building heights beyond what is currently allowed are recommended without providing a commensurate community benefit. Maximum heights may not be achievable in some locations due to view planes or other restrictions.
#264

Posted by Jim Mulligan on 11/11/2019 at 9:30am - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
For clarity, it appears as though the maximum heights achievable in this area means that those heights could be achieved, but not exceeded, with appropriate community benefits...is this a correct interpretation ?

Reply by Galia H. on 11/27/2019 at 5:52pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
I may be misinterpreting the conversations I've had, but everything shown is already at maximum heights achievable except where outlined by a pink line. Within the pink boxes, what is being shown is maximum heights achievable if significant community benefits are included.

#265

Posted by Craig Vanderlan on 02/04/2020 at 6:09pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
The projected maximum building heights "assume" that projected growth and density requirements will happen in a consistent and predictable fashion and also don't take other factors into consideration, such as climate change. Increased height and density might address a population issue, but damage surrounding neighborhoods ability to utilize solar. The plan should be flexible enough to flow with both increased populations as well as the sustainability issues.

#266

Posted by Alex Oberg on 11/11/2019 at 11:15am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
The entirety within the pink shaded area should be zoned the same, if not a slight step down from 12 to 10.

Reply by Anne on 03/12/2020 at 12:33pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
I noted this same revision. It makes sense to keep opportunities near major transit transfer on the table and allow for density there.

#267

Posted by Ryan Keeney on 01/15/2020 at 5:40pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -2

On the half blocks facing Colorado, a huge arterial road, at least five stories should be allowed.

Reply by BJWilson10 on 01/17/2020 at 3:11pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -1

Agree with Ryan. This is a good opportunity to allow up-to 5 with Community Benefit. Perhaps both blocks and on both sides of Colorado Blvd.

Reply by Emma Griffis on 01/28/2020 at 3:33pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

Also agree.

#268

Posted by Barb Frommell on 01/12/2020 at 10:21pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -3

I would recommend allowing up to 5 stories on the west site of Garfield north of 13th. There are already some 4-5 story apartment buildings on this block. Also, it will act as a buffer between National Jewish and the single family homes to the west.

#269

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 11:09pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 2, Disagree: -2
Q27 – These are very small lots and are adjacent to single family homes. How will these building heights transition to the adjacent 2.5 stories?

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 7, Disagree: -4
Hopefully by up zoning the single family homes.

#270

Posted by BJWilson10 on 01/31/2020 at 9:55pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
13th & Garfield would be a good spot to allow higher stories, 5?, with affordable housing or other community benefit. Especially with Garfield Bikeway.

#271

Posted by Ben G on 11/12/2019 at 10:15pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 14, Disagree: -3
There shouldn't be any land within a 5-minute walk of a future BRT station that doesn't allow at least three stories. Density around transit is key.

#272

Posted by Gale on 01/29/2020 at 11:46pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
Do not allow an additional 5 story building in a block where one already exist. This will cause parking and congestion problems in the streets and alley around it.

#273

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 11:09pm - Link
Q27 – These are very small lots and are adjacent to single family homes. How will these building heights transition to the adjacent 2.5 stories?

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -3
Hopefully by up zoning the single family homes.

Reply by Matthew Bossler on 01/10/2020 at 12:29pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Currently, the NW lot in this circumscribed proposed incentive overlay area is zoned MS-5, while the small lot on the SW corner of this circumscribed area is zoned MS-3. Perhaps the incentive overlay could account for this difference, by making the SW corner incentivized up to 5 stories, rather than 8.

Additionally, all portions of a building newly developed within MS zone districts is required to "step back" 25' from the closest interior lot line of the adjacent parcel which is itself a "protected district" (SU, TU, or RH zone district). The effect is scaling down the portion of the newly-constructed building to transition to existing context. This is clearly described in text and in graphic examples in the "townhouse" and "shopfront" building form descriptions under the Urban context chapter of the DZC (NOTE: the shopfront example is slightly erroneous). The perfect example of what this looks like in the flesh is the Blueprint Condos on the SE corner of Madison and Colfax. Go check it out.

Reply by Tony Smith on 01/29/2020 at 4:30pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
I am very concerned about the upzoning up to 8 stories of the current property between Adams and Cook Street (Paradise Cleaners and their adjacent parking lot). This is currently zoned MS-5 and would be perfect for the additional housing needed for future growth.

EIGHT stories would be monolithic, out of place, out of character and horrific for the houses immediately adjacent to the South; a perfect example of a building out of proportion on Colfax is the Storage Castle at Vine and Colfax.
Q24 - In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories would help these homes from being demolish and replaced with larger flat roofed wedding cake type structures.

#275

Posted by Gregory L. on 11/13/2019 at 3:13pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 13, Disagree: -7
Why is 3-story building not allowed in this area, and north City Park West? The community benefit would be more options for non-tower multi-family housing that is desperately needed. Preferable for-sale units. Other community benefit would be increasing the property tax revenue of these areas for the City to use to make transit, biking and walking improvements, and adding more frequently distributed high-quality public space for all to enjoy.

Reply by Carol Becht on 11/13/2019 at 9:59pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 6, Disagree: -12
If you walk around this area and take a look, you would see that 3 story units would be completely out of character with current majority 1920s single story bungalows. Even 2.5 story houses stick out like a sore thumb.

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:22pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 10, Disagree: -4
We have *got* to allow more variety, even in the rich, white neighborhoods.
taller as you get closer to downtown.

#277

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 11/19/2019 at 3:14pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 13, Disagree: -5
Allow taller buildings along/near 13th Ave. 3-5 stories.

#278

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 11:09pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1
Q27 – These are very small lots and are adjacent to single family homes. How will these building heights transition to the adjacent 2.5 stories?

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -1
Hopefully by up zoning the single family homes.

Reply by Kevin on 12/30/2019 at 11:52pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
I would guess by the same way they do today?

Reply by BJWilson10 on 01/17/2020 at 3:08pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
It was explained to us at the CPN Meeting on Jan 15th by Curt Upton, that only the areas Outlined in the Pink Box are potential Upzoning ONLY IF they provide a community benefit. All other shading is the existing Height Zoning as it is currently.

So...
For these small lots adjacent to residential homes, they could potentially zone-down as a community befit if they make an agreement with the owner of a property in the Pink outline area. This was explained to us using Tom’s Diner as an example.

#279

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 11:08pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

Q27 – These are very small lots and are adjacent to single family homes. How will these building heights transition to the adjacent 2.5 stories?

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:17pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -2
Hopefully by upzoning the single family homes.

#280

Posted by Aaron Goldhamer on 01/03/2020 at 5:50pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

The southeast corner of Detroit and Colfax has been an empty and largely unused lot for years...why? What can be done to incentivize some activity there?

#281

Posted by Ian Wheat on 01/14/2020 at 6:07pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -3

Please consider allowing greater height and density, at least up to 3 story duplexes throughout congress park, as a homeowner in this neighborhood I want a more inclusive community that can access and support local business, transit, schools!
5 stories of mixed use (and up to 8 stories) with a certain % of affordable housing should be allowed on both the north and south side of Colfax. There are few buildings of historical significance and in some cases, those buildings have been ruined by additions of little appeal. This would significantly increase the housing supply in East Central and reduce the need to flow significant changes through the interior neighborhoods.

#283

Posted by Mardi on 12/15/2019 at 7:36pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 1, Disagree: -5
I have several concerns about increasing the height limits along Colfax from Downing to Colorado boulevard. 1) the plan calls for “community benefits” when buildings exceed the current zoning. Some of the benefits include: affordable housing units; open space; and affordable commercial space. I want to see the affordable commercial space being dropped from the bevy of benefits. I fear that the majority of developers will opt for commercial space over housing and open space. 2) density increases, but who will pay for the upgrade needed in sewage, electrical, and water needed for that increase. Does the development PAY for itself in these areas? Or as the Denver Post pointed out in the article “Tax Authorities Created by Buiders, Developers leave Homeowners Paying the Bill Indefinitely “ (December 8-front Page). Circumstances may differ, but the trend is the same: homeowners pay the bill.3) permeable surfaces-open space, even lawns and tree covered parkways allow rain water to percolate into the soil and prevent flooding. May I remind you all that South City Park is the lowest point in all of metro Denver which is why City Park lake was deepened some years back and Jackson street was Designated a flood way. My wastewater itemization percentage has gone up to MITIGATE flooding just this year. The water department is PLANNING on a decrease in permeable surfaces it seems.

Reply by Alison Torvik on 01/31/2020 at 4:46pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
Let's get rid of on-street car storage and add tree lawns.

#284

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 10:53pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Q25 – This increased height incentive on Colfax and Josephine, will promote the demolition of this historic building, storefronts and displace established neighborhood business.

Reply by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:34pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: -2
I agree, and that conflicts with the earlier aim of preventing small, local business displacement. To prevent this, we should not only allow this density along Colfax, but also allow more density in Congress Park and the other "residential" neighborhoods, so there is less incentive to demolish on Colfax. We should also allow all residential areas to be mixed-use for non-noxious business so that some small businesses can set up in neighborhoods (small grocers, dentists, etc.)

#285

Posted by James B on 02/06/2020 at 12:04am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
I believe to maintain a pedestrian centered human-scale design, that the Colfax development plan should take into account the flow of pedestrian traffic to 16th and 14th Avenue. Having medium height business and residential on these neighboring streets would encourage people to stroll and explore - not just walk down the sidewalk on Colfax.

#286

Posted by BILL on 11/10/2019 at 8:01pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -9
Am I reading this right? Are you really recommending 20 story buildings along the North and NE side of Cheesmen Park? While I realize there are currently two buildings that come close to 20 stories but they are already muc. Don’t add to this. Why?

1) 13 th is already inadequate for the current transport scene (cars, truck, peds, bikes, scooters). Crossing it to access the park is already a challenging and unsafe activity. Adding a high density node will only exacerbate this.
2)Pedestrian access to the park from the north is already extremely limited. The only access point in the four blocks between Franklin and Race is the alley between Race and High. More high rises will only make park access worse.
3) The roads in Cheesmen are already used as a local parking lot for nearby residents and their visitors. Including overnight stays. This crowds the park and makes it more difficult for actual park users.
4) Yes I live just north of there and the existing buildings already cast large shadows throughout the year on the blocks further north. More shadow will be unwelcome.

Basically allowing 20 story buildings will exacerbate the already existing local problems. Also, the existing apartments go for more than $1 million each so you sure won't be helping the affordability issue

Reply by S on 11/18/2019 at 3:46pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 9, Disagree: 0

The existing zoning already allows 20 story buildings in this area. Nothing appears to be changing in this area as part of the plan.

#287

Posted by Philip on 02/04/2020 at 7:53pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

I'm a big supporter of more density and building height along Colfax. Colfax is currently underutilized: many empty lots, auto oriented dev'ts and fast food restaurants surrounded by parking lots. Colfax should be a dense, vibrant, pedestrian friendly multi-use corridor. It's location is excellent, near downtown and major parks. It also has great cultural amenities, like theaters. We should get more people living on Colfax to take advantage of this potentially great street.

#288

Posted by Elyse on 01/26/2020 at 7:34pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Though the additional height allowance is an appropriate tool, existing zoning at 9th and Downing is limited to 3 stories. The (G-MX-3) 3 stories should be maintained, rather than changed to 5, then allowing for an increase from the 3 only with community benefits.
In this section of the neighborhood, a maximum height of 8 stories would be inappropriate.

#289
Building height/mass are serious concerns. Note how much of nearby Cherry Creek North is now almost permanently in the shadows of the large buildings built along 1st avenue. This lack of sunshine makes for an unappealing experience there. Don't let that happen to the Colfax area. There needs to be more space between big buildings.

Hard disagree. Cherry Creek is thriving and we'd be lucky to have that kind of money invested along Colfax. Shadows aren't evil, parking minimums are.

There are already 5 to 8 story buildings located on Colfax, and up to 7 story buildings located near 13th and 14th avenue. These building heights are already a part of areas character and are well located for access to transit.

Today this property, located on the North West corner of 8th Avenue and Pearl Street, exceeds the 3 Story/45’ height limit being recommended. The recommended height for this property should be 5 Stories, at least, to ensure it is in conformance with the City's plans once adopted. The 5 story height limit is appropriate and exists in the area surrounding the property.

Q24 - In Row House Zoning in areas of existing Denver squares, if preservation is the goal height limits of 2.5 stories
would help these homes from being demolish and replaced with larger flat roofed wedding cake type structures.
HEIGHT INCENTIVES AND COMMUNITY BENEFITS ILLUSTRATIVE CONCEPT

Affordable Childcare provides an easily accessible Community-Serving Use.

Healthcare and wellness job training center connects residents to quality employment opportunities.

Increased tree canopy and integrated stormwater planters.

New affordable housing with access to transit and amenities.

Proposed Colfax BRT and center stations.

Mobility Hub provides transit information, bikes, scooters, and lockers.

High capacity transit service on Colorado Blvd.

Improved public open space at transit stops.

Hospital partnerships create affordable housing for healthcare workers.
Q26 – Is the city promoting demolishing the private historic National Jewish Hospital building and redeveloping the site?

Posted by Ally M. on 02/03/2020 at 5:16pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: 0
Love that this includes plants! More plants in the city please, for clean air and attracting birds :)

Reply by Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley on 02/03/2020 at 10:37pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: 0
How about green roof tops for tall multi-unit and commercial buildings? This has been successful in several other cities throughout the world. It provides a significant increase in the residents’ and visitors’ sense of mental and physical well-being as well as significantly decreasing chronic physical and mental illnesses.

Reply by Joseph on 02/05/2020 at 1:14pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
New commercial buildings over 25,000 square feet will be required to adhere to the Denver Green Building Ordinance. However, the inclusion of accessible green roof tops is subject to discussion with the Developer, whom should be incentivized to incorporate the nearby community during the design process.
This level of density is great and should be encouraged. Provided that the transit is also built to support it. The BRT must come to fruition.

#295

Posted by Elizabeta Stacishin on 02/04/2020 at 8:17pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0
I think there needs to be more emphasis on green space, street trees and greenery at the ground level -think quality of life, not just added density.

#296

Posted by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:23pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 12, Disagree: 0
This is what the intersection of two major streets should look like, yes.

#297

Posted by Elizabeta Stacishin on 02/04/2020 at 8:18pm - Link
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
I like the idea of improving the transit users experience, because currently it is not good.

#298

Posted by John Michael Watkins on 01/21/2020 at 12:26pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
I love this concept. I love the emphasis on transit, safe crosswalks, and effective density. I also wouldn’t mind seeing the last of the gas stations currently on this intersection.

#299

Posted by CPN MT on 12/15/2019 at 11:00pm - Link
Q26 – Is the city proposing purchasing land from the private National Jewish Hospital building and redeveloping the corner of the property for a public BRT / open space?

Reply by Matthew Bossler on 01/14/2020 at 12:33am - Link

Hopefully. That corner of National Jewish totally turns its back on both Colfax and Colorado with large river cobble, high concrete walls, and even larger flat, plain brick walls with no windows. This all adds up to making it an inhumane condition for pedestrians. I will be walking from my house to the BRT platforms regularly, and I really would like to see both some signs of life and a place to rest, go to the bathroom, or get a cup of coffee on this corner. From the looks of this rendering, the suggestion is that the concrete walls be removed, the landscape dropped to grade so that you can walk through it, and for the building to be adaptively reused to provide some community-serving retail. Love it.
2.1.4 GROWTH STRATEGY

Blueprint Denver provides a growth strategy where the majority of new jobs and housing is directed to centers, corridors and districts. A growth strategy helps manage the physical evolution of neighborhoods by informing goals for affordable housing, character preservation, and infrastructure improvements while helping make changes more predictable for residents.

PROJECTED GROWTH IN EAST CENTRAL

As of 2018, there were 34,400 households and 54,400 jobs in the East Central area. The area is expected to grow by 7,500 additional housing units (22% increase) and 12,300 additional jobs (23% increase) over the next 20 years. This translates to approximately 7.23 million square feet of new development.

For East Central, the goal is to direct 75% of housing and jobs to centers, corridors and districts.
There's a lot of opportunity for incremental, gentle-density growth in neighborhoods that are currently made up of predominantly single-family units. By legalizing two or three-unit buildings, we can provide much-needed new housing opportunities in a built form that could be nearly indistinguishable from the current housing stock.

I don't agree that Congress Park is the area to focus high density. I like how it is clustered along public transit routes and blends in the neighborhood. Keeping trees and disconnected impervious areas should also be a focus of the plan.

A significant part of the existing Congress Park appeal is that it's predominately made up of single-family units. With that being said, there are some blocks of Congress Park that are much more appealing than others largely based on when structures were built, how those structures are maintained, and the availability of on-street parking.

I disagree that single-family blocks are appealing. I live in the single-family portion of Congress Park just a smidge over from this pin, and wish that there were more people on my block and others south of 11th to say hi and interact with when I stroll around. If there were a greater variety of housing types (detached house, duplex, five-plex), housing tenure (rental v owned) and styles of architecture on the block, like Congress Park north of 11th, these blocks would be much livelier. More people would also mean more cars parked on the street, which would slow down the folks who speed through Madison because it's mostly a wide-open drag lane with parking utilization hovering at 30%. 

#300

Posted by Gregory L. on 11/13/2019 at 3:16pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 13, Disagree: -4

Reply by Morgan Lynch on 12/27/2019 at 4:13pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: -3

Reply by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 5:22pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -1

Reply by Matthew Bossler on 01/14/2020 at 12:43am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -4
#301

Posted by Paula Machlin on 02/05/2020 at 11:40am - Link

My rather large (for CPN) house was constructed as single family in the early 1900's then was a boarding house in WWII era, then was divided into three apartments sometime afterwards, then returned to single family in the '70's, I believe. Today, it remains single family. They were lovely apartments and sometimes I feel badly that it was converted back to single family. So it's possible to divide a house into 'good' apartments, even though I know that many of the divided houses really were poorly done. I suppose it's what the market demands that determines how well things are changed...

#302

Posted by Jeremiah Bebo on 11/19/2019 at 3:17pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 12, Disagree: -8

Allow all neighborhoods to have at least 2-3 units per property.

Reply by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 5:14pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 6, Disagree: -1

While allowing well-constructed ADUs would be a clear benefit, allowing existing homes to be split up is problematic. Some blocks within our neighborhoods have suffered for decades from single family intended homes that were split up into amateurish apartments during the 70's, 80's and early 90's. Many of these properties existed in disrepair up until this recent upswing in the market. We cannot promote the same mistakes that we should have learned from.

Reply by Ian Wheat on 01/14/2020 at 5:55pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: -1

We need to allow and more over encourage greater density, more units per land area to help with
affordability and allow more people to live in this central urban neighborhood close to jobs, schools, health care and with good transit, multimodal options. Having good design standards is certainly appropriate, and having spaces that engage with the street, community is good. Bigger lots don't mean better housing, it just means more expensive housing, and we want to be humane and welcoming, don't we?

#303

Posted by Stacy Householder and Rob Parker on 04/13/2020 at 1:14am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

ADUs, townhomes, and 2,3,4plexes are better suited for general urban and urban central neighborhoods (not "urban" like Congress Park). There isn't parking available to support this and it would change the character of the neighborhood -- which is designed to be a primarily single-family and should stay that way.

#304

Posted by Sandra on 01/05/2020 at 4:04pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

What are the assumptions behind these projections? Denver has already grown a whole lot in the past 20 years, and there's already a backlog of growth that's been forced into bedroom and outer-lying communities. Does the projected 7500 additional households mean this is how many households the ECAP area would accommodate if the entire city grew in an equitable way over the next 20 years? Does it at all address the housing backlog, or are we mainly looking to serve newcomers and future generations?

On jobs, are we looking at the count of jobs held by residents or the count of jobs in the area? It looks like the 12,300 news jobs figure is based on those 7500 new households x 2.33 people on average per denver household x 71% employment rate for folks above the age of 16. https://www.westword.com/news/changing-demographics-of-denver-in-2019-11546034

So are there corresponding goals for average distance traveled to work or number of residents who work in the same area, and how close or far are we to those goals?

#305
Multi-unit housing should be an option throughout every neighborhood in the plan.

#306

Please don't purposefully eliminate parking lots! There are gobs of restaurants and venues in this area plus all the residents. We need more parking, not less!

   Reply by Azar on 12/21/2019 at 12:00pm - Link
   Type: Answer
   Agree: 5, Disagree: 0
   Please look up "induced demand".

   Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:24pm - Link
   Type: Suggestion
   Agree: 8, Disagree: -3
   Eliminating parking minmums in this area should be job one.

   Reply by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 5:02pm - Link
   Type: Suggestion
   Agree: 4, Disagree: -1
   It's essential to put surface lots to better use than how they exist today. However, a certain amount of multi-level parking (parking garages) should exist as to not shift the burden into surrounding neighborhoods.

#307

Increased density in areas of predominantly single family homes by allowing ADUs or conversion to multiple dwelling
units should not be permitted. People bought their homes based on the character of their block as single-family and
should not be subjected to the increased noise, traffic and impact on parking from increased density. These areas are
not appropriate for new growth and there is no benefit to existing residents. Quality of life for existing residents and
homeowners should be prioritized over growth.

Reply by **Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley** on **02/03/2020** at **10:43pm** - [Link]
Agree: 3, Disagree: -2
Completely agree with the above comment, especially for Congress Park. We are being fed a load of B.S. about
more density bringing affordability and diversity. Also, the ADU incentive to maintain historic homes does not make
sense. It only adds more demand for parking in areas where parking is already overloaded.

Reply by **Katie** on **02/04/2020** at **9:29pm** - [Link]
Type: **Suggestion**
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
Agreed. I have heard and seen a lot of honest comments about a need for greater housing diversity in the
neighborhoods that have a majority of single family homes. While I understand the argument, our neighborhoods
are simply not the place for a change in housing types. There are very few areas in Denver left where you can find
a neighborhood with character like you find on many of blocks of the East Central Area that are being targeted as
needing more density. Who is going to ensure that the three units in the single-family-turned tri-plex is not going to
sell or rent for top dollar? No one. You can't regulate that. You don't end up with more affordability, you end up
with less options at higher prices for families. Don't leave out families. I moved here because I could find a single
family home in a beautiful city. Don't make families like mine move out of Denver. This area is for us too.

#308

Posted by **Paula Machlin** on **02/05/2020** at **11:33am** - [Link]
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
I believe that ADU's should be allowed if properly managed to have a look and feel that blends with the neighborhood.
(same with adding a dwelling unit in an existing structure.) While I acknowledge other commenters' concerns about
changing the character of single unit blocks, I think we need to add and diversify our housing stock, and I am confident
that not very many folks would create an ADU (which I realize doesn't comfort people, because it could happen...) I would
like ADU's and other density increasing proposals to require some type of affordable limits...if you build an ADU you need
to do below market rents, or sale, or something.
2.1.5 ZONING AND OTHER REGULATIONS

The Denver Zoning Code (DZC), adopted in 2010, sets regulations for development of private property, including uses, building placement, height, design, and parking, by neighborhood context. These regulations do not always result in development that contributes positively to the neighborhood. To implement the East Central Area Plan vision, some modifications to the existing zoning are necessary.

CURRENT ZONING IN EAST CENTRAL

Through the East Central planning process, several issues with current zoning and regulations have been identified. These include:

- **Bulk Plane** - In Single Unit and Two Unit areas, the bulk plane standard allows three-story, flat-roofed “wedding cake” buildings, which can be out of character with the rest of the neighborhood. The bulk plane also restricts some traditional roof forms. For example, cross gables and dormers would penetrate the bulk plane, so they cannot be replicated.

- **Character-Specific Standards** - Some neighborhoods have unique character-defining features that are not being reflected in new development. Examples include: asymmetrical side setbacks, raised front porches, and pitched roofs. Where these features are consistent, new development that does not include these features can look out of character.

- **Residential Renovations and Additions** - Some regulations, such as rear yard setbacks, building coverage, and bulk plane make it difficult to renovate and add on to existing buildings, unintentionally encouraging demolition.

- **Commercial Adaptive Reuse** - When converting an existing building to a new use, e.g. retail to a restaurant, regulations require coming into full compliance with existing standards, which may be expensive or physically difficult to accomplish. The adaptive reuse of existing buildings are often desired over new construction as they can simultaneously add vitality to neighborhoods and maintain character.

- **Residential / Commercial Transitions** - In mixed use areas, particularly along the Colfax corridor, current zoning permits mid-rise structures adjacent to lower scale residential homes. Additional zoning standards are needed to achieve better solutions for character-sensitive transitions to historic or lower scale contexts. (See Chapter 4: Colfax Corridor for more.)

EXISTING OVERLAYS AND HISTORIC DISTRICTS

- **Use Overlay 3 (UO-3)** - is the predominant overlay in East Central. It exists primarily in multi-unit and row house districts as well as some two-unit areas. It expands allowable uses within designated historic structures as an incentive to save and designate those structures as landmarks. Other use overlays include UO-1 (Adult Use) and UO-2 (Billboard).

- **Design Overlays** - The Uptown Design Overlay (DO-1) and the Capitol Hill/Uptown – R-4/OD-1 and Uptown – R-4-X Design Standards and Guidelines apply to parts of Capitol Hill, North Capitol Hill, and City Park West. These standards apply additional design consideration to new construction and modifications to existing buildings.

- **Historic Districts** - Several parkways are designated historic landmarks, including Park Avenue and its adjacent triangle parks, E. 7th Avenue and City Park Esplanade. Other historic districts include: Civic Center, Sherman – Grant, Pennsylvania Street, Quality Hill, East 7th Avenue, Humboldt Street, Humboldt Street-Park Avenue, Wyman, Swallow Hill, and Frank S. Snell Subdivision historic districts.

**Conservation Overlay** - A conservation overlay is a zoning code tool that is intended to perpetuate existing elements of neighborhood character as change occurs. In particular, the conservation overlay district tool has been used to modify bulk planes (such as lowering roof height), adjust lot coverage, and allow exceptions/encroachments in the bulk plane for accessary structures and for cross-gables. Currently, no conservation overlays exist in East Central.

**Design Overlay** - A design overlay is a zoning code tool that is intended to establish a common design character for future development and could be used where various underlying zone districts exist or in multiple different locations. They can modify most zoning standards and add new ones.

**Incentive Overlay** - Incentive overlays are intended to establish the provision of a community benefit in exchange for flexibility in certain zoning standards, such as allowing additional height. Currently, no incentive overlays exist in East Central.

**Design review** is qualitative, case-by-case review of proposed development guided by design standards and guidelines. Design review can be used to build upon existing zoning tools to address things such as human-scaled elements, ground-floor activation, mass, scale, and architectural articulation in more detail than would be possible through zoning alone. Design review may be either administered by city staff or administered by a stakeholder board.

**Historic Districts** - City codes also provide rules for establishing historic districts. This adds a design review process, using design guidelines. Some other special district overlays, such as conservation overlays, can be combined with historic district designation. Applications for work in a historic district are administered by city Landmark staff, with some projects requiring review by the Landmark Preservation Commission.
I support conservation overlays, but it needs to be an easier to navigate process. I looked into this for my area and found out that it would be an almost full-time effort to get this done. Also, I was told that it had to be initiated and moved forward by my city council person, yet the burden of the work would be on me and others I could round up to make it happen.

Design Review is an effective way of implementing neighborhood design guidelines, it works. Although it can lengthen the entitlement process.

Design review is a great way to encourage community input in development. It helps us ensure that development is the way we want it, consistent with a pedestrian oriented design guidelines.

Conservation overlays are as bad as HOAs. Ditch them.
Q29 – The Planning Department needs assist non-profit neighborhood RNO’s or residents who are interested in this type of preservation. This is an expensive and time-consuming process which involves education and consensus of residents.

#314

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 2:57pm - Link

Q31 – During public meetings the city has expressed support for assisting neighborhoods with preservation tools, such as Conservation Overlays or Historic Districts. In what ways can or will the city help non-profit RNO’s with these types of tools?

#315

Posted by Simon on 11/23/2019 at 1:25pm - Link

The soon to be explosive proliferation of 5G towers are a detriment to these historic neighborhoods. Denver should be working with the internet service providers to locate their radios/antennae on existing infrastructure, such as, but not limited to, traffic and street lights and find ways to eliminate the existing 5G towers.

#316

Posted by Mardi Mathers on 01/12/2020 at 6:11pm - Link

There is so much energy embodied waste when a structure is torn down. I suggest that we incorporate a policy that encourages materials reuse. A tax break or perhaps a break on some other fees for a specified percentage of materials reuse.

#317

Posted by brad on 01/20/2020 at 6:09pm - Link
I wish there were more stores in Congress Park. 12th Ave is great. Can it be expanded? Can a couple of isolated restaurants be placed in the middle of Congress Park? Is there opportunity to allow a few homeowners on 8th Ave to convert their homes (at least the first story) into a storefront, similar to 6th Ave?

#318

Posted by Mardi Mathers on 01/12/2020 at 6:26pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Lowering the bulk plan in residential areas is the only way to discourage wedding cake type new construction. I suggest if an owner is converting an existing structure the bulk plane may then be pierced for dormers or even pop ups as an incentive to maintain existing structures. However the "leave one wall of the old structure “ would not be considered maintaining the structure, perhaps a set percentage of the structure would eliminate this temptation.

#319

Posted by Paula Machlin on 02/05/2020 at 11:49am - Link
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I very much support the idea of discouraging scrapes and getting rid of the rules that allow 'retaining one wall' or other things that don't really accomplish the goal of maintaining the look and feel of the built environment. I am also okay with the idea of allowing a slight increase in height in some the single unit areas. I'm not sure what techniques really are best to protect the look and feel...so I hope that every effort is made to stop the wedding cake building and mini mansion phenomenon from infecting Congress Park. Can you build into the plan a way to rectify mistakes that are made? If, ultimately, a rule/proposal is not resulting in the desired outcome, can we build in a system to easily change it?

#320

Posted by myles tangalin on 12/19/2019 at 2:49pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -5

Q30 – This plan is recommending new commercial heights and additional incentive heights to commercial properties adjacent to residential homes on Colfax. If the desire is to create better solutions for character-sensitive transitions, these new proposed heights are not reflective of this goal.
Q28 – In zoned areas of RH 3.0, these larger flat-roofed “wedding cake” buildings can be disincentivized by reducing the height to RH 2.5, and this would help preserve areas of Historic Denver Squares.

Reply by Matthew Bossler on 01/14/2020 at 1:09am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -3
Evidence from elsewhere in the city (Potter Highlands, Wash Park) strongly suggests that dropping the bulk plane a half-story in RH3 districts to 2.5 stories would incentivize the wedding cake form (which is generally where the first two floors are fully built out to the side setback lines and the half-story is stepped back from one or both sides). If wedding cake forms are to be discouraged, it would be through either keeping the bulk plane at 3 stories or dropping it fully to 2, which would be a pretty significant downzoning relative to original built context. This area was originally built with both Denver Squares, 2-3-story flat-roof or pitched-roof apartment buildings, and a wonderful variety of duplexes and side-by-side multiplexes, most of which were built with flat roofs and contribute to neighborhood character. All of these forms usually also have habitable basements, and raised ground floors. More small apartment buildings (2-3 stories with habitable basements) proliferated in the 50-s-70s, and many flat-roof mid-rise (4-8 story) apartments were built here, as well.

It would be most prudent to at least allow heights of new construction to increase just marginally more than the average of the neighborhood, so that this area can incrementally urbanize. The character home + density bonus program is a great way to bring more value to homeowners of Denver Squares by allowing them greater income streams, therefore lessening the likelihood that they will be scraped and replaced. This is a better means by which to protect the neighborhood's formal character in a near-term future of responsible growth than would be lowering the bulk plane to match *one part* of the existing context, which is so wonderfully diverse.

#322

This is one of the key challenges to address. There is an inherent conflict between the increased height proposed for the
Colfax Corridor and a requirement for character-sensitive transitions to the adjacent lower scale residential homes. Reducing the height to eliminate the need for transition would be the ideal solution, which may just require expanding the number of lower height buildings to compensate for the loss of fewer, higher buildings. How many 3 story buildings are required to replace one 8 story building, seems to be the required calculation, based on population growth projections of course.

#323

Posted by Ryan Keeney on 01/15/2020 at 5:51pm - Link

Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

It should be possible to do adaptive resuse from residential to commercial anywhere in ECAP. Adaptive reuse provides the kind of flexibility to make our neighborhoods stronger, more resilient, and more financially productive while preserving existing structures.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 8:10pm - Link

Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Agreed. 100% adaptive reuse coverage from residential to commercial for East Central neighborhoods. It's how small businesses are built, it's how neighborhoods become full of character. It's how we afford the streets that everyone parks on.
Encourage renovations and additions instead of demolition in residential areas.

Renovations and additions help preserve neighborhood character by keeping most of the building intact and retaining character-defining features such as brick facades, front porches, and other period architectural features. Avoiding demolition can also help preserve mature trees and landscaping and results in less waste.

POLICY

Update regulations in residential zone districts to remove barriers to additions and renovations. The following should be considered:

1. Clarify regulations to ensure that the existing house is substantially preserved in exchange for greater flexibility (see Policy L5).
2. Allow penetrations to the bulk plane standard for dormers and cross gables.
3. Reduce the required separation between a garage and the main house to better enable rear additions.
4. Reduce rear building setbacks to allow flexibility for rear additions.
5. Allow building coverage exemptions for the full footprint of an accessory dwelling unit.
6. Encourage energy efficient upgrades, such as better insulation techniques, energy efficient windows and appliances, and higher-performing mechanical systems.
7. Encourage green stormwater management techniques, such as green roofs, increasing pervious surfaces, bioswales, and rain barrels.

B. Consider new regulations that require the salvaging or reuse of building materials when homes of certain age are demolished.
Really like this idea. Keep the building waste out of the landfills.

Reply by Will on 02/04/2020 at 10:16pm - Link
Agreed. Deconstruction instead of demolition should be built into policy.

How about encouraging reuse of building materials through either higher fees if a developer does not reuse or recycle, or a lowering of fees if materials are recycled.

Disconnecting impervious areas. Be smart with the green space if the intent of this plan is to increase impervious by reducing setbacks.

This recommendation to allow for less space between the garage and main house could lead to buildings that take up the
entire lot, thus losing green space and trees. It will also increase the potential for flooding by having more impermeable areas.

Reply by Elizabeta Stacishin on 02/04/2020 at 8:30pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: 0
That is a good point, but there could be mechanisms such as replacement or minimum tree canopy requirements, and penalties for mature tree removal. (checkout Seattle's Green Factor).

#328

Posted by TD on 01/25/2020 at 12:28pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -1
ADUs should not be allowed on lots with single family homes on either side because there will be an adverse affect on those homes with no corresponding benefits. ADUs are likely to be used for short term rentals that will degrade quality of live for the surrounding properties.

Reply by Alison Torvik on 01/31/2020 at 4:57pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
There's no evidence that all additional housing will be used for STRs.

Reply by Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley on 02/03/2020 at 11:09pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Actually, cities around the world are experiencing a huge influx of Air BnB and VRBO uses of what were once residence. This is driving out residents and increasing tourism to a point that the cities do not have the infrastructure to deal with them.

We live next door to a duplex that also has a third unit used as an AirBnB. We now have more cars on our street, increased noise, smoking, and other irritants that impose themselves on our quality of life.

#329
This rationale, that ADUs will incentivize people to not demolish their historic homes, does not make sense. What the ADUs will do is to add traffic, parking demand, and noise that will impact quieter neighborhoods such as Congress Park. It will also increase the use of these structures for Air BnB and VRBO usage.

#330

Rear yard setback are meant for sustainable and climate change reasons, which were placed in the 2010 zoning code with a lot of discussion. Increasing building coverage in SU up to RH zoned areas decreases the neighbor’s allowances to grow their own food and plants, lower building solar adaptation because of shadowing of the sun. There were great lengths to do shadowing studies.

Also, more impervious areas create flooding for neighbors due to uneven land shaping. Drainage is a very real problem, even though we are not in a flood plain. This has not been addressed with increased massing in our neighborhood. It has a long-term effect to adjacent property values and forced financial burdens.

The houses are quite large to begin with in this neighborhood. If new zoning changes occur in smaller owner-occupied neighborhoods, they can be addressed with an overlay, as has been done in other neighborhoods. But no mass uses category is acceptable nor forced zoning changes without studies to be conducted, with a lot of public discussions.

Also, please be very aware of design criteria with more than 2 story differences to adjacent properties in allowing for new development.

This appears to be in direct opposition to page 7 visions.

#331

Preserving the historical character is a must. This is especially true in Congress Park. Also, resources should be promoted and made available that help people who are remodeling their homes. These resources should focus on how to
maintain architectural character of the neighborhood, proper design elements and building materials that are consistent
with the turn of the 19th century and not Highlands Ranch or the faux historical look of Stapleton. Developers must be
required to use historically accurate design and materials.

#332

Posted by Mardi Mathers on 01/12/2020 at 6:15pm - Link
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
I'm in favor of INCREASING setbacks as a way to increase pervious surfaces, and decrease imperviousness.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 8:14pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Lawns are climate denial. Decrease setbacks, allow redevelopment. Re-purpose on-street parking for more
greenspace.

#333

Posted by Kevin on 12/31/2019 at 12:07am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -3
Another consideration should be gravel alleys. It would assist with permeability and some alleys could double as
greenspace\garden areas on edges while still allowing garage traffic to flow.

Reply by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 5:33pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: -1
Not sure how gravel alleys would hold up to the weather and trash trucks. Although if the city wants wants to
promote ADUs, many of the alleys will need to be cleaned up and consideration will need to be given to reduce
blight (i.e. the excessive amount of wires strung up between telephone poles).

#334

Posted by Elyse on 01/26/2020 at 7:40pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Full exemption to building coverage requirements for ADUs may be insensitive to neighboring lots. However, a requirement that the ADU have primary unit side setbacks, and be no larger than a certain percentage of the primary unit (70%?) may allow for these units to feel more gentle to neighbors.

#335

Posted by Phillip B Danielson on 11/19/2019 at 7:30pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 12, Disagree: -1
Absolutely! Historic preservation is what makes this area a great place to live.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 8:12pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Historic preservation is what makes this area an expensive and exclusive place to live and maintain. Allow more redevelopment to things we actually need, like apartments, condos, small commercial spaces.

#336

Posted by Ryan Keeney on 01/15/2020 at 5:54pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1
I strongly support these recommendations to remove barriers to additions and renovations. It's a win-win for historic preservation and flexibility.
L5
Encourage preserving buildings in Low Residential Places and expand housing options in neighborhoods.

Residents are concerned about preserving the great neighborhood character that could change due to the intensity of new construction. Many existing homes are large enough to accommodate multiple units or contain elements that facilitate multiple units. With affordability and neighborhood preservation concerns, allowing additional units in existing homes can help preserve neighborhood character while expanding housing options.

A. Create an incentive for maintaining existing houses by allowing an additional primary dwelling unit if the existing house is preserved. The following elements should be considered when implementing this policy:
1. Allow an additional unit within single-unit and two-unit zone districts. The extra unit would be in addition to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).
2. Develop criteria for eligibility for an additional unit, considering the age of the structure, and how much of the structure must be maintained.
3. Home ownership of units should be encouraged to help build equity and investment in the neighborhood.
4. Short-term rentals should be discouraged to help address the housing shortage in East Central.

B. Expand diversity of housing types and affordability to support households of different sizes, ages, and incomes in all neighborhoods. (See E11 for more detail.)

L6
Retain the character of High, High-Medium, and Low-Medium Residential Places and facilitate compatible infill development.

Large portions of the East Central area are zoned for multi-unit and mixed-use development. These areas have unique neighborhood character that is valued by the community, but also have many undeveloped or underdeveloped properties that could provide housing near jobs, services, transit, and other amenities. The existing design standards and overlays that are intended to ensure changes in the area are consistent with the valued character are out of date.

A. Promote preservation of historic and character-defining multi-unit and mixed-use buildings. Consider individual landmarks, historic districts, or other tools as appropriate.

B. Update the Capitol Hill/Uptown – R-4/OD-1 and Uptown – R-4-X Design Standards and Guidelines for new construction and modification to existing buildings. Updated design standards should address the following:
1. Materials: Improve the durability, craftsmanship, and sustainability of construction materials.
2. Setbacks: Calibrate setback requirements by street and context.
3. Residential ground floor design: Address the location and design of individual unit entries, stoops, weather protection, landscaping, and the size of and access to internal common spaces.
4. Commercial ground floor design: Address transparency requirements, glazing treatments, corner entries, and activation and outdoor seating.
5. Transitions: Refine transitions from more intense uses to single-unit, two-unit, and historic properties.

6. Massing: Provide variation by requiring material and scale transitions on larger developments to create the appearance of a series of smaller, urban buildings.

7. Streetscape/public realm: Improve landscaping requirements to create more usable open space, provide more tree canopy coverage, improve stormwater treatment, and appropriately address surrounding streets and public spaces.

Apply the revised design standards to all multi-unit and mixed-use zoning outside centers and corridors.

D. Encourage more larger units (2+ bedrooms) in multi-unit and mixed-use developments to accommodate a variety of household types and sizes.

E. Expand diversity of housing types and affordability to support households of different sizes, ages, and incomes in all neighborhoods. (See E11 for more detail.)
Needed here are actual design examples to illustrate and model this (e.g. with a case study or two, as below). Two excellent examples that could be used in the Humboldt St.-Franklin St. area: Design Overlay 3, an excellent developer-neighborhood resident cooperative solution in City Park West, in the 2010 Zoning Code; and the proposed design recently submitted for redeveloping the southeast corner of Colfax and Franklin in Cheesman Park neighborhood.

This is a great way to visually reduce the impact of denser development.

ADUs should be permitted only very selectively in Congress Park where the yards are very large and the ADU does not negatively impact adjoining properties. There needs to be individual zoning applications for each one and notice and opportunity for neighbors to weigh in. Many people will use them for short term rentals and they will not provide any long term housing and therefore will be detrimental to the neighborhood, both from a value and quality of life perspective.

I disagree but for the sake of argument, I will take it at your word that a new ADU that provides a place for a tourist or a short-term renter will not go to a long-term renter. If the plus is canceled out by a minus, then the equation remains the same and we're left at 0, so it's neither loss nor gain. So even accepting your premise, it's not a detriment; at worst, a neighborhood is right back where it started, just with a few extra residents walking around taking photos and going to restaurants.
I disagree strongly with your premise. In neighborhoods around the country that have built ADUs/have permitted the construction of ADUs, homeowners’ choices of what to do with them have run the gamut from, yes, short-term rentals, to medium-term rentals to young people who want to try and make it in the city, to allowing grandparents to come and live with their family while still allowing them some independence. ADU use is a continuum, and it is false to say that all ADUs are used for short-term rentals. And it is no detriment to a community to allow an elderly grandmother to move in with their extended family.

#340

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 3:26pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

Q35 – Revised Design Standards need to reflect existing neighborhood historic character. There are many current small businesses in historic retail trolley car storefronts that are still vibrant business and pedestrian environments. How will these Standards be reflective of these individual historic neighborhood areas?

#341

Posted by Ben G on 11/13/2019 at 9:18am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 12, Disagree: 0

Big fan of this, but curious about implementation. More multi-bedroom units would hopefully make East Central more suitable for families (millennials have families, too!).

Reply by Gregory L. on 11/13/2019 at 3:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 9, Disagree: 0

City of Vancouver did a great job incentivizing the construction of multiple-bedroom units that allow better for families to live in multi-unit buildings.

#342

Posted by Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley on 02/03/2020 at 11:16pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: 0
This is an absolute must!

#343

Posted by Elyse on 01/26/2020 at 7:44pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
This is an unclear policy to me, a trained urban planner. Please revise language to ensure that the intent is clear. I imagine this providing an opportunity to internally divide an existing home to create an apartment. Is that correct? If not, how would up to 3 units (including ADU) work on a single family lot?

#344

Posted by Sarah on 12/17/2019 at 1:41am - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 3, Disagree: -4
Why should short term rentals be discouraged? Short term rentals bring in a lot of tourism to our neighborhood and help allow for the existing residents to be able to afford to continue living in this area. East Central is a perfect location for short term rentals due to its proximity to downtown, local restaurants, entertainment venues, historic charm and general walk ability. This is exactly the experience many Denver tourists want.

Reply by Azar on 12/21/2019 at 12:08pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 7, Disagree: -2
Unregulated short term rentals encourage property owners to prefer a lot of short tourist stays over people who actually want to stay, work, buy, and live in the city. Please look up the effects of AirBnBs on cities. I actually do agree that tourists should get to experience Denver too, I just don't want it to be at the expense of medium- to long-term residents. I think short term rentals would be fine, but with regulations to ensure that entire neighborhoods don't end up with buildings that are empty of actual residents and only have tourists.

#345

Posted by Cindy sestrich on 02/05/2020 at 10:50pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Please refer to the above comment on page 38. This also reminds me of the garden court and unintended
consequences of the slot home outcome, with creative developers. Sectioning off and interior remodeling of existing structures can achieve the same end result, as was done in past incarnations of this area decades ago.

#346

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 3:01pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 0, Disagree: -2
Q32 – In the November ECAP Community Meeting it was noted as an Update Highlight that the “bonus residential unit” for the historic preservation was removed from the plan. Is this statement correct?

Reply by Jonathan on 01/01/2020 at 10:39pm - Link
Type: Answer
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
That was not stated in the meeting.

#347

Posted by David Engelken on 02/05/2020 at 4:32pm - Link
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Tremendous need for this with the 8-story and 5-story zoning between Franklin and Gilpin on the south side of 16th Avenue. Eight-story zoning there butts wall-to-wall against beautifully restored 2 and 2.5 story Victorians.

#348

Posted by David Engelken on 02/05/2020 at 4:37pm - Link
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Kudos to L6, B. 2: staying consistent with existing setbacks is crucial for preserving the planned, historic and generous front setback beauty of the entire City Park West neighborhood bounded by Park Avenue and Lafayette on the west, York on the east, 17th Avenue corridor on the north, and Colfax Avenue corridor on the south.

#349

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 3:12pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Q34 – The Planning Department needs to assist non-profit neighborhood RNO’s or residents who are interested in this type of preservation. This is an expensive and time-consuming process which involves education and consensus of residents.

#350

Posted by Lou and Kate Kintz on 01/14/2020 at 5:03pm - Link

Please do NOT increase taxes for those property owners who choose not to build an ADU on their property.

#351

Posted by Logan Meyer on 12/10/2019 at 2:41pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 15, Disagree: -1

Why are you limiting this to single-unit and two-unit zone districts? Capitol Hill is already dense, and is made up of primarily large old mansions that have been split up into 3-5 apartments. These are old, beautiful homes that have character and could easily be preserved and enhanced with another unit along the alley in a neighborhood that already embraces and appreciates density and more neighbors. This is a great way to allow for additional affordable (owners/developers/renters) don't have to pay for the land (just the additional cost of the small ADU) in neighborhoods that again already appreciate and embrace vibrancy and density.

Only allowing ADUs in single family and two-unit zone districts, makes ADUs effectively largely illegal in Capitol Hill (many many Grand Homes, that look like large single family mansions but actually commonly contain 3-6 units), the exact neighborhood that would most appreciate and benefit from additional small missing middle housing. This is a weird requirement limiting ADUs to places where they are not always appreciated, and making them illegal in places where they would be appreciated :(

Allowing ADUs on large old multiunit cap hill homes allows property owners to add additional affordable housing to already dense and vibrant neighborhoods that welcome it? This seems like it would be a win win win to increase housing supply in neighborhoods that our welcome to it, are already dense, and would like to be even more affordable.

#352
Q33 – In neighborhoods such as Congress Park, will this mean zoning changes or other city tools to incentivize demolition of existing single family homes?

#353

It would be fantastic if ADUs were allowed in all of East Central, including in Congress Park. When regulated properly, ADUs are a fantastic way to keep the character of a neighborhood while simultaneously supporting a range of housing options in the central city. Mother-in-law need a little extra care? ADU. Kiddo back from college but can't afford to rent an expensive apartment in Denver? ADU. Need a little extra income yourself? Rent your ADU. We are a grown-up city now and need grown-up solutions to the housing challenges we face as a region, and I would much rather see a few ADUs on my block than see sprawling houses from Colorado Springs all the way to Fort Collins. Vancouver, CA does an excellent job with their ADUs or "laneway" houses, and I'd love see Denver follow suit. Thanks!

Reply by Gregory L. on 11/13/2019 at 3:22pm - Link

Agree. Would go a step further in legalizing two or three-unit buildings City-wide, especially in East Central area.

#354

Blanket Lot Coverage standards need to be carefully looked at and should be an essential starting point around the conversation of adding additional units to a parcel. I would question the ability of a 37.5' lot's ability to support 3-living units not to mention significantly impacting adjacent properties.

#355
Allow ADUs everywhere!

#356

If you’re talking about allowing increased density through the addition of additional living units on a parcel, it should not be to help foster the short-term rental contingent. Allowing STR’s would do absolutely nothing to address affordable housing which I thought was a primary goal within this ECAP Plan.

#357

The conversion of single family homes to multiple units in congress Park should not be permitted in areas of largely single family homes or where the property in question has single family homes on either side because the increased density will be detrimental to surrounding properties. There will be increase noise and more vehicles trying to park in already congested areas.

#358

I’m not sure how important ADUs are to increase housing, especially affordable housing. Lots that have room for an ADU aren’t going to charge an affordable rent for low income. I think working inside and adding on to non- historic homes to make them multi family has far greater potential.

Reply by Azar on 12/21/2019 at 12:03pm - Link
Denver can do both of those things. We need more housing stock for all levels of income and all housing needs, not less.

#359

Posted by Jim R on 01/02/2020 at 5:45pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 7, Disagree: -3
There is an important distinction between a property owner adding additional units to their property while residing there vs. creating an environment enabling and encouraging investors to convert existing single family homes and and operating 'mini' multifamily housing endeavors. Converting a property to higher density has a significant impact to neighboring homes.

#360

Posted by Morgan Lynch on 12/27/2019 at 4:18pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 2, Disagree: -3
Agree. If the goal is to increase housing, short-term rentals take away from that.

#361

Posted by TAD on 12/05/2019 at 7:08pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -13
Additional density by way of ADUs or additional units should not be permitted. The main benefit is to the homeowner and it can be very detrimental to neighbors.
Case Study:
Portland’s Residential Infill Project

Portland, Oregon is expected to adopt a number of zoning code amendments to their single-dwelling zoning rules that seek to limit the scale of new homes and increase housing choices. Many of the scale issues they are addressing are similar to Denver’s. Below is a list of amendments they are considering:

- New floor area ratio (FAR) standards for primary and accessory structures to establish a house size by zone that is proportional to the lot size.
- Revising the way height is measured (from lowest point as opposed to highest).
- Allowing exceptions to overall height, such as dormers.
- Increasing setbacks.
- Allowing up to 4 dwelling units per lot.

Case Study:
Vancouver’s Character Home Retention Program

In 2018, Vancouver, British Columbia amended rules and added guidelines that incentivize saving a “character house.” A character house is generally defined as a typical one family dwelling constructed prior to January 1, 1940 that has original massing and roof form plus another original feature(s) such as: original porch, cladding, window openings, period details or streetscape content. In exchange for preserving the house, property owners can receive increased floor area and/or additional units on the same lot.
Yes, these are terrific suggestions, especially the floor to area ratio for multi unit buildings. Mandating affordability is obviously difficult, but it would be easier if we saw fewer 3br, 4bth, 2800 sq foot town homes and more 3br, 2bth 1500 to 1800 sq foot type of units. Real missing middle.

Minneapolis recently allowed 4 dwelling units per lot across all single family zoned areas. I support this policy, because too much of our residential land is devoted to single family housing. As a result we're not building enough new housing and prices are skyrocketing. We need to increase the amount of land available for new housing, otherwise the city becomes more and more unaffordable.

Agreed.

This is wonderful. Homes built before 1940 certainly have a special character that is unlikely to ever be replicated again (although I have seen some new builds in Baker that look like old Victorians). We should make every reasonable effort to preserve historically significant buildings.
Agree that we should do everything possible to preserve the pre-1940s homes, especially in Congress Park. Not sure that ADUs are the way to do it. Because of increased parking, using the ADUs for short term rentals, and other unintended consequences, we should find other ways to incentivize preserving historic homes.

#365

Posted by Nancy Stephenson and Georganne Bley on 02/03/2020 at 11:21pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0
In Congress Park, we do not want 4-plexes or 4 units per lot!

#366

Posted by Richard L. on 01/28/2020 at 5:03pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 4, Disagree: 0
I think this is a great idea and should be given serious consideration.
Work with neighborhoods to modify zoning standards for new construction to be more consistent with neighborhood character in Low Residential Places.

New construction in single-unit and two-unit areas is sometimes out of context due to the mass and scale of new buildings in contrast to older buildings. Modifying zoning requirements such as setbacks and building coverage can help ensure new buildings and additions make good neighbors and fit in with the established character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Update zoning regulations to create more contextual standards for massing, scale, and height, such as:

1. Reduce building coverage standards, including exemptions for garages if inconsistent with the established pattern in the neighborhood.
2. Increase side setbacks to reduce looming effects and encourage side yards. Consider a combined minimum for both sides and a one side minimum to allow greater flexibility.
3. Reduce the length of two-story side walls. Consider a maximum dimension for two-story walls before a change in plane is required or limit the percentage of wall plane that can be at the minimum side setback.
4. Reduce the appearance of building scale and promote compatible roof forms by considering the following:
   a. Set a maximum dimension for a flat or low-sloping roof to discourage out of character 3-story houses.
   b. Modify bulk plane standards to encourage pitched roofs in neighborhoods where it is the traditional roof form.
   c. Modify bulk plane standards to provide exceptions for cross gables and dormers. This would provide an alternative to flat roofs and accommodate more floor area in a sloped roof form.
   d. Ensure building height is measured so that the final finished grade is taken into account to help preserve the “Denver Hill” in new construction.
   e. Modify the bulk plane standard to maintain a 1-1.5 story height in the front portion of lots in areas where these heights are prevalent. In exchange, taller building heights in the rear portion of the lot would allow additions while helping to preserve the established scale of the neighborhood at the street.
#367

Posted by **Jon Hindlemann** on 02/05/2020 at **11:47am** - [Link]

*Type: Suggestion |
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

The scale of the building in the rear yard is as important as in the front / street exposure. Rear yard privacy should remain a priority as should solar access. This later point is (unfortunately) not addressed anywhere in the new plan.

---

#368

Posted by **Cindy sestrich** on 02/05/2020 at **10:53pm** - [Link]

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Very good bulk plane standard for massing taller buildings away from existing lower neighborhood heights in transitions. It has not been done in new developments around the city, which has created shadowing effects making properties less desirable.

---

#369

Posted by **Jon Hindlemann** on 02/05/2020 at **11:53am** - [Link]

*Type: Suggestion |
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

The important aspect here would be the height and lateral distance of the side gable element. Bulk plane exemptions and / or adjustments should be reviewed carefully and the plan review process might want to include shade studies.

---

#370

Posted by **Jon Hindlemann** on 02/05/2020 at **12:22pm** - [Link]

*Type: Suggestion |
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

This could be a positive change, depending of course on what the modifications are. The devil is in the details. Of course playing devil's advocate, would a reverse modification be appropriate where flat / minimal pitched roofs are established in a neighborhood and One wanted to build a high pitched roof?
Allowing dormers, oriel windows, turrets and other architectural details beyond a dull bulk plain would do a lot for allowing more interesting buildings!

#372

This is an effective way to reduce the impact of smaller side setbacks

#373

It would be great if ADUs could receive some sort of a "coverage bonus" (e.g. ADU lot coverage multiplied by 0.5 or 0.75 when calculating lot coverage).

#374

Completely agree with WELL DEFINED AND TIGHT zoning standard modifications that work to preserve the character of this neighborhood. If enacted, it should not be easy/routine for a developer or individual to obtain an exemption.

#375
neighbors. If a person wants to live in a new house rather than a 100-year old house, it should blend in with the old houses.

#376

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 3:51pm - Link
Type: Question
Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

Q36 – These recommendations can help preserve existing neighborhood character but may need more testing in specific architecture contexts. Construction periods reflect different neighborhood housing types such as Victorian, Denver Square or Bungalow. How would these modifications reflect neighborhood character in these different period contexts? How can we test these recommendations to see if it meets the overall goals for the neighborhood?

#377

Posted by Sarah on 12/17/2019 at 1:50am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 3, Disagree: -7

Consider who will be impacted by reduced sunlight due to the shade cast from the tall building. It is already difficult to maintain gardens in this neighborhood and it will be harder with less access to sunlight. The projected shadow of new construction should be taken into consideration with taller buildings.

Reply by John Riecke on 12/30/2019 at 11:34pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 5, Disagree: -3

Consider who will be impacted by reduced buildability due to a ban on tall buildings. Forcing people out of the neighborhood in order to protect someone's squash harvest is cruel.

Reply by Kevin on 12/31/2019 at 12:19am - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 6, Disagree: 0

I don't get why this is really an issue. I lived adjacent to 4 story apartment building in West Wash Park for a few years and had a great garden. The Sun is pretty high in the Spring/Summer.
I do not think it is so much a question of increasing side setbacks as it is of re-examining the bulk plane standard and the potential for limiting the 'long wall' as well as the continuous vertical side walls of 23-25' in height. These 'boxes' are not only woefully out of context in much of the ECAP neighborhoods, but also have an extreme impact on the solar access the adjacent neighbor to the north has available to them.

Why are "Low Residential Places" sacrosanct? People need places to live and deserve not to be squeezed along arterial corridors in order to please the elitists living in the neighborhood interiors.

Kudos for this L7, A. 3. concern with side wall height and bulk plane. When the original zoning of City Park West's current G-RO-3 area was created by CPD, working with newly-formed Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, (subsequently activist Carla Madison won its current extension across the neighborhood), side wall height and bulk plane were considered crucial by CPD staff to maintain and preserve the neighborhood's historic character.

Increase side setbacks in the East Central? Please don't. What is this 1990s Highlands Ranch? In Cap Hill, one of the best reasons to live there, is because it is walkable and boasts small parcels with small side setbacks, making everything very close together, enjoyable and walkable. Also the added benefit of being built before cars, and most lots fortunately not having parking minimums not ruin the street walking experience. Maybe even more egregious side setbacks make sense in car-addicted Congress Park, but please do not enforce a suburban style, car dependent side setbacks.
(environmentally disastrous, infra-structurally unprofitable, walking quality destroying) on a neighborhood like Capitol Hill where people chose to live there specifically because it is walkable and has small side setbacks and it is human scale not SUV scale : ( 

Reply by **John Riecke** on **12/30/2019** at **11:31pm** - [Link](#)

*Type: Answer*

*Agree: 4, Disagree: 0*

+1

Reply by **Daniel** on **01/09/2020** at **12:02am** - [Link](#)

*Type: Suggestion*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Also +1. The density in the neighborhood adds to what makes it special. I've never heard anyone complain about not having enough sideyard. I like that old neighborhoods are compact.
RECOMMENDATIONS

L8
Encourage high-quality design and character preservation in Centers and Corridors

With most of the growth directed to Centers and Corridors, new development should help advance the vision for quality design, a diversity of small, locally owned businesses, compatibility with adjacent residential neighborhoods, and preservation of unique existing commercial buildings that contribute to East Central’s character.

A. Modify regulations to improve design quality in Centers and Corridors. Primary elements to consider include:
   1. Ground floor design treatment and activation standards
   2. Parking locations and design
   3. Materials
   4. Transitions to lower scale residential and historic districts
   5. Streetscape and open space design
   6. Creative design solutions and flexibility

B. Strengthen standards for active ground floor use areas. Primary elements to consider include:
   1. Limiting residential units on the ground floor.
   2. Discouraging visible parking garages on upper levels of buildings fronting primary streets.
   3. Encouraging publicly-accessible open space, such as plazas and pocket parks.
   4. Incorporating enhanced streetscape amenities such as café seating, benches, trees, lighting, bike/scooter parking, curbside management, etc.
   5. Evaluating build-to alternative standards for barriers to providing open space, patios, and streetscape improvements and update standards as needed.

C. Prepare guidelines for sensitive transitions to residential districts and historic buildings. Primary elements to consider include:
   1. Increasing side setbacks to be more compatible with front setbacks of buildings on side streets.
   2. Increasing upper story stepbacks.
   3. Four-sided façade treatments and contextual building materials.
   4. Parking and loading location and design.
   5. Ventilation and refuse container location.
   7. Enhanced landscape buffers, including an option to create agreements with adjacent property owners to install enhanced landscaping on their property.
   8. Access to sunlight.
   9. Balcony and window design to enhance privacy.
   10. Landscaped facades, such as climbing vines, ‘green screens’, and balcony planters.
What does this actually mean? How about looking at massing along the south side of Avenues and the shade coefficient which essentially puts south side sidewalks and part or all of the street in shadow throughout the bulk of winter leaving snow and ice on these pedestrian paths and streets for prolonged periods. In addition, why not look at opening up the corners of arterials / cross-streets whereby the building corner would actually be clipped at an angle to allow for improved sight lines, solar exposure and improved pedestrian crossing.

Reply by Joseph on 02/05/2020 at 1:21pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Great insight, Jon!

Additional: Add new development multistory requirements for onsite and connected green spaces for dog parks and people oriented green spaces, beyond tree lawns. Tree planting must be to the standards for longevity and watering schedules. Tree canopies along Colfax are vital to combat pollution.

Q38 – Outreach to adjacent residential property owners and neighborhoods is needed on this topic to determine priorities of guidelines. Before this plan recommending additional building heights adjacent to single family residential homes is adopted, notification and meetings on this topic for homeowners needs to be completed.

Reply by Kevin on 12/31/2019 at 12:33am - Link
Type: Answer
There has been quite a bit of outreach already but why should single family homes receive special consideration? How does that fit into Blueprints equity goal? There appears to have been some reliance on RNO's to do neighborhood outreach, but that does appear to have been a poor choice, as some RNO leads have chosen to censor some voices that have differing opinions from their own.

#385

Posted by John on 02/05/2020 at 2:54pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I would rather have a visible parking garage than not having parking. It appears that a consistent theme through this plan is not enough attention being paid to parking. Promoting mass transit, biking, etc. is great, but making parking a nightmare is not the way to do it.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 8:23pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

100% disagree. Parking garages are city destroyers. Too much attention is being given to parking in this plan, and it's the wrong kind of attention. We should be eliminating minimums and enacting maximums.

#386

Posted by Logan Meyer on 12/10/2019 at 2:59pm - Link

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 18, Disagree: -4

Please eliminate parking minimums along future transit corridors like Colfax. The best commercial corridors in Denver provide a great pedestrian experiences (16th street mall, larimer square, Little man ice cream (highands) and Colfax has a great opportunity to do just that. Parking minimums immediately gatekeep young and financially strapped entrepreneurs from creating small businesses and walkable buildings along these corridors and instead ensure that large car oriented chains (with the legal and financial resources available to navigate the parking minimums) are the norm and get to operate our most important corridors : (}

Reply by Will on 02/04/2020 at 10:20pm - Link

Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Also add parking maximums to code.

Reply by John on 02/05/2020 at 2:51pm - Link
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
This is a good point, but maybe a better approach is more flexibility tailoring parking requirements to the business. Chik-filet should have to provide parking while a small store or restaurant should not. Development along Colfax has a huge impact on the surrounding neighborhood's parking.

Reply by John R on 04/06/2020 at 8:21pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
100% agree with Logan Meyer, parking minimums destroy a city, Denver is no different. I also 100% agree with Will, it's past time to enact parking maximums. Here's a suggestion: make the current minimums the new maximums. Anything less is bad design, bad urbanism, and climate change denial.

#387

Posted by CPN MT on 12/19/2019 at 3:57pm - Link
Type: Suggestion
Agree: 1, Disagree: 0
Q37 – High Quality Design and Character Preservation include many aspects of the building exterior. Please add more exterior elements recommendations that relate to Design and Character Preservation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Mobilize next steps for preserving historic buildings and neighborhood character.

Discover Denver is a program that surveys neighborhoods to identify buildings that are historically, architecturally or culturally significant to Denver’s history. Much of the East Central study area has been surveyed by Discover Denver and some areas have already been identified as “Areas of Historic Significance” which could warrant additional protection by creating a historic district. Some other areas have unique architecture and patterns that may not warrant a historic district, but could benefit from additional character protection, such as a Conservation Overlay district.

L9

A. For areas identified as an “Area of Historic Significance,” partner with Historic Denver to engage residents on the creation of a historic district. Identify additional incentives to encourage property owners to designate, such as:
   1. Technical assistance writing designation applications.
   2. Additional financial incentives, such as fee reductions.
   3. Alternative preservation tools, such as conservation easements or private covenants.
   4. Assistance with community engagement.

B. For areas identified as “Areas of Historic Interest,” encourage Discover Denver to prioritize these areas for future survey phases.

L10

Continue Improving Out of Date Zoning Regulations

Properties that have retained Former Chapter 59 zoning or the Billboard Use Overlay allow development are not consistent with the vision for East Central.

A. Rezone Former Chapter 59 properties into the Denver Zoning Code (DZC).

   1. Ensure that fees are structured as to promote rezoning out of Former Chapter 59 zone districts and into the DZC and reflect the true cost of administration.

B. Review use and applicability of UO-2 (Billboard Overlay). When a rezoning occurs, recommend eliminating this overlay.
Thank you for these encouragements and recommendations, important and useful in the G-RO-3 area between 17th Avenue and Colfax Avenue corridors.

This term needs further explanation: Chapter 59 Zoning.

Q39 – The Discover Denver survey in Congress Park has identified large areas as “Area of Significance” and the majority of the neighborhood as having “Good Integrity.” If the goal is to “Mobilize next steps for preserving historic buildings,” do not limit it to the creation of a historic district. Other tools for preservation to explore with the neighborhood could include a Conservation Overlay, etc. Commit to working with the residents to find the right tool(s) for that neighborhood and preserve those historic buildings and character. In our neighborhood and city surveys, preserving character is always the most important item.

Do not do this. Congress Park should not be a museum.
Why are some neighborhoods marked as "historic" when others in the East area with similar architecture are not?