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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sustainable Growth. Forecasts estimate that the population of Denver will grow to 686,636 residents by 2020 (an increase of 132,000 people over a twenty year period). To accommodate this growth the city developed an integrated land use and transportation plan, Blueprint Denver, to ensure that Denver evolves in a sustainable manner. The Blueprint Denver planning process revealed that existing zoning would not promote sustainable patterns of development, where land use could be closely linked to the transportation system. To reverse this problem, Blueprint Denver divided the city into two broad categories:

1. Areas of Change – where growth is desirable and may be closely linked to the transportation network.
2. Areas of Stability – where preservation of both the existing character and intensity of development takes precedence.

Blueprint Denver designates University Park as an Area of Stability. The Area of Stability designation does not mean that no change will occur. However, minor infill and redevelopment in these areas should have a stabilizing effect on neighborhood character, with modest infill redevelopment or large projects occurring on a limited basis in a small area.

Zoning & Urban Design Challenges. Existing zoning within University Park does not support its Area of Stability designation. The majority of the zoning in the neighborhood lacks sufficient form-based design and development standards to ensure that new development is sensitive to the existing context. This plan explores the various zoning issues and recommends actions to reinforce the neighborhood as an Area of Stability, while capitalizing on investments that support transit and improvement to the neighborhood’s edges.

Transportation Challenges. Two major transportation corridors form the eastern and western boundary of the University Park neighborhood. Pedestrian improvements along these streets will ensure neighborhood access to the light rail station areas and will strengthen the economic development potential of the corridors. As transit oriented redevelopment near the stations and along the corridors occurs, it will be particularly important to ensure the dedication of sufficient right of way to handle increased pedestrian loads.
Placemaking. Placemaking and character conservation will augment investment in the University Park area. Unlike other parts of the city, pressure to redevelop land in University Park is quite strong. A strong commitment to preservation and urban design quality means creating and tapping economic and regulatory incentives to build, maintain, restore and adaptively reuse architectural resources that add value and character to a place. Some new construction in University Park threatens the very things that have made the neighborhood a desirable place to live, such as deep setbacks, classic architecture, mature tree canopy. Preservation of existing historic resources, stabilization of established residential areas and promotion of high quality design in new construction need not be at odds with development objectives. Flexible standards that focus on conservation of cherished historic resources without prohibiting development in the surrounding area and promoting compatible development reinforces a vibrant, healthy and diverse urban environment. Cities thrive on variety – blending different places such as corridors with neighborhoods, and on a finer grained level, mixing a variety of building forms and site development patterns within these areas in a rational, orderly and compatible way contributes to a sense of place.

The primary goals of this plan are:
1. Create a sense of place with identifiable districts that support discernible patterns of land development.
2. Promote high quality design, preserve historic resources and complement the traditional urban patterns of development.
3. Protect and enhance the mature tree canopy, the presence of generous front and back yard spaces and the outdoor recreational spaces (parks and trails) to preserve the sense a neighborhood in park.
4. Focus compact, mixed-use or high density residential development to places where it may be best integrated with the transportation system.
5. Provide a variety of housing options that appeal to young families and empty nesters.
6. Increase opportunities for formal and informal public gathering.
7. Connect residential areas and neighborhood gathering places with safe and attractive multimodal linkages.
8. Improve roadway safety for all modes of travel and enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of public streets for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders.
10. Organize business interests in commercial areas and enhance the image of commercial districts.
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“I like to see a man proud of the place in which he lives. I like to see a man live so that his place will be proud of him.”
—Abraham Lincoln
INTRODUCTION
Purpose of the Plan
Property owners, elected officials, neighborhood organizations and city departments will use the University Park Plan for many purposes over its lifespan. The following is a description of the primary uses of the plan ranging from big picture expectations to implementation.

- **Data Resource:** The plan offers a collection of existing conditions data about the planning area in an easy-to-reference document.

- **Reinvestment Guidance:** Market conditions cannot be guaranteed and changes in demographics cannot be accurately predicted. However, it is clear that the addition of the light rail station generates reinvestment interest. The plan establishes a vision that guides public and private decision-making and investment over the coming years. It covers the topics of land use, urban design, parks and preservation, mobility and economic development. The plan offers guidance on reinvestment for the near-term but is expected to be sufficiently flexible so as to adapt to changing markets and demographics.

- **Zoning Amendments:** The plan does not convey or deny any zoning entitlement but is an essential evaluation tool used in proposed zoning map amendments. Furthermore, the plan does not change zoning code language, but establishes goals and parameters for future zoning language amendments.

- **Capital Improvements:** A plan can provide the justification or the prioritization and allocation of funding from the city’s capital improvement budget and other sources.

- **Funding and Partnership Opportunities:** Implementation of plans requires a collaborative effort between neighborhoods, businesses, elected officials and city departments. Plans typically require funding beyond the city’s budget. This plan identifies and supports these partnerships and resource leveraging efforts.

The plan is neither an official zone map, nor does it create or deny any rights. Zone changes that may be proposed as part of any development should be consistent with this plan and must be initiated under a separate procedure established under the City and County of Denver’s Revised Municipal Code.
Study Area

The University Park Statistical Neighborhood is situated in southeast Denver. University Park is bordered on three sides by major arterial roadways (Interstate 25/Southeast Light Rail Line to the north, South University Boulevard to the west, and South Colorado Boulevard to the east); Yale Avenue to the south, bisected by East Evans Avenue; and flanked by the University of Denver, the University Light Rail Station, and the Colorado Light Rail Station.
Project Partners & Plan Process

The University Park Community Council (UPCC) prepared and approved a neighborhood framework plan in 2000, but it was not completed at that time due to financial and planning staff constraints. The process was reinitiated in 2002, but was discontinued for the same reasons. Reinvigorated by city officials and the neighborhood, the small area plan moved to completion and adoption in 2006-2007. UPCC volunteered numerous hours to craft and refine a vision for the University Park area and to provide other input about the existing conditions and desired outcomes for the area. The University Park Plan is the result of input from a broad stakeholder group comprised of residents, business owners, property owners, non-profit organizations, developers, architects, real estate professionals, schools, political leaders and city staff.

As part of the process, a nonscientific Small Area Plan survey was distributed to neighborhood residents and businesses in the fall of 2006. Nearly 150 completed surveys (out of approximately 3,500 households in University Park), were collected and used as one tool to help identify the key neighborhood issues and opportunities. A follow-up survey was distributed in the winter of 2006 and 2007 to better define the issues and generate plan concepts (50 completed surveys were collected). Public input was further expanded and refined by UPCC General Meetings, interviews and focus groups. At the general meetings, staff presentations updating attendees on the status of the plan were followed by interactive visioning breakout sessions. Participants were encouraged to express their hopes and concerns for the community using large maps and graphic symbols.

Maps were used at public meetings to gather spatially related input.
Relationship to Existing Plans & Studies
Citywide & Small Area Plans (Adopted by City Council)
Citywide and small area plans adopted by City Council are Denver’s guiding documents. Policies among these plans must be consistent. These plans provide a framework for the development of regulatory tools and provide guidance for development and investment decisions by city staff and elected officials. Several plans and studies provide relevant information for portions of University Park and the surrounding area. These documents include:

Denver Comprehensive Plan 2000
This plan is a fundamental resource for neighborhood planning. The elements that are most applicable to University Park speak to preserving and enhancing the character of Denver’s neighborhoods. The Legacies chapter of Plan 2000 provides particularly relevant guidance for University Park and the issues that challenge the neighborhood’s stability. This chapter calls for urban design standards in zoning to ensure that new development respects traditional character and compact forms of development. The Legacies chapter further espouses a need to promote strong connections to public places, preservation of historic resources and parks.

The citywide land use and transportation plan set the broad growth management strategy for the city. The plan divides the city into Areas of Stability, where the current land uses, character and density are appropriate, and Areas of Change, where new development and revitalization are desired. Residents of University Park participated in the Blueprint Denver planning meetings. University Park was designated as an Area of Stability. The City held two “Small Area Workshops” in 2001 for this neighborhood, which refined development patterns, types, and densities to accommodate increases in population.

Denver Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Plan (2006)
This strategic plan is a guide for prioritizing the planning and implementation activities related to transit oriented development (TOD) at existing and future RTD rail stations. Generally speaking, TOD is a compact mix of land uses within walking distance of a transit station. As part of a regional system of TOD, a resident within a station area can reasonably live, work and play without the daily use of a private car. Since no two station areas are alike, the strategic plan lays out a TOD Typology for the Denver stations. Given its relationship to the University of Denver, University Station is identified as a Campus/ Special Events Station. With its existing concentration of office and entertainment uses, Colorado Station is an Urban Center Station.
**Parks Game Plan (2003)**

The Denver Parks and Recreation Plan identified the I-25 corridor between South University Boulevard and East Hampden Avenue as an area that presently poses challenges for safe access. It also indicates that University Park is categorized as having 5.1 to 7.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 people. East Iliff Avenue, South University Boulevard, South St. Paul Street, East Yale Avenue, and South Colorado Boulevard have been categorized as “Green Streets” in the Game Plan.

**Denver Bicycle Master Plan (1993) and Denver Bicycle Master Plan Update (2001)**

This plan identifies South St. Paul Street, East Iliff Avenue, and Buchtel Boulevard as neighborhood bike routes. It also identifies two trails as off-road routes – Buchtel Trail, and the trail in McWilliams Park.

**Pedestrian Master Plan (2004)**

The Pedestrian Master Plan promotes safe and convenient access to local destinations and transit. The following streets in University Park are identified as pedestrian routes: St. Paul St., Iliff Ave., and S. University Blvd. In addition the plan identifies St. Paul St. (between Buchtel and Evans), Buchtel Blvd. as “linear projects”. The plan lists South University and I-25, and South University and Evans as “project intersections”.

**Colorado Station Framework Plan (2003)**

This plan presents a concept for the proposed ten-acre Transit Oriented Development (TOD) adjacent to the light rail station immediately east of University Park’s border at South Colorado Boulevard and Colorado Center Drive.
Other Plans & Studies (not adopted by City Council)
Denver’s City Council may not adopt all plans and studies conducted for an area as supplements to the Comprehensive Plan. However, these documents provide useful information that may be integrated into the goals, recommendations and implementation strategies of this plan. These plans and studies include:

*University Park Assessment (2004)*
The Assessment includes both quantitative and qualitative data. Community Planning and Development (CPD) developed the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The University Park Community Council (UPCC) distributed and retrieved a questionnaire to assess current neighborhood priorities, and sponsored a community meeting for the purpose of collecting further input.

*University Park Report (1923)*
This report was prepared by S.R. DeBoer to address concerns relating to neighborhood character. The report made references and recommendations regarding commercial corridor development, zoning, transportation, beautification, tree planting, and landscaping, and public park and recreation areas. Some of the landscaping recommendations developed in the report remain evident in University Park to this day.

*University Park Framework Plan (2000)*
The framework plan was the product of six months of intensive collaboration between some 200 University Park residents and city. At the time, it was designed as a prototype for other neighborhoods who were interested in writing similar plans. It was voted on at the May 2000 University Park Community Council (UPCC) General Meeting and published in June 2000.

*The Historic Buchtel Boulevard Plan (2000)*
The Historic Buchtel Boulevard Plan was drafted as an adjunct to the University Park Framework Plan. The Buchtel Plan was originally drawn in 1976 as a part of the Colorado Centennial presentations.

*University of Denver Campus Master Land Use Plan (2002)*
Completed in the Summer of 2002, the University of Denver Land Use Plan is a tool designed to guide the development of the campus over a 20-year time frame. Throughout the process, University Park was represented by a resident appointed to serve in the development of the plan. Generally speaking, the plan is intended to facilitate internal decision making by providing a rational basis for the site selection of future campus facilities and buildings. Secondly, the document establishes a context whereby City & County of Denver planning staff can base land use and transportation decisions. Lastly, and most germane to the residents and businesses of the University Park neighborhood, the plan provides an understanding of DU’s land acquisition and development intentions for years to come. Whereas the plan claims that certain guiding principles found in the plan will last in perpetuity, it also acknowledges
that not all campus improvements can be forecasted and planned for in the ever-changing arena of higher education. For this reason, some of DU’s holdings within University Park (e.g. I-O zoned surface parking lot) remain a concern for some neighborhood residents. The 2007 Land Use Plan Update was completed in the fall of 2007.

Key Land Use Plan recommendations directly related to DU’s interface with the University Park neighborhood include:

Traffic & Parking – The “promenade”, the proposed central spine for the organization of open space and pedestrian circulation on campus, should “embrace the new light rail station at the northern end of campus” and “encourage greater emphasis on rail travel to and from the campus” by creating a “seamless access corridor”. By physically and psychologically linking the campus with RTD’s University station, DU should help mitigate the traffic and parking implications of its operations.

South University Boulevard – The Land Use Plan recommends strengthening the image of DU along this corridor by developing new facilities and improving the streetscape and pedestrian experience.

Gateways – The campus gateway at the intersection of South University Boulevard and Buchtel Boulevard should be better defined. The entranceway represents an opportunity for “significant program expansion and urban design improvements that will distinguish the University from surrounding properties.”

Student Housing – Undergraduate residential housing is planned for the center of campus along the promenade to enliven the campus environment and strengthen the sense of community. To act as a buffer between these dormitories and adjacent residential neighborhoods, new graduate student and faculty/staff housing is recommended for the campus periphery on the west side of South University Boulevard.
Campus Retail – Retail (serving students, faculty and staff) is to be focused in two areas adjacent to University Park. The generalized land use map identifies the South University Boulevard blocks between Asbury and Evans Avenues and Wesley and Harvard Avenues as Retail Transition areas. Businesses may be privately owned and operated or an extension of existing campus services.

In terms of plans for new land acquisition, the Land Use Plan anticipates growth and expansion on land either currently owned or to be acquired within the following areas:

- West of South University Boulevard
- South of Interstate 25
- North of Harvard Avenue
- East of High Street

The fraternities, sororities and ancillary University facilities within the University Park neighborhood along Columbine and Josephine Streets are expected to maintain their present uses. The plan does not recommend land acquisitions within these areas.


The University of Denver (DU) campus is directly adjacent to the west border of University Park. There are also scattered holdings of University property within the University Park neighborhood. Expansion of DU programs and facilities has raised many issues relating to edge compatibility, parking, and traffic.

The Parking Management Plan evaluated existing campus development, and facilities contemplated in the future, and equated this development to existing Denver parking requirements. The University will provide the required amount of parking – campus-wide, as dictated by the city’s parking regulations. Parking demand for planned development projects will be continually assessed and future parking facilities should be sited to mitigate potential spillover into the adjacent neighborhoods while providing strategic reservoirs that encourage park once behavior.

DU’s Master Plan calls for main street style retail improvements at South University and Evans that better link the campus to the shopping district.
The Traffic Mitigation Plan details specific locations and measures to minimize traffic generated by the University of Denver, and its impact on adjacent residential areas. The plan has been implemented in the University Statistical Neighborhood, but not in University Park. The City approved the plan for University in 2002. Plans for the University Park Statistical Neighborhood were submitted at the same time; however, the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program is no longer staffed at this time. Plan components for the University neighborhood were implemented using private funding sources in 2005, but the University Park Traffic Mitigation Plan implementation has not yet been realized.
University Park Area History

University Park owes its beginnings as a neighborhood in the mid 1880’s to University of Denver (then Colorado Seminary) leaders who envisioned a college environment and surrounding community founded on the concepts of “conscience and culture,” far from the school’s location in bustling downtown Denver. The generosity of a potato farmer and a bishop’s wife helped the dream take shape, and the availability of transportation boosted chances that the community would become reality.

Colorado Seminary, founded in 1864 and reorganized as the University of Denver in 1880, had been operating downtown at 14th and Arapaho St. when trustees decided that the busy urban center was no longer suitable as an academic center. Mrs. Elizabeth Iliff Warren, wife of Bishop Henry Warren, pledged $100,000 to the school if it were to relocate to an area far from the “unsavory” influences of central Denver. Various sites were looked at, and trustees settled on the present location, envisioning it as a bucolic, educational enclave. Seminary president John Evans supported this choice, realizing that his Denver and New Orleans railroad sliced through the area, and could provide transportation to students and potential home buyers as well as bring in supplies without a long wagon haul.

In 1885, farmer Rufus “Potato” Clark owned much of the land now occupied by the University of Denver (DU) and University Park. He agreed to donate 80 acres to DU if the school erected the main buildings as soon as possible, platted 200 acres as a town site within six months, and planted 1,000 forest trees along the streets and in parks. Ten additional owners promised to deed 70 more acres and additional cash to the university if these stipulations were met.

University Park was dedicated on Arbor Day in 1886 as University Park Colony, lots were platted, and the vision of an elite community surrounding the university began to take shape. Early marketing required that “strangers to us” needed recommendations to apply for membership and to purchase a lot, initially sold for $150 each. The location was touted as having unsurpassed mountain views, distant from smelters, with pure air and no saloons. Buyers were required to develop their lots according to a “tasty and artistic plan”. The Circle Railroad promised to extend tracks on the popular line east from South University Boulevard to South Milwaukee Street and run four trains per day. A few years later an electric line was extended to South University Boulevard and East Evans Avenue, followed by an electric trolley down Evans and Milwaukee alongside the Circle Railroad tracks. The Evans Store on the corner of Evans and Milwaukee served as a market, post office, and lively hub for the growing community. It is still standing, currently housing an insurance office.

Chamberlin Observatory was completed in 1890 in the southern portion of Observatory Park. Designed by Robert Roeschlaub in the Richardson Romanesque style, it is still used by DU for astronomy classes.
for star gazing, and by the University Park neighborhood for annual events. Since 1977, the State Historical Fund has awarded major grants to DU to help fund much-needed restoration work with matching funds provided by the University Park's Chamberlin Observatory Restoration Committee, the Denver Astronomical Society, and by DU itself. The observatory was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1980 and received Denver local landmark designation in 1994. Since 1977, the State Historical Fund has awarded major grants to DU, including a $200,000 grant in January, 2006, to help fund much-needed restoration work with matching funds provided by University Park’s Chamberlin Observatory Restoration Committee, the Denver Astronomical Society, and by DU itself.

In 1892, Bishop and Mrs. Henry Warren purchased a full block of land at 2160 South Cook Street and built their showplace residence, Fitzroy Place, a carriage house, and gardener’s cottage, on the southern portion. The structures are University Park landmarks notable for their outstanding architecture and setting surrounded by abundant open space. Although the architectural plans were supplied by the Albany, New York, office of Fuller and Wheeler, it is possible that local architects were also involved. The three-story home included 13 rooms and 12 fireplaces, and was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1975, both the mansion and the carriage house were designated as local landmarks in 2007. Today the building houses a private school, Randell-Moore School of Denver.

Iliff Hall, at 2201 South University Blvd., was built in 1892 for DU’s first graduate department, the Iliff School of Theology. Although the school closed in 1900, it reorganized and incorporated as an independent institution in 1903. The deed was transferred from Colorado Seminary to the Iliff School of Theology, and the school was officially reopened in 1903. Iliff Hall still houses the school, which was placed on the National Registry of Historic Places in 2006.

University Park School was built in 1893 just east of the southeast corner of St. Paul Street and Iliff Avenue. Although additions were made and the original structure was demolished, the location of the school remains the same.

Attendance at DU plummeted when the Silver Panic occurred in 1893. In 1900, Dr. Henry Buchtel was named Chancellor, and his remarkable fundraising skills rescued the school. In 1905 he and his wife built their California bungalow style residence, Buchtel Bungalow, at 2100 Columbine Street. Their home also served as the governor’s mansion while Buchtel served as governor from 1907-1909. The building was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1988. According to current plans, history will repeat itself when it will soon serve as the residence for current Chancellor Robert Coombe and his wife.

Many additional historic structures exist in University Park, and are described in Don Etter’s University Park/Denver Four Walking Tours, published in 1974. The walks focus on early development from 1886 -1910, and include 101 structures (some of which have been demolished).
As the years progressed, University Park evolved from the remote enclave envisioned by its founders. Denver’s growth, modern transportation, and the area’s continued desirability all contributed to increased residential and business development. Throughout its history, the residents have been active stewards of their neighborhood, aware of the unique qualities that brought them here. In 1923, community leaders enlisted notable landscape architect and city planner S.R. DeBoer to design a plan to help ensure the future of this special part of Denver. Although the plan was never fully implemented, portions of the plan can be seen in University Park today - planting of diverse street trees, a natural streetscape for parts of the eastern blocks, and a treed edge along McWilliams Park and on the DU campus. The concepts promoted by DeBoer - a “secluded nook, a quiet, peaceful part of the city”, encouraged by a lush greenscape, are relevant today. The planner noted in 1923 that the community was “in danger of losing its character as a beautiful residence district in Denver,” by encroaching development, and was being proactive in “planning its own neighborhood not for commercial benefit but for the protection of its homes”. Even prior to DeBoer’s vision, a 19th century “green plan” was drawn for University Park that showed “a method of parking the streets and avenues”, how and where to plant street trees.

University Park’s Centennial celebration in 1986 included the dedication of Buchtel Centennial Park at Buchtel Boulevard and Columbine. Buchtel Boulevard was constructed on land donated by DU in memory of Henry Buchtel after his death in 1924, and trees were planted by the school. A trail was built on land bordering the linear boulevard in 1996. The property including the boulevard and land on which the trail was later built, from South University to Monroe Street was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1992. Prairie Park was established along the area adjacent to the historic trail, on land recently acquired from RTD. Plans currently call for planting native plants requiring little irrigation, recalling early days when the entire area was mostly a prairie.

*Special thanks to Rosemary Stoffel, University Park resident and volunteer historian*

Sources for the University Park history include:
- Application, Iliff Hall, National Register of Historic Places, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, May, 2005
- Breck, Allen D., *From the Rockies to the World*, 1989
- Etter, Don, *University Park/Denver Four Walking Tours*, 1974
- Goodstein, Phil, *South Denver Saga*, 1991
- University Park Colony pamphlet
- University Park Addition map
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“Imagination is more important than knowledge. For while knowledge defines all we currently know and understand, imagination points to all we might yet discover and create.”
—Albert Einstein
University Park experienced a population boom after World War II until 1970. From the most recent Census data it appears that the neighborhood is once again experiencing a renewed population increase that is outpacing comparable neighborhoods. By focusing new growth to urban neighborhood station areas and transit rich corridors, University Park has the opportunity to take advantage of public investments in transit and accept growth in a manner that complements and sustains this Area of Stability.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Unless otherwise noted, all demographic data was collected from the 2000 Census. For more thorough analysis, the data compares University Park to Denver, as well as abutting southeastern neighborhoods including University to the west, Cory-Merrill to the north, University Hills to the east, and Wellshire to the south.

Population & Growth

Like most neighborhoods during the baby boom years of 1950 to 1970, University Park grew significantly after World War II from approximately 5,500 people to just over 8,000 people. Also like many established urban neighborhoods, the community lost population between 1970 and 1990, ultimately dropping to just over 6,000. Over the fifty-year period, University Park added 1,406 residents at a modest annual growth rate of approximately 0.5 percent per year. This represents faster growth than both the University and Cory-Merrill neighborhoods, but significantly slower growth than University Hills and Wellshire.

![University Park Population Graph](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>9,393</td>
<td>8,196</td>
<td>8,696</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>8,165</td>
<td>6,934</td>
<td>6,161</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hills</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>8,083</td>
<td>7,981</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory-Merrill</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>-1,919</td>
<td>-0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellshire</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census

During the most recent census period, 1990-2000, University Park added over 700 residents. This influx of newcomers exceeded the growth of the other comparison neighborhoods. Perhaps symbolic of the increasing attractiveness of more urban living, only the more established University and University Park communities increased in population, whereas the newer neighborhoods remained stable or actually continued to lose residents.
Population & Housing Density

Population density can be quantified in terms of people per acre. Using this measure, University Park is more densely populated than all of the neighboring communities with the exception of University. Using the most recent Census data for all of the areas, the neighborhood had an estimated 9.2 persons per acre. This exceeds the figure of Denver (5.1 persons per acre) as a whole. Much of this discrepancy, however, is attributable to Denver’s more recent annexations of large swaths of unpopulated land in the Gateway Area and Denver International Airport (DIA).

Residential density is customarily expressed in terms of housing, or dwelling, units per acre. Using the most recent dwelling unit counts, the housing densities for the comparison neighborhoods more or less mirror the range of population densities. At 4.7 dwelling units per gross acre, University Park’s residential density is higher than all of the comparison neighborhoods except for University. Gross densities are approximately 20-40 percent less than net densities since they include roads and other open spaces. It should be noted, however, that there is not a direct correlation between the two measures of density. With fluctuations in household sizes, or the average number of people living in a household, a neighborhood may have a higher housing density but a lower population density and vice versa.

Sex & Age of the Population

Based on a comparison of the composition of University Park’s population by sex and age relative to Denver, it is clear that the neighborhood is home to older adults and people in their twenties. The University of Denver and Iliff School of Theology may account for the higher concentration of post-secondary school aged individuals in University Park. The chart (right) suggests that University Park may also be home to a number of “empty nest” households. The significantly lower share of children and youth coupled with notably fewer females in their thirties and smaller than average household sizes suggests the neighborhood may have a smaller proportion of young families than other neighborhoods in Denver.
Household Type
University Park residents predominantly live in family households, yet this is below the average for Denver as a whole. About 60% of the University Park households live in families, whereas nearly three-quarters of Denver households live in families. Non-family households comprise just over 25% of Denver households and over 40% of University Park households. The concentration of older adults (especially females) and post-secondary aged individuals may account for this difference in household types. Planning for goods and services should account for the different needs of these population groups.

Household Size
As alluded to earlier, residential density and population density are not directly correlated. Comparing University Park to University is a case in point. The residential densities of the two neighborhoods are closer than their population densities. This is a function of household size, or the average number of people living in households. University Park residents live in households of smaller than average size compared to both Denver and other southeast city neighborhoods. Whereas University Park’s households average less than two persons per household, the University neighborhood average is 2.22, much closer to the city-wide figure of 2.31. The prevalence of smaller household types (students, renters and seniors on the peripheral edges near South University and South Colorado Boulevards) and the number of “empty nesters” internal to the neighborhood in University Park may account for some of the difference between the University and University Park neighborhoods.

Household Income
With its mix of housing and family types, University Park has historically been home to a mix of income groups. Over 22 percent of the households possess annual incomes of over $100,000, approximately 21 percent earn less than $25,000. Over half (56 percent) of all households are in the lower to upper-middle income range of $25,000 - $100,000. According to ESRI Business Analyst, the Median Household Income is $56,921, Per Capita Household Income is $47,692, and Average Household Income is $91,251. Overall, the neighborhood has higher than average disposable income, as well as income groups with distinct market preferences. More effort may be needed to promote the needs of different market segments and balance the range of shops and services that appeal to lower income student populations as well as higher income and older residents.
Sixty-six percent of the net acreage of the University Park neighborhood is single-family in nature. The community offers dense housing options in multi-family residential structures at the neighborhood periphery along South University and South Colorado Boulevards. As the area matures, residential densities may increase in these transit-rich areas though the majority of the land area will remain single-family.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Land Use
In terms of existing land uses, University Park is primarily a single family neighborhood. Approximately two-thirds (69 percent) of the net acreage (i.e. not including roads) is currently single family in nature. Consistent with its historic image as a neighborhood within a park, the second most prevalent land use is classified as parks and open space (6 percent). Civic uses including schools, churches and other public facilities constitute 6 percent of the uses. Despite housing a significant number of the neighborhood’s residents, more compact housing types such as multifamily developments of over 9 units (5 percent) and 2-8 units (2 percent) represent only 7 percent of all land uses by acreage. Retail and services are limited in University Park with only 2 percent of the net land area.

Spatially, lands uses in the neighborhood are largely segregated (see Existing Land Cover map on the following page). With the exception of parks, open space and some civic uses, the internal residential neighborhood between Columbine Street to the west and Jackson Street to the east is almost exclusively single family. The one exception is a mix of uses, a small remaining vestige of the trolley car era, at the corner of Evans Avenue and Milwaukee Street across from Observatory Park.

A greater mix of uses and housing types can be found along South University and South Colorado Boulevards, the transit rich corridors that form the east and west boundaries of the neighborhood. South University Boulevard exhibits a finer grain of uses including neighborhood retail and services, multifamily housing and campus-related uses primarily oriented towards the University of Denver students. South Colorado Boulevard possesses a similar blend of uses albeit on a more sprawling scale defined by land uses that cater almost exclusively to automobile demands for space.
In terms of existing land uses, University Park is primarily a single family neighborhood. Approximately two-thirds (66 percent) of the net acreage (i.e. not including roads) is currently single family in nature. Consistent with its historic image as a neighborhood within a park, the second most prevalent land use is classified as parks and open space.
Zoning

The University Park statistical neighborhood contains over one square mile, or approximately 744 acres, of land. Over 90 percent of this land is zoned for residential use with over three-quarters (77 percent) dedicated to single family, detached units. Less than 10 percent of the land area is zoned for high density multifamily housing (R-3 or R-4). Another 5 percent is zoned for low to medium density housing (R-2 or R-2A). Of the remaining zoning districts, just over 5 percent of the area allows for retail, limited office or residential mixed use. The distribution of zone districts and their location and descriptions are found below.

R-1: Single-Unit Detached Dwellings/Low Density. Foster family care and day care allowed as home occupations by permit and other additional home occupations and room-renting to one or two persons are allowed upon application and issuance of a permit. Minimum of 6,000 square feet of land required for each dwelling unit. (Density is approximately 7.3 dwelling units/acre.)

R-2: Multi-Unit Dwellings/Low Density. Typically duplexes and triplexes. Home occupations are allowed by permit. A minimum of 6,000 square feet of land is required for each duplex structure with an additional 3,000 square feet required for every unit over 2. (Density is approximately 14.5 dwelling units/acre.)

R-2A: Multi-Unit Dwellings/Medium Density. 2,000 square feet of land required for each dwelling unit unless site plan is submitted under the Planned Building Group (PBG) provisions, in which case 1,500 square feet of land is required for each unit. Home occupations are allowed by permit. (Density is approximately 21.8 dwelling units/acre.)

R-3: Multi-Unit Dwellings/High Density. Building size is controlled by bulk standards, off-street parking and open space requirements. Building floor area cannot exceed 3 times the site area. Maximum density is determined by the size of the units and the factors mentioned above.

R-4: Multi-Unit Dwellings and/or Offices, High Density. The purpose of this district is to provide a location for high density residential and intensive office development. Building size is controlled by bulk standards, off-street parking and open space requirements. Allows hotel or motel uses and limited acces-
Existing Zoning

- **University Park Neighborhood Boundary**
- **Park**

**Zoning (Within UP Neighborhood)**

- **Low / Medium Density Residential**
  - R-1
  - R-2
  - R-2-A

- **High Density Residential**
  - R-3
  - R-4

- **Planned Unit Development**
  - PUD

- **Business**
  - B-1
  - B-2
  - B-3

- **Mixed Use**
  - R-MU-30

- **Industrial**
  - I-0

- **Institutional**
  - R-5

- **Arterial Business**
  - B-A-2

- **Parking**
  - P-1
sory retail shopping. Building floor area cannot exceed 4 times the site area.

**R-5: Institutional District.** Allows colleges, schools, churches and other institutional uses. Maximum lot coverage is 60% of the zone lot. Building height is controlled by bulk standards.

**R-MU-30: Residential Mixed-Use District.** The R-MU-30 district is a primarily residential district allowing higher density multiple unit dwellings of a density appropriate to the center-city and other activity centers such as light rail transit stations. Supporting commercial development, such as consumer retail and service uses and small-scale office uses, is encouraged to create a truly mixed-use environment. No maximum residential density is prescribed. Instead, maximum height, setbacks, and open space requirements determine the scale of buildings.

**B-1: Limited Office.** This district provides office space for services related to dental and medical care and for office-type services, often for residents of nearby residential areas. The district is characterized by a low-volume of direct daily customer contact. This district is characteristically small in size and is situated near major hospitals or between large business areas and residential areas. The district regulations establish standards comparable to those of the low density residential districts, resulting in similar building bulk and retaining the low concentration of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Building height is controlled by bulk standards and open space requirements. Building floor area cannot exceed the site area.

**B-2: Neighborhood Business.** This district provides for the retailing of commodities classed as “convenience goods,” and the furnishing of certain personal services, to satisfy the daily and weekly household or personal needs of the residents of surrounding residential neighborhoods. This district is located on collector streets, characteristically is small in size, usually is entirely surrounded by residential districts and is located at a convenient walking distance from the residential districts it is designed to serve. The district regulations establish standards comparable to those of low density residential districts, resulting in similar standards. Building floor area cannot exceed the site area.

The new mixed use project on the northeast corner of South University Boulevard & Evans Avenue resulted from the rezoning of the land from the B-2 to the R-MU-30 zoning district. The property increased the utilization of urban land at the intersection of two enhanced transit corridors.
B-A-2: Arterial Service District. This district is intended as a tourist oriented area, allowing restaurants and hotels or motels with accessory automobile service stations. Requires 100 feet of arterial street frontage. Zone lot coverage not to exceed 30%. Building height is controlled by bulk standards. Front setback areas are required for landscaping.

B-3: Shopping Center District. This district is primarily to provide the retailing of most commodities and the furnishing of certain personal services, satisfying all household and personal needs of the residents of surrounding residential communities. This district is normally located on major arterial or collector streets at or near the intersection with another major arterial or collector street so that is has good vehicular accessibility. This district is characteristically large, usually is entirely surrounded by residential districts, and is located a convenient driving distance from the residential districts it is designed to serve. The district regulations establish standards comparable to those of low density residential districts, resulting in similar building bulk on smaller parcels and retaining a low concentration of vehicular traffic. Building height is controlled by bulk standards and open space requirements. Building floor area cannot exceed the site area.

I-0: Light Industrial/Office District. This district is intended to be an employment area containing offices, and light industrial uses which are generally compatible with residential uses. I-0 zoned areas are designed to serve as a buffer between residential areas and more intensive industrial areas. Bulk plane, setback and landscaping standards apply in this district. Building floor area cannot exceed 50% of the site area; however, office floor area may equal site area. Some uses are conditional uses.
P-1: Off-Street Parking. Allows parking lots and structures. Bulk and setback regulations apply to structures. This zone is intended to provide needed business parking without the expansion of the business zone; e.g. a buffer between business and residential uses. Requires visual barriers adjacent to residential uses.

PUD: Planned Unit Development. PUD is a form of development generally characterized by a unified site design for clustering buildings and providing common open-space, density increases, and a mix of building types and land uses. The process involves site plan review, during which the city agencies and neighborhood residents have considerable input in determining the nature of the development. In effect, any PUD is a specific zone district for a specific area, including precise regulations written by the applicant, and when approved by City Council, is enforced by the city. It allows maximum flexibility during the planning stage and maximum assurance that exactly what is proposed will be developed.

This plan provides guidance for the redevelopment of underutilized parcels within University Park, such as the University of Denver parking lot pictured below. These sites present opportunities for growth that may augment and reinforce the best qualities of this traditional urban neighborhood.
HOUSING

Age of Housing
Of 3,687 housing units in the study area, more than three quarters of the units were built prior to 1969. The median year of construction is 1959. These numbers indicate that the neighborhood includes a mature housing stock. Some of the housing in the neighborhood may be reaching the end of its life cycle, and may be appropriate for redevelopment. However, much of the area’s housing stock represents building eras that contribute to the architectural legacy of the neighborhood. Given the desirability of the neighborhood careful attention must be paid to character preservation and context-sensitive design and development standards to ensure that redevelopment and additions respect established patterns of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999 to March 2000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 to 1998</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1994</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 or Earlier</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Structure Built</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure
The majority of residents in University Park moved to the neighborhood within the past 10 to 15 years. As new residents seek out this neighborhood, it will be important to maintain, respect and enhance the features that make University Park an attractive place to live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 Households by Year Householder Moved In:</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1999 to March 2000</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1995 to 1998</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1990 to 1994</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1970 to 1979</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1969 or Earlier</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Householder Moved In</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some emerging patterns of development respect traditional development patterns (such as the front setbacks, building orientation to the street, articulation of the front façade, roof forms, ratio of window to wall plane) while others diverge from such patterns altogether.

**Occupancy Status**

In 2007 according to ESRI Business Analyst, 43.9 percent of the 3,659 housing units in the market area are owner occupied; 49.6 percent, renter occupied; and 6.4 percent are vacant. In 2000, there were 3,690 housing units—41.9 percent owner occupied, 54.5 percent renter occupied and 3.6 percent vacant. The rate of change in housing units since 2000 is -0.12 percent. Median home value in the market area is $353,030, compared to a median home value of $192,285 for the U.S. In five years, median home value is projected to change by 3.94 percent annually to $428,355. From 2000 to the current year (2007), median home value changed by 4.77 percent annually.

**Housing Value**

With its intact supply of traditional homes, tree lined streets, park amenities, and good schools, University Park is an attractive residential area. This attractiveness is illustrated in the high housing values for the neighborhood. House values in University Park are significantly greater than the median housing value for the city as a whole (approximately $255,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>$251,849</td>
<td>$353,030</td>
<td>$428,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>$316,385</td>
<td>$440,920</td>
<td>$531,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data provided by ESRI Business Analyst*

Despite the high value of owner occupied units, rents remain relatively affordable in University Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Owner Costs</th>
<th>Average Owner Costs</th>
<th>Median Rent</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Average Gross (w/utilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,461</td>
<td>$1,655</td>
<td>$621</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data provided by ESRI Business Analyst*
University Park provides multifamily housing options at the edges of the neighborhood.
Sidewalk Type

- **Attached**
- **Detached**
- **Nonexisting**

The presence of detached sidewalks corresponds to the neighborhood vintage. Generally, the older, original sections of the neighborhood contain detached sidewalks. While areas that matured after 1950 either have no sidewalks or sidewalks are attached.
LEGACIES

Residents in University Park value the variety of historic structures, the public parks and open space, and the abundant tree canopy that characterize their neighborhood.

Historic structures include Chamberlin Observatory in Observatory Park, designed by Robert Roeschlaub more than a century ago in the Richardson Romanesque style. Considered the architectural centerpiece of University Park, it is owned by the University of Denver (DU) and used by the school for astronomy classes, by the Denver Astronomical Society for stargazing and teaching, and by the community for neighborhood events including the annual Holiday Sing and Fourth of July parade. It was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1980 and received Denver local landmark designation in 1994. The State Historical Society awarded $200,000 in January, 2006 to DU to help fund much-needed restoration. UPCC, DU and the Denver Astronomical Society donated additional funds.

Fitzroy Place (also known as the Iliff Mansion) was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974, and ranks as a major historic landmark in the neighborhood. The mansion and carriage house were designated local landmarks in November, 2007. Completed in 1892 by Bishop Henry Warren and Mrs. Elizabeth Iliff Warren, the impressive Richardson-Romanesque architectural style structure is set prominently in the southern portion of an entire city block at 2160 So. Cook St. The setting, quality of architectural design, and history make this a significant part of Denver's historic urban scene.

Buchtel Bungalow, 2100 So. Columbine, was built by DU Chancellor Henry Buchtel and his wife in 1905. The California bungalow style residence also served as the governor's mansion when Buchtel served as governor from 1907 - 1909. The building was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1988, and now serves as the residence for current DU Chancellor Robert Coombe and his wife.

University Park Elementary School was built in 1893 just east of the southeast corner of So. St. Paul St. and E. Iliff Ave. Although additions were made and the original structure demolished, the location remains the same.

Although not officially located in the University Park neighborhood, several properties directly across So. University Blvd. are historically significant, and entwined with the history of the neighborhood.
Iliff Hall at 2201 So. University Boulevard was constructed in 1892 to serve as a theological education facility, which it does to the present day. It was designed in the Richardson Romanesque style with influences from the Gothic Revival, and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2006. Funding was contributed by Mrs. Elizabeth Iliff Warren and her son; other visionaries instrumental in constructing Iliff Hall include Governor John Evans, John Wesley Iliff, Mrs. Warren’s first husband, and Bishop Henry Warren, whom Mrs. Warren married after Iliff died. It is connected to the University Park neighborhood along tree-lined Warren Ave., which continues on the east side of So. University Blvd.

Also on Warren Ave. and on the east side of So. University Blvd. is University Hall, as well as the Mary Reed Building, constructed in 1932 in the collegiate Gothic style. Shortly after Mary Reed funded construction of Margery Reed Hall in her daughter’s memory, she donated additional funds to erect a new library, the Mary Reed Building, which now houses the University’s administrative offices, including those of the Chancellor and Provost.

Evans Chapel on the DU campus was built by DU founder John Evans in 1873 in memory of his daughter. Originally located at 13th and Bannock streets in downtown Denver, the chapel was moved to the campus in 1906 when it was threatened with demolition. It was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

In addition to these buildings, many residences in University Park could be characterized as historically interesting. The University Park Community Council offered a workshop to residential property owners interested in historic designation.

Abundant green space also characterizes this older Denver neighborhood. Three public parks - Observatory Park, McWilliams Park and the new Prairie Park offer a sanctuary for public use, and Buchtel Trail adjacent to Prairie Park is a popular spot for walkers. The Historic Buchtel Boulevard Trail, from South University Boulevard to South Monroe Street, was named to the National Register of Historic Places in 1992.

Mature street trees contribute to the green ambiance throughout the neighborhood. University Park contributes to Denver’s urban forest with abundant leafy coverage, and ranks among the highest in amount of canopy coverage with more than 30 per cent of the neighborhood sheltered by trees.
Abundant green spaces in three public parks and several trails, as well as in generous front, rear and side yard setbacks characterize the park-like setting of University Park. Mature trees in these private spaces and in the public spaces lining streets contribute to the neighborhood’s green ambiance. Preservation of this character is essential to the stability of the neighborhood.
MOBILITY

With the completion of the Southeast Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor in 2006, University Park expanded its regional transportation choices to a considerable degree. In addition to major vehicular thoroughfares (including I-25, South University Boulevard, South Colorado Boulevard and Evans Avenue), University Park residents, employees and students now have ready access to two of the 15 new light rail stations along the 19 mile corridor. Circulation within the neighborhood is provided through an interconnected grid system of local streets and pedestrian routes and bicycle facilities.

Street Classification & Typologies

According to *Blueprint Denver: An Integrated Land Use and Transportation Plan*, all streets should accommodate multiple transportation choices including vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. That is, all streets should be complete in terms of design for and use by a variety of modes in addition to cars. Recognizing that different streets serve different purposes, Blueprint also emphasizes that designs match the character of adjacent land uses and improve the people trip carrying capacity of corridors.

Street classifications and typologies help identify the function and character of streets. Conventional street functional classifications capture a street’s engineering design, travel characteristics and connectivity within the city and beyond. These classifications form a hierarchy of streets ranging from those designed primarily for travel mobility (arterials) to those for access to property (local streets).

Street typologies go a step further to describe a street design based on surrounding land uses and urban context. Typologies define the street environment that should be created to support and act in concert with the urban context. For example, whereas traditional street classification tends to cater primarily to motorized vehicles, multi-modal street types incorporate design elements for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Such designs balance the transportation system and encourage better interface between land use and transportation.

Mixed-Use Streets (South University, Evans, South Colorado Ave.). Mixed-use streets accommodate a variety of travel choices including walking, biking and transit. Pedestrian amenities and facilities including a mix of uses, landscaped medians, tree lawns, and street furniture (benches, lighting, trash cans) attract pedestrians and bicyclists. On-street parking, bicycle lanes, landscaping and wide sidewalks are high priorities.

Commercial Streets (S. Colorado Boulevard north of E. Evans Avenue). These arterials typically serve commercial strip areas with buildings set back deep from the street. Historically, they are highly auto-oriented with little consideration for the pedestrian environment. Emphasis is placed on auto mobility and access to commercial properties.
Residential Streets (South University, Buchtel, St. Paul, Iliff, Yale). As arterials (only South University Boulevard south of Wesley Avenue), residential streets balance transportation choice (private vehicles, transit, walking) with access to residential properties. As collectors, residential streets are designed to emphasize walking, bicycling and land access over auto mobility. In both cases, residential streets tend to be more pedestrian-oriented than commercial streets, giving a higher priority to landscaped medians, tree lawns, sidewalks, on-street parking, bicycle lanes and connections to local parks.

Interstate 25 (Blueprint Street Type: Undesignated Arterial). I-25 is a major interstate highway in the western United States and the primary north-south conduit through Colorado. Originating in the north at Interstate 90 in Buffalo, Wyoming, it travels south to Interstate 10 at Las Cruces, New Mexico. Running just east of the Front Range, it passes near and/or through Fort Collins, Denver, Castle Rock, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo. As the northern border of University Park, I-25 actually travels east-west through the neighborhood with exits at both South University and South Colorado Boulevards. The I-25 Transportation Expansion (TREX) project opened in 2006 making the interstate a complete street with the addition of a high frequency, high volume light rail line.

South Colorado Boulevard (Blueprint Street Type: I-25 to Evans - Commercial Arterial; Evans to Yale - Mixed Use Arterial). South Colorado Boulevard (Highway 2) extends approximately 24 miles north-south through the urban Denver region. Originating in the north at Interstate 76 in Brighton, it travels south just east of downtown Denver intersecting Interstate 70, Colfax Avenue (Highway 40/287), and Interstate 25 before terminating in the south at E. Hampden (Highway 285) in Cherry Hills Village. It serves as University Park’s eastern boundary.

South University Boulevard (Blueprint Street Type: I-25 to Wesley - Mixed Use Arterial; Wesley to Yale - Residential Arterial). South University Boulevard is one of the arterial grid streets in southeast Denver. From a diamond interchange at Highway 470 on the north side of suburban Highlands Ranch, it heads due north through Centennial, Greenwood Village, and Cherry Hills Village before entering Denver. On the western edge of University Park, it serves as the University of Denver’s “Main Street” before intersecting with Interstate 25 and continuing north to Cherry Creek.

Evans Avenue (Blueprint Street Type: I-25 to Wesley - Mixed Use Arterial). Evans Avenue is a major east-west cross-town connection within Denver. Originating to the west at South Federal Boulevard, it travels east before veering south and turning into East Iliff Avenue near South Quebec Street. It bisects University Park between South University and South Colorado Boulevards. Within the neighborhood, it includes a modest mix of uses at Milwaukee Street, mature tree lawns and a number of planted medians.

Residential streets emphasize walking, bicycling and land access over auto mobility. Some of University Park’s residential streets lack sidewalks, like South Jackson Street. The addition of sidewalks could diminish the pastoral setting. However, traffic calming and signs warning motorists to share the road with pedestrians and cyclists can have a positive impact.

Other parts of the neighborhood have wide roadways and attached Hollywood sidewalks that function more as wide curbs than pedestrian zones. In these areas efforts should be made to narrow the vehicle travel way and widen the pedestrian realm with larger or detached sidewalks.
Blueprint Denver identifies S. Colorado Boulevard (south of Evans Avenue) as a Mixed Use Arterial. To achieve this vision, street retrofit solutions will be needed to accommodate pedestrians and transit commuters in addition to cars.

Transit

The transit needs of University Park residents are currently served by Regional Transportation District (RTD) bus and light rail service. RTD is the authority created by the Colorado General Assembly in 1969 to plan and build a public transportation system for the Denver region.

In anticipation of the completion of the Transportation Expansion (T-REX) project and the opening of the Southeast Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor in the fall of 2006, RTD developed the SE Corridor (T-REX) Service Plan. The plan includes an extensive variety and quantity of changes to existing, as well as new transit services. According to RTD, reductions or additions were needed to accommodate current customer needs and to shape future travel patterns.

For the purposes of the service plan, University Park is within the Northwest Core Grid as part of the RTD core grid network of higher frequency bus services. This sub-area is bounded by Hampden Avenue to the south, Broadway to the west, East Alameda Avenue to the north, and I-225 to the east. Existing route coverage within the grid is planned to be maintained with some restructuring to better connect with LRT service and to eliminate redundancy.

The system changes impacting University Park including streamlining and rerouting into LRT stations are listed below:

- Route 21 (Evans Crosstown) is rerouted to serve Colorado Station
- Route 24 (University Crosstown) serves University Station
- Route 24L (South University Limited) will replace the current Route 24X, but it terminates at University Station instead of proceeding downtown.
- Route 40 (South Colorado Boulevard Crosstown) is rerouted to serve Colorado Station
- The new Route 46 (Cherry/Dahlia) replaces the Bee-Line to provide needed service to the densely populated City of Glendale and Cherry Creek.
- Route 52 (West 52nd Avenue/South Pearl) will no longer serve University Park by terminating at East Alameda Station. Although the new Route 79 (East Florida) replaces the discontinued segment between the East Alameda and South University stations, it will not provide service along Buchtel Boulevard nor will it serve Colorado Station. This change is not expected to have a detrimental impact upon existing ridership.
Anticipating unexpected system demands and community desires once light rail begins service in the Southeast Corridor, the service plan addresses future changes and growth. Recognizing that transit services are fiscally constrained and, therefore, limited to the most cost-effective routing, it suggests that other services can be planned now for future implementation in a priority order and as funds become available. It does, however, offer the caveat that, except for immediately apparent over or under capacity situations, RTD does not plan to evaluate and recommend system adjustments for at least six to nine months after light rail is operational. This trial period will permit time for riders to adopt regular travel patterns such as parking and riding or “kissing and riding” (i.e. being dropped off at the station).

### RTD Station Park-And-Ride Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana &amp; Pearl</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmoor</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleview</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RTD Final SE Corridor (T-REX) Service Plan, 2006*

### Projected Denver Southeast Corridor LRT Ridership by Station, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana &amp; Pearl</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmoor</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleview</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RTD Final SE Corridor (T-REX) Service Plan, 2006*
“We think too small, like the frog at the bottom of the well. He thinks the sky is only as big as the top of the well. If he surfaced, he would have an entirely different view.”
—Mao Tse-Tung
UNIVERSITY PARK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

VISION

“To perpetuate and enhance the integrity of the University Park neighborhood.”

This vision describes the University Park neighborhood over a planning horizon of approximately 20 years, as an end result. The vision uses the present tense to convey the expectation that opportunities will be captured, issues will be addressed and goals will be achieved. It envisions and articulates what the plan policies and recommendations are designed to realize and against what objectives they should be measured.

The overriding theme of the plan is to create and nurture a community that accommodates a wide variety of uses and people in an environment that enhances the quality of life for residents and the vitality of businesses. In building this community, the intent is to capitalize on University Park’s many existing assets and maximize their value. To this end, the following visions describe the neighborhood as it evolves with the successful implementation of the goals and recommendations of the plan.

I. A stable Single-Family Residential Neighborhood with the seamless integration of well-designed housing, fine schools, places of worship and gathering, open spaces, charming streets, sidewalks and bikeways, verdant well-kept landscaping, and convenient shops and services.

a. A neighborhood that supports and encourages active living and forms of transportation throughout the neighborhood with ample sidewalks, bikeways and open spaces.

b. A serene place of quiet streets and plentiful open spaces, yards and tree lawns, amid the busy life at the edges of the neighborhood and beyond.

c. A community that accepts change and works with the city to incorporate new development without losing the charm of the neighborhood by increasing the awareness of its historic built and natural legacies.

d. A neighborhood enhanced by a pleasant relationship with the University of Denver including continuing cross-representation on neighborhood and University committees and councils and the Iliff School of Theology.
e. A cooperative town-gown dialogue with the University of Denver and the Iliff School of Theology including special emphasis on opportunities and issues such as South University Boulevard Main Street, Chamberlin Observatory, future development plans, University-related traffic, parking and student behavior.

f. A friendly community where neighbors know one another and work together to perpetuate University Park as a wonderful place, supporting their commonality, respecting one another’s differences, and working wisely on catalytic projects to benefit not only the neighborhood but all current and future generations of Denver residents.

g. A greater sense of certainty and trust among the neighborhood, the development community and the city in terms of new development and redevelopment.

h. A well-defined neighborhood with distinct gateway features (e.g. signage) to welcome visitors and cue them to the residential and pedestrian nature of the community.

II. True transit oriented Urban Neighborhoods, located at the northwest and northeast corners of University Park, where all residents have pleasant and convenient walking and biking routes to the University and Colorado Stations and space is made for new households and employment to capitalize on the tremendous regional investment in sustainable transportation. New transit oriented development is seamlessly integrated into the urban fabric without undue negative impact on the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

III. A rich mix of neighborhood and destination uses along the visually interesting and pedestrian friendly Mixed Use Boulevard and Main Street districts.

The vision for University Park includes a rich mix of neighborhood and destination uses along the visually interesting and pedestrian friendly Mixed Use Boulevard and Main Street districts.
FRAMEWORK PLAN

- Urban Design & Land Use
- Parks & Preservation
- Economic Development
- Mobility

PURPOSE

The framework plan articulates the primary issues, opportunities, and goals that affect the future of University Park. This section structures its recommendations around key topics that must be addressed comprehensively to steer the small area towards its vision as a thriving community. The District Plans follow the Framework Plan and provide more targeted policy guidance and direction in designated sub areas within University Park.

The framework plan is divided into four topical areas:

- Urban Design & Land Use – addresses the elements of community structure, public spaces, as well as building form, orientation and character, and articulates future land use and development patterns
- Parks & Preservation – identifies historic resources and elements of the built and natural environment unique to University Park that should be preserved for future generations
- Mobility – explores issues related to neighborhood connectivity, transport and access for all modes of travel
- Economic Development – examines the economic viability of University Park and recommends actions to enhance the business performance, leverage community resources and attract desired uses to the area

The plan is not an official zone map; it does not create or deny any rights. Zone changes that may be proposed as part of any development should be consistent with this plan and must be initiated under a separate procedure established under the City and County of Denver’s Revised Municipal Code.

“A wise man will make more opportunities than be finds.”
—Sir Francis Bacon
University Park is a desirable central city neighborhood. Older homes in the neighborhood are being redeveloped in favor of larger structures offering more of the amenities demanded by today’s real estate market.

**URBAN DESIGN & LAND USE**

**Priority Issues & Opportunities**

**Character of Single-Family Residential Areas**

Similar to other stable neighborhoods in Denver, University Park’s high land values (relative to the values of existing homes and structures) created pressure to redevelop housing that is not in high demand in the market. It is often more profitable for buyers to raze existing homes and build larger homes with more amenities on the same lot. While this phenomenon has signaled neighborhood reinvestment and helped meet the needs of a changing marketplace, it has also challenged the existing neighborhood pattern of architectural types and site design. University Park has always been home to a variety of architectural styles, but there is concern that these new homes are not consistent with the overall neighborhood fabric in terms of open space, tree canopy, lot coverage/building orientation (i.e. amount of the lot occupied by building(s) and their placement on the lot), building mass (i.e. the perceived size of buildings) and building heights.

**Placemaking**

While land use mixture is an important foundation for any neighborhood, the experience of place is what truly defines success and quality. For example, mixed use zoning does not in and of itself create pedestrian oriented places that draw in residents, businesses, shoppers and transit riders. Land use regulation is only one piece of the puzzle. Placemaking captures the total art of creating public spaces that truly befit human activities in terms of both form and function. Full implementation of placemaking precepts can better expand economic, environmental and social capital within neighborhoods.

**Community Gathering and Interaction**

Outside the home and work, everyday life occurs in the places in-between, third places. Third places are informal gathering spaces such as coffee shops and cafes, bookstores and bakeries, libraries and laundromats, balconies, plazas, porches and pocket parks. Ubiquitous in great cities and neighborhoods, third places provide space for people to simply unwind and discover opportunities for the planned and unplanned community interactions that forge relationships and build stronger neighborhood cohesion. Pedestrian and form-based enhancements to the South University and Colorado corridors could increase the availability and accessibility of these special places to the neighborhood.
Streetscapes
University Park’s streetscapes include the vehicular travel ways, as well as the following elements of the street edge:

- amenity zone (which includes street trees, lighting, benches, trash receptacles)
- the pedestrian realm or the sidewalk
- the building edge or frontage zone (facades, the relationship of buildings to the street – setbacks or build-to lines)
- open space (plazas, pocket parks and patios)

Street character provides visual cues that define an area for visitors and residents, motorists and pedestrians. These cues influence human behavior. Well designed streetscapes encourage activity, slow traffic, increase the sense of safety and provide opportunities for exchange, as well as movement. Streetscapes vary depending on the community context. Within the low intensity residential areas, for instance, tranquil spaces with ample greenery between homes provide soothing spaces for neighborly interaction and child’s play. In commercial districts, mixed use buildings that form a consistent street wall provide a sense of enclosure around the street. In post-war years, the increasing popularity of the automobile began to curb opportunities for exchange in favor of individual movement. This behavioral shift resulted in wider streets that facilitate more rapid vehicle movement and unimpeded access to private property at the expense of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Both South University and South Colorado Boulevards within University Park show signs of the negative influence of an unbalanced transportation system. Both corridors could benefit from street retrofit solutions.

Underutilized parcels
There are a number of underutilized parcels in University Park where the underlying land value exceeds the value of the structures thereon. While this represents potential for positive reinvestment and redevelopment for Denver and the neighborhood, it also creates opportunities for incompatible development within areas of stability. Existing zoning for these sites both within and at the periphery of the neighborhood lack form-based standards that could help attract investment while helping to mitigate the impacts (e.g. visual) of development.

Predictable Form of Future Development along the Neighborhood Edges
Two high volume corridors form the western (S. University Blvd.) and eastern (S. Colorado Blvd.) borders of University Park, a high amenity neighborhood. The neighborhood shares its western border with the University of Denver and Iliff School of Theology. Both corridors provide access to light rail stations within walking distance of portions of the neighborhood. Existing zoning allows for significantly greater development than the as-built condition. Given the neighborhood’s central city location, proxim-
University Lofts at the intersection of Evans and South University contributes positively to the urban design and land use mix of the neighborhood edge.

Pedestrian oriented design provides ample room for people to relax and invites community interactions.

ity to choice transit and the University of Denver, land values and market demand for development are high. Emerging projects illustrate the pressure to develop more intensely and it is likely that the mass and scale of future projects will be different from the existing urban fabric. Crafted more than half a century ago, the existing zoning in University Park fails to provide a predictable development framework to ensure that this new growth complements and sustains the vital attributes of University Park. Appropriate, predictable regulatory tools (including “form-based” standards such as building envelope and active ground floor treatment) do five things:

1. Base design performance on the regulations, not on the opinions of any individual plans reviewer, neighborhood agent or developer.
2. Preserve existing by-right development potential in forms that are more appealing to the community at-large.
3. Provide the community with a sense of certainty about expected growth.
4. Stabilize and enhance the investment climate (“form-based” standards alleviate the risk that future property development will not be held to the same quality of design).
5. Enhance the short and long-term marketability of projects by adding the placemaking details that are becoming increasingly important to consumers.

Transitions
Existing zoning lacks the appropriate standards to ensure smooth transitions between areas of differing development intensities. It is unclear from the current regulations how buildings should approach areas of intense activity (such as station areas) versus areas of low intensity (such as single-family residential areas). The regulations make few distinctions as to appropriate transitions beyond bulk plane restrictions, setbacks and floor area ratios, none of which provide sufficient information to predict the form of future development.

Pedestrian Oriented Design & Development Standards
Existing zoning in University Park lacks the appropriate form-based design and development standards to create memorable and inviting places for people. Existing regulations largely ignore the pedestrian by failing to encourage visually interesting buildings that provide a sense of enclosure around the street. In commercial districts, buildings are often setback from the streets and sidewalks with parking separating the pedestrian from shopping and services. The absence of a walkable environment prevents visitors from parking once and walking between multiple destinations. Rarely do residents in the surrounding area walk to shopping areas.
Incongruous Zoning along South University Boulevard – Density by Design
Over the short stretch of South University Boulevard on the western edge of the neighborhood, there are six zoning districts. The zoning is applied primarily in an alternating pattern of commercial (B-2) and residential zone districts (R-3 and R-4). This pattern helps focus commercial activity to concentrated districts, and avoids an over saturation of retail and services not supportable by the area’s market. However, the B-2 zoning may not permit sufficient development potential to attract the desired mixed use projects (particularly housing above ground floor retail and services), while the residential zoning along the corridor allows higher intensity of development than today’s as-built condition. So, where the corridor should be most dense, the commercial areas, the as-built condition is low density, primarily single use commercial, and it is perpetuated by the existing zoning. Where the corridor should provide residential uses in a compact and dense form, there is pressure to develop towering apartments.

Growing market demand for this higher density residential product has its pros and cons. On the one hand, the nearby commercial districts benefit from a symbiotic relationship with the residential districts that supply customers. An increase in the density of dollars in these areas expands the buying power of the overall neighborhood and improves the area’s potential to attract and retain desirable businesses. On the other hand, the zone districts promote low intensity where it should be highest and high intensity where it should be more compact from an urban planning perspective. Of particular note, the residential zoning lacks appropriate standards to ensure an active, pedestrian friendly ground floor façade, and the building envelope is only limited by floor area ratio and bulk plane restrictions. The lack of predictability about this future form creates confusion, and increases risk for developers and uncertainty for nearby residents. Any attempt to alter the zoning along South University Blvd. should protect the alternating pattern of residential and commercial development and must preserve the existing by right development potential of the residential districts within height and bulk standards that are more responsive to community preferences and smart growth best practices. To balance the pressure for residential growth, consideration should be given to the appropriate zoning regulations in the B-2 areas that will attract more desirable mixed use development.

Transit Oriented Development
University Park enjoys superior local and regional access via the RTD bus and rail system. Over 20 percent of the neighborhood land area and over 30 percent of the dwelling units are within short walking distance (½-mile) of rapid transit service via the Colorado and University light rail stations. Though the existing zoning near transit allows for the intensification of residential densities needed to support transit oriented development, the existing land uses within a ½-mile of the stations do not create visually interesting, aesthetically pleasing or physically safe routes for neighborhood residents walking or biking to the stations, and the zoning lacks sufficient standards to ensure the evolution of such an environment. As a result, neighborhood transit riders are more likely to drive the short distances to the park-and-ride.
facilities, thereby generating more traffic and fewer of the health and environmental benefits associated with well-designed Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Similarly, “choice riders” (people who have other options, but choose to take transit) find an unappealing option and are less likely to switch to transit. Redevelopment must promote pedestrian friendly design that encourages walking and allows people to live without daily use of a car, with particular attention to increasing the people-trip capacity of the system through the provision of ample, attractive pedestrian facilities.

**Value-Added Development & Reinvestment Potential**

The enhanced transit service provided by the Southeast Light Rail line expands the mobility choices of the nearby residents and makes the station areas more accessible to the region. Opportunities to increase the activity and add value to the transit system investment are important. Reinvestment can provide additional services conveniently located for the neighborhood, as well as an opportunity for residents to live near the station and reduce household transportation expenditures. In addition, increased convenience allows more time to be devoted to family and friends rather than commuting. For example, riders can stop for coffee, pick up dry cleaning or meet for dinner near the station. Finally, employers and retail benefit from enhanced foot traffic, exposure and access.

**Housing Options**

With its central location, mix of uses, social and cultural opportunities, park-like setting and transit accessibility, University Park is an attractive community for all stages of the life cycle. The growing attractiveness of University Park as a residential enclave continues to entice the redevelopment, demolition and/or enlargement of smaller homes. While this phenomenon has signaled neighborhood reinvestment and helped meet the needs of a changing marketplace, it has also diminished the supply of more modest housing stock. Its desirability has increased home values to levels that are inaccessible to many young families and fixed-income retirees. Adding more affordable residences in transit rich areas would allow senior residents to age in place near loved ones and could help replenish the neighborhood with young couples and families. Building housing in transit rich areas may alleviate the need for daily use of a car, and frees income for housing that would otherwise defray transportation costs (gas, parking, car maintenance).
Urban Design & Land Use Goals

Goal 1: Development Patterns – Urban Design Districts
Establish distinct urban design districts that prescribe the pattern of existing and future development, as well as contribute to an evolving sense of place within the University Park study area.

Goal 2: Residential Neighborhood Character Stability
Preserve the single-family nature of University Park’s residential neighborhood, and respect the urban design and the architectural character of established and preferred residential forms.

Goal 3: Compact, Mixed-Use Development near Transit
Create healthy neighborhood edges and encourage dense, compact and transit supportive growth (along transit corridors and in station areas that serve nearby residents) with a vital mix of retail shops, services, employment and civic uses.

Goal 4: Diverse Housing Options in Appropriate Locations
Diversify the mix of housing types near transit amenities to allow residents to age in place, live without the daily use of a car and accommodate the housing needs of empty-nesters, students, young professionals and families.

Goal 5: Centers, Gateways & Focal Points
Establish identifiable gateways and focal points to signal arrival at key neighborhood destinations, commercial districts and station areas.

Goal 6: Public Gathering
Increase the opportunities for informal and formal public gathering in the community.

Goal 7: Historic Resources & Compatible Development
Preserve historic resources and complement the traditional patterns of development.

Goal 8: Street Character and Hierarchy
Connect residential areas and neighborhood gathering places with safe and attractive multimodal linkages (that emphasize bicycle and pedestrian comfort). Identify the appropriate urban design details to distinguish a clear hierarchy of street types in University Park.
University Park is an Area of Stability with many single-family homes. Redevelopment of existing residential structures in R-1 areas should respect traditional patterns. Growth that deviates from this pattern should be directed to form vibrant, healthy neighborhood edges, such as along Main Streets.

**Urban Design & Land Use Recommendations**

Recommendation 1: Patterns of Development - Urban Design Districts
Define the prevailing and desired neighborhood patterns of development. The Urban Design concept creates a framework for future growth and change, as well as preservation and stability, to guide future development/redevelopment consistent with the district descriptions that follow. The urban design concept identifies four types of urban design districts:

- Residential Neighborhood
- Urban Neighborhood
- Main Street
- Mixed-Use Boulevard

These four districts (as described in the following text) illustrate a potential future structure of the urban environment that may be achieved with successful implementation of this plan.
Recommendation 1.1: Single-Family Residential Neighborhood
Development pattern: Low intensity, low density
Typical scale: Buildings 1-2 stories, 25%-37.5% lot coverage
Uses: Residential, primarily single-family dwellings
Features: Front porches, patios
Street Character: Deep front yards provide semi-public open space at street edges, plentiful street trees, detached sidewalks
Parking/Vehicle Access: On-street or in garages. Garages style/access differs according to:
   a. detached and accessed from alley
   b. attached/recessed from front façade and accessed from street by narrow driveway (10’ or less in width)
   c. attached prominently to the front façade and accessed from street by wide driveway (greater than 10’ wide) – note that this is a limited existing pattern that should not be perpetuated in University Park

A consistent pattern of development defines Single-Family Residential Neighborhood areas. Housing options are appropriate for a central city location. Single-family predominates; occasional duplexes may be interspersed. Buildings of one to two stories characterize the prevailing degree of development. Higher intensity buildings in a Single-Family Residential Neighborhood form a transition between the prevailing neighborhood pattern and an activity center. Single-Family Residential Neighborhoods offer urban dwellers a place of refuge near downtown with neighborhood serving shopping districts and transit stations at the edges. Dwellings are often setback deeply from the sidewalk to provide a semi-public green edge. Back yards or courtyards provide private open space. Sidewalks are generally detached from the street by landscaped tree lawns. Parking is provided on street or in garages (typically accessed from an alley). Garage size/orientation significantly influences the character/pattern of different parts of Single-Family Residential Neighborhoods. Limited redevelopment or additions reflect prevailing, desired patterns of development. The Single-Family Residential Neighborhood includes all areas currently zoned R-1. New patterns of preferred development may eventually emerge in isolated areas where existing housing stock is outdated or declining. As an Area of Stability, deviation from the single family nature should happen only after sufficient community input to justify some redevelopment. Such redevelopment should encourage revitalization and reinvestment that is aligned with market demand and smart growth best practices in a manner that sensitively integrates new development with the stable single-family context.
Recommendation 1.2: Urban Neighborhood

Development pattern: Radial (increasing density and intensity approaching the station area) or as residential links along an arterial corridor.

Typical scale: Transitional scale, height and lot coverage vary depending on proximity to the light rail station platform (3+ stories, 60-100% lot coverage) and relationship to areas of lower intensity/density (under 3 stories, 30-60% lot coverage).

Uses: Emerging mix of residential housing options with limited complementary uses (such as daycare, library, postal services, neighborhood market, boutique hotel or bed and breakfast).

Features: Balconies, patios, stoops, discrete signage, pedestrian lighting.

Street Character: Street trees, tree lawns, wide detached sidewalks.

Parking/Vehicle Access: Parking provided on street, in structures or garages accessed from alleys.

Urban Neighborhood typologies emerge in University Park within a 1/4 to 1/2 mile of the perimeter of the light rail stations (excluding properties zoned R-1) in the northwest and northeast corners of the neighborhood and in between segments of Main Streets. Urban Neighborhoods provide adequate residential densities to increase transit usage, to direct growth to the neighborhood edges, and alleviate incompatible growth pressures in the low intensity core of the neighborhood. Since Urban Neighborhoods evolve in established residential areas, initial changes add density and intensity in compact building forms that blend in with the prevailing residential context. Development may progress initially from residential additions and rehabilitations to the addition of carriage houses and conversion of single-family structures to duplexes, triplexes and quads. Over the long-term, small and medium scale apartments or condominiums emerge in appropriate locations. Density and height increases with proximity to the stations, and these areas may include some complimentary non-residential uses (such as daycare, library, postal services, neighborhood market, small offices, boutique hotel or bed and breakfast). Urban Neighborhoods provide a variety of housing options appealing to young families, empty nesters and students. Redevelopment of existing property to more intense development patterns must ensure the dedication of sufficient right of way to promote a walkable environment that can handle increased pedestrian loads. Front yards, courtyards, pedestrian courts, porches, stoops, and balconies are key features. Sidewalks are detached with tree lawns. Parking is provided on-street or in garages and parking spaces accessed from alleys.
Recommendation 1.3: Main Street
Development pattern: Linear, buildings oriented to the street/sidewalk
Typical scale: 2-5 stories (up to 8-10 stories in transit rich activity centers or nodes), 75%-100% lot coverage (with 75% building frontage along sidewalk)
Uses: Mixed vertically and/or horizontally
Features: Large display windows, balconies, patios, plazas, iconographic and projecting signs, direct access from public sidewalks
Street Character: Street furniture, street trees and wide sidewalks with trees in grates
Parking/Vehicle Access: On-street, in structures or behind street-facing buildings in small surface parking areas accessed by alleys

South University Boulevard is envisioned as a Main Street catering to the University of Denver and Iliff School of Theology campus community and the University Park Neighborhood. Despite its status as a busy north-south arterial, the corridor still bears resemblance to its past as a former streetcar route. This history provides the “bones” for the evolution of a linear development pattern applied primarily as a veneer along the arterial thoroughfare. Buildings of 2 to 5 stories with residential units or office space over active ground floor uses such as retail shops or restaurants typify the character of these corridors. Buildings of greater intensity (up to 8-10 stories) may occur at major transit stations areas or other centers (or nodes) of pedestrian activity. Buildings orient to the sidewalk in a pattern that defines street edges and corners, and creates a comfortable pedestrian environment. Large display windows, balconies, patios, plazas, street furniture, street trees, wide sidewalks, iconographic and projecting signs are common features that support the pedestrian context of a Main Street. The street edge accommodates a high degree of pedestrian foot traffic typically with an 8’-10’ wide sidewalk separated from the automobile travelway by a 7’-8’ parking lane and an 8’-10’ wide, hardscaped amenity zone that includes trees in grates, bike parking facilities, street furniture, information/parking kiosks and pedestrian lighting. Parking is provided on-street, in structures or behind street-facing buildings in parking areas accessed by alleys.
Recommendation 1.4: Mixed-Use Boulevard

Development pattern: Combination of linear and node development, emerging pattern of linear mixed-use and large format retail centers (with liner commercial and outlot or pad site development) alternating with nodes of intensely developed land at major transit transfer points

Typical scale: 1-10+ stories, 50%-100% lot coverage (greater height and lot coverage at the intersection of major transit routes)

Uses: Horizontal mix of commercial uses with nodes of vertical mixed-use that includes ground floor retail with office and residential above at major transit transfer points

Features: Monument signs, enhanced transit facilities, shade and water quality improvements in parking areas, dedicated transit service lanes

Street Character: Emerging boulevard with high degree of access management and greater attention to pedestrian access at key transit nodes

Parking/Vehicle Access: Off street parking in structures or well screened and landscaped surface lots

With its blend of commercial establishments, high density housing and high volumes of vehicular traffic, South Colorado Boulevard is designated as a Mixed Use Boulevard. The purpose of this district is to improve the pedestrian experience while respecting the important role the street plays in the regional roadway hierarchy. The guiding principle contends that traffic need not preclude all pedestrian activity as illustrated by major commercial boulevards in other cities. Mixed-Use Boulevards occur along major urban thoroughfares that link jurisdictions and carry high volumes of automobiles (including significant transit). Evolution of these places involves a careful balancing of the streets for multiple modes of transportation coupled with new land development patterns. Effective land development patterns concentrate retail in mixed-use centers at key transit transfer points along a corridor (such as a light rail stop of the intersection of two enhanced transit routes). Outlot or pad sight development and liner commercial development in large format retail centers helps define the street edge and makes these places more appealing to pedestrians. In the stretches between these centers construction of high density residential may prevent an over saturation of commercial development and build in a population base to support retail. Site designs with a high degree of access management limit curb cuts and consolidate driveways to aid traffic flow and improve the pedestrian experience.

With complete, context-sensitive street solutions, Mixed-Use Boulevards in an auto-oriented context may be retrofitted to carry a high volume of traffic that includes cars, transit, bikes and pedestrians. Sustainable, pedestrian friendly land development patterns emerge in response to these retrofit solutions that increase people trip capacity, as with the Octavia Boulevard in San Francisco.
Recommendation 2: Residential Neighborhood Regulatory Tools

Work with the Zoning Code Task Force to establish and apply form based zoning tools appropriate for residential building types (primarily single-family) that define the residential portions of the neighborhood. Ensure that these zoning tools consider, prescribe and respect the traditional and desired forms and patterns of development. Consider:

- **Urban design** (lot and block structure, site design, building orientation, setbacks, relationship of buildings to streets, presence/size of private open space)

- **Range of building types:**
  - Promote single-family houses in areas currently zoned R-1
  - Allow a combination of single-family houses and duplexes in areas currently zoned R-2
  - Provide a range of multi-family dwellings (triplexes, quads, row houses, townhomes, apartments) in areas currently zoned R-3

- **Architectural character** (building envelope; wall plane dimensions, rhythm, proportions; roof forms; subordinate volumes, massing, scale; height; materiality; front façade articulation – glazing, entries, porches, balconies, stoops; location and size of garages and driveways)

- **Location criteria** for certain building types and uses to ensure the evolution of the appropriate residential neighborhood texture that complements the transportation network:
  - Ensure rational evolution of neighborhoods and their station areas and boulevards, so that changes in development intensities occur in harmony with prevailing neighborhood character.
  - Correlate higher intensity structures to close proximity of station area platforms or as end cap buildings on block faces fronting busy neighborhood streets.
  - Allow select small-scale, low impact uses such as a corner store, small office or service (daycare, printer, post office) that reinforce traditional neighborhood patterns of development by providing for daily needs of neighborhood residents in appropriate locations (such as the ground floor of buildings on corner lots in areas currently zoned R-3)
Recommendation 3: Mixed-Use Boulevard Regulatory Tools

Work with the Zoning Code Task Force to establish and apply form based zoning tools that facilitate the development of mixed-use places along arterial corridors. Ensure that these tools increase predictability of the future built environment and provide a sense of certainty among residents, the private development community, investors and the city. Ensure that these zoning tools integrate desired forms and patterns of development with the transportation system, with particular emphasis on pedestrian friendly design. To this end, use buildings to define street edges and corners. Promote ample glazing at the ground floor that permits a visual connection between activity inside and outside of a building. Ensure that sustainable design and development standards promote places that are approachable by multiple modes of transportation. Sensitive design parking areas to minimize visual impacts on the community and incorporate sustainable elements. Consider:

- **Urban design** (lot and block structure, lot coverage, site design, building orientation, setbacks or build-to lines, frontage requirements)

- **Density** (dwelling units or employment per acre)

- **Architectural character** (building envelope; wall plane dimensions, rhythm, proportions; roof forms; subordinate volumes, massing, scale; height minimums and maximums; materiality; front façade articulation/modulation – glazing, entries, porches, balconies, stoops; location and size of garages and driveways)

- **Uses** - Focus a robust mix of land uses at key transit (bus or rail) centers along mixed-use arterials. In the stretches between centers encourage high density residential development to prevent excessive saturation of commercial uses and provide a sufficient population base to support retail. Consider limitations and special conditions to prevent a proliferation of gas stations and drive-through uses and temper the impacts that these uses place on the transportation system and the community’s visual appearance. Establish standards to enhance the urban design of auto-oriented uses and large format retail centers.
Gateways and focal points may provide distinguishable landmarks within the urban environment to mark a significant point of entry or community gathering area. The presence of landmarks (such as this iconic public art installation at the Colorado Station) facilitates wayfinding and draws attention to special areas within a community.

“Landmarks can make important to our eyes city areas which are important in functional fact but need to have that fact visually acknowledged and dignified.”
— Jane Jacobs

**Recommendation 4: Neighborhood History & Pattern Book**
Develop educational materials and/or sessions describing the unique development history of University Park and its neighborhood patterns, landscaping and historic resources. Work with the city to create a pattern book for the University Park urban design districts to illustrate preferred land development patterns. Promote this document to architects, homebuilders, developers, existing and prospective residents/property owners, realtors, elected officials and other groups to help educate the community about high quality, preferred styles of design. Explore both traditional and contemporary patterns with an emphasis on techniques that allow myriad styles to co-exist harmoniously.

**Recommendation 5: Gateways & Focal Points**
Establish gateways and focal points in key locations with significant or unique attributes such as an historic building, unique neighborhood destination, a notable entry point or critical intersection. Gateways and focal points may include public art, fountains, plazas, a sign, a landmark building or a significant architectural feature (such as a clocktower).

**Recommendation 6: Community Gathering**
Enhance community cohesion by providing space for gathering and congregation, especially along South University and South Colorado Boulevards. The consideration of gathering space should not be limited to formal public spaces such as parks, schools, and churches. Engage streets and sidewalks and increase the number of “eyes on the street” (i.e. natural surveillance) with porches, stoops, terraces, courtyards, balconies and other such places where natural, unexpected community interaction may occur. Foster neighborhood and social encounters through wide sidewalks, protection from the elements, shade trees, seating, and some outdoor sales and dining along mixed use streetscapes on South University and South Colorado Boulevards. Incorporate attractive, landscaped and functional open spaces such as plazas or courtyards into higher density development.

**Recommendation 7: Functional Open Space**
Establish zoning tools that facilitate the aggregation of required open space in order to capture opportunities with new development to create functional open spaces linked to the existing system (when development occurs adjacent to parks or trails), or to provide community gathering spaces in the form of courtyards or plazas, rather than “leftover spaces” along corridors.
Recommendation 8: Compatible Development, Transitions & Design Principles

Integrate new development with the existing neighborhood fabric. Arrange residential, employment and retail uses, services and open spaces to be convenient to and compatible with each other. Where commercial or high intensity residential districts share an edge with low density (predominantly single family) residential areas ensure appropriate transitions take place within the commercial or high intensity residential areas. Create buildings that provide human scale and interest through the use of varied forms, materials, details and colors while relating the size, dimension and symmetry of new construction to the proportions of adjacent buildings. Refer to the following design and development principles as the foundation on which to design architectural forms which challenge the senses, spark conversation, draw visitors and create future landmarks:

1. **Height** - The upper stories of taller buildings (as these buildings approach low intensity residential buildings) are expected to step back to preserve pedestrian scale, compatibility with existing structures, solar access and a sense of privacy.

2. **Mass** – Relate the perceived form, quantity or aggregate volumes of new construction to the form of traditional development patterns.

3. **Scale** – Relate the intervals, rhythm and order of new construction to traditional development patterns.

4. **Spacing** – Relate the location of windows, doorways and other features, horizontal or vertical banding, caps, bases and central entries to adjacent structures that reflect traditional development patterns.
Recommendation 9: Architectural Detailing
Architecturally finish and detail elevations for all exposures of the building with the primary street facing façade having appropriate architectural expression.

1. Wall Plane Relief. Provide relief in the wall plane of the façade. Large expanses of blank wall are not appropriate for pedestrian oriented development. Include human scaled building elements and architectural variation including form, detail, materials and colors to provide visual interest. Prominent and/decorative parapets and cornices are appropriate. Use repeating patterns of color, texture, material or change in plane as integral parts of the building fabric, not superficially applied.

2. Ground Floor Activation/Articulation. In commercial and mixed-use areas, provide pedestrian active uses on the first floor of commercial and mixed-use buildings, directly accessible from public space. Provide a primary building entrance facing or clearly visible from the public sidewalk. Clearly articulate the main entrance of buildings. Secondary entrances may be provided from parking areas or side streets. Use transparent clear glazed areas that permit views of interior activities.

3. Materiality. Use durable materials that complement Denver’s tradition as a city of brick and masonry construction.

4. Signage & Lighting. Ensure that signs are compatible with and enhance the character of the surrounding area when considered in terms of scale, color, material and lighting levels. Signs should be creative in the use of two and three dimension forms, profiles and iconographic representation while being constructed of high quality, durable materials that are appropriate to an urban setting. Encourage the use of halo and internal illumination in sign design to improve the visual quality of signs at night. Discourage the use of plastic box signs. Provide uniform lighting ratios in parking areas. Employ full cut-off fixtures and use lowest, most subtle lighting levels to promote dark skies and eliminate hazardous glare, light pollution and light trespass. When designing storefronts consider the placemaking benefits of ambient lighting that spills onto the sidewalk from display windows and entryways.
Recommendation 10: Street Character
Spatially define streets with context-sensitive buildings, sidewalks and landscaping that foster pedestrian activity. When redevelopment occurs ensure the dedication of Right-of Way sufficient to account for increased foot traffic, to reinforce the urban design of public streets and to integrate land uses with the transportation system. Consider the different ways that front yards, building facades and sidewalks influence street character. Consistently apply setback, landscaping and sidewalk criteria within the block context to ensure visual harmony of the street edge:

1. **High Density Residential or Mixed-Use Context:** In emerging higher density residential areas and in transit rich, mixed-use settings (light rail station areas and mixed-use boulevards or main streets identified by Blueprint Denver), allow shallow setbacks or zero setbacks/build-to lines that orient buildings to form a consistent street wall. Especially in commercial areas, orient structures on corner lots to “hold the corner”. Use stoops, balconies and street facing patios to activate the street edge with opportunities for informal community interaction. Use formal, urban landscaping techniques such as planter boxes on windows ledges, manicured hedges (to define patio spaces) and trees in grates to soften the building edge. Ensure that sidewalks and amenity zones are sufficiently sized to handle increased foot traffic generated by transit stations, ground floor retail spaces and higher density housing.
   a. In predominantly high density residential areas, provide a detached sidewalk (typically 8’-10’ wide) separated from the street by a landscaped tree lawn (typically 5’-8’ wide).
   b. In mixed-use or commercial districts, provide a detached sidewalk (typically 10’ wide) separated from the street by a hardscaped amenity zone (typically 8’-10’ wide) with trees in grates.

2. **Low Density Residential Context:** In low density residential areas that reflect the traditional character of University Park, promote deep front setbacks that frame the street with a semi-public green edge. Promote buildings with a single point of entry to reinforce the single family nature of the area (load multi-family dwellings from an interior corridor). Use detached side walks (typically 5’ wide) separated from the street by a landscaped tree lawn (typically 5’-10’ feet wide).
Recommendation 11: Parking and Vehicle Access

Minimize the visual impacts of parking areas, parking structures and residential garages on pedestrians, street character, open spaces and adjoining development. Ensure a level grade on a sidewalk whenever crossed by a driveway. Buffer parking lots from sidewalks, residential areas, and open spaces with a landscaped edge and low screening wall or solid hedge. Wrap parking structures with active ground floor uses and office spaces or residential uses on upper floors. Design parking and site access to minimize impact on the pedestrian realm and effectively manage vehicle movements.

1. **In high intensity residential or mixed use areas:**
   - Locate parking at the rear of the site away from the street.
   - Utilize alleys or shared driveways for site access; minimize and consolidate access points.
   - Separate drive-through lanes from the pedestrian realm.

2. **In low intensity residential areas:**
   - Where possible provide access to garages from alleys.
   - Recess garages from the front elevation of the residential structure.
   - Use narrow driveways (typically 10' wide) to access garages from the street.

Recommendation 12: Encourage “Trip-Chaining”

Promote this plan at concept development and encourage private developers to program a mix of land uses at, around and leading up to light rail stations to create more interesting and active walking routes and opportunities for riders to “trip chain” (e.g. grab the paper and cup of coffee, drop off and pick up dry cleaning).


To encourage home ownership and dense residential development near transit, work with developers and private lenders to establish programs to increase the home buying power of residents. As gas prices rise households must spend an increasing portion of their income on commuting costs. Households living near transit may choose an alternative mode of transportation. By decreasing their transportation costs, these households may direct a greater share of their income toward housing and ideally home ownership. Establish Smart Commute Mortgage programs for housing available within ¼ to ½ mile of transit stations or along enhanced transit corridors. Complement Smart Commute Mortgage programs by encouraging developers to incorporate share car programs with new projects.
PARKS & PRESERVATION

Priority Issues & Opportunities

Parkways, Parks and Open Space
An “emerald necklace”, or a system of open spaces, is a critical component of classic urban neighborhoods. The protection of open space, street trees and landscaping is an abiding neighborhood value. Not limited to publicly owned spaces such as Observatory Park, McWilliams Park, Prairie Park, Buchtel Centennial Park, and Historic Buchtel Boulevard, the neighborhood’s open spaces include tree lawns and street trees, deep, landscaped front setbacks, the presence of back yards, other functional, aggregated open spaces, such as courtyards, patios or plazas. It is this peaceful setting that has attracted new residents and housing redevelopment. To protect this ambient neighborhood amenity careful attention must be paid to preserving these open spaces through appropriate regulatory tools, as well as organized community efforts to promote open space acquisition and tree canopy preservation.

Trails
As part of its “emerald necklace”, University Park possesses two east-west trails, the Buchtel Trail and Harvard Gulch Trail. Both trails could be enhanced as logical connections between South University and South Colorado Boulevards and beyond. Despite the preservation of the Buchtel Trail as valuable open space connecting the neighborhood to the new light rail stations, more needs to be done to protect and enhance its parkway status. Breaks along the Harvard Gulch Trail such as its termination at South Jackson Street and a lack of curb ramps are reported to inhibit connectivity and usage. East of Jackson, surface parking areas serving the YMCA and other businesses fronting South Colorado Blvd. do not orient to the gulch and consume valuable land in vehicle storage that might otherwise be used for open space and outdoor recreation. The city and community should explore opportunities to partner with the YMCA and the other businesses to improve this area as shared outdoor recreational space.

Historic Places
University Park is rich in historic legacies within both the built and natural environments. These include public and private structures and landscapes throughout the neighborhood. Development pressure in the area has begun to threaten the preservation of some of these city and neighborhood treasures.
Parks & Preservation Goals

Goal 1: Parks & Recreation Resources
Maintain, enhance and expand parks and open spaces.

Goal 2: Ambient Open Space Preservation
Preserve and maintain University Park’s legacy of deep, landscaped front setbacks and backyards.

Goal 3: Tree Canopy
Protect the neighborhood tree canopy, and maintain and enhance the neighborhoods street trees and tree lawns.

Goal 4: Emerald Necklace of Trails and Open Spaces
Connect and enhance the network of trails and open spaces that form an “Emerald Necklace” throughout University Park.

Goal 5: Historic Preservation
Preserve historic sites unique to University Park & Denver.

Goal 6: Value Historic Resources
Promote restorations and renovations of residential and commercial structures that maintain the historic style, quality and character of original buildings, and adaptively reuse historic resources in University Park.
Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Tree Preservation Strategy

Founded on Arbor Day 1886 with an initial planting of 1,000 trees, University Park contains a mature tree canopy that is a defining element of the neighborhood. For the neighborhood, tree preservation is an aesthetic, environmental and historic preservation issue. Protection of the neighborhood’s trees calls for a three-pronged strategy including regulatory, educational and community investment components.

- Regulatory strategies: Working in concert with the city-wide zoning code update and Greenprint Denver, support new zoning tools to preserve the tree canopy. Pursue the reasonable extension of tree protection granted to public right-of-way trees to front setbacks. Monitor and strengthen enforcement of the existing Tree Protection Ordinance. Address tree protection prior to the beginning of construction projects. Encourage developers to transplant trees displaced by construction to appropriate open spaces such as along the Buchtel Trail.

- Educational strategies: Improve tree care and protection by residents and businesses through education opportunities including resources available through Denver Forestry, horticultural organizations, and university extension programs. Work with schools to teach children about the neighborhood’s trees and their importance to the environment.

- Community investment: Pursue a street-tree planting program for the neighborhood. Identify opportunities for additions to the tree canopy, including street trees and plantings on public properties.

Recommendation 2: Community Improvement Strategies

Explore the neighborhood interest in promoting initiatives within University Park to make community improvements.

Recommendation 3: Buchtel Improvements (Parkway/Trail, Prairie Park and Buchtel Centennial Park)

Strengthen Buchtel Boulevard/Trail as a green connection between the Colorado, South University and Louisiana Pearl light rail stations with better neighborhood connections and crossings, maintenance and amenities (e.g., trees, trash receptacles, benches, wayfinding signage). Reinforce and enhance the elements that define Buchtel Boulevard as a parkway. Remove encroachments into the public right of way. Improve pedestrian crossings at St. Paul at Monroe. Complete plan to restore native grasses and provide educational walks identifying drought-resistant native plants.

Founded on Arbor Day 1886 with an initial planting of 1,000 trees, University Park’s mature tree canopy is a defining element of the neighborhood.

Strengthen Buchtel Trail and Parkway as both a neighborhood historic resource and an important bicycle and pedestrian link between the University and Colorado Stations.
Recommendation 4: Respect Historic Resources
Balance redevelopment of underutilized parcels and neighborhood reinvestment with the respect of key historic sites unique to the city and the neighborhood.

Recommendation 5: Preservation
Encourage the restoration, renovation or adaptive reuse of historic residential and commercial structures. Support historic landmark designations of structures and districts that reflect outstanding elements of the neighborhood’s and city’s cultural, geographic, artistic, social, economic, political, architectural or historic heritage. Work with the city to complete an inventory of historic structures. Encourage, through education, those who own historic properties to nominate their property for designation as a historic property.

Recommendation 6: Harvard Gulch East End
Work with the YMCA and other property owners to aggregate shared parking facilities into a parking structure and incorporate the surface parking areas as open space. Explore redevelopment options that promote buildings that orient to the open space as well as South Colorado Blvd. and E. Yale Ave. Link the Harvard Gulch Trail to South Colorado Blvd at Yale.
MOBILITY

Priority Issues & Opportunities

Safe Routes to Transit

A major component of the allure of University Park is its highly walkable residential character within a park-like setting. While this environment is conducive to pleasure walks and strolls within the neighborhood, it does not necessarily carry over to South University and South Colorado Boulevards or their new light rail stations. Residents perceive the streets as psychological barriers to walking to shopping and services along these corridors. The streets do not encourage pedestrian access to the regional transportation system. The street environment limits pedestrian support for local businesses and transit service. An overall lack of continuity in detached sidewalks makes many streets in University Park uncomfortable for pedestrians. Many blocks have no sidewalks. Vacant land and underutilized properties create gaps in the urban fabric and unappealing streetscapes. Multiple curb cuts for driveways encourage turning movements that interrupt traffic flow and introduce conflicts with pedestrians and other vehicles. Unless the urban environment changes, existing riders are likely to continue driving to their stations and prospective riders are less likely to make the switch to transit.

Balanced Multimodal Streets

University Park is bordered by two major arterials (South University & South Colorado Boulevards) and bisected by another (Evans Avenue). While these three corridors take traffic off neighborhood streets and provide superior north-south and east-west vehicular access, their traffic volumes and general automobile orientation tend to discourage walking, bicycling and transit usage. For example, right-of-way (ROW) constraints have resulted in the acceptance of detached sidewalks in some areas, thereby leaving pedestrians without a buffer from moving traffic. For these reasons, residents indicate that they drive to destinations (e.g. light rail stations, movie theater, Observatory Park) even though the destinations may be within walking distance of their homes. Blueprint Denver identifies all three streets as Enhanced Transit Corridors. The Parks & Recreation Game Plan identifies South University & South Colorado Boulevards as Green Streets. All of the streets fall under the design guidelines established by the Denver Pedestrian Master Plan. These guiding documents establish the minimum characteristics for pedestrian routes and create policy support to transform these arterials into more balanced multimodal corridors over time.
**Pedestrian Master Plan**

The 2004 Denver Pedestrian Master Plan identifies and prioritizes five needed pedestrian projects within University Park. Although the projects have not been scoped or analyzed to determine feasibility, they do have plan support and warrant further exploration. The intersections of South University Boulevard/Evans Avenue and South University Boulevard/I-25 have been identified as targets for Special Crossings (e.g. sidewalk bulb outs, pedestrian refuges, special treatment crosswalks). The east-west street segments of Warren and Iliff Avenues from South University Boulevard to South Colorado Boulevard and the north-south segment of St. Paul Street between Asbury and Evans Avenues have been identified as targets for Upgrades (e.g. streetscaping, sidewalks, lighting).

**South University Boulevard**

Ranging between approximately 29,000 (near Yale Avenue) and 42,000 (near I-25) cars per day, South University Boulevard carries a significant volume of traffic along the western border of University Park. This equates to approximately 2,900 to 4,200 cars during the peak commuting hour of the day. According to surveys and focus group input, the traffic creates a mental barrier for University Park residents and employees seeking access to University Station and/or shopping and services on the west side of the street. A scattering of pedestrian friendly uses and amenities along South University tends to draw pedestrians more than South Colorado Boulevard which lacks such uses and amenities. Furthermore the University of Denver and Iliff School of Theology generate a high volume of pedestrian foot traffic throughout the day. As an Enhanced Bus Transit Corridor (identified by Blueprint Denver) and a Green Street (identified by the Parks & Recreation Game Plan), it is evident that this street serves a special purpose in the transportation network. Given the automobile intensity, high volume of transit service and demand for space from pedestrians, land redevelopment along South University must ensure the provision of adequate right-of-way for pedestrians to enhance the people trip carrying capacity of the corridor.

**South Colorado Boulevard**

Ranging between approximately 41,000 (near Yale Avenue) and 55,000 (near I-25) cars per day, South Colorado Boulevard carries a significant volume of traffic along the eastern border of University Park. This equates to approximately 4,000 to 5,500 cars during the peak commuting hour of the day. Though traffic signals are timed per American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards, pedestrians (especially seniors, persons with disabilities or small children) may find it difficult to comfortably cross in the time permitted. This is reflected by many residents’ preference for driving to both the United Artists Theater and Colorado Station. Even when residents do not have to cross South Colorado Boulevard, pedestrians must navigate an unfriendly environment on the west side of the street with deep building setbacks, frequent curb cuts and little spacing or buffering between sidewalks and cars. Without significant street retrofit solutions and extensive land redevelopment, it will be difficult to achieve the Blueprint Denver and Game Plan visions for an Enhanced Transit Corridor and Green Street.
Resident Mode Choice
According to 2000 Census data, more than 80% of University Park residents commuted alone to work in a private vehicle. To fully realize the benefits of superior access to transit in the form of both bus and light rail, neighborhood residents must take steps to shift their commuting behavior and utilize available transit options.

Wide Neighborhood Streets
Streets in some portions of the neighborhood (especially north of Buchtel) are wider than what is typically found in University Park. These streets include attached Hollywood sidewalks (sloping, 2'-3' wide paved areas that function more as extensions of the curb rather than walkable, pedestrian friendly sidewalks). Since this area provides neighborhood access to two light rail stations, the city should explore a demonstration project to improve the conditions for pedestrians.
Mobility

RTD Bus Route

Bike Routes

- On Street
- On Street - Proposed
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- Bike Trail - Proposed

Light Rail Station
Southeast Corridor Line
**Mobility Goals**

**Goal 1: People Trip Capacity**
Balance mode choices in major urban thoroughfares to enhance the people-trip carrying capacity of existing rights of way.

**Goal 2: Bike and Pedestrian Connections**
Enhance pedestrian and bicycle linkages to the light rail stations.

**Goal 3: Pedestrian Comfort**
Enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of public streets for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit commuters.

**Goal 4: Street Hierarchy**
Define a clear hierarchy of streets and distribute multi-modal traffic throughout the area street grid.

**Goal 5: Connections**
Improve transportation connectivity within the neighborhood and enhance links to the regional transportation network.

**Goal 6: Capital Improvements**
Make needed public infrastructure upgrades in the study area.

**Goal 7: Shift Travel Behavior**
Design programs to target “choice” riders and influence commuter travel behavior.

**Goal 8: Drainage & Water Quality**
Incorporate water quality best management practices, provide adequate site drainage facilities and water detention.
Until the new Southeast Light Rail Corridor matures, wayfinding signage will be critical in directing riders to their stations. This sign heading north on South University Boulevard is not clear and could be easily missed by commuters driving to the University Station.

---

**Mobility Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Street Design**

Work with the city to create complete, context-sensitive street design standards that may be applied to major urban thoroughfares like South Colorado and South University Boulevards.

**Recommendation 2: Signage & Wayfinding**

Improve wayfinding with well designed and consistent signage indicating access to station areas, reservoirs of parking, bike routes, trails, historic and cultural resources.

**Recommendation 3: Buchtel Boulevard**

Support Denver’s Department of Parks and Recreation efforts to improve Buchtel Boulevard as a parkway and green connection between the Colorado, University and Louisiana Pearl light rail stations with better neighborhood connections and crossings, maintenance and amenities (e.g. trees, trash receptacles, benches, wayfinding signage). Remove right of way encroachments.

**Recommendation 4: Street Hierarchy**

The plan establishes an urban design framework for a hierarchy of streets to serve a variety of mobility functions and promote safe and pleasant multi-modal connections throughout the neighborhood and to key destinations such as transit stations, town centers, schools and parks. For this hierarchy of streets establish ideal street cross sections that enhance the character and identified function of the streets.

- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes.** Establish a network of enhanced pedestrian/bike routes on St. Paul, Iliff, Warren and Monroe. Consider the following elements for bicycle and pedestrian routes: striped bike lanes (on Iliff), narrow travel lanes, detached sidewalks (ideally 5’-10’ tree lawn, 5’-8’ sidewalk) and on-street parking.

- **Multimodal Green Streets.** Establish a network of multi-modal green streets on Buchtel, St. Paul (north of Buchtel) and Evans. Where right of way permits, consider the following elements: 10’ wide travel lanes, striped bike lanes, detached sidewalk (ideally 10’ tree lawn, 5’-8’ sidewalk), landscaped median or parkway setbacks, and on street parking.

- **Mixed-Use Enhanced Transit Corridors.** Establish a network of mixed-use streets to create strong neighborhood edges and enhance the pedestrian experience of the transit rich South University and South Colorado corridors. Consider the following elements: 11’ travel lanes, on street parking (South University Blvd. only) and detached sidewalks (ideally an 8’-10’ amenity zone and 8’-10’ sidewalk).
Recommendation 5: Station Area Amenities
Include bicycle racks and storage facilities in station areas. Provide information kiosks, route maps/information, newstands, coffee carts and the like. Install clocks and devices to forecast real-time transit arrivals and departures. Provide comfortable seating and gathering areas with well-designed lighting and landscaping.

Recommendation 6: Pedestrian Improvements
Improve pedestrian facilities within the neighborhood, particularly at key intersections linking the neighborhood to transit stations and other destinations.

- Install pedestrian countdown timers at the following intersections South University and Buchtel, South University and Evans, South University and Warren, South University and Iliff, South University and Harvard, St. Paul and Evans, St. Paul and Buchtel, South Colorado and Buchtel, South Colorado and Iliff, South Colorado and Yale, and S. Colorado Blvd. and E. Evans Ave.
- Explore ways to improve the pedestrian friendliness of various intersections along Buchtel Boulevard. Consider converting/adding 4-way stops or pedestrian activated signals at St. Paul, S. Monroe, and S. Clayton.
- Review signal timings at intersections to allow for more comfortable crossing times and identify needed Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) intersection upgrades.
- Implement the Pedestrian Master Plan projects identified in the University Park neighborhood:
  a. special crossing project identified South University Boulevard at Evans Avenue
  b. the Warren and Iliff upgrade projects to improve connectivity across the neighborhood
- Require the dedication of sufficient right-of-way when redevelopment significantly alters the as-built condition to handle increased pedestrian loads and create walkable environments.
- Enhance walking routes via the Buchtel Boulevard and Harvard Gulch greenways.
- Explore a potential pedestrian skybridge over South Colorado Boulevard as part of a private development project.
- At major intersections with at grade pedestrian crossings explore the possibility of installing pedestrian refuge islands.
- Improve/add sidewalks along E. Asbury Ave. between S. Josephine and S. Madison Streets.
Recommendation 7: Access Management
Manage access and eliminate/limit curb cuts as redevelopment occurs. Encourage private property access from shared driveways, connected parking, side streets and rear alleys.

Recommendation 8: South Colorado Boulevard
Prioritize South Colorado Boulevard for additional study to improve its function as a Green Street and Enhanced Transit Corridor (as designated by the Game Plan and Blueprint Denver respectively). Explore a variety of context-sensitive street retrofit solutions to improve traffic flow, enhance safety and aesthetics, limit turning movements and manage access. Ensure that any zoning changes, especially form-based standards, contribute to the evolution of a more balanced, multi-modal environment.

Recommendation 9: Transit Station Design, Transit Marketing & Increasing Choice Ridership
Develop a program for the design of light rail stations and high volume bus stops in the study area. Incorporate marketing principles in the design of station area features. Study the marketing elements that when incorporated in a design or marketing program will influence the behavior of choice riders (individuals who could otherwise drive, but choose to take transit). Establish neighborhood transit challenges and information programs to encourage University Park residents to use transit.

Recommendation 10: Water Quality Best Management Practices
In site planning, and particularly in the design of surface parking lots, incorporate water quality best management practices to retain water on site and reduce pollutant and particulate matter run-off. Refer to the City and County of Denver's Water Quality Management Plan for best management practices.

Recommendation 11: Green Alleys and Pedestrian Courts
In mixed-use areas with large volumes of pedestrians, explore ways to maximize the entire transportation network including alleys. Make alleys interesting, inconspicuous community places by improving their appearance and function. Enhance these places as alternative circulation systems for pedestrians or cyclists. Encourage alley beautification with landscaping. Should alleys begin to attract pedestrians and cyclists, explore opportunities for businesses to orient to an alley entrance or to create a pedestrian court linking an alley to a street. Use porous paving materials to reduce impervious surface run off. Look to model programs in Ft. Collins, CO, Chicago, IL and Pasadena, CA (off South Colorado Boulevard) for ideas and inspiration.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Primary Issues & Opportunities
University of Denver Campus

Between student, faculty and staff the University of Denver accounts for an average weekday population of in excess of 13,000 individuals. Nearly 2,000 students live on campus in residence halls, in fraternities and sororities, or in DU owned apartment buildings. Ninety-two percent of first-year undergraduates and 50-60% of sophomores live on campus (DU provides approximately 2,800 beds for undergraduate students). The campus provides about 400 beds for graduate student housing. Between Magness Arena and the Newman Center, the university has the capacity to seat approximately 10,000 people for sporting and cultural events. The campus residents, faculty, staff and visitors create demand for housing and complementary retail, services and restaurants.

Retail Leakage despite High Disposable Incomes
Analysis of the University Park demographics provided by ESRI’s Business Analyst, shows that the median disposable income of University Park residents is $44,581. The market analysis reveals that residents spend outside of the community due to an overall lack of shops and services to capture their demand despite the higher than average disposable incomes.

Neighborhood Serving Business Attraction
Despite the mix of uses along South University and South Colorado Boulevards, retail and services orient more to University of Denver students (e.g. limited service restaurants) and through traffic (e.g. strip retail and other auto oriented uses) rather than to residents. Given the higher incomes and market segment profiles of the neighborhood residents, existing businesses may not adequately cater to household expenditures that could be captured with more neighborhood-oriented retail and services along the two corridors. Residents have expressed a desire for full-service restaurants, cultural opportunities, and a grocer and specialty retail such as a bookstore or bakery.

South University Boulevard Zoning and Development Pattern
Existing zoning along South University Boulevard permits the greatest intensity of development in the residential portions of the corridor, while the commercial stretches have fairly limited development potential. A lack of design and development standards that ensure the evolution of a vital place with coherent urban design creates uncertainty for residents and developers alike.
The Newman Center (above) and the Ritchie Center (below) attract visitors for cultural and sporting events that give University Park a competitive edge for investment and redevelopment. Business development should capitalize on the destination itineraries of visitors, as well as the market preferences of local residents.

Economic Development Goals

Goal 1: Competitive Advantage
Augment the competitive advantage for investment and redevelopment in University Park’s business districts.

Goal 2: Redevelopment & Strategic Growth
Improve the zoning regulatory environment and direct intense growth to commercial centers along Main Streets and Mixed-Use Boulevards.

Goal 3: Business & Institutional Organization
Organize business and institutional interests along University Park’s Mixed-Use Boulevards.

Goal 4: Community Development
Enhance the physical appearance of the community’s shopping areas, transportation facilities and public spaces.

Goal 5: Capitalize on Investment in Light Rail
Leverage private investment to capitalize on the public investments in light rail expansion to the study area.

Goal 6: South University-Commercial Area Connectivity
Improve connections between the college campuses and the South University Boulevard commercial district.
Recommendation 1: Organized Business & Property Owners in Mixed-Use Districts

Capitalize on the city’s business assistance functions. Work with the Office of Economic Development to organize business and property owners in mixed-use districts. Explore strategies and options to improve commercial areas over time, such as a Business or Community Improvement District. Consider the following activities:

1. **Data collection and analysis.** Inventory available commercial/mixed-use properties, know the market value and the zoning for these properties, determine their ownership and make the data publicly available. Together with corridor advocates (merchants representative), continue to monitor market conditions – changing demographics, lease rates, absorption - and the performance of merchants (using benchmarks) - maintain a business database and update this market analysis.

2. **Advocacy & Partnerships.** Apprise property and business owners of market opportunities (host property and business owner round tables) and facilitate discussions among potential partners. Facilitate relationships with and solicit the input of property owners, residents, churches, and colleges in the neighborhood because these groups have the most at stake, they have the strongest vested interest in the neighborhood environment.

3. **Marketing & Special Events.** Create targeted marketing materials which tell the “story” of the study area. Organize special events like fun runs, sidewalk sales or farmer’s markets to draw visitors and nearby residents for shopping and social interaction.

4. **Storefront Improvement.** Work with the Office of Economic Development to provide revolving loan funds and grant dollars for façade improvements. Offer storefront design assistance with the disbursement of façade loans and grants. Monitor the program’s use over time and measure the City’s return on investment based on increases in property values rather than increases in sales revenue.

5. **Business Attraction & Promotion.** Promote a mix of stores including specialty food stores (selling baked goods, ethnic foods, coffee, and wine), ethnic restaurants, pharmacies, art shops, antique stores, hardware stores, and service providers (laundry, video rental, garden). Concentrate on attracting locally owned and operated businesses that build a uniquely Denver commercial environment. Hire a leasing professional, or establish a quasi-public retail leasing and management agency to plan and coordinate management and recruitment of retail tenants.

6. **Clean & Safe Program.** Develop a clean and safe program for the corridor – managing the street’s image and providing service levels above standard city services. Consider levying an additional assessment on property owners who neglect their property.
Recommendation 2: Private-Public Partnerships
Work with the city to take the following proactive responsibilities for community investment, redevelopment and overall enhancement:

1. Assist with property assemblages at catalyst locations.
2. Use mechanisms for property acquisition including land swaps, low-interest loans, land write-downs, etc.
3. Work with the private sector to position opportunity sites in appropriate locations for local, regional and national investment interest.
4. Work with the public sector to ready the regulatory environment for investment (zoning, alley width and access, lighting, streetscape improvements, parking, etc.).
5. Work with intermediary organizations (i.e., Piton Foundation, Urban Land Conservancy), whether corporate, non-profit, or philanthropic, which have the flexibility to provide patient capital (20- to 30-year time horizon) for financing land banking efforts.

Recommendation 3: Parking Management
Support the City’s efforts to develop a Strategic Parking Plan and a toolkit of parking best management practices. As tools become available, work with area merchants and the University to establish shared parking arrangements and other parking management efforts to increase parking convenience for customers, students, employees and residents. Explore development of a parking benefits district that leverages parking resources and returns revenues to the community for improvement and beautification projects.

Recommendation 4: Flexible and Strategic Parking Regulations
Reduce development costs and increase affordability by adopting parking standards reflective of the smaller household sizes and enhanced transit accessibility of those areas within a 1/4-mile of the light rail stations and along enhanced transit corridors.
Recommendation 5: Connection to South University
Work with the University of Denver to create a promenade between the campus and the Asbury Row Commercial District per the University of Denver Master Plan concept.

Recommendation 6: Redevelopment of South Colorado & Buchtel
Between Monroe and South Colorado from Evans to Jewell, work with existing property owners to explore transit oriented development options that take better advantage of proximity to Colorado station.
District Plans

- Single-Family Residential Neighborhood
- Urban Neighborhoods
- Main Streets
- Mixed Use Boulevard

“Indeed, a distinctive and legible environment not only offers security but also heightens the potential depth and intensity of human experience.”

—Kevin Lynch
A variety of building types and uses comprise University Park and its environs. To the extent that like styles and uses may be clustered a discernible mosaic of districts emerges.

**Purpose**

In order to better address issues and opportunities within distinct areas of University Park, the plan establishes districts with more focused goals and recommendations. Policy statements augment those described for University Park as a whole. Although they are all a part of the greater integrated neighborhood, they each are unique in terms of character, land use, zoning, urban form and relation to the transportation network. Although their boundaries are not absolute and they should have transitions, the identified districts are as follows:

- Single-Family Residential
- Urban Neighborhoods
- Main Street
- Mixed Use Boulevard

Given the distinct character of the two light rail station areas, issues and opportunities are identified for both the University and Colorado Station Urban Neighborhoods. The Main Street district is also divided into multiple areas (Asbury Row, University Cultural District, Ivy Towers) for analysis and policy purposes.

District plans do not represent zoning, nor do they convey or deny any rights. Zone changes that may be proposed as part of any development must be initiated under a separate procedure established under the City and County of Denver’s Revised Municipal Code. The district plans provide policy guidance regarding the appropriate character of sub-areas and should be used when evaluating potential land use changes and infrastructure investments.

The overall intent of this section is to define the character of University Park’s unique districts. By so doing, it serves to infuse the areas with a sense of place that can be enhanced and carried into the future. With a single vision for each of these districts, residents, businesses and developers will enjoy greater certainty and will know what to expect as development and redevelopment occurs over time.
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood

A majority of University Park is designated as Residential Single Unit. Although there are some exceptions related to deeper lots and relationship to transit, the large area is generally bounded by I-25 to the north, Josephine Street to the west, Yale Avenue to the south and Jackson Street to the east. The purpose of this district is to protect and preserve the tranquil nature of the existing residential fabric internal to University Park. With the exception of the small node of businesses at the intersection of Evans Avenue and Milwaukee Street, the Residential Single Unit district consists of primarily single family uses with some civic uses such as schools, places of worship and parks.
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Primary Issues & Opportunities

University Park Neighborhood Character
University Park may be considered a neighborhood in a park. Dedicated over 100 years ago on Arbor Day, a park like setting is a key character defining element of the neighborhood. Deep front yard setbacks, a prevalence of generous back yards, building footprints with a low lot coverage ratio and a robust tree canopy are character defining features of the neighborhood.

Prevalence of Scrape-offs and Redevelopment
Over the past ten years University Park has experienced an acceleration of scrape-offs and redevelopment of its original housing stock. The pace of redevelopment has heightened concern over neighborhood character stability.

Neighborhood Diversity and Patterns of Future Forms
University Park is home to a variety of street types lined with a range of housing styles. On a given block one may find a narrow street with detached sidewalks lined with trees and turn of the century houses. Around the corner emerges a much wider street with attached sidewalks or no sidewalks lined with mid-century modern ranches. The neighborhood does not reflect, nor do its residents desire, relentless homogeneity in building form or neighborhood structure. However, there is an aspiration to respect block patterns and prevailing housing characteristics and styles that represent best design practices or references to the neighborhood’s original housing styles. Too often redevelopment results in the housing styles that are insensitive to context. On many blocks, one may find such variety of forms that the architectural style of the block becomes illegible.
Good design should be encouraged to better address the transitions between land uses and districts.

**Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Goals**

**Goal 1: Neighborhood Character**
Honor the character of University Park.

**Goal 2: Neighborhood Edges**
Foster a harmonious relationship between buildings and uses at the edges of the neighborhood.

**Goal 3: Parking**
Develop strategies to minimize parking impacts on neighborhood streets near centers of activity.
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Neighborhood History & Pattern Book
Develop educational materials and/or sessions describing the unique development history of University Park and its residential patterns, landscaping and historic resources. Create a University Park pattern book to illustrate preferred development. Promote this document to architects, homebuilders, developers, existing and prospective residents/property owners, realtors, elected officials and other groups to help educate the community about high quality, preferred styles of design. Explore both traditional and contemporary patterns with an emphasis on techniques that allow myriad styles to co-exist harmoniously.

Recommendation 2: Residential Zoning & Neighborhood Character Conservation
Safeguard the character of established neighborhoods that contain an intact inventory of buildings characteristic of a particular construction era such as Victorian, Craftsman or Mid-Century Modern. For such areas explore the creation and use of conservation districts that provide an additional measure of character preservation without the restrictions of historic district designation. Ensure that additions, infill and redevelopment projects complement the urban design of established neighborhood patterns of development, but allow and encourage designs that are “of their time”. As part of the city-wide Zoning Code Update, refine neighborhood typology recommendations for University Park to help guide future context-sensitive development. Ensure that new zoning tools retain the low density of the existing R-1 zoning, but ensure that new standards incorporate basic requirements that reinforce the appropriate form of residential. Consider envelope/glazing on the front of the facade, number/location of entries, elements such as roof form, building orientation, and garage location/driveway size that help define University Park’s character.

Recommendation 3: Outstanding Project Recognition
Publicly recognize infill and redevelopment projects that respect the existing character of adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood. Nominate projects for design awards programs offered by AIA, Mayor’s Design Awards, Historic Denver, etc. Establish a recognition program through the neighborhood association. Promote award winning projects to the Home Builders Association, the Board of Realtors and other groups to generate buzz for well-designed projects.

The Architectural Pattern Book: A Tool for Building Great Neighborhoods prepared by Urban Design Associates describes the history and variety of pattern books. This useful reference also provides an overview of the application of pattern books to the current practice of neighborhood character preservation.
Recommendation 4: Neighborhood Parking
Monitor parking behavior on neighborhood streets and work with the city to establish appropriate tools to minimize spillover parking such as improved signage and wayfinding (to help visitors and commuters find reservoirs of parking for the University of Denver, commercial areas and the light rail stations). Develop shared parking strategies that improve utilization of available parking resources in commercial districts, as well as public on-street resources. Work toward solutions that increase the convenience and ease of parking for customers, visitors and residents. For example, explore the creation of a parking benefits district in areas where there is high demand for on-street public parking spaces. Leverage this demand to generate resources that may be returned to the area for neighborhood improvements.

Recommendation 5: Yard Enclosure and Visual Order
When enclosing a front yard with a wall, fence or hedge, consider the enclosure material within the context of the block. Neighbors should work together to improve the visual image of their respective blocks.

Recommendation 6: Encroachments into the Public Right-of-Way
Ensure that yard enclosures do not encroach into the public right of way particularly when such encroachment would result in attached sidewalks. Prevent encroachments into the public right-of-way and limit the use of revocable permits. Remove encroachments and restore the appropriate condition of the public right of way.

Recommendation 7: Warren Street & Observatory Park Cohesion
On Warren Street between Fillmore and Milwaukee, create a better connection between the two halves of Observatory Park. Work with Parks & Recreation and Public Works to identify the appropriate solution(s), such as narrowing the right-of-way width, changing pavement material or installing a raised traffic table to slow neighborhood traffic.
Recommendation 8: Street Width and Sidewalks North of Buchtel
The neighborhood streets north of Buchtel contain attached, narrow sidewalks that are not conducive to walking. These streets provide neighborhood access to the light rail station areas. Event traffic uses Colorado Avenue as an alternative to Buchtel. St. Paul provides the only connection across I-25 between South Colorado and South University Boulevards, making it a critical path for pedestrians and cyclists. The neighborhood should work with the city to develop a demonstration project to reduce the perceived width of these two streets and retrofit the sidewalk grid where feasible throughout the area to detached, 5’ wide sidewalks with landscaped tree lawns.

Recommendation 9: Steele Street (north of Colorado Avenue)/St. Paul Street
The pavement is in poor condition on Steele (north of Colorado St.)/St Paul Street (between Evans and Interstate 25). Given this street’s particular importance as a neighborhood connection across I-25, it should be repaved or preferably reconstructed to improve the cross-section. Narrow the vehicle right of way (to match the width south of Evans) by adding sidewalk width and striping for parking and bicycle lanes. Install a pedestrian countdown timer at the intersection of St. Paul with Buchtel and Evans.

Recommendation 10: Monroe Parkway
North of Buchtel, should redevelopment occur at the existing apartment complex on the east side of Monroe, ensure the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to match Monroe south of Buchtel. With additional right-of-way extend the sense of a parkway that defines the edge between the neighborhood and the intensity of South Colorado Boulevard and the emerging station area.
Recommendation 11: South Jackson Street – Issues for Further Consideration
Work with Community Planning & Development (Plan Implementation & Landmark Preservation) to identify appropriate tools to maintain the special character of South Jackson Street, particularly the deep front, side and rear setbacks that create a unique, pastoral sense of place.

Recommendation 12: North of Buchtel – Issues for Further Consideration
In the area north of Buchtel the predominant zoning and use is single family residential. Though this pattern should continue to predominate, four discrete areas deserve further consideration of compatible redevelopment scenarios that reinforce neighborhood stability.

- Area A: Two wedges of residential uses flanking Steele Street between Colorado Ave. and Interstate 25 between S. University and South Colorado Boulevards is an important neighborhood gateway for local residents.
- Area B: On the block bounded by Steele, St. Paul, S. Colorado and Jewell the houses front St. Paul, leaving the garages to front the west side of Steele. This rear frontage lacks harmony with the front facing facades on the east side of Steele. Consideration for a new development pattern on this block should promote front facing facades on both the east side of St. Paul and west side of Steele.
- Area C: In the area north of Prairie Park the wedge between Adams, Monroe and Jewell could more effectively address and engage the greenway. Consider opportunities to better integrate the neighborhood with Prairie Park.

Recommendation 13: Jerome St. – Issues for Further Consideration
Land within the existing R-1 boundaries on Jerome Street contains several, dated housing structures. The land is in single ownership and is oriented toward South Colorado Boulevard, not the single-family neighborhood. Consideration should be given to feasible future redevelopment scenarios that make highest and best use of the land while reinforcing the neighborhood character. Explore a variety of ideas and possibilities to ensure disposition of the land in a manner that benefits the neighborhood.

Recommendation 14: South St. Paul Street between E. Wesley and E. Vassar Streets
The houses on the East side of S. St. Paul front St. Paul, leaving garages to front on the West side of S. Steele Street. Consideration of a new development pattern in these blocks should promote front facing facades on both the East side of S. St. Paul and the West side of S. Steele Street.
Urban Neighborhood Districts

University Station Urban Neighborhood
Forming a transition between the Asbury Row Main Street and the Single Family Residential Neighborhood, the University Station Urban Neighborhood lies between Interstate 25 and Iliff Ave. Over time, this area has the potential for transit oriented housing growth given the reasonable walking distance to University Light Rail Station and the South University Boulevard Enhanced Transit Corridor. With sensitive design and development standards this anticipated growth could create a vital neighborhood edge that buffers the stable single-family neighborhood to the east and south. Prospective development opportunities may incorporate sufficient housing density and options to support neighborhood businesses along Asbury Row and a range of future residents. The area is currently comprised of a mix of residential uses including higher density apartments, fraternities and sororities associated with the University of Denver and some single family housing.

Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood
The purpose of this district is to capture potential transit oriented housing, employment and retail growth within reasonable walking distance of Colorado Station and buffer the stable single family neighborhood to the west and south. In addition to easy access to light rail, the district is directly across South Colorado Boulevard from Colorado Center, a major entertainment and office center. The area is currently comprised of a mix of moderate to high density residential uses and automobile oriented retail and services.
Urban Neighborhood Primary Issues & Opportunities

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategic Plan Typology Designation

The TOD Strategic Plan designates University Station as a Campus/Special Event Station and Colorado Station as an Urban Center Station. As the station area transitions from the core to the neighborhood, the development pattern may change. This plan better defines the appropriate transit-oriented growth patterns within each station's area of influence:

- University Station Urban Neighborhood. With limited campus-related land uses, this edge of the station area has the potential to function as an Urban Neighborhood that incorporates a mix of residential options, with limited office and neighborhood serving commercial uses.

- Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood. With a modest land use mix of limited office (<25,000 square feet), retail and residential, the station has the potential to become an attractive vibrant Major Urban Center with a larger office presence and an entertainment component. As the station's area of influence approaches the University Park neighborhood, an Urban Neighborhood typology may be appropriate.

Enhanced Transit Value Capture

The neighborhood, city and region have a stake in helping light rail station areas and rapid bus corridors succeed. In addition to taking cars off overburdened roads, shortening commutes and improving air quality, enhanced transit facilities have the potential to create unique places, stimulate economic development, and augment the overall quality of life. Compact, dense, well-designed buildings and enhanced pedestrian and bike connections to the University and Colorado Stations will help the urban neighborhood evolve and thrive.

Context-Sensitive Neighborhood Edge

Since the urban neighborhoods are adjacent to (and in some cases include) an existing fabric of single-family homes there is a need for context-sensitive design solutions and development standards to ensure that future growth occurs in a compatible manner.

Transit Adjacency vs. Transit Oriented

With physical constraints including heavy traffic, wide travelways (especially South Colorado Blvd and the Buchtel/South University Boulevard intersection), narrow/attached sidewalks, and large surface parking lots, the urban neighborhood districts are in need of retrofit solutions. In their current form these areas exhibit transit adjacent development characteristics that lack those elements which truly orient and link the areas seamlessly to the light rail stations.
Redevelopment Barriers: Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood

Market factors such as expensive land values and high traffic counts tend to favor maintenance of the status quo, auto oriented strip retail or large-format retail centers. Redevelopment in the district has yet to alter the auto orientation of the station area, leverage pedestrian friendly development and neighborhood-serving retail or generally capitalize on the access to superior transit.

Recent Rezoning Adjacent to Colorado Station

The rezoning of the large format retail center along South Colorado Boulevard between Evans and Buchtel to RMU-30 will allow for higher intensity development at the Colorado Center in the future. However, despite the rezoning, the redevelopment scheme produced a reconfigured large format, auto-oriented retail center with some minor outlot/pad site development. Over time, effort should be made to redevelop this site to the extent allowed by the mixed-use zoning.

Super Blocks

In the Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood, large undivided tracts of land define the development pattern. These super blocks reduce the connectivity of the street grid system, limit accessibility, deprive the community of opportunities for interaction and diminish the potential for active, pedestrian oriented street fronts. In the seminal work, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Jane Jacobs describes the need for small blocks and cautions that the benefits and ideal performance of small blocks must not be stymied by repressive zoning that results in “regimented” structures:

“...Frequent and short blocks are valuable because of the fabric of intricate cross-use that they permit among the users of a city neighborhood. Frequent streets are not an end in themselves. They are a means toward an end. If that end — generating diversity and catalyzing the plans of many people besides planners — is thwarted by too repressive zoning, or by regimented construction that precludes flexible growth of diversity, nothing significant can be accomplished by short blocks. Like mixtures of primary use, frequent streets are effective in helping to generate diversity only because of the way they perform. The means by which they work (attracting mixtures of users among them) and the results they can help accomplish (the growth of diversity) are inextricably related. The relationship is reciprocal.”

As the Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood redevelops over time, short blocks should replace the super blocks and new zoning should encourage a vital mix of uses. Controls on building form should be sufficient to encourage a pedestrian and transit oriented environment without limiting interesting architectural expression.

Merchants Row (a 2006 Mayor’s Design Award winner) in Curtis Park illustrates context-sensitive infill in an urban neighborhood setting near rapid transit. Though the contemporary structure is of a greater development intensity, its rhythm, massing and scale complement the nearby historic buildings.
Urban Neighborhood Goals

Goal 1: Predictable, Context-Sensitive Zoning Tools
Establish a predictable regulatory framework for development that results in desirable forms without diminishing existing development potential.

Goal 2: Enhanced Pedestrian Experience
Promote a built environment that supports walking.

Goal 3: Access to Transit
Increase the convenience and ease of walking and biking to transit.

Goal 4: Catalyst Development
Catalyze true transit oriented development in the Urban Neighborhoods associated with University and Colorado Stations.
Urban Neighborhood Recommendations

Recommendation 1: University Station Urban Neighborhood Zoning & Redevelopment
Retain the limited development potential of the R-2 as a transition to the Single-Family Neighborhood. Improve the design and development standards of all the residential zoning or rezone to a new district that promotes existing development potential in compact forms more acceptable to the community at large and which further smart growth outcomes. Ensure that future development densities help sustain transit, as well as nearby retail and services. Direct the greatest vertical intensity of development to the intersection of enhanced transit routes and in closest proximity to the light rail station areas. To encourage ground floor activity, allow a discrete set of non-residential uses to occur on the ground floor of residential buildings such as daycare, limited postal services and other low impact, neighborhood-serving, boutique commercial uses. Encourage more intense uses to locate in nearby commercial districts that serve the neighborhood. Work with the University of Denver to explore rezoning options for the existing parking lot that is currently zoned I-O. Consider options that will take advantage of the proximity to transit.

Recommendation 2: Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood Zoning & Redevelopment
A variety of zone districts comprise the existing regulatory environment for the Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood including R2-A, PUD, BA-2 and RMU-30. This diversity of zoning lacks a coherent framework for future growth. An additional challenge for future growth is the presence of super blocks. With future redevelopment efforts, restore a street grid that provides enhanced connectivity between the neighborhood and station area, and the opportunity for mixed-use buildings with pedestrian active ground floor uses.

Recommendation 3: Neighborhood Edges & Transitions
Ensure that any new zoning standards protect the edges of single family residential areas adjacent to Urban Neighborhoods. Taper building heights with distance from station areas and the intersection of enhanced transit corridors as Urban Neighborhoods approach Single-Family Residential areas. Use attractive landscaping, building articulation and modulation, setbacks, stepbacks and active lower floors that engage the street (e.g. stoops, balconies, windows and ground floor retail where appropriate) to reduce the perceived mass of larger structures.
Recommendation 4: Monroe Parkway
North of Buchtel, should redevelopment occur on the east side of Monroe, ensure the dedication of sufficient right-of-way to match the width cross-section of Monroe south of Buchtel. With additional right-of-way extend northward the sense of a parkway that defines the edge between the neighborhood and the emerging Colorado Station TOD. Balance the cross-section for cars, bikes, parking and walking by using a generous landscaped median, narrow travel lanes, a striped bike lane, parking lanes, and a sidewalk detached with a tree lawn.

Recommendation 5: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
Improve key walking and biking routes and intersections accessing transit. Work with Denver Parks & Recreation and Public Works to enhance Buchtel Boulevard as a parkway, pedestrian route, bicycle route and transit connection. Support pedestrian intersection improvements along South Colorado Boulevard at Buchtel and Evans, as well as along Buchtel and Evans at Monroe and St. Paul to better link the neighborhood to Colorado Station.

Recommendation 6: Catalyst Sites
Develop opportunity sites with catalyst projects that fulfill the vision for the districts.
Potential Catalyst Sites

1) Northeast DU Parking Lot
Underutilized satellite parking facility has good access to light rail & I-25. Current I-O zoning may be incompatible with neighborhood.

- Development should be consistent with 2007 University of Denver Land Use Plan and Transit Oriented Neighborhood goals and recommendations.
- Encourage transit oriented uses such as residential, graduate campus facilities and limited retail.
- Discourage automobile oriented uses that fail to capitalize on transit.
- Use design to mitigate impact on adjacent R-1 district.
- Preserve the mountain views from the Buchtel Trail.

2) Buchtel Park
Current project is underway.

- Just within ½-mile walking radius of the light rail station
- 7-stories, 111 units
- Underground parking
- Studios, 1-bed, 2-bed

3) Asbury Green (Josephine & Asbury)
Underutilized land just outside ½-mile walking radius of the station and one block from S. University Boulevard Main Street.

- Potential development is subject to protective bulk plane restrictions.
- Further removed from transit, development could provide a transition from higher densities into R-2 environment.
Existing Conditions
Illustrative Concept from the Blueprint Denver Areas of Stability Workshop Results, June 6, 2001
**Potential Catalyst Sites**

1. **Apartments**
   - Three-story garden style apartments on Buchtel Boulevard & Jewell Avenue.
   - Rental apartments are within easy walking distance of Colorado Station.
   - Site is broken into two zoning districts, R-2-A and R-3.
   - Moderate density rentals can better support transit with enhanced design.
   - Any future activities should be consistent with Transit Oriented Neighborhood goals and recommendations.
   - Development should be context-sensitive towards adjacent Residential Single Unit.
   - Use design measures to mitigate impact on adjacent R-1 district.

2. **Auto-oriented hospitality area**
   - Food and lodging at the intersection of Buchtel Boulevard & South Colorado Boulevard.
   - Directly across S. Colorado Blvd. from Colorado Center and Colorado Station.
   - Existing zoning is B-A-2.
   - High visibility close to transit makes this an ideal site for residential and retail TOD.

3. **Former Albertsons Site**
   - Large format shopping center on the southwest corner of Buchtel Boulevard & S. Colorado Boulevard.
   - Single story redevelopment plans improve the appearance of the site, but do not capitalize on the presence of transit.
   - Existing R-MU-30 zoning allows for a mix of uses including residential and building heights of up to 85 feet (waived 140’ maximum).
(3) Former Albertsons Site
Large format shopping center on the southwest corner of Buchtel Boulevard & S. Colorado Boulevard.
- Single story redevelopment plans improve the appearance of the site, but do not capitalize on the presence of transit.
- Existing R-MU-30 zoning allows for a mix of uses including residential and building heights of up to 85 feet (waived 140’ maximum).

Main Street Districts

Asbury Row District
This district is the northernmost segment of South University Boulevard bordering University Park from the four corners of Evans Avenue to I-25. The segment north of Asbury consists of moderate and high density housing, the area south of Asbury is a mix of campus and residential-serving retail establishments. This latter block bears the most resemblance to South University Boulevard’s past as a mixed use streetcar corridor with many of the buildings brought up to the sidewalk. This urban form and blend of uses along Asbury Row, combined with its proximity to University Station, provide the ingredients for a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use environment.

South University Cultural District
South of Evans Avenue and north of Wesley Avenue along South University Boulevard is the University Cultural District. The character of this district is defined by the historic core of the University of Denver campus to the west including the Mary Reed Building, Daniels College of Business, and Iliff School of Theology Campus. The east side of South University Boulevard is a mix of residential and civic uses including the University Park United Methodist Church. The cultural anchor of the district is the Robert and Judi Newman Center for the Performing Arts.

Ivy Towers District
The district designated as Ivy Towers is the segment of South University Boulevard between Wesley Avenue to the north and Yale Avenue to the south. Named for its east-west street names of elite colleges and universities (Wesley, Harvard, Vassar, Yale) and its tall residential buildings, the district is primarily composed of higher density housing with some retail and services.
To the south, the district has access to the Harvard Gulch Trail and DeBoer Park to the west and Robert H. McWilliams Park to the east.

**Main Street Primary Issues & Opportunities**

**Asbury Row Commercial District Vitality**
With high daily auto, pedestrian and transit rider counts, strong demand exists for shops, services, restaurants and other commercial uses. Furthermore, the adjacency to a University campus (with a daytime population of 13,000 individuals) and a prominent neighborhood (with higher than average disposable incomes) present the opportunity for a distinct niche market to emerge in the Asbury Row district.

**Ivy Towers District Vitality**
Auto-oriented uses in the Ivy Towers District diminish the appeal of the commercial district and fail to capitalize on the nearby neighborhood market demand for shops and services.

**South University Main Street - Shortcomings of Existing Zoning**
Along South University Boulevard, existing zoning is applied in an alternating pattern of residential and commercial districts. This pattern can produce desirable results of high density residential stretches supporting and separating limited amounts of commercial activity. The constrained commercial boundaries prevent over saturation of business uses that the market may not be able to support. Unfortunately, two problems exist with the predominant zone districts, B-2 and R-3. Both districts were created in the 1950s and do not contain intent statements that clarify the original purpose and desired development outcomes of the districts.

- **Shortcomings of the B-2.** The B-2 lacks sufficient development potential to produce the mix of residential or office uses over ground floor shops, services and restaurants that are viewed as desirable by today’s standards. Instead the greatest development potential is possible in the R-3 districts where the prevailing community tolerance is for small apartment buildings of a density and height consistent with or only slightly higher than what exists today.

- **Shortcomings of the R-3.** In the R-3 areas, it is questionable whether the city planners and community members in the 1950s conceived of the development potential that is becoming a reality today. Development potential in R-3 is limited by bulk plane requirements, setbacks, open space requirements, a floor area ratio and parking requirements. No provisions ensure the aggregation of required open space, so that providing 2’x 1000’ strip of land is technically the same as providing 20’x100’ useable open space. With no limit on zone lot consolidation, assemblages stretching half a block or more are possible. These consolidated zone lots have
With such a variety of residential development characterizing the R-3 zone district and with no intent statements in the zoning, it is hard to know what form of development was originally envisioned by this zone district. The potential for tens of thousands of square feet of development. A much different type of structure is emerging on these assemblages than the modest apartment buildings that characterize the typical zone lots of 6,250 SF (on which the R-3 zoning was most frequently applied). These typical zone lots permit 18,750 SF of development, likely in the form of a 3-5 story building, once setbacks, open space requirements and bulk plane restrictions are factored in. It is possible to achieve the permitted R-3 development potential within 4-5 stories on a large assemblage. However, in the absence of a height restriction, it is also possible to construct towers. Relying on these antiquated formulas for development leaves building form to chance.
Main Street Goals

Goal 1: Appropriate Mix of Uses
Promote uses that suit the needs and preferences of nearby residents in the neighborhood, as well as the destination itineraries of visitors.

Goal 2: Spatially Define Main Streets
Define street edges and corners with compact, multi-storied buildings that form a continuous street wall.

Goal 3: Orientation of Mixed-Use Development
Encourage mixed-use development with the greatest intensity focused to the corridor, especially near major transit stops and in commercial districts.

Goal 4: Pedestrian Comfort
Improve the function and appearance of mixed-use boulevards to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering. Provide strong pedestrian connections to and crossings along Main Street districts and encourage neighborhood access by foot and bike.

Goal 5: Destination Development
Promote commercial districts along Main Streets as a destination for locally owned shops, restaurants and entertainment venues.

Goal 3: Context-Sensitive Variation & Character
Retain the alternating pattern of mixed-use and residential development along the corridor and ensure that building forms respond to their context.

Goal 4: Strategic Parking Supply
Provide a strategic supply of parking to serve regional visitors to Mixed-Use Boulevards and minimize the adverse affects of spillover parking in neighborhoods.
Main Street zoning incorporates form-base design and development standards and intent statements that improve the predictability of the future form of development.

Main Street Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Zoning for South University Boulevard
Use form based zoning standards to improve the predictability of land development for both investors and nearby residents in the various districts along South University Boulevard:

1) Asbury Row District: Retain the mixed use context of the district (currently zoned B-2, R-MU-30, R-3 and R-4) by applying more consistent zoning that includes form-based design and development standards. Ensure that such standards:
   - Orient buildings to the street to form a consistent street wall and activate the ground floor with retail, pedestrian entries, display windows, outdoor seating and the like.
   - Provide for a mix uses in the district with neighborhood serving shops/services and residential options.
   - Support 1-5 stories of development with greatest intensity focused to the intersection of enhanced transit corridors and in close proximity to the light rail station.
   - Locate parking in the rear of sites, underground or in structures wrapped with commercial and or residential uses to minimize the visual impact of parking facilities. Restrict parking access from S. University Blvd to limit turning movements and interruptions to the pedestrian realm, use side streets and alleys for parking access wherever possible.

2) University Cultural District: Retain the residential context (currently zoned R-3) by defining the intent of the zoning, as well as the desired form of development. Ensure that the zoning standards:
   - Activate ground floors with stoops, pedestrian entries, appropriate amount of glazing, balconies, ground floor residential common areas
   - Allow a mix of housing types townhouse, apartments, lofts, etc….
   - Support moderate densities (3-5 stories) to ensure an appropriate transition from the northern segment
   - Orient buildings to the street with shallow front setbacks that accommodate stoops/porches
   - Locate parking in the rear of sites, underground or in structures wrapped with commercial and or residential uses to minimize the visual impact of parking facilities. Restrict parking access from S. University Blvd to limit turning movements and interruptions to the pedestrian realm, use side streets and alleys for parking access wherever possible.
3) **Ivy Towers District:** Retain both mixed use context between Wesley and Harvard (currently zoned B-2) and the residential context in remaining area (currently zoned R-3) by updating the zoning with form-based regulatory tools that clarify the intent of the zoning and:

- Support moderate densities of 3-5 stories
- Activate the ground floor with retail, pedestrian entries, display windows, outdoor seating in mixed use area and with stoops, pedestrian entries, appropriate glazing, balconies, ground floor common areas in the residential segments of the district
- Uses include a mix of neighborhood serving shops and services, as well as a variety of housing types such as townhouses, apartments, lofts, etc.
- Buildings have a strong relationship to the street, either oriented to the sidewalk to form a consistent street wall in the mixed-use segment or shallow setbacks in the residential segment.

**Recommendation 2: Underutilized Land**
Redevelop underutilized land, especially surface parking lots, with a mix of uses and structured parking.

**Recommendation 3: Pedestrian Connections**
Provide strong pedestrian connections to conspicuous, safe and comfortable crossings along Main Street districts at Buchtel, Evans, Warren, Iliff, and Harvard.

**Recommendation 4: Parking**
Provide a strategic supply of parking to support retail activity and minimize spillover parking into the neighborhood. Encourage better management and centralization of parking through shared and structured parking. Simplify parking requirements to respond to zone lot sizes, the presence of transit and the pedestrian oriented nature of Main Streets. Support preservation and adaptive reuse with flexible parking standards for historic buildings. Place parking behind and/or to the side of buildings rather than in front of them.

**Recommendation 5: University & Neighborhood Collaboration**
Explore collaborative development opportunities with Iliff School of Theology and the University of Denver to enhance the Main Street Districts, especially Asbury Row and the University Cultural District.

**Recommendation 6: University Master Planning & Implementation**
Participate in future master planning and implementation efforts with the Iliff School of Theology and University of Denver to emphasize the campuses as destinations, unique neighbors and valued community resources.
Recommendation 7: The Iliff Campus

- Explore collaborative development opportunities with the Iliff School and the University of Denver to enhance the Main Street Districts, especially Asbury Row and the South University Cultural District.
- Participate in future master planning and implementation efforts with the Iliff School and the University of Denver to emphasize the campuses as destinations, unique neighbors and valued community resources.
MIXED USE BOULEVARD

South Colorado Mixed Use Boulevard
This district stretches along South Colorado Boulevard from Evans Avenue to Yale Avenue. The purpose of this district is to transform South Colorado Boulevard over time into a true multimodal street by significantly enhancing the pedestrian environment. Indeed, despite its mixed use character, the corridor is viewed by residents as outright hostile towards walkers and bicyclists. The area is currently comprised of a mix of moderate to high density residential uses, automobile oriented retail and services and some civic anchors including the Most Precious Blood Catholic Parish and School, the Schlessman Family YMCA and the fire station.

Mixed Use Boulevard Primary Issues & Opportunities

Negative Impacts of Traffic
As a major metropolitan area arterial, this portion of South Colorado Boulevard carries between 40,000 and 50,000 cars per day. Creating a pedestrian environment along a street of over 25,000 cars per day is considered challenging. High traffic volumes do not have to preclude a walkable environment as evidenced by other major thoroughfares in other U.S. cities (e.g. Michigan Avenue in Chicago or Octavia Boulevard in San Francisco). Although retail visibility is high for streets with over 30,000 cars per day, access and convenience become more problematic, thereby hindering the retail benefits of traffic. Market factors such as expensive land values and traffic counts favor maintenance of the status quo, auto oriented strip commercial retail.

Negative Impacts of the Built Environment
Reflecting the disconnect between land use and transportation, the building forms along the corridor are set back from the street behind large reservoirs of surface parking. Without on-street parking or detached sidewalks, pedestrians have no buffer from the intense volume of traffic. Pedestrians walking up and down South Colorado Boulevard must frequently negotiate cars entering and exiting driveways. Residents do not consider the east side of the corridor to be safely accessible by foot and, as a result, opt to drive even to close destinations.

Transit Station Catalyst
Maturation of the Southeast Light Rail Corridor and TOD within the Colorado Station Urban Neighborhood could attract positive redevelopment further south along the South Colorado Mixed-Use Boulevard, thereby extending the influence of transit. At Yale, development could capitalize on access to the stations to the north or east on Yale at I-25.
Mixed Use Boulevard Goals

Goal 1: Mixed Use Boulevard Zone District
Create new zoning to promote the evolution of mixed-use boulevards along out-dated auto-oriented commercial strips.

Goal 2: Anchors for Pedestrian Friendly Development
Increase pedestrian activity at key gateways and focal points along mixed-use boulevards.

Goal 3: Compact Mixed Use Development
Encourage compact forms of development.

Goal 4: Multimodal Corridor for All Users
Balance right-of-way to support multiple modes of transportation, improve person-trip capacity and enhance land development potential.

Goal 5: Parking for People
Provide parking strategically rather than in sprawling underutilized surface lots.
Mixed Use Boulevard Recommendations

Recommendation 1: South Colorado Mixed-Use Boulevard Zoning and Retrofit
Work with owners of large format retail shopping centers to develop retrofit strategies that intensify the land development along the South Colorado Mixed-Use Boulevard.

- Engage public and private participation to begin a dialogue for both sides of S. Colorado Blvd.
- Encourage a vibrant mix of uses including residential, employment, shopping and entertainment to effectively allow residents to live, work and play without the use of a car. Promote vertical mixed use development within buildings such as ground floor retail and upper floor office or residential.
- Break up super blocks into a series of short blocks with an interconnected street grid to restore a more urban and walkable environment.
- Provide human-scaled, pedestrian friendly sense of enclosure with street trees and multi-storied buildings brought closer to the street. Engage pedestrians with ground floor interest such as plazas, outdoor seating, shade trees and display windows. Attract pedestrian scaled buildings where mixed-use boulevards abut low density residential areas.
- Focus structural and use intensity to the corridor. Use predictable building forms rather than floor-to-area ratios (FAR) to determine development potential.
- Encourage the redevelopment of underutilized surface parking lots.

Recommendation 2: Gateways & Focal Points
Punctuate the corridor with gateways and focal points that signal arrival in activity centers at major intersections:

- Leverage existing community assets and public gathering places including Most Precious Blood and the YMCA as potential anchors for new pedestrian areas.
- Support higher densities along South Colorado Boulevard in appropriate areas including the Colorado light rail station area (½-mile).

Recommendation 3: Strategic Use of Parking Resources
Provide a strategic supply of parking to support retail activity and minimize spillover parking into the neighborhood. Better manage parking resources and centralize parking supplies through shared and structured parking. Place parking behind and/or to the side of buildings rather than in front of them.
Recommendation 4: Balanced Multimodal Neighborhood Seam
Recreate South Colorado Boulevard as a seam between the University Park and University Hills.

- Leverage redevelopment to bring the street to Enhanced Transit Corridor standards including 16’ pedestrian zones, 8’ tree lawns and street furniture.
- Explore options including pedestrian refuges and better signalization to improve pedestrian crossings.
- Consolidate driveways and limit curb cuts as redevelopment occurs to reduce vehicle and pedestrian conflicts. Minimize the number and size of curb cuts, as well as restrict the number of access points from the primary street versus side streets.
- Better manage access along South Colorado Boulevard with a median to increase traffic flow, safety and pedestrian activity.
- Enhance pedestrian visibility at key locations, especially E. Yale Ave.
- Undertake additional study of S. Colorado Blvd. and explore street retrofit strategies. Consider preparation of street design guidelines.
“Vision without action is a daydream. Action without vision is a nightmare.”
—Japanese proverb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility &amp; Partners</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive rezoning</td>
<td>Update University Park’s zoning with form based standards that ensure implementation consistent with the land use, urban design and district concepts articulated by this plan. (Reference pages: 51-52, 55-59, 61-69, 86, 106, 112-113, 115-116, 120)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community Planning &amp; Development, Zoning Code Task Force, Denver City Council, University Park Community Council</td>
<td>• Urban Design &amp; Land Use #1-#3, #7-#11&lt;br&gt;• Mobility #1, #7&lt;br&gt;• Economic Development #4&lt;br&gt;• Single-Family Residential Neighborhood #2, #5, #11-#13&lt;br&gt;• Urban Neighborhood #1-#3&lt;br&gt;• Main St #1, #4&lt;br&gt;• Mixed Use Blvd #1, #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Options in Transit Rich Locations &amp; Smart Commute Mortgage Program</td>
<td>Encourage and facilitate the development of housing options near transit and promote programs like a Smart Commute Mortgage Program, the Metro Mayor’s Caucus TOD loan pool for the construction of housing near transit, and the Metro Mayors Mortgage Assistance Program for first time home buyers. (Reference pages: 59, 60, 73, 103)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Office of Economic Development (Housing &amp; Neighborhood Development Services), Metro Mayors Caucus, local banks, SEEDCO, Enterprise Foundation</td>
<td>• Urban Design &amp; Land Use #13&lt;br&gt;• Urban Neighborhood #1, #2, #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway &amp; Focal Point Strategy</td>
<td>Define the neighborhood points of entry and unique focal points with distinct features (signage, architectural elements, public art, fountains, etc.) to welcome visitors and cue them to environmental conditions. (Reference pages: 52, 62, 69, 118)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>University Park Community Council, University of Denver, Historic Denver, American Institute of Architects, Office of Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>• Urban Design &amp; Land Use #5&lt;br&gt;• Main Street #3&lt;br&gt;• Mixed Use Blvd #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Element</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Responsibility &amp; Partners</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parks & Preservation                              | Tree Preservation Strategy
Develop a three pronged strategy comprised of regulatory, educational and investment/partnership tools to preserve mature (and plant new) trees in the neighborhood. (Reference pages: 20, 44, 76) | 1        | University Park Community Council, Greenprint Denver (Million Trees Initiative)           | • Parks & Preservation #1                             |
|                                                 | Neighborhood Pattern Book
Prepare a Neighborhood Pattern Book that provides guidance about prevailing character and styles of development in the neighborhood. Illustrate building forms and infill/addition techniques to assist property owners in making design decisions that reinforce neighborhood character. (Reference pages: 37-38, 41-44, 51-52, 69, 77, 96-98) | 2        | Community Planning & Development (Landmarks)                                               | • Urban Design & Land Use #4
• Single-Family Residential Neighborhood #1, #2     |
|                                                 | Harvard Gulch East End Development
Work with existing property owners to integrate the terminus of Harvard Gulch with the intersection of Colorado and Yale. Explore options that allow for the intensification of development and the aggregation of land for outdoor recreation and community gathering. (Reference pages: 77, 120) | 2        | Community Planning & Development, Office of Economic Development, Parks & Recreation        | • Parks & Preservation #6
• Mixed Use Blvd #2                                |
|                                                 | Warren Street & Observatory Park Cohesion
Narrow the right of way between the north and south portions of Observatory Park that are bisected by Warren Street. Consider other improvements such as a raised traffic table, bulbouts or other traffic calming techniques that improve the cohesion of the two halves of the park. (Reference pages: 99) | 3        | Public Works, Parks & Recreation, Community Planning & Development                          | • Single-Family Residential Neighborhood #7           |
|                                                 | Historic Structures Inventory
Work with the city to complete an inventory of historic structures. (Reference pages: 37-38, 41-44, 51-52, 55, 60, 69, 72, 74, 75, 96-98) | 2        | Community Planning & Development, Historic Denver, Colorado Preservation Inc.               | • Parks & Preservation #4, #5                        |
|                                                 | Conservation Districts
Safeguard the character of established neighborhoods containing an intact inventory of buildings characteristic of a particular construction era such as Victorian, Craftsman or Mid-Century Modern. Explore the creation and use of conservation districts that provide an additional measure of character preservation without the restrictions of historic district designation. (Reference pages: 37-44, 51, 55, 60, 69 74-75, 77, 96-98) | 3        | Community Planning & Development, Historic Denver, Colorado Preservation Inc., American Institute of Architects, Congress for the New Urbanism, American Planning Association | • Urban Design & Land Use #1
• Parks & Preservation #4, #5
• Single-Family Residential Neighborhood #1, #2    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility &amp; Partners</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mobility     | University Park Pedestrian Improvements – identify grants, CIP funds, TREX improvement funds and other program funds to make needed pedestrian improvements in the study area. Improve pedestrian facilities within the neighborhood, particularly at key intersections linking the neighborhood to transit stations and other destinations. Consider improvements such as pedestrian countdown timers, refuge islands, bulb-outs, pedestrian activated signals and ADA upgrades along the following streets and intersections: University (at Buchtel, Evans, Warren, Iliff and Harvard), Colorado (at Iliff and Yale), Buchtel (at S. St. Paul, S. Clayton, and S. Monroe), St. Paul (at Evans). (Reference pages: 41, 56, 60, 83-84, 116) | 1 | Public Works | • Urban Design & Land Use #10  
• Mobility #4, #6  
• Main Street #3 |
|             | Buchtel and North of Buchtel Demonstration Project - Buchtel Boulevard (including Prairie Park and the Buchtel Trail) provide excellent pedestrian connections to the two station areas flanking the neighborhood. North of Buchtel, St.Paul/Steele Street provides the only bicycle and pedestrian connection across I-25 between University and Colorado. In the area north of Buchtel streets are wide with no sidewalks or attached Hollywood sidewalks. With the potential for catalyst development projects occurring in the Urban Neighborhood districts associated with University and Colorado Stations, this area would benefit from significant bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Such a demonstration project would include improvements to Buchtel Blvd & Trail (per Parks and Recreation plans) and to S. St. Paul/S. Steele Street (striped bike lanes, detached sidewalks), as well as greater accommodation throughout the area for bicyclists and pedestrians. (Reference pages: 41, 56, 60, 72, 76, 83-84, 100, 101) | 1 | Parks & Recreation, Public Works, Community Planning & Development | • Urban Design & Land Use #10  
• Parks & Preservation #3  
• Mobility #1, #3, #4, #6  
• Single Family Residential #8, #9 |
|             | Transit Station design, marketing and wayfinding campaign - Develop a program for the design of light rail stations and high volume bus stops in the study area. Incorporate elements that attract choice riders (individuals who could otherwise drive, but choose to take transit). Improve station area wayfinding. (Reference pages 83-85) | 1 | Community Planning & Development, Office of Economic Development | • Mobility #2, #3, #9 |
|             | Green Parking Lots & Alleys – maximize the utility of alleys for circulation (by bicyclists and pedestrians) and detention/water quality. Prepare “green” design standards for parking lots and alleys that incorporate new technologies (like solar carports) and environmental best management practices (such as porous paving materials and bio-swales). (Reference pages: 85, 90) | 2 | Public Works, Environmental Health, Parks, Community Planning & Development, Greenprint Denver | • Mobility #10, #11  
• Economic Development #5 |
|             | Colorado Boulevard Enhanced Transit Corridor Retrofit Study & Street Design Guidelines - Undertake a more in-depth study of Colorado Boulevard and analyze strategies to improve the people-trip carrying capacity of the corridor and development potential of adjacent land uses. Develop recommendations to enhance the pedestrian experience especially for transit commuters. Explore the potential for a pedestrian skybridge over Colorado Boulevard as part of a private development project. (Reference pages: 41, 56, 60, 72, 83-85, 121) | 3 | Community Planning & Development, Public Works | • Urban Design & Land Use #10  
• Mobility #1, #4, #6, #7, #8  
• Economic Development #6  
• Mixed Use Boulevard #1, #4 |
|             | Drive-Less Challenge - Develop a neighborhood campaign to educate residents about transit services available to residents. Highlight routes and destinations accessible by transit. Explore bicycle and pedestrian routes and the variety of destinations that are accessible within 5-, 10-, 15-, and 30-minute distances. Challenge residents to apply knowledge and incorporate walking, biking and transit use into daily routines. (Reference pages: 73, 80, 82, 85) | 3 | UPCC, Transportation Solutions, University of Denver, RTD DRCOG, Kaiser, Environmental Health | • Urban Design & Land Use #12  
• Mobility #9 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility &amp; Partners</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Economic Development | Catalyst Project Development  
Work with the city to attract catalyst development projects that bring value added development to the community that takes advantage of investment in rapid transit. Pursue public-private partnerships that facilitate development in a manner that implements the vision of this plan. (Reference pages: 51-52, 56, 59, 86-87, 89-90, 102-110, 116, 118, 120) | 1 | Office of Economic Development, Community Planning & Development | • Economic Development #2, #6  
• Urban Neighborhood #1, #4, #6  
• Main Street #2  
• Mixed Use Blvd #1, #4 |
| Economic Development | Neighborhood Marketplace Initiative RFP  
Organize University Boulevard merchants and property owners, as well as the University of Denver to respond to the city’s Request for Participation solicitation for the 2009 or 2010 Neighborhood Marketplace Initiative. (Reference pages: 59, 86-90, 107-110) | 2 | Office of Economic Development, Council District 6 Office | • Economic Development #1, #4 |
| Economic Development | University and Colorado Boulevard Improvement District  
Work with merchants, property owners, residents and the University of Denver to explore the potential formation of a Business or Community Improvement District to promote and enhance the Main Street and Mixed Use Boulevard districts. (Reference pages: 27, 59, 76, 86-90) | 3 | Office of Economic Development, property owners, University of Denver, Council District 6 Office | • Economic Development #1, #2 |
| Economic Development | Neighborhood Parking Strategy  
Increase the convenience and ease of parking for customers and residents. Pursue parking management strategies and flexible parking regulations that more effectively supply parking in high demand locations and minimize the visual impacts of parking on the built environment. (Reference pages: 73, 89, 97, 99, 114, 116, 119, 120) | 3 | Office of Economic Development, Community Planning & Development, Public Works, Regional Transportation District, University of Denver | • Urban Design & Land Use #11  
• Economic Development #3, #4  
• Single-Family Residential Neighborhood #4  
• Main Street #4  
• Mixed Use Blvd. #3 |