In recent years, “slot homes” have been constructed in many neighborhoods throughout Denver, resulting in a new development pattern that can detract from the design quality and sense of community in Denver’s neighborhoods.

This document summarizes a recommended strategy to address identified problems with slot home development. It is part of a Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment project that has included research, analysis and public outreach to identify the problem, explore alternatives and identify tools to promote improved design outcomes in all Denver Zoning Code districts where slot homes occur. A Slot Home Task Force composed of community stakeholders is guiding the project to ensure an inclusive public process and outcomes that are:

**Effective.** Proposed solutions should promote the established vision for the neighborhood and directly address one or more elements of the problem statement summarized on page 2.

**Equitable.** Proposed solutions should incorporate feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, including residents, builders and design professionals.

**Flexible.** Proposed solutions should promote creative designs and allow property owners and builders to adapt to changing market conditions.

**Predictable.** Proposed solutions should result in predictable, clear, outcomes for all stakeholders.

The project will culminate in proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code in early 2018. See Schedule and Next Steps for more information.

**WHAT IS A SLOT HOME?**

A “slot home”, or “sideways-facing town home” is a multi-unit residential structure consisting of attached dwelling units arranged side-by-side and primarily perpendicular to the street. They can be developed in a wide range of zone districts across the city. Neighborhoods where slot homes most commonly occur are West Colfax, Jefferson Park, Highland, Five Points, Sunnyside, Berkeley and Cherry Creek. Three typical slot home configurations are illustrated below.
PROBLEM STATEMENT

City staff, the Slot Home Task force and general public contributed to development of the following Problem Identification Statement. The recommended strategy summarized on the following pages provides solutions to address the problem statement in a variety of contexts.

The problem is new slot home construction does not promote neighborhood objectives* in five key respects:

1. **Public Realm Engagement.** Many slot homes do not engage the street, sidewalk and semi-public frontages with street level building activities, porches, or pedestrian entrances and transparency (windows) that promote interaction with neighbors and ownership of the public realm.

2. **Neighborhood Context.** The siting, setbacks and uses (residential, commercial, etc.) within slot homes sometimes do not reflect the existing character or desired future conditions* of the street, block and neighborhood.

3. **Building Mass & Scale.** Many slot homes do not incorporate Human Scale proportions, heights and design elements that could promote compatible mass and scale relationships among buildings, such as coordinated facade widths, heights in stories, window patterns or distinctions between building floors.

4. **Vehicle-oriented Design.** Slot homes often incorporate visible driveways, parking areas and garage doors that negatively impact the pedestrian-oriented character of the street, sidewalk, and neighborhood.

5. **Impacts on Neighbors.** Slot homes often orient their most active facade areas towards adjacent properties, rather than the street and sidewalk, or include other elements, such as rooftop decks, which may have negative visual, solar, or privacy impacts on neighbors.

*Note that desired future conditions and neighborhood objectives are informed by the existing zoning intent statements, small area plans and citywide plans.

CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL SOLUTIONS

Solutions to identified issues with slot home development should balance multiple community objectives. The task force and city staff used the criteria below to ensure that the recommended strategy successfully balances multiple objectives. More details are provided in Criteria For Successful Solutions on page 37.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

Solutions should produce outcomes that are consistent with the established vision for the neighborhood or area and directly address one or more elements of the problem statement.

**EQUITY**

Solutions should incorporate feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, including residents, property owners, builders and design professionals and should apply equally to similar properties in a variety of neighborhoods across the city.

**FLEXIBILITY**

Solutions should allow property owners and builders to adapt to changing market conditions and maintain flexibility to promote creative designs that can relate to a variety of neighborhood contexts.

**PREDICTABILITY**

Solutions should result in predictable, clear, outcomes for all stakeholders meaning that property owners should be able to predict the likely outcome of an approval process if they follow the regulations, city staff should be able to consistently interpret regulations and neighborhoods should have a reasonable understanding of the character of development that can occur.
SOLUTION FOR MIXED USE DISTRICTS

The recommended strategy includes a package of tools that would not allow ‘slot home’ development in mixed use districts. Instead, side-by-side residential units* could be built that differentiate the residential frontage from commercial frontages, engage the public realm, incorporate reduced mass and scale, minimize vehicle-oriented design and limit impacts on neighbors. Refer to the Slot Home Strategy for more details and examples.

**Recommended Standards for Side-by-Side Residential in Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), and Main Street (MS) Zone Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design Tools</th>
<th>Building Design Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Require Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>Any dwelling unit located within 10’ of the primary street setback or side street setback shall be oriented to the corresponding street. The corner unit shall be oriented to the primary street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Require Entry Features for Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>Each dwelling unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street facing facade that incorporates a visually prominent porch, patio or canopy (such features are allowed to encroach into the primary street setback).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Reduce Maximum Building Height in Feet</td>
<td>Maximum height for flat roofs shall be 30’ in two-story districts and 38’ in three-story districts. Maximum height for sloped roofs (with a minimum pitch of 6:12) shall be 35’ in two-story districts and 45’ in three-story districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Revise Building Height Exceptions</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be set back 1 foot from the perimeter of the building for every 1 foot of height when exceeding maximum building height in feet or stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Limit Rooftop and Second Story Decks</td>
<td>Prohibit rooftop and/or second story decks in the rear 35% of the zone lot depth when adjacent to a Protected District with the same standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Increase Transparency Standards</td>
<td>Primary Street transparency standard shall be a minimum of 40%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Design Tools</th>
<th>Site Design Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G Increase Primary Street Setback</td>
<td>Primary Street setback shall be a minimum of 10’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Increase the Side Setbacks</td>
<td>Side street setbacks shall be a minimum of 7.5’. Side interior setbacks shall be a minimum of 5’ when providing pedestrian access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Allow Setback Encroachments</td>
<td>Porches, canopies and similar features shall be allowed to encroach into the primary street and side street setbacks in alignment with the existing Multi Unit (MU) standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Build-to Alternatives</td>
<td>The Garden Wall and Pergola alternatives shall not be allowed. The Courtyard alternative shall be allowed to meet 30% of required build-to. A build-to exception for the drive way will be allowed for zone lots without alley access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicular Design Tools</th>
<th>Vehicular Design Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions</td>
<td>Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Allow Encroachments for Parking Areas</td>
<td>Allow the required 5’ back out space to encroach up to 2.5’ into the side street when screened with landscaping and garden wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that side-by-side units could also continue to be built using existing Row House and Duplex standards without side-facing units to the rear.

This graphic illustrates a design outcome using the tools described in the Mixed Use Strategy on a corner lot in a C-MX-3 zone district.
The recommended strategy includes a package of tools that would not allow ‘slot home’ construction in multi-unit districts. Instead, side-by-side residential units* could be built that engage the public realm, incorporate reduced mass and scale, minimize vehicle-oriented design and limit impacts on neighbors. Refer to the Slot Home Strategy for more details and examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDE-BY-SIDE RESIDENTIAL IN MULTI UNIT (MU) OR RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO) ZONE DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Require Units Oriented to the Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Require Entry Features for Units Oriented to the Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Reduce Maximum Building Height in Feet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Revise Building Height Exceptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Limit Rooftop and Second Story Decks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Increase Transparency Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SITE DESIGN TOOLS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SITE DESIGN STANDARDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Limit Block Sensitive Setback</strong></td>
<td>The maximum block-sensitive setback minimum shall be 20’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Increase the Side Setbacks</strong></td>
<td>Side interior setbacks shall be 7.5’ for units oriented to the street, all other units shall be setback 12.5’ for the side interior. Side street setbacks shall be 7.5’ regardless of unit orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Allow Setback Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>Single story porches, canopies and similar features shall be allowed to encroach 5’ into the minimum side interior setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Increase Build-to Percentage</strong></td>
<td>The required build-to percentage shall be a minimum of 70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Revise Build-to Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>The Garden Wall and Pergola alternatives shall not be allowed. The Courtyard alternative shall be allowed to meet 30% of the required build-to percentage. Allow a build-to percentage exception of 12’ for the drive way for zone lots without alley access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>VEHICULAR DESIGN TOOLS</strong></th>
<th><strong>VEHICULAR DESIGN STANDARDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions</strong></td>
<td>Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Allow Encroachments for Parking Areas</strong></td>
<td>Allow the required 5’ back out space to encroach up to 2.5’ into the side street setback when screened with landscaping and garden wall. Allow for internal access drive or drive aisle to encroach up to 7.5’, but at not point closer than 5’ from a zone lot line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that side-by-side units could also continue to be built using existing Row House and Duplex standards without side-facing units to the rear.

This graphic illustrates a design outcome using the tools described in the Multi Unit Strategy on an interior lot in a G-MU-3 zone district.
SOLUTION FOR GARDEN COURT IN MU DISTRICTS

The Garden Court strategy in Multi Unit zone districts was a result of an evaluation of the tools described in Section 3, Slot Home Task Force feedback, community review, and external testing. The Garden Court strategy described below is based on the existing Garden Court building form. Refer to the Slot Home Strategy for more details and examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR THE GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM IN MULTI UNIT (MU) OR RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO) ZONE DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Revise Maximum Building Height in Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Revise Building Height Exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Increase Pedestrian Access Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Rooftop and Second Story Decks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Introduce a Transparency Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURTYARD DESIGN TOOLS</th>
<th>COURTYARD DESIGN STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Increase Street Facing Courtyard Width</td>
<td>Increase the street-facing courtyard width to a minimum of 30’ or 33% of the zone lot width (which ever is greater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Require Residential Units on Three Sides</td>
<td>Revise the courtyard design standards to be bound on 3 sides by dwelling units (not just building facades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Introduce a Landscaping Standard</td>
<td>Require a minimum of 50% of the courtyard area shall be planted with live landscaping materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE DESIGN TOOLS</th>
<th>SITE DESIGN STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H Increase Minimum Zone Lot Size and Width</td>
<td>Increase the minimum zone lot width to 75’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the minimum zone lot size to 9,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Limit the Block Sensitive Setback</td>
<td>The maximum block-sensitive setback minimum shall be 20’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICULAR DESIGN TOOLS</th>
<th>VEHICULAR DESIGN STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Limit Vehicle Use Areas</td>
<td>Vehicle use areas shall not be located between the primary street zone lot line and the rear of the minimum courtyard depth extended to the full width of the zone lot line. Provide an exception for zone lots without alley access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This graphic illustrates a design outcome using the tools described in the Multi Unit Garden Court Strategy on an interior lot in a G-MU-3 zone district.
SOLUTION FOR ROW HOUSE/TOWN HOUSE DISTRICTS

The recommended strategy includes a package of tools that would not allow ‘slot home’ construction, or other development currently allowed by zoning standards for the Garden Court building form, in row house and town house districts. Instead, side-by-side residential units could be built as duplexes, row houses or townhouses where all residential units face the street to match the surrounding neighborhood context of lower-scale development (often including single-family homes and duplexes) that directly engages the street. Refer to the Slot Home Strategy for more details and examples.

RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ROW HOUSE BUILDING FORM IN ROW HOUSE (RH) AND TOWN HOUSE (TH) ZONE DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Require Units Oriented to the Street</strong></td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit shall be oriented to the corresponding street. For the corner dwelling unit, the dwelling unit shall be oriented to the primary street. Oriented to the Street: Each unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one other dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VEHICULAR DESIGN**

| Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions     | Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’ |

The following graphics illustrate design outcomes using the tools described in the Row House Strategy on an interior and corner lot in a U-RH-2.5 zone district.
SCHEDULE AND NEXT STEPS

The final strategy report has been informed by the thorough review and evaluation of Slot Home Task Force, External Testing Group, and the community. These strategies and standards will inform the drafting of the text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code (DZC). The text amendment and adoption process will include the following steps.

- **Task Force Review of Draft Text Amendment.** The Slot Home Task Force will review the Draft Text Amendment to the DZC. Any recommended changes will be made prior to the public review draft.

- **Public Review of Draft Text Amendment.** The Draft Text Amendment will be published online for the public to review and provide comments. During this time, staff will present to the Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC) Zoning and Planning (ZAP) committee. Any other Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs) or other interested organizations may request a staff presentation on the proposed Text Amendment.

- **Planning Board.** The Denver Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the proposed Text Amendment and consider it against the review criteria found in Section 12.4.11.4 of the DZC. The Planning Board will receive public input via written comments and public testimony, and ultimately make a recommendation to the Denver City Council.

- **Denver City Council.** The Denver City Council will also hold a public hearing on the proposed Text Amendment and consider it against the review criteria found in Section 12.4.11.4 of the DZC. The City Council will receive public input via written comments and public testimony, and then vote on whether to approve the Text Amendment.

- **Implementation.** The proposed Text Amendment is anticipated to be scheduled for City Council adoption in the second quarter of 2018. If approved, the new standards will take effect approximately three days after City Council adoption following the Mayor’s signature and publication of the ordinance. In recognition of the significant investment required for Site Development Plans (SDP), projects that have submitted a complete formal SDP application prior to the effective date may choose whether to conform to the new regulations or to continue review under the existing DZC. Any SDP not approved within 6 months after the effective date will be subject to the new regulations. Projects that have not made significant progress and therefore not submitted a complete formal SDP application before the text amendment effective date, will be subject to the new regulations proposed with the Text Amendment and described in this Strategy Report.
In recent years, “slot homes” have been constructed in many neighborhoods throughout Denver, resulting in a new development pattern that can detract from the design quality and sense of community in Denver’s neighborhoods. For an illustrated definition of “slot home” development, see page 10.

THE SLOT HOME EVALUATION PROJECT

This report is part of a citywide Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment project being conducted by Denver’s Department of Community Planning and Development (CPD). The project will include research, analysis and public outreach to identify the problem more clearly, explore alternatives and identify tools to promote improved design outcomes. It will culminate in proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code to address slot homes in early 2018. The project will consider all zone districts and building forms that are relevant to slot home construction regardless of where they occur in Denver. This includes the Garden Court building form, which is subject to the regulatory moratorium summarized at right. A stakeholder task force will guide the project and ensure an inclusive public process. See 2.2 Problem Statement for more information.

The Slot Home Evaluation Project will result in specific recommended amendments to the Denver Zoning Code to promote multi-family infill development that engages the public realm, considers the character of the neighborhood, addresses human scale, and minimizes vehicular and neighbor impacts while ensuring solutions that provides equity, flexibility and predictability.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This Problem Identification Report is intended to define issues with slot home development. It describes the existing conditions and regulations under which slot homes are built, summarizes trends in recent slot home construction, and outlines public process used to develop the final problem statement in Section 2.2 on page 36.

Future versions of this report will build on the problem statement with an evaluation of alternatives and a recommended strategy for addressing slot home development. See page 11 for an illustrated project time line.
A “slot home” is a multi-unit residential structure consisting of attached dwelling units arranged side-by-side and primarily perpendicular to the street. Most dwelling units have an individual, direct entrance to the exterior facing a side lot line or center pedestrian court. Individual vehicular garages are generally located beneath each unit. Slot homes are also sometimes called “sideways-facing town homes” or “fraux homes.” As illustrated below and on the following page, slot homes have been built throughout Denver’s neighborhoods using a variety of configurations. See pages 19-22 for additional information on the slot home configurations illustrated below.

### A. Single Row of Slot Homes - See Page 27 For More Information

- **A.** Single row of slot homes with mid-block side facing row homes attached garages below each unit
- **B.** Single row of slot homes with mid-block or corner-lot drive aisle between units attached garages below each unit
- **C.** Single row of slot homes with corner-lot street facing row homes attached garages below each unit
- **D.** Single row of slot homes with mid-block or corner-lot drive aisle between units attached garages below each unit

### B. Slot Homes with a Center Driveway - See Page 28 For More Information

- **A.** Slot homes with a center driveway mid-block or corner-lot drive aisle between units attached garages below each unit
- **B.** Slot homes with a center driveway mid-block or corner-lot drive aisle between units attached garages below each unit
Slot homes occur in a variety of zone districts, from lower-scale Row House (RH) districts to multi-unit (MU) residential districts, mixed-use (MX) commercial districts. Depending on the zone district, slot homes are built using a range of Denver Zoning Code building forms, including the Town House, Row House, Garden Court, Apartment, General and Shopfront forms. See Section 1.2 “Existing Zoning” on page 16 for more information.

C. SLOT HOMES WITH A CENTER PEDESTRIAN COURT OR MEWS - See PAGE 29 For More Information

D. SLOT HOMES WITH DETACHED PARKING IN THE REAR - See PAGE 30 For More Information

SLOT HOME EVALUATION PROJECT TIME LINE

Denver’s Department of Community Planning and Development (CPD) is conducting research, analysis and public outreach to identify the slot home problem more clearly, explore alternatives and identify tools to promote improved design outcomes. The process will lead to proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code to address slot homes in early 2018 as illustrated on the project time line below.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Community engagement in the Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment project will include a stakeholder task force, community open houses, a public adoption process and a range of other engagement opportunities. Each phase of the project will use an iterative stakeholder engagement approach to identify issues and select strategies to address slot home development. City staff will conduct research and generate initial content, the Slot Home Task Force (see below) will review and refine materials, and the wider community will provide feedback back to city staff and the task force.

Slot Home Task Force

The City of Denver’s Department of Community Planning and Development (CPD) has convened the Slot Home Task Force to assist city staff with an evaluation of issues associated with slot home development in Denver’s neighborhoods, and recommend specific zoning text amendments to address identified issues. The 16 member task force represents community and other stakeholder interests, including residents, property owners, Registered Neighborhood Organization (RNO) representatives, elected officials, developers and architects to help ensure an inclusive public process.

Ten task force meetings have been scheduled during the Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project. Early in the process, meetings will focus on better defining issues related to slot homes. The task force will then explore alternative design solutions and recommend specific strategies for updating the Denver Zoning Code. All meetings are open to the public. Visit www.denvergov.org/slothomes for the latest meeting schedule.

The Denver Planning Board and City Council will consider task force recommendations before adopting potential future amendments to the Denver Zoning Code.

Community Open Houses

Open house sessions provide an opportunity for members of the public to review key project documents and provide feedback to the Slot Home Task Force and city staff. They will be scheduled to coincide with project milestones, including issue identification, review of alternative design solutions, proposed strategies and discussion of potential updates to the Denver Zoning Code.

Visit www.denvergov.org/slothomes for information on upcoming open house events.
Other Opportunities for Community Participation

The Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project will include a range of community outreach opportunities in addition to regularly-scheduled public task force meetings. Key opportunities will include:

- **Presentations to Neighborhood Organizations or Others.** Upon request, city staff will attend scheduled neighborhood organization meetings to present the project, answer questions and obtain feedback. City staff will also provide updates to the Zoning and Planning Committee (ZAP) of Inter Neighborhood Cooperation (INC).

- **Office Hours/One-one-one Sessions.** In later phases of this project, city staff will schedule sessions for individual residents or other stakeholders to drop-in and discuss project recommendations.

- **Public Hearings.** In the final phase of the project, the Denver Planning Board and City Council will review, and potentially adopt, proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code. Members of the public may sign up to speak at these public hearings.

- **Web Site and Newsletter.** A project web site at [www.denvergov.org/slothomes](http://www.denvergov.org/slothomes) will provide updated information on project events, community feedback and proposed strategies.

Open house sessions provide an opportunity for members of the public to review key project documents and provide feedback to the Slot Home Task Force and city staff.

Slot Home Task Force members engaging with community members to refine and discuss the problem statement.
1.0 EXISTING SLOT HOME CONDITIONS

Slot homes have been built in many different neighborhoods in a variety of configurations. Their defining characteristic - a sideways orientation at the street - can occur in a range of zone districts using several Denver Zoning Code building forms.

This section provides background information on how and where slot homes occur, and summarizes trends in slot home construction across Denver. It focuses on the existing zoning regulations that allow for slot home construction and typical slot home configurations on a variety of lots. The existing conditions summarized in this section provide a foundation for the draft problem statement set forth in Section 2.0 on page 35.

1.1 PLANNING CONTEXT

Citywide and neighborhood-specific plans articulate the vision and objectives for neighborhood development throughout Denver. Each plan is based on extensive public process that seeks to balance a variety of stakeholder interests. The city uses plan guidance to inform implementation efforts, such as regulatory updates, that shape the character of redevelopment. The adopted plans summarized below provide guidance relevant to addressing slot home development.

**Comprehensive Plan 2000**

This plan sets the overall vision for Denver. It directs planning efforts to build on the city’s legacy of high-quality urban design and stable, attractive neighborhoods. Comprehensive Plan 2000 notes that the Denver Zoning Code is an evolving document that will continue to be revised to promote a built environment with greater overall design integrity. The plan also acknowledges the need to accommodate infill development that is “consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.”

**Blueprint Denver**

This plan builds on Comprehensive Plan 2000 with focused citywide land use and transportation recommendations. It designates the entire city as either an Area of Stability (stable residential areas that may accommodate some new development and redevelopment) or Area of Change (areas where the majority of new development will occur). Blueprint Denver also recommends implementation of specific design standards for neighborhood development including building height, scale, pedestrian access, vehicular access and garage design. The city is currently updating Blueprint Denver as part of the DenverRight planning process.

**Neighborhood & Small Area Plans**

Neighborhood and small area plans provide additional guidance regarding design and development objectives within some individual neighborhoods, corridors and other districts. The city is currently updating or drafting new plans that will cover the whole city through the Neighborhood Planning Initiative.
1.2 EXISTING ZONING

Existing zoning regulations allow for slot home construction in a range of zone districts using a variety of building forms. Specific development standards, such as height limits, setbacks and transparency requirements, shape the form of slot homes and other neighborhood infill. As summarized in the sidebar at left and on page 25, the standards that apply to slot home development have evolved over time. This Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project will propose updates to Denver Zoning Code districts and building forms to address slot home development.

Additional details on zone districts, building forms and design standards that relate to slot home development are provided below.

Zone Districts in Which Slot Homes Occur

Slot homes may be built in a variety of existing zone districts, including Town House (TH), Row House (RH), Multi Unit (MU), Residential Office (RO), Mixed Use (RX, MX) and Main Street (MS) districts. They are also possible in some special zone districts such as Master Planned (M) or Industrial Mixed Use (I-MX). Slot homes are not possible in Single Unit (SU) or Two Unit (TU) districts. Although the zone districts that allow for slot home construction cover a significant portion of the city’s geography, actual slot home construction is concentrated in Multi Unit (MU), Mixed Use (MX) and Row House (RH) zone districts within the Denver Zoning Code’s Urban (U-) and General Urban (G-) neighborhood contexts (primarily established locations relatively near the core of the city), as illustrated in the charts on page 26.

Building Forms Used to Develop Slot Homes

Within each zone district, the development standards associated with one or more building forms may be used to build slot homes. The specific development standards (maximum height, minimum setbacks, etc.) vary by the combination of zone district and building form. Depending on the zone district, slot homes may be built using the Town House, Duplex, Row House, Garden Court, Apartment, General or Shopfront building form standards as summarized in “Summary of Zone Districts & Building Forms” on page 17. Although some Denver Zoning Code building forms are named with an architectural style or land use (i.e., Duplex or Apartment), they do not control the specific architectural style of the building and often allow for a wide range of uses.

The development standards associated with each building form set up a three-dimensional “envelope” in which buildings may be built and specify required features such as entry locations and minimum percentage of transparent windows on the primary street facade. Larger building forms, such as the Apartment, General and Shopfront, allow a flexible three-dimensional envelope that can accommodate a range of smaller buildings. For example, a building built under the Apartment building form may look like a row home or duplex as long as it fits within the Apartment envelope.

The Denver Zoning Code Apartment and General building forms are most often used for slot home development as illustrated in the charts on page 26.
### SUMMARY OF ZONE DISTRICTS & BUILDING FORMS

The table below provides a summary of zone district and building form combinations under which slot homes may be built. The development standards (maximum height, minimum setbacks, etc.). This table does not include Downtown (D-) or special zone districts. As illustrated in the table, slot homes are never possible in Single Unit (SU), Two Unit (TU) districts or using the Suburban House, Urban House, Tandem House or Drive Thru building forms. Development standards that apply to specific zone district and building form combinations are summarized in the table on page 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context/Zone District Category</th>
<th>Building Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-)</td>
<td>Single Unit (SU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town House (TH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Corridor (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)</td>
<td>Single Unit (SU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Unit (TU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town House (TH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Corridor (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)</td>
<td>Single Unit (SU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Unit (TU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row House (RH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)</td>
<td>Row House (RH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Office (RO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center Neighborhood Context (C-)</td>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Creek North (CCN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- = Allows for slot home construction  ☐ = Allows for slot home construction with limitations, or on some lots/streets (see below)

*Two units per building only **Corner lots only (note that Town House and Row House forms are allowed on interior lots but may only have slot home characteristics when located on a corner with driveway access visible from the side street) ***Only in the U-RH-3A zone district on lots with arterial street frontage
DENVER ZONING CODE
NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXTS

The Denver Zoning Code is organized around “neighborhood contexts” intended to capture general development patterns across the city from Downtown to Suburban areas. Neighborhood contexts relevant to slot home development include:

- **Suburban (S-)** with curving streets and varied block shapes/sizes - predominantly single-unit residential and shopping centers
- **Urban Edge (E-)** with curving and grid street patterns - predominantly single-unit residential and smaller shopping areas
- **Urban (U-)** with a regular street grid/alleys - predominantly single and two unit residential with main streets and corner stores
- **General Urban (G-)** with a regular street grid/alleys - predominantly multi-unit residential with main streets and corner stores
- **Urban Center (C-)** with regular street grid/alleys - predominantly multi-unit residential and mixed-use

SLOT HOMES IN FORMER CHAPTER 59 ZONE DISTRICTS

The existing zoning summarized in this section is applicable to the portions of Denver that were zoned after the 2010 Denver Zoning Code Update (nearly all recent slot home construction has occurred in these areas). It does not apply to the approximately 20% of the city that still has site-specific zoning in the Former Chapter 59 zoning code. Such areas are not part of the slot home evaluation project because the Former Chapter 59 zoning code cannot be amended.

---

**Zoning Code Development Standards Related to Slot Homes**

Denver Zoning Code development standards that relate to slot homes include maximum building height, minimum lot size, vehicle access standards, transparency requirements, entry requirements and other standards related to land use and building form. Specific development standards that relate to slot homes are summarized below. The illustrations on page 22 and table on page 23 provide a summary of applicable development standards.

**Maximum Building Height Standards**

In some Town House (TH) and Row House (RH) zone districts, maximum permitted building height is 2.5 stories or 30’. However, in most zone districts where slot homes are built, the height limit is 3 stories or 40’-45’. In high-scale mixed-use commercial districts where slot homes are sometimes built, maximum height can be as high as 5 stories or 70’, but slot home construction in these districts rarely exceeds about 3 stories or 45’ based on market conditions and building code requirements.

**Measurement of Maximum Building Height**

Building heights in feet are measured from a “base plane” calculated using the average of existing grades. In some cases, zoning height measurement rules do not count raised basements or garden levels as even though they may appear as an additional story when viewed from the street. In zone districts with 2.5 or 3 story height limits, this may result in buildings that appear to be 3 or 4 stories (or more using the height exceptions described below).

**Exceptions to Maximum Building Height**

All zone districts have permitted height exceptions for unoccupied building features, such as rooftop mechanical equipment and screening, elevator penthouses, and unoccupied rooftop stairwell access. The design parameters and maximum height exceptions are specific to each zone district, and most building features that exceed the maximum height must be set back from the perimeter of the building.

**View Planes**

In some areas, view planes establish more restrictive height limits to protect views of downtown and the mountains from specific vantage points. Generally, the closer a structure is located to the viewpoint, the more restrictive the height. View plane maps are posted to the city’s web site.
Build-to Standards

Build-to standards require that buildings be located within a specified setback range for a minimum percentage of the lot width to bring buildings close to the sidewalk edge and promote an active frontage. Build-to standards apply to the Shopfront and General building forms in all neighborhood contexts and to the Row House and Apartment building forms in the General Urban (G-) neighborhood context.

Alternatives to Build-to Standards

When a building cannot fully comply with the required build-to standards, the Denver Zoning Code allows for a certain percentage of the build-to requirement to be met by prescribed alternatives. These alternatives include garden walls, pergolas, courtyards and arcades.

Minimum Setback Standards

Minimum setback standards dictate building location in relation to front, side and rear lot lines. In Mixed Use (MX) and Main Street (MS) districts, there is generally no minimum primary street, side or rear setback required. In some cases, minimum required setbacks vary by building form.

Primary Street Block Sensitive Setbacks

In lower-scale residential zone districts in the Suburban (S-), Urban Edge (E-), Urban (U-), and General Urban (G-) neighborhood contexts, a minimum primary street block sensitive is required to maintain the existing front yard character along a block. When required, the block sensitive setback takes into account the primary street setbacks of existing structures surrounding a property where redevelopment is proposed. A required block sensitive setback will generally be greater than the Denver Zoning Code setback otherwise prescribed for the lot.

BUILD-TO ALTERNATIVES

When a building cannot fully comply with required build-to standards, the Denver Zoning Code allows for a certain percentage of the requirement to be met by alternatives that clearly define the public realm, as illustrated in the examples below. See Denver Zoning Code Section 13.1.5.6.E for additional details and larger-scale illustrations.

“Garden Wall” is one of the most commonly used build-to alternatives. It allows masonry walls or mental fences with masonry piers to meet a specified percentage of the build-to requirement.

The "Permanent Outdoor Patio Seating" build-to alternative allows permanent seating areas to meet a specified percentage of the build-to requirement.

PRIMARY & SIDE STREET DESIGNATIONS

In most zone districts, the primary street is considered the zone lot line abutting the "long side of an oblong block," whereas the side street abuts the "short side of an oblong block." While some exceptions do apply, these street designations compel corresponding zoning standards such as build-to, setbacks, etc., with the Primary Street typically including the most prescriptive set of standards.
**Transparency Standards**

Transparency standards require a minimum percentage of transparent glass located within a “zone of transparency” (near eye level) on street level building facades to promote a more active and engaging frontage. They apply to the Apartment, Row House, General and Shopfront building forms in all zone districts.

**Transparency Alternatives**

Like Build-to, when a building cannot fully comply with the required transparency, a certain percentage of the requirement can be provided using pre-defined alternatives that also engage the frontage, like ATMs, enhanced wall design (the most commonly used transparency alternative for slot homes), permanent outdoor eating/serving areas, and permanent art.

**Pedestrian Access Standards**

Pedestrian access standards specify required locations and features for building entries. They apply to all building forms in all zone districts, ranging from simple “Entry Features” (which can include gates or other features) on Duplex forms to an “Entrance” (which must be a street-facing door) on most other building forms. The Row House building form requires each unit to have a street-facing Entrance, while the Apartment, General and Shopfront building forms require only one Entrance per building.

**Street Level Active Use Standards**

The General and Shopfront building forms in the Urban (U-), General Urban (G-) and Urban Center (C-) neighborhood contexts limit inactive uses (parking structures, mini-storage, and some industrial uses) for a depth of 15’ along a percentage of the street level building facade to promote an active street frontage. Required percentages are highest for the Shopfront and General building forms in the Urban Center (C-) neighborhood context.
Vehicle Parking Standards

The amount of vehicle parking required greatly influences site layout and building design. Residential vehicle parking requirements vary by neighborhood context from 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit in Suburban (S-), 1 space in Urban Edge (E-), Urban (U-) and General Urban (G-), to 0.75 spaces in Urban Center (C-). The Denver Zoning Code allows for certain reductions or exemptions from parking for proximity to enhanced transit facilities/corridors, programmatic features, such as care and bike share, or use and lot characteristics. Most commonly, slot home developments provide 2 spaces per dwelling unit.

Parking Lot Design Criteria

Parking lots must be designed to meet minimum configuration standards to ensure usability and maneuverability. For slot home development, key standards include a minimum 23’ wide drive aisle for two-way drive-aisles, a 5’ back out space at the dead-end of a drive-aisle, and a requirement that each surface or garage parking space must be accessible in no more than two standard movements.

Parking Encroachment into Setbacks

In some cases, the Denver Zoning Code allows surface parking to encroach into side interior, side street or primary street setbacks. Slot homes built under the Apartment building form generally allow parking within the side interior setback only in the rear of the zone lot.

Landscaping & Grading Requirements

The Denver Zoning Code requires that all open areas within the build-to range and required setbacks be landscaped with at least 50% living material. Open areas are areas that are not covered by a permitted site improvement, such as a building or sidewalk. For most slot home development in zone districts with setbacks requirements, the Denver Zoning Code restricts the amount of grading that can be done within the first 10’ of the zone lot boundary and generally prohibits altering of grades within the side-interior setback.

PROTECTED DISTRICTS

The Denver Zoning Code designates some zone districts as “Protected Districts” that introduce requirements for compatible scale transitions between lower and higher-scale zone districts. Protected districts include Single Unit (SU) and Two Unit (TU) zone districts in all neighborhood contexts, Townhouse, lower scale Multi Unit districts in the Suburban (S-) and Urban Edge (E-) neighborhood contexts and Row House (RH) in Urban (U-) and General (G-) neighborhood contexts. Special requirements associated with Protected Districts apply to lots in adjacent higher-scale districts rather than lots within the Protected Districts themselves.

A slot home built on a lot adjacent to a Protected District must incorporate a larger side interior setback and further setback building elements taller than 27’ along the lot line adjoining the Protected District.
The graphics below illustrate key existing Denver Zoning Code standards that are relevant to slot home design in Denver. Letter labels refer to the summary table of zoning standards on the following page.
The table below summarizes key existing Denver Zoning Code standards that are relevant to slot home design in Denver. It does not summarize all applicable standards. Letter labels in the left column refer to key standards illustrated on the previous page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HEIGHT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Stories &amp; Feet (max)</td>
<td>For most zone districts and building forms where slot homes are permitted, the maximum building height is 2.5 to 3 stories (35’ to 45’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Stories &amp; Feet (max on rear portion of lot)</td>
<td>In Row House (RH) zone districts, building height is further limited on the rear 20%-35% of lot depth and a bulk plane limits height at the sides of a lot. In other districts (MU, MX, MS), height limits do not vary across the lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Height Exceptions</td>
<td>Features such as roof parapets and eaves may exceed height limits. Unoccupied elevator penthouses and roof access stairwells may generally exceed height limits by up to 1 story (12’).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SITING</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Required Build-To</td>
<td>In MX, RX, MS, MU, and RO zone districts, buildings must be located near the Primary Street for 50%-70% of the frontage to help activate the public realm. Standard does not apply in RH zone districts or to the Garden Court building form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Zone Lot Width &amp; Size (min)</td>
<td>In MX, RX, and MS zone districts, there is no minimum zone lot size. For MU and RO zone districts, the minimum zone lot dimensions are 50’ wide and a size of 6,000 square feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SETBACKS &amp; BUILDING COVERAGE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Primary Street (min)</td>
<td>Some low scale residential zone districts require a block sensitive setback. Otherwise the required setback varies from 0’ (MX, MS districts) to 20’ (RH Districts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Side Street (min)</td>
<td>Most zone districts require buildings to be set back a minimum of 5’ from a side street zone lot line. No side street setback is required in MX or MS zone districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Side Interior (min)</td>
<td>Most zone districts and building forms require buildings to be set back a minimum of 5’ to 7.5’ from a side zone lot line. No side interior setback is required in MX or MS zone districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Rear, alley/no alley (min)</td>
<td>Most zone districts require buildings to be set back at least 10’ to 12’ from the rear zone lot line when there is an alley or 10’ to 20’ when there is not an alley. A rear setback is not generally required in MX or MS zone districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARKING</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Surface Parking between building and street</td>
<td>Surface parking is not allowed on primary streets. Surface parking is not allowed on primary or side streets in MS districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Vehicle Access, 3 or more side-by-side dwelling units in one structure</td>
<td>For all zone districts and building forms, slot homes must take vehicular access from an alley. Where no alley is present, street access is allowed. This special slot home standard was added to the Denver Zoning Code in 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESIGN ELEMENTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Upper Story Setback adjacent to a Protected District</td>
<td>When buildings are built adjacent to Protected Districts, upper stories (above 27’) on the side of the building facing the Protected District must be set back at least 25’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Street Level Activation</td>
<td>25% to 30% transparent glass is generally required on the Street Level facing a Primary Street. Requirements are higher in MS districts and no transparency is required for the Garden Court building form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Transparency, Side Street (min)</td>
<td>25% transparent glass is generally required on the Street Level facing a Side Street. No transparency is required for the Garden Court building form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Street Level Transparency Alternatives</td>
<td>Alternatives to transparent glass may be used to meet up to 80% of the transparency requirement. Alternatives include special wall design elements and permanent art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Pedestrian Access, Primary Street</td>
<td>Each building is generally required to have at least one entrance facing the Primary Street. The Row House and Garden Court forms require Street Level entrances for each dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>USES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Zoning Standards Relevant to Slot Homes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> In U-MX and G-MX zone districts, 40% of the Street Level facing a Primary Street must include uses other than parking. In C-MX and all MS zone districts, 100% of the Street Level facing a Primary Street must include uses other than parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 SLOT HOME DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

As summarized in the previous section, slot homes can be developed in a wide range of zone districts, using several Denver Zoning Code building forms. Zoning code allowances have combined with recent real estate market conditions to produce a significant boom in slot home construction across the city. Trends in the typical location of slot homes are summarized below. The timeline on the next page illustrates past regulatory and market conditions that have culminated in the current slot home boom, the characteristics of which are summarized on page 26. Pages 27-30 illustrate typical slot home configurations that have been built in Denver.

Typical Neighborhood & Block Locations

While slot home development is technically possible in wide variety of neighborhoods across the city, it has been most intensive in older neighborhoods near downtown and on square blocks where multiple alleys (such as some blocks in West Colfax, Jefferson Park and Highlands) may offer advantages for vehicular access.

Slot Home Compatibility by Location

Compatibility is influenced by the context of the area where slot homes are built. When a block consists primarily of single family homes and duplexes, but is within a zone district that allows for larger-scale multifamily development, a new slot home development is often seen as incompatible. However, the same slot home development may be significantly more compatible if located on a block that is already more diverse with existing multifamily and slot home development. Where slot homes have been built in mixed-use commercial areas such as Tennyson Street in the Berkeley neighborhood, they may create a gap in the active street frontage.

In some neighborhoods, slot home development may be seen as compatible even where single family homes predominate because local objectives favor redevelopment and change. Most such neighborhoods are designated as Blueprint Denver Areas of Change. See “Blueprint Denver” on page 15 for more information.

Typical Lot Sizes and Dimensions for Slot Homes

Slot home development tends to occur on relatively narrow and deep lots, as illustrated in the charts on page 26. However, some of the slot home configurations illustrated on pages 27-30 require wider lots. These configurations tend to be built in neighborhoods, such as West Colfax, with small single-family homes on large lots.
Slot homes are not a new phenomenon despite the growing attention across the city. Slot homes have been impacted by various forces such as building codes, zoning and real estate market forces. The following timeline is an overview of the impacts and some of the developments that have occurred over time.

**First Zoning Ordinance**
- **1925**
  - Denver’s first zoning ordinance is adopted defining zones regulating building height and use.

**Former Chapter 59 Zoning**
- **1956**
  - The city adopted and mapped the first zoning code addressing uses and building limitations for all development. In response to city growth and the needs for the multi-family housing, many of Denver’s single-family residential neighborhoods were zoned R-3 or R-4 allowing for multi-family uses and regulating through floor area ratio instead of building height.

**Slot Home Beginnings**
- **1974**
  - Development of sideways facing town homes lacking pedestrian entries and featuring large garages at the street became more common. This development type was commonly occurred in R-3 zoning.

**Denver Zoning Code**
- **2010**
  - The adoption and mapping of the Denver Zoning Code leads a new form based approach and the introduction of new standards such as pedestrian entries, transparency, block-sensitive setbacks to promote new development that contribute to the pedestrian experience on the street.

**Neighborhood Redevelopment**
- **2005**
  - Following two decades of growth and redevelopment, sideways facing town homes evolve to a larger scale infill development providing additional density and amenities to the development.

**Construction Defects**
- **2011**
  - Developers react to the construction defects law with a sharp decrease in condo development, reducing the number of new for-sale housing units. As a result, developers began to search for new ways to construct for-sale fee-simple multi-unit housing.

**More Slot Homes**
- **2013**
  - In response to market demands, slot homes become a more prevalent development trend emerging in traditionally low-scale residential neighborhoods.

**City Initiates Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment**
- **2016**
  - Community Planning and Development kicks off the Slot Home evaluation and text amendment project to consider all zone districts and building forms that are relevant to slot home construction. Slot homes are described as sideways facing residential buildings that turn their sides to the street and may detract from the quality and the community of Denver’s neighborhoods.

**DZC Text Amendments**
- **2014**
  - CPD initiated a series of text amendments to address some of the concerns associated to slot homes. Improvements to the code addressed pedestrian entries, transparency alternatives, revised vehicular access to require alley access, and increased street level active use requirements in MS districts and created standards in MX districts. All of these amendments were adopted with the intent to achieve a better quality of experience for the pedestrian environment.

**Garden Court Moratorium**
- **2016**
  - City Council approved a moratorium on the use of the Garden Court building form, with exceptions, finding that the recent and proposed projects were not appropriate or consistent with the intent of the form.
The charts below provide a graphic summary of slot home developments approved in 2015 and 2016 through the Site Development Plan (SDP) process. While the analysis is intended to capture a variety of slot homes across the city, it does not encompass every slot home approved or constructed since 2014.

**ZONE DISTRICTS**
- G-MU-3
- U-MX-3
- G-RH-3
- G-RO-3; G-RO-5; U-MS-2;
- U-RH-3A; U-RH-2.5; C-MX-3;
- C-MX-5; I-MX-3; E-MU-2.5

**NEIGHBORHOODS**
- WEST COLFAX
- JEFFERSON PARK
- HIGHLANDS
- FIVE POINTS
- CHERRY CREEK; SUNNYSIDE;
- BERKELEY; UNIVERSITY; HALE;
- CITY PARK WEST; NORTH
- CAPITOL HILL; REGIS

**BUILDING FORM**
- GENERAL
- APARTMENT
- ROW HOUSE
- GARDEN COURT
- SHOP FRONT
- TOWN HOUSE
- DUPLEX

**ZONE LOT CHARACTERISTICS**
- 12,500 SF (MEDIAN)
- ranging from as small as
  - 5,900 SF
  - to 28,150 SF
- 90’ WIDE

**ZONE DISTRICTS**
- 12,500 SF (MEDIAN)
- ranging from as small as
  - 5,900 SF
  - to 28,150 SF
- 90’ WIDE

**FORM CHARACTERISTICS**
- 80% of Slot Homes are built in 3 story districts
- 91% are built within 1-foot of the side setbacks
- 42% provide twice the parking required

**BUILDINGS**
- 2 are contained within the average slot home development

**DWELLING UNITS**
- 10 for an average development (with some as small as 3 units and others as large as 28 units)

**NO FRONT PORCH**
- 60% of slot homes did not provided any sort of front porch on the development

**BLOCK SENSITIVE SETBACK**
- 38% of slot homes were subject to a block sensitive setback

**ALLEY ACCESS**
- 77% provided vehicular access from the alley

**ROOF DECK**
- 83% provided a roof deck, which often required a height exception
SLOT HOMES IN DENVER - A Single Row

The following four pages provide a sample of typical slot home configurations that have been built in Denver. The model images do not illustrate surrounding context, which likely influences their compatibility.

As illustrated on this page, a single row of slot homes is a common configuration, especially in neighborhoods with a pattern of narrow lots, or where lot consolidation is difficult. This configuration can generally be built on a lot as narrow as about 60’ wide, which allows for 5’-7.5’ setback on the pedestrian access side, 25’-30’ street level building width (allowing for garage depth and a small entry) and a 23’ wide driveway. Per the chart below, the Denver Zoning Code generally allows this configuration to be built using the Apartment, General or Shopfront (but not the Garden Court) building forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District Category</th>
<th>Town House</th>
<th>Garden Court</th>
<th>Row House</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Shopfront</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town House (TH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row House (RH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Configuration could be built in the building form
= Configuration could be on a corner lot if able to meet the standards of the Row House or Town House

---

Side interior pedestrian entry
Primary street setback ‘front lawn’
Individual garages face side interior drive aisle
Side interior drive aisle
SLOT HOMES IN DENVER - Center Drive

Two rows of slot homes with a vehicular access driveway located between buildings is one of the most common slot home configurations, especially in neighborhoods with a pattern of wider lots, or where alley access is not present. Generally, this configuration can be built on a lot as narrow as about 100’ wide. Slot homes with a center driveway are most commonly built using the Apartment building form in the G-MU-3 zone district. Because the required courtyard must not be used for vehicle access, the Denver Zoning Code Garden Court building form does not allow for this slot home configuration, per the chart below.

### Building Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District Category</th>
<th>Garden Court</th>
<th>Row House</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>General Shopfront</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town House (TH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row House (RH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Office (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor (CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (MX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **= Configuration could be built in the building form
- **= Configuration could be on a corner lot if able to meet the standards of the Row House or Town House

* This type may also occur in the duplex building form.

---

Side interior pedestrian entry
Primary street setback
Center drive aisle garage entries
Row house appearance when located on corner
SLOT HOMES IN DENVER - Center Court/Mews

Two rows of slot homes are sometimes configured around an interior court or mews (pedestrian access walkway) with vehicular access driveways located at either side, or to the rear along the alley. Because this configuration usually requires a wider lot than the “center drive,” it is most often located on:

» Zone lots with public alley frontage on one or both sides that may be used as a driveway

» Zone lots in Row House (RH) zone districts where the Garden Court is the only Denver Zoning Code building form that allows for slot home development

» Zone lots greater than about 125’ in width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District Category</th>
<th>Building Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town House (TH)</td>
<td>Town House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row House (RH)</td>
<td>Garden Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Unit (MU)</td>
<td>Row House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Office (RO)</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor (CC)</td>
<td>Shortfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street (MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Configuration could be built in the building form
- Configuration could be on a corner lot if able to meet the standards of the Row House or Town House

Side interior garage entries
Interior pedestrian entries from court/mews
Primary street setback ‘front lawn’
Side interior drive aisle
SLOT HOMES IN DENVER - Detached Parking

Each of the three previously illustrated slot home configuration (a single row, center driveway and center court) is sometimes built with parking detached (usually at the rear of the lot) from the primary structure rather than located below each unit. This variation often appears very different because it promotes front-facing units and does not include a side driveway to provide individual garage access. It is most often located on lots about 50'-60' wide where a side driveway would not be possible. Slot homes with detached garages are most commonly built using the Apartment building form in the G-MU-3 zone district. When this configuration is built with two rows around a center pedestrian court, it may be built in an Row House (RH) zone district using the Garden Court form per the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District Category</th>
<th>Town House (TH)</th>
<th>Row House (RH)</th>
<th>Multi Unit (MU)</th>
<th>Residential Mixed Use (RX)</th>
<th>Residential Office (RO)</th>
<th>Commercial Corridor (CC)</th>
<th>Mixed Use (MX)</th>
<th>Main Street (MS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ☐ = Configuration could be built in the building form
- ☐ = Configuration could be built side by side around a pedestrian walkway meeting the standards for a "Garden Court"
1.4 ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Slot Home Development is not only subject to Denver Zoning Code Standards, but other standards such as Building Code and Fire Code shape the built form, site layout and the public realm. Through the Site Development Plan (SDP) review process and subsequent development permits, various agencies review the development proposal to ensure compliance with city and other applicable regulations. The following is a summary of standards required by other agencies within the city that are most applicable to slot home development.

**The Parks & Recreation Forestry Office**

The Parks & Recreation Forestry Office is the city agency responsible for trees in public parks, parkways and other public property. The city forester must approve through a permit the removal or planting of any street trees.

- Denver’s street trees are under regulation of the City Forester, but their maintenance is a responsibility shared by adjacent property owners.
- Permits are required prior to the removal or planting of any street trees. Once a tree has been permitted for removal, there is no requirement to replace the tree.
- If the conditions will not lead to the success of the tree, street trees will not be required by the City Forester. However, the forester will work with applicants to develop creative solutions for trees to thrive in a variety of conditions.
- Public Works ROW Inspection Services currently conducts the inspection of street trees as shown on the approved Site Development Plan.
- Currently, there are no rules that mandate the planning of trees for new developments.

Per conversations with the Forestry Office, the following development impacts have shown to be problematic with regard to maintaining and promoting Denver’s street trees:

- Often, when transitioning from an attached to detached sidewalk, existing street trees are at jeopardy of being lost.
- Permitted encroachments into the build-to or districts with 0-foot front setbacks can result in trees being removed on the property. Often these buildings impact to the root system of trees located within the ROW.
- Often, taller buildings (3-stories and above) that are built at the front setback can have impacts on the street trees and the building occupies space that the tree canopy would have previously occupied.

**DENVER ZONING CODE TREE PRESERVATION**

*The Denver Zoning Code provides additional standards for single-unit and two unit zone districts whereas, owner of the zone lot shall be required to preserve any established tree within the primary and side street setback areas of the zone lot. (Denver Zoning Code 10.5.3.1)*
Public Works

Public Works manages most the use of the city’s right-of-way. The public right-of-way (ROW) is an area of land owned or controlled by the city for the purposes of constructing, operating and maintaining public facilities such as streets, alleys, sidewalks, bike paths for the needs of transportation, utilities and other public infrastructure.

Public Works Development Services is responsible for determining the required improvements and reviewing plans for regulatory compliance in the areas of transportation, survey and right-of-way management.

Public Works also operates other city services such as solid waste management, parking operations, wastewater management, and street maintenance.

Each site and development is reviewed on a case by case basis; however, the following points are some standards that relate to slot home development:

- To determine whether attached sidewalks or detached sidewalks are required, the staff reviewer will analyze the existing context and make a determination of the character. Exceptions are: arterials and RTD bus routes are always detached sidewalks.
- The typical standard in residential areas is a 5-foot sidewalk with an 8-foot tree lawn; however, this often varies based on the context of the surrounding properties.
- Public Works does not have any landscaping requirements that are applied to the ROW. However, some materials are prohibited for use in the ROW.
- The property owner is responsible for the care and maintenance of their property frontage. For slot homes, this most commonly means that the units “fronting” the street are required to maintain the sidewalk and “tree lawn.”
- Public Works will review all alley vacations (per policy Street and Alley Vacation Number 5 Effective November 15, 2006) which evaluates the alley’s need to support the street grid system and to ensure maintained or improved existing condition.
- Developments located on the corner of the property, often required a pedestrian sight triangle at the corner of the alley.
- Public Works will defer to the Zoning Code on Vehicular Access which typically requires access to be from the alley when present and from the street when no alley is present.

Solid Waste

Solid Waste Management provides solid waste collection (trash, recycling and composting) for single-family homes and small multi-family units. Small multi-family units are considered 1-7 units. Developments with more than 7 units must contract with a private sector hauler to obtain solid waste and disposal services. The bins are to be kept on the private property and out of public view between collection days.
Denver Building Code (Building & Fire)

The building and fire department is responsible for the enforcement and inspections of the city’s building and fire codes through the review of Site Development Plans and issuance of building permits.

Slot Homes can be built under the International Building Code (IBC) or the International Residential Code (IRC). Most commonly, slot homes are built under the IRC. The following bullets are some of the standards required by the IRC that apply to slot home development:

- Buildings are limited to 3 stories. For buildings with a roof-top stair enclosure, a maximum 6-inch roof overhang can occur for weather protection, however the overhang cannot exceed this dimension as to create additional habitable space above the third floor.
- Buildings must be set up in a “townhouse” format, the stacking of units prohibited.
- Interior lot line setbacks are 3-feet to allow for egress and openings, if the setback is between 3 and 5’ opening are limited to 25% of the wall. However, it is more common to build at a 5-foot setback which allows for unlimited openings and windows.
- Buildings can typically build at a 0-foot setback on the primary street and rear alley lot line.
- In most situations, buildings that are cantilevered over drive aisles must maintain a 6-foot separation between units (3-feet on each unit) as an alternative to continue the 2-hour fire wall to the ground. A greater separation may be required depending on the length of the cantilevered portion of the building. If the building is equipped with a sprinkler system, no separations are required.
- Slot homes that comprise of two buildings must maintain a separation of 10-feet between the cantilevers.
- One entrance to each unit provide direct access into common living space.
- Units that are more than 150-feet from the street are required to be sprinklered.
- Egress windows from the bedrooms are required
- When required, Fire Alarm Control Panel (FACP) must be located at the sidewalk of the addressed side of the building, clearly labeled and easily accessible for emergency fire access.
- Roof access is only required for buildings 4 stories or greater.
- A 5-foot sidewalk or clear access is requires along the property lines to provide access to the bedrooms.

These building and fire standards are in addition to zoning requirements. Whatever requirement is more strict, the stricter regulation applies. So even though the building and fire code may allow reduced setbacks, if the zoning code has greater setbacks, the zoning code regulations will apply.
2.0 IDENTIFYING THE SLOT HOME PROBLEM

Denver residents have struggled with issues related to the compatibility of slot home development for many years. Recent updates to the Denver Zoning Code have addressed some previously-identified concerns with slot home development, but included only a few “quick wins” (see “2015 Zoning Text Amendment” on page 16 for more information). The Slot Home Evaluation Project will include a comprehensive review of community-identified issues associated with slot homes.

This section provides information on the process to better identify slot home issues and provides a formal problem statement that will provide a foundation for evaluation of alternative designs and recommended strategies.

2.1 PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

City staff, the Slot Home Task force and general public all contributed to development of the Problem Identification Statement on the next page. The process included:

- **City Staff Evaluation & Refinement.** Staff reviewed previous community comments and surveyed existing slot home development to draft an initial problem identification statement for task force and community review. Staff also refined the statement based on task force and community feedback.

- **Task Force Review.** The Slot Home Task Force met three times to review staff’s initial problem identification statement, tour slot home developments and provide feedback to inform a refined problem identification statement for presentation to the community. Task force feedback resulted in the addition of “Building Mass & Scale” as a problem statement element, additional consideration of impacts to neighborhood context and other problem statement refinements. Task force review also resulted in introduction of the “Criteria For Successful Solutions” on page 37 to ensure that strategies proposed in later project phases successfully balance multiple community objectives.

- **Community Review.** City staff and the Slot Home Task Force hosted a community open house to solicit community comments on the task force’s draft problem identification statement. Open house participants were generally supportive of the draft problem statement, with particular emphasis on issues with public realm engagement, changes to neighborhood context and inappropriate building mass/scale. Participants also expressed a range of other concerns, including problems with parking, poor construction quality and landscaping in the public-right-of-way. Community feedback resulted in refinements to the Public Realm Engagement problem statement element and the addition of ‘rooftop decks’ to the Impacts on Neighbors element.

An appendix to this report includes a summary of community and task force feedback, including open house comments and task force meeting summaries.

REMINDER: WHAT IS A SLOT HOME?

For the purpose of this evaluation and problem identification, a “slot home” is a multi-unit residential structure consisting of attached dwelling units arranged side-by-side and primarily perpendicular to the street. Most dwelling units have an individual, direct entrance to the exterior adjacent to a side lot line. Individual vehicular garages are generally located beneath each unit.

Slot homes are also sometimes called “sideways-facing town homes” or “fraux homes.” See “Slot Homes in Denver” on page 10 for more information.
2.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The following problem identification statement is based on the community and Slot Home Task Force feedback summarized on the previous page, as well as evaluation of the existing slot home characteristics and trends summarized in Chapter 1.0 Existing Slot Home Conditions. It will guide the remaining steps in the project, including a recommended strategy to address slot homes, and a proposed Denver Zoning Code text amendment.

The problem is new slot home construction that does not promote neighborhood objectives* in five key respects:

1. **Public Realm Engagement.** Many slot homes do not engage the street, sidewalk and semi-public frontages with street level building activities, porches, or pedestrian entrances and transparency (windows) that promote interaction with neighbors and ownership of the public realm.

2. **Neighborhood Context.** The siting, setbacks and uses (residential, commercial, etc.) within slot homes sometimes do not reflect the existing character or desired future conditions* of the street, block and neighborhood.

3. **Building Mass & Scale.** Many slot homes do not incorporate Human Scale proportions, heights and design elements that could promote compatible mass and scale relationships among buildings, such as coordinated facade widths, heights in stories, window patterns or distinctions between building floors.

4. **Vehicle-oriented Design.** Slot homes often incorporate visible driveways, parking areas and garage doors that negatively impact the pedestrian-oriented character of the street, sidewalk, and neighborhood.

5. **Impacts on Neighbors.** Slot homes often orient their most active facade areas towards adjacent properties, rather than the street and sidewalk, or include other elements, such as rooftop decks, which may have negative visual, solar, or privacy impacts on neighbors.

*Note that desired future conditions and neighborhood objectives are informed by the existing zoning intent statements, small area plans and citywide plans.
CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL SOLUTIONS

Solutions to identified issues with slot home development should balance multiple community objectives. The task force and city staff will use the draft criteria outlined below to ensure that the recommended strategy (to be proposed in Phase 3 of the Slot Home Evaluation project) successfully balances multiple objectives. Note that the criteria will be refined to reflect community feedback and task force discussion.

EFFECTIVENESS

Proposed solutions should produce outcomes that are consistent with the established vision for the neighborhood or area and directly address one or more elements of the problem statement outlined on page 36, by promoting development that activates the public realm, reflects neighborhood context, incorporates pedestrian-scale elements, emphasizes pedestrian orientation and minimizes the negative impacts of adjacent properties. Where multiple solutions could address the problem statement, the tool that is the least complex and most directly addresses an identified issue will be preferred over a tool that may have wider effects.

EQUITY

Proposed solutions should incorporate feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, including residents, property owners, builders and design professionals. They should also apply equally to similar properties in a variety of neighborhoods across the city and promote the construction and maintenance of housing options for a variety of demographics, including low income residents, singles, families and seniors.

FLEXIBILITY

Proposed solutions should allow property owners and builders to adapt to changing market conditions and maintain flexibility to promote creative designs that can relate to a variety of neighborhood contexts. The desire for flexible solutions should be carefully balanced with a need for predictable outcomes as described below.

PREDICTABILITY

Proposed solutions should result in predictable, clear, outcomes for all stakeholders. This means that property owners should be able to predict the likely outcome of an approval process if they follow the regulations, city staff should be able to consistently interpret regulations and neighborhoods should have a reasonable understanding of the character of development that can occur. Requirements that clearly implement Denver Zoning Code intent statements, building forms and zone districts, support predictable development outcomes.
A number of potential tools could be used to address the Problem Statement as described in Section 2.2. The Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project will focus on zoning tools (also called zoning standards) that may be implemented through a text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code.

This section outlines a range of zoning tools and associated standards that could be used to address the Problem Statement. Most of the tools are currently used in some part of the Denver Zoning Code. Additional tools that are not currently used in any part of the Denver Zoning Code have been added to this section for consideration and evaluation by the task force. Many of the tools, however, do not currently apply to Denver Zoning Code building forms that are commonly used to develop slot homes, or could be calibrated to more directly address future slot home development.

The tools outlined in this section are organized into "Building Design Tools" (the vertical component of development and redevelopment), "Site Design Tools" (the arrangement of buildings and spaces on a site) and "Vehicle Use Area Tools" (the arrangement and design of spaces used for vehicular movement and parking). The description of each tool includes a summary of potential advantages and disadvantages as identified by the Slot Home Task Force, as well as initial ideas on use of the tool to address the Problem Statement. This analysis along with additional Slot Home Task Force discussion has informed the recommended use of the selected tools into inclusion of the strategy. Tools identified for inclusion in the strategy "are recommended for further evaluation and testing as part of the strategy" and denoted with a green check mark.

Details on the specific application of the tools, numerical standards and general rules are found in the next Section 4.0 Slot Home Strategy. If the recommended tools do not adequately address the problem statement, additional tools within this section may be considered for evaluation.
3.1 BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS

Building design tools address the vertical component of development and redevelopment, which includes the visual and functional character of individual buildings. The Denver Zoning Code (DZC) currently uses the building design tools summarized below, although some tools do not currently apply to slot home development.

Transparency Standards

Transparency Standards are intended to maximize the transparency through the use of windows at the street level to activate the street. Additionally, the use of doors and windows can be used to establish scale, variation, and patterns on building facades that provide visual interest and reflect the uses within the building.

Transparency must be applied within the Zone of Transparency which is located at the street level between 2 to 9 feet in elevation to count toward the standard.

Transparency standards relate to public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Transparency standards:
- Transparency provides ownership and engagement to the public realm
- Provides architectural interest and scaling elements to the facade

Disadvantages of Transparency standards:
- May be difficult to ensure that transparency meets the intent of street level activation when located on garages or stairwells

Potential use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Consider revisions to the Rule of Measurement (ROM) to allow for windows on residential uses to be elevated
- Connect transparency standards to active use requirements

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Transparency Alternatives

Transparency alternatives are intended to provide visual interest on building facades, to activate the public street and sidewalk, and enhance the visual quality of the built environment along street level facade areas where windows do not provide sufficient transparency or when otherwise not feasible.

Transparency alternatives can be applied singularly or in combination to meet the required transparency standard, however alternatives cannot be used to meet the entirety of the transparency standard. Permitted alternatives are:

- Display cases
- Automated Teller Machines (ATM)
- Wall Design
- Permanent Outdoor Eating/Serving Areas
- Permanent Art

Transparency alternatives relate to public realm engagement elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Transparency Alternatives:
- Provides flexibility for areas where windows are not feasible

Disadvantages of Transparency Alternatives:
- Reduces predictability of outcomes
- May not sufficiently activate the public realm

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Explore appropriateness of alternatives
- Consider providing a different range of alternatives that more effectively activate the public realm

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Building Height

Building height maximum is measured in stories as well as feet. The intent of the building height maximum in stories is to provide a simple reference for visualizing building height and to provide a consistency of building scale to maintain the neighborhood context. In some districts, an additional Half Story is permitted to allow for additional floor area while minimizing additional building bulk. Additionally, Mezzanines are permitted with the intent of reading as a part of the single story and extend into the space below. The rule of measurement for building height can enable for an additional story when on a sloping lot. What might be perceived as a garden level or basement, might not be considered a story if it meets the criteria. In addition to the maximum building height in stories, there is a maximum building height in feet with the intent to ensure a maximum vertical distance to ensure consistency of building scale within the district.

Building height standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Height in Stories and Feet
- Provide a consistent way of visualizing building scale
- Maintain a consistent sale and maximum height throughout the neighborhood

Disadvantages of Building Height in Stories and Feet
- The maximum feet in height can result in buildings that appear to be more stories than identified in the zone district

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could revisit height in feet to better align with exiting context and typical floor to floor heights
- Could consider appropriateness of allowing mezzanines in residential uses

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
- At this time, city staff are exploring code-wide revisions to half stories and mezzanines. Any use of this tool will go beyond the scope of slot homes and therefore is not detailed in the report.
Building Height Exceptions

Building height exceptions standards are intended to allow for building features to exceed the maximum height for utility purposes or building amenities. Building height exceptions vary by feature enabling for some exceptions greater allowances or requiring the feature to be set back from the building perimeter.

Dependent upon the encroachment, certain architectural, site and service/utility elements may encroach into the setback as specified in the Denver Zoning Code Setback Design Standards Exceptions. Examples of allowable encroachments are unoccupied elevator pent houses, stair enclosures, eaves and elevator lobbies.

Building height exceptions relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Height Exceptions
• Provides flexibility in placement of utilities
• Provides opportunity for additional amenities

Disadvantages of Building Height Exceptions:
• Some height exceptions can cause for the height encroachment to appear as an additional story

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
• Explore appropriateness of exceptions, with specific attention to stair enclosures

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
• The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Upper Story Setback/Stepback**

Upper story setbacks and stepback standards are intended to provide an appropriate height and massing transition to the adjacent protected district or when required on the primary street, to provide an appropriate pedestrian scale height and massing along the primary street. Upper story setbacks are measured from the primary street zone lot line. Upper story stepback is measured from the building face and then extends horizontally.

Upper story setback/stepback standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

*Advantages of Upper Story Setback standards:*
- Provide appropriate height transition to adjacent properties
- Provide a pedestrian scaling element

*Disadvantages of Upper Story Setback standards:*
- Reduce flexibility
- Might not be consistent with the existing character of the street

*Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:*
- Could introduce a setback standard to the primary street

*Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:*
- Other tools such as building height and height exceptions more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale and impacts to neighbors elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Bulk Plane**

Bulk Plane standards are intended to shape the building forms and reduce the effective massing to the adjoining properties. Bulk plans include a vertical height at the side zone lot line and an angle that determines the slope of the plane.

Bulk plane standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

*Advantages of Bulk Plane standards:*
- Restricts the taller portions of the building to the interior portions of the lot
- Helps reduce the potential for taller walls immediately adjacent to the neighboring property

*Disadvantages of Bulk Plane standards:*
- Might reduce flexibility
- May not be appropriate for the existing context

*Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:*
- Could create a new standard that is better calibrated to context and form
- Could create a bulk plane standard that is measured from the primary street

*Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:*
- Other tools such as building height and height exceptions more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale and impacts to neighbors elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Pedestrian Access Standards

Pedestrian access standards are intended to give prominence to the pedestrian realm as a defining element of the neighborhood character. They should also provide convenient access to the building and create a visual hierarchy to aid in way-finding while creating interesting human-scaled facades.

Pedestrian access standards vary based off of the building form standards. The different pedestrian access standards are:

- **Entrance**: a door, recessed entrance, or corner entrance
- **Entry Feature**: door, gate, front porch, front stoop, front terrace, canopy, and/or arcade
- **Pedestrian Connection**: paved surface connecting through drive aisle or parking lot

Pedestrian access standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Pedestrian Access Requirements:
- Entry features can further define the pedestrian realm and provide a hierarchy and scaling elements to the building facade

Disadvantages of Pedestrian Access Requirements:
- Entry features such as a front porch, canopy or stoop might be more compatible with some contexts than others

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could increase the requirements to better promote activation of the public realm and establish human scale
- Could require pedestrian entries at the primary street to have entry features such as porches, canopies or stoops that can encroach into the setback

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Pedestrian Access (entrance) Alternatives

Pedestrian access (entrance) alternatives are intended to provide a clear and obvious, publicly accessible route connecting the primary street to the primary uses within the building. The use of these alternatives are only allowed in when an Entrance is required. The permitted entrance alternatives are:

- Courtyard or Plaza
- Covered Walkway

Pedestrian access alternatives relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Entrance Alternatives:
- Provide flexibility
- The use of courtyards or plaza can increase the semi-private space

Disadvantages of Entrance Alternatives:
- Covered walkways might not provide the same level of public realm engagement

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could create new alternatives

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools have been selected to address the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Street Level Active Use Standards

Street level active uses are intended to promote activity on the street and sidewalk, to enhance safety and encourage a vibrant public realm.

Street level active uses include all permitted uses within the zone district with the exception of mini-storage, wholesale trade or light storage, parking spaces or aisles. The standard must apply for a depth of 15-feet of the Street Level floor area.

Street level access standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicle-oriented design elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Street Level Active Use Standards:
  • Ensures that uses at the street level contribute to the public realm

Disadvantages of Street Level Active Use Standards:
  • Reduces flexibility, especially on small lots for parking layouts
  • Permitted active uses may not contribute to activation of the public realm

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
  • Could revisit the list of active uses to better promote the public realm
  • Could consider the range of building forms to which the requirements apply

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
  • Other tools have been selected to address the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Articulation Standards

Articulation standards are a new tool that does not currently exist within the Denver Zoning Code. Articulation standards are intended to add texture and rhythm to the building façade in a way that promotes human scale and maintains the rhythm of the street face. Methods of articulation commonly include façade plane change, material change, vertical projections and window design.

Articulation standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Articulation Standards:
- Address the challenge of blank walls that do not relate to the context or human scale
- Can promote visually interesting buildings that relate to the human scale

Disadvantages of Articulation Standards:
- Can often times force haphazard designs that do not relate to the building function

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could consider the introduction of a standard to address blank walls at the street

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as unit orientation to the street and entry features more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Units Oriented to the Street**

Unit orientation to the street is a new tool that currently does not exist in the Denver Zoning Code. The code currently requires a street facing entry, however the "side-facing" orientation of the building at the street remains problematic. Unit orientation to the street is intended to provide a clear and visually prominent orientation to the street in a way that is consistent with the character of the street, block and neighborhood. Unit orientation to the street would result in a traditional row house appearance from the street.

Unit orientation standards relate to public realm engagement, neighborhood context, building mass and scale, vehicle neighborhood design and the impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Standards to Units Oriented to the Street:**
- Re-orient the most active portion of the building to the street in a way that contributes to the activation of the public realm
- Limits the ability for vehicular use areas to become a predominate site feature
- Promotes a row house-type street rhythm that is typical of traditional residential and storefront contexts
- Eliminates the typical slot home characteristics such as blank walls, lack of street engagement, and predominate vehicular drives

**Disadvantages of Standards to Units Oriented to the Street:**
- Limits flexibility of site configuration

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Consider requiring units located at the street to be oriented to the street

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Rooftop Deck Locations

Rooftop decks are intended to provide residents with private outdoor space. In some districts, the location of rooftop decks are limited with the purpose of protecting the privacy of adjacent rear yards in the low-scale residential neighborhoods.

Rooftop deck location standards relate to neighborhood design and the impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Rooftop Deck Location Standards:
- Can minimize the visual and privacy impacts to adjacent residential neighbors

Disadvantages of Rooftop Deck Location Standards:
- Reduces flexibility and the opportunity to provide private outdoor space and amenities for residents

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could consider placing limitations on the location and/or size of rooftop decks

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool when adjacent to Protected Districts directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Courtyard Standards

Courtyard standards specific to the garden court building form are intended to promote a high quality common open space. Courtyard standards currently include dimensional standards, grade standards, accessibility standards and enclosure standards.

Courtyard standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Garden Court Standards:
- Provides a shared amenity for residents
- Provides a minimum area of open space
- Provides an alternate building form

Disadvantages of Garden Court Standards:
- Current standards do not result in a form or garden court space that is consistent with the intent

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider revisions to the dimensional standards to create an outcome that aligns with the intent
- Consider revisions to the enclosure standards to ensure the courtyard with residential units

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the Garden Court Building Form strategy.
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3.2 SITE DESIGN TOOLS

Site design tools address the arrangement of buildings and spaces on a site, as well as the visual and functional character of those spaces and how they shape the public realm. The Denver Zoning Code currently uses the site design tools summarized below, although some tools do not currently apply to slot home development.

Build-To Standards

Build-To standards are intended to provide a consistent street edge to enhance the character of the context, define street to promote pedestrian activity and provide consistent siting and pedestrian orientation to the street. Build-to standards require for a percentage of the building frontage to be located within the build-to range (depth) of the street.

Build-to standards relate to the public realm engagement, vehicular oriented design, and neighborhood design elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Build-to standards

- Provides a consistent street edge and siting for buildings
- Ensures that the street edge is defined by a building wall instead drive aisles or other inactive uses

Disadvantages to Build-to Standards:

- The build-to standard does not align with the Street Level Active Use Standard or Transparency Standards ensuring that the most activated portion of the building is at the street.

Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:

- Consider revisions to calibrate build to better respond to neighborhood context

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Build-To Alternatives**

Build-To Alternatives are intended to define the public realm and enhance the visual quality of the street when it is not possible to define the street edge with a building façade.

Alternatives can be applied singularly or in combination to meet the required build-to standard. All permitted alternatives are:

- Permanent outdoor seating
- Private Open Space
- Garden Wall
- Pergola
- Arcade
- Courtyard

Build-to alternatives relate to the public realm engagement, vehicular oriented design and neighborhood design elements of the **Problem Statement**.

**Advantages of Build to Alternatives**
- Provide flexibility, especially for larger sites where the building is not large enough to meet the standard

**Disadvantages to Build-to Alternatives:**
- Does not always achieve the intent to enhance the public realm with a defined street edge

**Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:**
- Explore appropriateness of alternatives
- Develop new alternatives that support the intent of the build-to standard

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Setback Standards

Setbacks are the minimum distance in which a building be set back from the zone lot line. Setback standards are intended to site buildings consistent with the intended character and use buildings to create positive transition between districts and developments.

Primary Street Setback

Primary street setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

Side Interior/Street Setback

Primary street setbacks relate to the neighborhood design, and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

Rear Setback

Rear setbacks relate to the neighborhood design and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Setbacks:

- Side setbacks can protect privacy
- Provide space for landscaping and open space
- Primary street setbacks provide the opportunity for entry features and other architectural elements that support the transition from public to private space

Disadvantages of Setbacks:

- Setbacks do not always respond to the context or use

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:

- Require a minimum setback for residential-only projects

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- The use of this tool (primary and side setbacks) directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.

BUILDING & FIRE CODE SETBACKS

Often times, Building and Fire Code will place setback requirements to the side interior dependent on the uses and amount of glazing. For the details of standards relating the Building and Fire code, please see page 33 for Building and Fire standards.
**Setback Encroachments**

Setback Encroachments are intended to allow minor architectural elements to encroach into a setback while maintaining an open and unobstructed minimum setback space. Dependent upon the encroachment, certain architectural, site and service/utility elements may encroach into the setback as specified in the Denver Zoning Code Design Standard Exceptions Section. Examples of allowable encroachments are porches, canopies, access ramps, gas and electric meters, and solar panels.

Primary street setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, building mass and scale elements of the problem statement as described in Section 2.2 on page 36.

**Advantages of Setback Encroachments:**
- Enabling for desired entry features to further define the pedestrian entry can provide architectural interest, human scaling and support the transition of public to private space
- Provide flexibility for placement of utility equipment that may be required by other agencies such as excel or the fire department

**Disadvantages of Setback Encroachments:**
- Enables for "less desirable" utility equipment to be placed at the front of the building in a way that can detract from the character of the public realm

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Provide allowances for desired entry features such as porch, patio, canopy or stoops

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Block Sensitive Setbacks**

Block sensitive setback standards are intended to maintain an established context or pattern by ensuring that the setback is sensitive to the existing block context. Block Sensitive Setbacks are applied when there are at least three residential structures on the same primary street frontage in residential zone districts. Through the use of reference lots, a minimum setback is established which ensures that the development is not located any closer to the primary street than the closest front facade of the structure of the reference zone lot.

Block sensitive setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, building mass and scale elements of the **Problem Statement**.

**Advantages to Block Sensitive Setbacks:**
- Maintains the character established by the existing block context

**Disadvantages to Block Sensitive Setbacks:**
- Forces a build condition based off of an existing condition that may change over time as redevelopment occurs

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Develop block sensitive setback standards that are more responsive to existing and future contexts
- Develop a maximum block sensitive setback

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Landscaping Standards**

Landscaping standards are intended to provide an attractive landscaped edge and screening adjacent to the street right-of-way, promote the community appearance of the public realm, improve site permeability and mitigate visual impacts on surrounding properties. Landscaping standards apply to all developments in all zone districts with the exception of Single-Unit (SU) and Two-Unit (TU) zone districts. Landscaping standards currently require a minimum of 50% of the open areas within the required build-to range or setbacks be landscaped with live planting material.

**Tree preservation** is required for residential districts for trees located within the front or side setback in Single-Unit (SU) and Two-Unit (TU) zone districts.

Landscaping standards relate to the public realm engagement and neighborhood design elements of the **Problem Statement**.

**Advantages of Landscaping Standards:**
- Provide an attractive edge to enhance the public realm
- Promotes the character of the neighborhood

**Disadvantages of Landscaping Standards:**
- Landscaping standards are only applied when there are open areas in the setback

**Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:**
- Consider revising standards to better align with the existing and future character
- Require landscaping standards for the garden court building from to better align with the building form intent

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- Other tools such as the primary street setback more directly address the public realm engagement and neighborhood design elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.

For landscaping standards within the Right-of-way (ROW) please see page 31 for Forestry and Public Works standards.
**Zone Lot Standards**

**Zone Lot Size Minimum** standards are intended to provide a minimum lot area required for development. This ensures that zone lots cannot be reduced to a size that is not compatible with the character of the district.

**Zone Lot Width Minimum** standards are intended to maintain an established context of lot width. Often, zone lot width will be associated to a specific building form which is only available for use once the minimum standard has been met. Zone lot width is the distance between the zone lot lines intersecting the Primary Street zone lot line.

Zone Lot standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

*Advantages of Zone Lot Minimum:*
- Maintains a rhythm of the street character
- Building forms and uses can be calibrated to the size of the zone lot

*Disadvantages of Zone Lot Minimum:*
- Might restrict lots for certain types of development

*Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:*
- Consider revisions to calibrate minimum standards to better respond to building form and neighborhood context

*Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:*
- Other tools such as unit orientation to the street more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Building Coverage Standards

Building Coverage standards are intended to provide a minimum area of openness on a lot by limiting the amount of area that buildings may occupy. Building coverage provided as a maximum percentage of the zone lot that may be occupied by the building. The building coverage measurement includes: structure completely/partially enclosed, decks and exterior balconies.

Building coverage minimums relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Coverage maximums:
- Ensures that a minimum amount of open space is provided
- Promotes openness between structures

Disadvantages of Building Coverage maximums:
- Reduces flexibility

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could be required in some contexts or forms where in alignment with the character

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as setbacks and building height in feet more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Open Space Standards

Open Space standards are not currently a tool within the Denver Zoning Code. However it is a tool commonly used by other cities to ensure a minimum amount of usable open space for each development. Open Space standards are intended to provide a minimum area of usable space. Open Space standards would likely integrate landscaping standards.

Open Space standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Open Space Standards:
- Ensures that a minimum amount of usable open space is provided
- Promotes opportunities for social interaction with neighbors

Disadvantages of Open Space Standards
- Reduces the building footprint
- Can pose a long term maintenance challenge

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider introducing the standard in residential districts

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as setbacks and building height in feet more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Site Grading Standards

Site grading standards are intent to maintain the natural site contours to preserve neighborhood characteristics as viewed from the street and minimize potential adverse impacts of grade changes and retaining walls on adjacent properties. Site Grading standards currently limit the alternation of grade within one-foot of the existing grade within 10-feet of the primary street zone lot line. Additional exceptions to this standard are currently provided to ensure proper site drainage, landscaping and retaining walls, and barrier free access ramps as required.

Site grading standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Site Grading Standards:
- Maintains the existing character of the street
- Minimizes impacts to the adjacent properties

Disadvantages of Site Grading Standards:
- Poses a challenge with ADA standards

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider new exceptions to the grading standards

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools have been selected to address the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
3.3 VEHICLE PARKING DESIGN

Vehicle Parking Standards and Design tools address the minimum requirements for vehicle parking. Parking design tools address the arrangement and design of spaces used for vehicular movement and parking.

Minimum Parking Standards & Exceptions

Minimum parking standards set a minimum number of off-street vehicle parking spaces based on the number of residential units or square footage of a specific use in a development. They are intended to balance vehicular parking needs with city-wide pedestrian and multi-modal transportation objectives. The Denver Zoning Code provides limited exceptions to minimum parking standards for small zone lots, historic structures, ground floor retail in mixed use projects, tree preservation and projects with affordable/senior housing, small units, bike/car share facilities or proximity to multi-modal transit.

Minimum parking standards relate to neighborhood design, and vehicle impacts elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Minimum Parking Standards:

- Reduces potential on-street parking impacts to existing residents and businesses
- Exceptions and alternatives can provide flexibility

Disadvantages of Minimum Parking Standards:

- May promote façade designs with limited activation where parking is located behind street-facing facades
- Increases development costs and reduces housing affordability
- Does not consider site-specific on-street parking supply or demand

Potential use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- Could consider standards to encourage/discourage provision of on-site vehicular parking

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- Other tools such as vehicle access and layout standards more directly address the vehicular oriented design component of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Parking Location

Parking locations standards are intended to minimize the visual impacts of parking areas to the public realm and the adjacent properties while minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

Currently, parking location standards only apply to surface vehicular parking.

The Street Level Active Use requirement also impacts the location and amount of structured parking located within the front 15-feet of the building meeting the primary street build-to standard.

Parking location standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of parking location standards
- Ensures vehicular parking does not adversely impact the public realm

Disadvantages of parking location standards
- Might restrict some development configurations

Potential revisions to parking location standards
- Consider potential revisions on where parking is allowed on site

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as vehicle access and layout standards more directly address the vehicular oriented design component of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Vehicle Parking Layout, Access and Circulation

The following standards apply to all off-street parking areas except for single-unit and two-unit developments.

Parking layout standards include the parking space angles, parking aisle, garage door setbacks. These standards ensure that a minimum 5-foot back-out space is provided at the end of parking rows along with providing a 5-foot setback when the public alley is used to access the garage.

Vehicle access is commonly required from the alley, however access can be provided from the street when no alley is present. In General and Shopfront building forms, when there are three or more side-by-side dwelling units in one structure, alley access is required when present. For developments in higher intensity districts that do not have units side-by-side, vehicular access is determined at time of Site Development Plan Review.

Parking access and circulation standards provide the minimum width for internal drives to ensure access and egress from each parking space in a standard two-turn movement. The minimum width for two-way traffic is 20-feet and 23-feet required for 90-degree parking spaces.

Parking layout, access and circulation standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Ensures adequate accessibility and safety for parking areas
- Ensures vehicular parking does not adversely impact the public realm

Disadvantages of Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Might discourage better designs that diminish parking impacts to the public realm

Potential revisions to Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Consider applying a vehicular use setback at the primary street
- Consider reducing the drive way and drive aisle width

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Perimeter Surface Parking Lot Landscaping Standards

Parking screening and landscaping standards are intended to minimize the visual impacts of parking areas to the public realm and the adjacent properties. Perimeter planting strips, trees and garden walls can be required within the zone lot between any surface parking lot and the street. Standards for these vary by context and/or district.

Parking landscaping standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Parking Lot Landscaping standards:
- Provides visual relief from vehicular use areas

Disadvantages of Parking Lot Landscaping standards:
- Minimum landscaping requirements may not sufficiently address the vehicular impacts to the public realm

Potential revisions to Parking Lot Landscaping standards:
- Consider increasing landscape standards for parking areas

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
This section provides the recommended strategies to address the Problem Statement. Strategies are described as a series of zoning tools and standards that result in a preferred design outcome. The strategies and standards vary by application to Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS), Multi Unit residential (MU, RO) or Row House (RH, TH) zone districts. Each strategy provides an overview of the zoning tools applied including the specific standards.

4.1 STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

These strategies described on the following pages were developed out of an evaluation of the potential tools summarized in Section 3.0, city staff evaluation, Slot Home Task Force discussion, community feedback, and external testing. The strategies described on the following pages were developed through an assessment of the potential tools summarized in Section 3 including city staff evaluation, Slot Home Task Force discussion, community feedback, and external testing.

- **City Staff Evaluation & Refinement.** Throughout this phase of the project, staff continually evaluated the application of the tools to a variety of sites and zone districts. Further refinement of the proposed tools was made based on the feedback from the following stakeholders.

- **Task Force Review.** The Slot Home Task Force met five times to review potential tools, select appropriate tools to address the Problem Statement, and evaluate the outcomes of the applied tools. The Slot Home Task Force confirmed the use of some additional tools that were proposed by the community for inclusion in the final strategy.

- **Community Review.** City staff and the Slot Home Task Force hosted a community open house to solicit community comments on the draft strategy. Open house participants were generally supportive of the proposed strategy, finding that the Problem Statement was adequately addressed. Community feedback resulted in refinement to standards and the addition of new tools also recommended by the testing group.

- **External Tester Review.** The testing group was comprised of architects and developers and tested the proposed strategies and standards to ensure that the standards met the Criteria for Successful Solutions and effectively addressed the Problem Statement. The testing group presented their findings and additional tools to the Slot Home Task Force for consideration.

An Appendix to this report includes a summary of community, testing and task force feedback, including open house comments, testing outcomes, and task force meeting summaries.

The strategies described in this report focus on tools to address side-by-side, attached residential units (such as slot homes) rather than Multi Unit configurations accessed by common hallways, vertically stacked units, or mixed-use buildings.
4.2 STRATEGY FOR MIXED-USE (MX, RX MS) ZONE DISTRICTS

Mixed-use districts include Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), and Main Street (MS) zone districts. They are intended to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering within and around the city’s neighborhoods. Buildings are pulled up to the street with parking tucked behind to promote an active street frontage. This is particularly true for Main Street (MS) zone districts, where relatively strict build-to and active use requirements seek to enhance the pedestrian-oriented character of vibrant streets and corridors.

Slot homes in Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) zone districts have sometimes been built adjacent to low-scale homes or other residential buildings. As summarized in "Slot Homes in Denver - What Has Been Built?" on page 26, slot homes are most often located in the U-MX-3 (Urban Neighborhood Context, Mixed Use, 3-Story) zone district.

The strategy options summarized in this section could apply in the following zone districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (E-)</th>
<th>Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-MX-2, -2x, -2A, -3, -3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (U-)</th>
<th>Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-MX-2, -2x, -3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (G-)</th>
<th>General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-MX-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-RX-3, -5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-MS-3, -5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (C-)</th>
<th>Urban Center Neighborhood Context (C-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-MX-3, -5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-RX-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-MS-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (I-)</th>
<th>Industrial Context (I-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-MX-3, -5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Context (M-)</th>
<th>Master Planned Context (M-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-RX-3, -5, -5A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-MX-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-IMX-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Outcome: Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) Zone Districts

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the sideways-facing slot home configurations summarized in "Slot Homes in Denver". As a result of this orientation, slot homes typically do not engage the street or sidewalk with street level residential uses, porches or clearly-defined pedestrian entrances. Often, the siting and setbacks do not reflect or respond to the exiting character of the street, block or neighborhood. Additionally, the allowable building height in feet may enable mass and scale that do not relate to human scale or the adjacent buildings. Current design outcomes commonly integrate a visible driveway that can become a predominant site characteristic.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing Denver Zoning Code standards in the U-MX-3 zone district. This models includes the use of the garden wall build-to alternative.
**Strategy: Mixed Use Zone Districts**

The Mixed Use strategy is the result of an evaluation of the tools described in Section 3, Slot Home Task Force feedback, community review, and external testing. The Mixed Use strategy and standards would apply to Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), and Main Street (MS) zone districts in the Urban Center (C), General Urban (G), Urban (U), Urban Edge (E), and Industrial (I) neighborhood contexts. The following table provides the tools and standards for the Mixed Use Strategy. Additionally, a summary of the Problem Statement elements addressed by each tool is provided.

### Recommended Standards for Side-by-Side Residential in Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), and Main Street (MS) Zone Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design Tools</th>
<th>Building Design Standards</th>
<th>Public Realm Engagement</th>
<th>Neighborhood Design</th>
<th>Building Mass and Scale</th>
<th>Vehicle Oriented Design</th>
<th>Impacts to Neighbors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Require Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit located within 10’ of the primary street setback or side street setback shall be oriented to the corresponding street. The corner unit shall be oriented to the primary street. Oriented to the Street: Each dwelling unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one other dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the corresponding street. No dwelling unit may be located between another dwelling unit and the corresponding street. The width of each dwelling unit shall not exceed the depth.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Require Entry Features for Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>Each dwelling unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street facing facade that incorporates a visually prominent porch, patio or canopy (such features are allowed to encroach into the primary street setback). A porch or patio shall have a minimum depth of 5’. A canopy shall have a minimum depth of 3’.</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Reduce Maximum Building Height in Feet</td>
<td>Maximum height for flat roofs shall be 30’ in two-story districts and 38’ in three-story districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Revise Building Height Exceptions</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be setback 1 foot from the perimeter of the building for every 1 foot of height when exceeding maximum building height in feet or stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Limit Rooftop and Second Story Decks</td>
<td>Prohibit rooftop and/or second story decks in the rear 35% of the zone lot depth when adjacent to a Protected District with the same standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Increase Transparency standards</td>
<td>Primary Street transparency standard shall be a minimum of 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE DESIGN TOOLS</td>
<td>SITE DESIGN STANDARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Increase Primary Street Setback</td>
<td>Primary Street setback shall be a minimum of 10’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Increase the Side Setbacks</td>
<td>Side street setbacks shall be a minimum of 7.5’. Side interior setbacks shall be a minimum of 5’ when providing pedestrian access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Allow Setback Encroachments</td>
<td>Porches, canopies and similar features shall be allowed to encroach into the primary street and side street setbacks in alignment with the existing Multi Unit (MU) standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Revise Build-to Alternatives</td>
<td>The Garden Wall and Pergola alternatives shall not be allowed. The Courtyard alternative shall be allowed to meet 30% of required build-to. A build-to exception for the drive way will be allowed for zone lots without alley access.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation (advantages, disadvantages and recommended use) of each of the recommended tools along with other tools not recommended for inclusion into the strategy is found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes.
The following graphics illustrate design outcomes that apply the tools described in the Mixed Use Strategy. Below is an example of the applied strategy on a corner lot in a C-MX-3 zone district.

Below is an example of the applied strategy on an interior lot in a U-MS-3 zone district, abutting a protected district to the rear.
4.3 STRATEGY FOR RESIDENTIAL MULTI UNIT (MU, RO) ZONE DISTRICTS

Multi Unit zone districts include Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts. The intent of Multi Unit zone districts are to promote and protect higher density residential neighborhoods within the character of the neighborhood context. They are intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley, where present.

In Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts, most slot home development occurs using the Apartment building form as described in Slot Homes in Denver.

The recommended strategy in this section is intended to apply to the following zone districts:

- **Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)**
  - E-MU-2.5
- **Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)**
  - U-RH-3A
- **General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)**
  - G-MU-3, -5
  - G-RO-3, -5
**Existing Outcome: Multi Unit (MU, RO) Zone Districts**

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the typical sideways-facing slot home configurations. As a result of this orientation, slot homes typically do not engage the street or sidewalk with street level pedestrian friendly activities and instead have visible driveways that become a predominant site characteristic. Often, the setbacks are significant and do not respond to the desired future character of the street, block or neighborhood. Additionally, the allowable building height in feet may enable mass and scale that does not relate to the human scale and can appear to be greater than the intended height in stories. Current design outcomes commonly integrate a visible driveway that can become a predominant site characteristic.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing Denver Zoning Code standards in the G-MU-3 zone district under the Apartment building form. This model includes the use of the garden wall build-to alternative.
Strategy: Multi Unit Zone Districts

The Multi Unit strategy is a result of an evaluation of the tools described in Section 3, and Slot Home Task Force feedback, community review, and external testing. The Multi Unit strategy described below is based on the existing Apartment Building form. The proposed building form standards would apply to the Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts in the General Urban (G), Urban (U), Urban Edge (E), and Master Planned (M) neighborhood contexts. The following table provides the tools and standards for the Multi Unit Strategy. Additionally, a summary of the Problem Statement elements addressed by each tool is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR AN SIDE-BY-SIDE RESIDENTIAL IN MULTI UNIT (MU) OR RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO) ZONE DISTRICTS</th>
<th>Public Realm Engagement</th>
<th>Neighborhood Design</th>
<th>Building Mass and Scale</th>
<th>Vehicle Oriented Design</th>
<th>Impacts to Neighbors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Require Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit located within 10’ of the primary street setback or side street setback shall be oriented to the corresponding street. The corner unit, shall be oriented to the primary street. Oriented to the Street: Each dwelling unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one other dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the corresponding street. No dwelling unit may be located between another dwelling unit and the corresponding street. The width of each dwelling unit shall not exceed the depth.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Require Entry Features for Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>Each dwelling unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street facing facade that incorporates a visually prominent porch, patio or canopy (such features are allowed to encroach into the primary street setback). A porch or patio shall have a minimum depth of 3’. A canopy shall have a minimum depth of 3’.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Reduce Maximum Building Height in Feet</td>
<td>Maximum height for flat roofs shall be 35’ in three-story districts Maximum height for sloped roofs (with a minimum pitch of 6:12) shall be 40’ in three-story districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Revise Building Height Exceptions</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be setback 1 foot from the perimeter of the building for every 1 foot of height when exceeding maximum building height in feet or stories</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Limit Rooftop and Second Story Decks</td>
<td>Prohibit rooftop and/or second story decks in the rear 35% of the zone lot depth when abutting a Protected District with the same standard.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Increase Transparency standards</td>
<td>The primary street transparency standard shall be a minimum of 40%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design Tools</td>
<td>SITE DESIGN STANDARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Limit Block Sensitive Setback</td>
<td>The maximum block-sensitive setback minimum shall be 20’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Increase the Side Setbacks</td>
<td>Side interior setbacks shall be 7.5’ for units oriented to the street, all other units shall be setback 12.5’ for the side interior. Side street setbacks shall be 7.5’ regardless of unit orientation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Allow Setback Encroachments</td>
<td>Single story porches, canopies and similar features shall be allowed to encroach 5’ into the minimum side interior setback.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Increase Build-to Percentage</td>
<td>The required build-to percentage shall be a minimum of 70%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Build-to Alternatives</td>
<td>The Garden Wall and Pergola alternatives shall not be allowed. The Courtyard alternative shall be allowed to meet 30% of the required build-to percentage. Allow a build-to percentage exception of 12’ for the drive way for zone lots without alley access.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Design Tools</td>
<td>VEHICULAR DESIGN STANDARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions</td>
<td>Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Allow Encroachments for Parking Areas</td>
<td>Allow the required 5’ back out space to encroach up to 2.5’ into the side street setback when screened with landscaping and garden wall. Allow for internal access drive or drive aisle to encroach up to 7.5’, but at not point closer than 5’ from a zone lot line.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation (advantages, disadvantages and recommended use) of the recommended tools is found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes.
The following graphics illustrate design outcomes that apply the tools described in the Multi Unit Strategy. Below is an example of the applied strategy on a corner lot in a G-MU-3 zone district.

Below is an example of the applied strategy on an interior lot in a G-MU-3 zone district.
**Strategy: Garden Court Building Form in Multi Unit Zone Districts**

The Garden Court strategy in Multi Unit zone districts was a result of an evaluation of the tools described in Section 3, and Slot Home Task Force feedback, community review, and external testing. The Garden Court strategy described below is based on the existing Garden Court building form. The proposed building form standards would apply to the Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts in the General Urban (G), Urban (U), Urban Edge (E), and Master Planned (M) neighborhood contexts. The following table provides the tools and standards for the Multi Unit Strategy. Additionally, a summary of the Problem Statement elements addressed by each tool is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR THE GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM IN MULTI UNIT (MU) OR RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO) ZONE DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Revise Maximum Building Height in Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Revise Building Height Exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Increase Pedestrian Access Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Introduce a Transparency Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURTYARD DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Increase Street Facing Courtyard Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Require Residential Units on Three Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Introduce a Landscaping Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Increase Minimum Zone Lot Size and Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Limit the Block Sensitive Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEHICULAR DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Limit Vehicle Use Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation (advantages, disadvantages and recommended use) of the recommended tools is found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes.
The following graphic illustrates a design outcome that applies the tools described in the Multi Unit Garden Court Strategy. Below is an example of the applied strategy on an interior lot in a G-MU-3 zone district.
4.4 STRATEGY FOR ROW HOUSE AND TOWN HOUSE (TH, RH) ZONE DISTRICTS

In addition to Mixed Use and Multi Unit zone districts described above, slot homes can sometimes be built in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts as described in Slot Homes in Denver. The intents of RH and TH zone districts are to promote existing and future patterns of lower scale building forms that address the street in a similar manner as an urban house building form. They are intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley, where present. Lot coverage is typically moderate, accommodating consistent front and side yards.

Most commonly, slot home development occurs using the Row House and Town House building forms, but may also occur using the Garden Court building form.

The predominate land use pattern in RH and TH zone districts is low scale single unit and two unit homes. Often, slot homes have replaced these low scale residential forms as summarized in "Slot Homes in Denver - What Has Been Built?" on page 26.

The recommended strategy in this section is intended to apply to the following zone districts:

- Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)
  - E-TH-2.5
- Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)
  - U-RH-2.5, -3A
- General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)
  - G-RH-3
- Master Planned Context (M-)
  - M-RH-3
Existing Outcome: Garden Court Building Form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Districts

In most Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts, the Garden Court building form is an allowable building form, in addition to the Row House, Town House, Duplex, Tandem House, and Urban House building forms. The Garden Court building form was initially developed to acknowledge the lower scale bungalow courts that were often considered as a compatible feature of existing low-scale neighborhoods and that encouraged a shared amenity space of street-facing open space.

Existing zoning regulations for the Garden Court building form allow for a typical sideways-facing slot home configurations. As a result of this orientation, slot homes built in the Garden Court building form typically do not engage the street or sidewalk in a way that promotes ownership of the semi-public and public realm. This orientation to the narrow courtyard instead of the street does not respond to the desired future character of the street, block or neighborhood. Additionally, the standards for the courtyard are often insufficient and do not align with the character or intent.

The model below illustrates an outcome allowed by the existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for the Garden Court building form in the existing U-RH-2.5 Zone District.
**Strategy: Garden Court Building Form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts**

The strategy for the Garden Court building form is to remove this building form as an allowable building form in all Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts.

Allowing a Garden Court building form in a Row House or Town House zone district may not result in clear and predicable outcomes. The Garden Court building form, which traditionally orients to the courtyard and not the street, conflicts with the intent of the RH and TH zone districts which describes buildings as orienting to the street and vehicular access is from the alley. Additionally, none of the zone district specific intent statements speak to the allowance of the Garden Court building form.

The Garden Court building form was intended to capture an existing type of low scale residential building design that was most commonly developed in the mid-20th century. The Denver Zoning Code (DZC) provides the flexibility for compliant structures (DZC 12.6) and therefore it is not necessary to have a building form to capture the existing built form.

Additionally, the other allowed buildings forms of provide a level of variation and flexibility that is appropriate for the zone districts.

The Garden Court building form is not a predictable outcome that is appropriate for the RH and TH zone districts.
**Existing Outcome: Row House and Town House Building Form in Row House (RH) & Town House (TH) Zone Districts**

In the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts, the Row House building form (or alternately Town House building form in some contexts) is a permitted building form in addition to the Duplex, Tandem House, and Urban House (and/or suburban house) building forms. The Row House building form is intended to accommodate a Multi Unit residential structure of attached residential units arranged side-by-side with clear unit orientation to the street and a direct entrance to the street. These design features promote ownership of the public and semi-public realm.

The Row House building form requires each unit to have a street facing entrance; however, some configurations that adhere to the existing standard, produce an outcome that is similar to that of a slot home. While pedestrian entrances are street-facing, the units do not clearly orient to the street nor are the units arranged parallel to the street in a side-by-side manner. The model below illustrates two different outcomes allowed by the existing standards for the Row House (RH) zone districts under the Row House building form (based on the U-RH-2.5 zone district).
**Strategy: Row House and Town House Building Forms in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts**

The Row House strategy was a result of an evaluation of the tools described in Section 3, and Slot Home Task Force feedback, community review, and external testing. The Row House strategy described below is intended to apply to the existing Row House and Town House building forms. The proposed building form standards would apply to the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts in the General Urban (G), Urban (U), Urban Edge (E), and Master Planned (M) neighborhood contexts. The following table provides the tools and standards for the Multi Unit Strategy. Additionally, a summary of the Problem Statement elements addressed by each tool is provided.

---

**RECOMMENDED REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ROW HOUSE BUILDING FORM IN ROW HOUSE (RH) AND TOWN HOUSE (TH) ZONE DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Realm Engagement</th>
<th>Neighborhood Design</th>
<th>Building Mass and Scale</th>
<th>Vehicle Oriented Design</th>
<th>Impacts to Neighbors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit shall be oriented to the corresponding street. For the corner dwelling unit, the dwelling unit shall be oriented to the primary street. Oriented to the Street: Each unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one other dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions</td>
<td>Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graphics illustrate design outcomes that apply the tools described in the Row House Strategy. Below are examples of the applied strategy on an interior and corner lot in a U-RH-2.5 zone district.
## 4.5 NEXT STEPS

The final strategy report has been informed by the thorough review and evaluation by the Slot Home Task Force, External Testing Group, and the community. These strategies and standards will inform the drafting of the text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code (DZC). The text amendment process will include the following steps.

- **Task Force Review.** The Slot Home Task Force will review the draft text amendment to the DZC. Any recommended changes will be made prior to the public review draft.

- **Public Review.** The Draft Text Amendments will be published online for the public to review and provide comments. During this time, staff will present to the Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC) Zoning and Planning (ZAP) committee. Any other Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs) or other interested organizations may request a staff presentation on the proposed Text Amendment.

- **Planning Board.** The Denver Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the proposed Text Amendment. A Planning Board public review draft will be posted to the project website (www.denvergov.org/slothomes) a minimum of 30-days prior to the hearing. The Planning Board will review the proposed Text Amendment and consider the Text Amendment Review Criteria found in Section 12.4.11.4 of the Denver Zoning Code. The Planning Board will have the opportunity to receive public input via written comments and public testimony. The Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Denver City Council.

- **Denver City Council.** The Denver City Council will hold a public hearing on the proposed text amendment. The City Council will consider the text amendment review criteria found in Section 12.4.11.4 of the Denver Zoning Code. The City Council will receive public input via written comments and public testimony. The City Council will then vote on the proposed text amendment.

- **Implementation.** The proposed text amendment is anticipated to be scheduled for City Council adoption in the second quarter of 2018. The text amendments will take effect approximately three days after City Council adoption following the Mayor’s signature and publication of the ordinance. In recognition of the significant investment required for site development plans, projects that have submitted a complete formal Site Development Plan (SDP) application prior to the effective date may choose whether to conform to the new regulations or to continue review under the existing Denver Zoning Code. Any SDP not approved within 6 months after the effective date will be subject to the new regulations. Projects that have not made significant progress and therefore not submitted a complete formal SDP application before the text amendment effective date, these projects will be subject to the new regulations proposed with the Text Amendment and described in this Strategy Report.

### CONCURRENT TEXT AMENDMENTS

As a part of the city’s ongoing effort to keep the Denver Zoning Code (DZC) relevant, effective and user-friendly, city staff has begun preparing for a package of text amendments, commonly known as Bundle. Some of the potential revisions to the DZC could impact slot home development in ways that effectively address the problem statement.

Some of the potential amendments relate to the following standards:

- Mezzanine allowances in residential building forms
- Building heights 2-story zone districts
- Protected district standards in MX/MS-2x zone districts
- 1/2 story allowances
- Height exceptions
- Height in stories on sloping lots

Draft proposals are expected to be available near the end of 2017. For more information about the proposed text amendments and adoption schedule, go to [www.denvergov.org/textamendments](http://www.denvergov.org/textamendments)
### 4.6 TOOLS RECOMMENDED FOR APPLICATION TO OTHER BUILDING FORMS

The above strategies apply to side-by-side attached residential development. The following tools included in the above strategy are recommended for application to other building forms as described below in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS</th>
<th>SHOP FRONT</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>APARTMENT</th>
<th>ROW HOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require Units Oriented to the Street</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit shall be oriented to the corresponding street. For the corner dwelling unit, the dwelling unit shall be oriented to the primary street. Oriented to the Street: Each unit shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one other dwelling unit with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Primary Street Transparency Standard</td>
<td>Increase the Primary Street Transparency Standard from a minimum of 30% for Residential Only Buildings to a minimum of 40%*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SITE DESIGN TOOLS | | | |
|-------------------| | | |
| Limit Block Sensitive Setback | The maximum block-sensitive setback minimum shall be 20’ | X | X | |
| Increase the Side Street Setbacks | Side street setbacks shall be a minimum of 7.5’ | | | X |

| VEHICULAR DESIGN TOOLS | | | |
|------------------------| | | |
| Reduce Minimum Driveway Dimensions | Minimum drive-aisle width shall be 20’ and minimum internal access drive width shall be 12’ | | | X |

*Standard may vary based on neighborhood context
### 4.7 TOOLS RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER STUDY AND CONSIDERATION IN FUTURE TEXT AMENDMENTS

The following tools have been identified through the process by the Slot Home Task force and/or community for future consideration. The first set of tools titled “Tools Included in Strategy for Side-By-Side Residential” were included in the strategy for side-by-side residential. However, the impact or need for these tools to be applied to other building forms (eg. apartment buildings) or design outcomes (eg. mixed use buildings) will need further study to understand the need and impacts prior to an amendment to the Denver Zoning Code. The second set of tools titled “Tools Not Included for Side-By-Side Residential” has been identified by the Slot Home Task Force and/or community. In staffs evaluation, these tools are not synonymous to side-by-side residential and therefore may require additional policy discussion or external agency coordination prior to an amendment to the Denver Zoning Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOLS INCLUDED IN STRATEGY FOR SIDE-BY-SIDE RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>POTENTIAL APPLICABILITY</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL ONLY in Multi Unit Zone Districts</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL ONLY in Mixed Use Zone Districts</th>
<th>MIXED USE OR NON-RESIDENTIAL in Mixed Use Zone Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore additional requirements for pedestrian entrances (e.g. requiring entry features in addition to a pedestrian entrance)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore reduced building height in feet in two (2) and three (3) story districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore limitations to rooftop and second story decks when adjacent to a Protected District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore an increased Primary Street setback for residential only buildings in a mixed use and/or main street zone districts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore increased Side Street and Side Interior setbacks when providing pedestrian access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore revisions to the Build-To Alternatives to eliminate the garden wall and pergola</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore reduced dimensions for vehicular use areas on small scale residential projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOLS NOT INCLUDED IN STRATEGY FOR SIDE-BY-SIDE RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>POTENTIAL APPLICABILITY</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL ONLY in Multi Unit Zone Districts</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL ONLY in Mixed Use Zone Districts</th>
<th>MIXED USE OR NON-RESIDENTIAL in Mixed Use Zone Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore allowances for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as accessory to multi-family uses (e.g. allowing ADUs accessory to Row Houses)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore revisions to better accommodate the city-wide solid waste bin system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore revisions to enhance the landscaping standards on the zone lot and within the public right-of-way</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore new tools to better address design aesthetics and quality (eg. articulation, materials, upper story transparency, utility locations, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore additional flexibility for grading standards in the front and side setbacks to meet ADA requirements.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore new build-to exceptions to allow for flexibility for utilities, drainage and fire access.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Slot Home Task Force has worked diligently since January 2017 to identify the issues revolving around Slot Home development, evaluate various design tools, and ultimately confirm the selected strategies to be incorporated into the Denver Zoning Code that will address future projects. The following pages include summaries from the monthly Task Force meetings in addition to the Community Open House Summaries and External Testing results.
5.1 TASK FORCE MEETING SUMMARIES

Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment Task Force
Summary – Meeting 1 – Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Meeting Objectives:
- Clarify the charge to the task force
- Establish working relationships among the task force members
- Refine an initial problem statement to guide future discussion

Task Force Members in Attendance: Nathan Adams, Dave Berton, Enrico Caccionini, Anna Cawrse, Scott Chomiak, Anne Cox, Jane Crisler, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Christine Franck, Sarah Kaplan, Maggie Miller, Ty Mumford, Councilman Wayne New, Heather Noyes, Melissa Rummel. Not in Attendance: Don Elliot, CPD Staff; Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Kyle Dalton, Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Andy Rutz; Observers: Afar Chavez [CPD], Josh Rogers [Denver resident], Amanda Sandoval [Council Aide, District 1], Melissa Horn [Council Aide, District 10]

I. Aspirations
The Task Force and staff identified their favorite multi-unit residential buildings and discussed some of the aspirations that each Task Force member has for the slot home evaluation project. Some of those aspirations are:
- Fostering design creativity and diversity in a way that respects Denver rather than freezing things in time
- Bringing better design and density to Denver in a way that uses the right forms in the zoning code
- Promoting a common-sense approach to maintaining density while addressing the needs of the market and affordability
- Establishing long-term stability and clarity in the code so that it is less subject to varied interpretations
- Addressing the need for density and affordability by producing a product that is attainable for buyers
- Ensuring zoning code consistency that respects the character of the neighborhood
- Giving CPD the ability to intervene when there is a conflict between the development form and the character of the neighborhood
- Producing a code that supports friendliness to the street
- Reflecting the existing intent statements of the zone districts within the code
- Encouraging consistency in the zoning code so that everyone knows what to expect
- Emphasizing the public realm and exploring the relationship between the public and private spaces
- Creating walkable places
- Creating building forms that will serve for the long-term, even as the market changes
- Creating a predictable flexibility that results in calculated variety
- Finding ways for the existing neighborhood fabric to inform new development
- Generating an architecture that ultimately creates a better and more urban, beautiful and active public realm
- Ensuring that our city looks like Denver and not just some other city
- Preserving use-by-right land-use while making zone code interpretation more consistent
- Addressing concerns from the public while developing a healthy amount of flexibility in a more clearly understandable code

II. How the Group Will Operate
- The best way to build consensus is to build trust; this process will work if the participants act in ways that are trustworthy and honorable
- Task Force members need to be forthright about what they care about and be comfortable with disagreeing – while not being disagreeable
- Respect opinions that are not your own, and build to something that everyone can work with; the final recommendation will not be what any single Task Force member would write on their own
- In communicating with the public or media, “I am on the task force and I think” is fine; “I am on the task force and s/he thinks” is not
- Mike Hughes, as facilitator, will aim to make the process as transparent as possible and to handle process questions between meetings so that these meetings can be as substantive as possible
III. **Staff Presentation**

Staff presented how this effort is defining slot homes, what the scope of the project is, and how the effort will be broken into phases for the next year of work. Staff also gave an introductory presentation on urban design and the relationship of the public and private realms. The presentation emphasized the transition from public to semi-public, semi-private and private spaces. This was followed by an introduction the Denver Zoning Code. Staff concluded with a synopsis of the research and analysis that went into the draft Problem Identification Report, including information on historical and recent slot home development trends, geographic information on where most slot home construction is occurring, and a graphic summary of four typical configurations.

IV. **Task Force Discussion/Activities on Problem Statement**

Staff presented the problem identification approach as well as the five elements of the draft Problem Statement. Following that presentation, the Task Force participated in two activities to provide Staff with feedback. In the first activity, task force members used post-it notes to describe positive and negative attributes of the four slot home configurations. In the second activity, members used post-it notes to comment on each of the five elements of the draft Problem Statement – identifying opportunities to refine, strengthen or add to those elements, while also allowing for issues that were completely missing from the draft Problem Statement.

Task Force discussion during the first exercise included the following:

- It is important to be specific about what we mean by density; is it building mass or number of people?
- Massing is an important element of the problem; we should develop tools to manipulate a building’s massing more than the code has in the past, particularly to respond to context
- Though massing is modified by the primary/front setbacks, we need to produce better outcomes
- There is a need for predictable flexibility
- Scale and massing don’t fit the context, which may be a result of most of the designs being boxes that fully occupy the allowable envelope
- There is a lack of transition between the new and the old
- New buildings that don’t fit the existing context interrupt the rhythm of the street
- It is important to keep in mind that even an apartment building next to a single-family home can make a good or a bad good transition; the issues are not necessarily slot home specific; perhaps studying ways to promote consistency in materials and architectural cues is a means to better align with the context, even if the scale is quite different
- Many of the slot homes don’t have front porches, yet most homes traditionally have them
- The MX & MS districts enable building right up to the street, and so developers do just that; in MU districts, the allowance to encroach on the front setback can be taken advantage of to create front porches
- Creating effective transitions between the public and the private spaces makes a tremendous difference in the pedestrian experience; we should emphasize the pedestrian experience
- Of the four typical configurations of slot homes that were shown, the Center Court is the least successful for the public realm since it creates two access points from the street
- If developers were required to include and improve street trees, there would be a linear element that would connect the neighborhood in a way that is already established throughout the city; there should be way to require one tree for every 35’ of frontage for all projects larger than one unit
- The work done in this Task Force should inform what happens in Public Works and vice versa
- ADA requirements make it difficult to build front porches
- In the last year, Forestry and Transportation have started to require street trees and right-of-way improvements
- Separate trash bin for each unity in multi-unit developments are overwhelming the alley
- One of the slot home configurations that seemed to have the most positive post-it notes is the Detached Parking configuration, but it is the least developed type; its relationship to the public realm is the strongest
There are challenges in developing this type in the current market, because most buyers are unwilling to buy something with detached parking.

The most profitable slot home models have no transition from private to public.

We must reclaim that transition while still finding a way to develop units that make financial sense.

The composition of the façades is important; those that are disorderly and chaotic get negative reviews; those with more transparency and a more orderly façade were received more favorably.

All design decisions for this building type can be tied to construction costs; that is what drives the developer’s decisions.

Land is expensive; windows are expensive; favored materials are expensive.

A fenestration requirement could compel a more orderly, consistent set of architectural details.

Transparency alternatives do not achieve the same positive outcomes that transparency itself does.

The Task Force discussion on the second activity included the following:

- It will be important to avoid getting stuck in the current context if the area is targeted for fundamental change to its character; it isn’t enough to say that it doesn’t work simply because it does not respond to what is next to it today.

- How are we able to tell what is an area of change vs. an area of stability? New design should be more in harmony with the existing context if it is an area of stability as opposed to an area of change; in an area of change, the context is less relevant or even completely irrelevant.

- Looking at two different streets – Tennyson and W. 38th – each street might demand different requirements that address the context of the two different streets; it should be important to understand what the street is like and then respond accordingly.

- There is not enough calibration and granularity of the forms themselves within many contexts, so there is a need to take into consideration separate solutions for separate contexts.

- Street engagement should be more specifically about engagement with the public realm.

- The names used for some forms convey something to the public that isn’t reflected in code.

- We need to think about what should apply city-wide and what should apply to individual neighborhoods through overlay districts (or some other technique).

- It may be worth exploring having a zoning code form that explicitly applies to the slot home; if that were the case, it would be important to consider what zone districts it would be allowed in.

Staff will use this discussion to inform the final version of the Problem Statement.

V. February Meeting

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 8th, 2017 2:00-5:00 at. The February 8th meeting will begin with a tour of slot home development in small groups followed by a discussion with the reconvened Task Force. The February meeting will provide an opportunity to:

- Identify slot home issues and may occur across a variety of contexts vs. issues particular to specific neighborhoods or lots.

- Relate observed issues back to the draft problem statement.

- Discuss criteria for successful solutions.

- Provide feedback to City staff to revise the problem statement for public review.
Meeting Objectives:

- Identify slot home issues that may occur across a variety of contexts vs. issues particular to specific neighborhoods or lots
- Relate observed issues back to the draft problem statement
- Discuss criteria for successful solutions
- Provide feedback to City staff to revise the problem statement for public review

Task Force Members in Attendance: Dave Berton, Enrico Cacciorini, Anna Cawrse, Scott Chomiak, Anne Cox, Jane Crisler, Don Elliot, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Christine Franck, Sarah Kaplan, Maggie Miller, Ty Mumford, Councilman Wayne New, Heather Noyes, Melissa Rummel; Not in Attendance: Nathan Adams; CPD Staff: Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Kyle Dalton, Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Andy Rutzi; Observers: Justin Archuleta [RedT Homes rep for Nathan Adams], Angela Steiner [RedT Homes], Amanda Sandoval [Council Aide, District 1]

I. Slot Home Tour

The Task Force members were assigned one of three tour areas [West Colfax, Berkeley, or Highland/Sunnyside]. Each tour visited 4 developments and evaluated the developments with respect to the revised problem statement.

II. Problem Statement Revision

Staff provided a brief review of the problem statement revisions: Street Engagement has been revised to Public Realm Engagement; Building Placement has been replaced by Building Mass and Scale with a focus on design elements that promote compatible mass and scale between the buildings. Task Force members should provide any final thoughts on the problem statement to staff as soon as possible to bring the document to its final form.

III. Group Polling

The Task Force members were provided with a polling device to answer some questions related to the tour and problem statement. In the polling exercise, Public Realm Engagement ranked as the most problematic with Vehicle Oriented Design as the second most problematic.

IV. Group Discussion – Tours and The Problem Statement

Discussion – Tejon Street Photo (Sunnyside/Highlands Tour)

- Public realm engagement was the worst. This was because the gas meters were at eye level, the tuck-under parking is visible, no front door and minimal transparency; some level of landscaping would have helped.
- The development reads as 3 stories even through it is in a two-story main street district. The development didn’t respond to anything in the surrounding contexts as the building floors are not articulated.
- The organization of the units appear to create very isolated spaces that do not promote community or engagement of neighbors.
- The front is very planar, however it’s important to note that these are people’s bedrooms so large windows are incompatible with the use.
- A zero-foot setback works for commercial when you have active uses and large windows, it does not work when it’s a fully residential building.

Discussion – Tennyson Street Photo (Berkeley Tour)

- It’s important to note that artwork would no longer count as a transparency alternative and while the garden wall meets the code, it does not meet the spirit (intent) of the code.
- The lack of defined public or private space leaves a small space that only seems to collect trash.
• Something that this building does well is the expression of the base and the horizontal expression of the two stories above.
• The window proportioning is reasonable, given that it is like the nearby, older buildings.
• The Mass and Scale element of the problem statement should include proportions.
• Tennyson is a street with a tree lawn, but this building, with two-feet of width, doesn’t provide enough space to make the landscaping work. Thus, it does not contribute to the public realm.

Discussion – West 16th Photo (West Colfax Tour)
• Setbacks for residential-only buildings are good, however this setback is too much.
• The windows on this building do not have any sort of relationship with the use, in this case it is just the backside of the stairwells.
• The execution of these semi-private spaces do not produce a sense of ownership.
• The interior “slot” is oriented away from the street which is bad.

Discussion – North Tennyson Street (Berkeley Tour)
• When looking at this building, we should expand the area of the Pedestrian Realm part of the problem statement to include the area along the side of the building; these elements of pedestrian access are part of the public realm.

Discussion – North Lowell Blvd (West Colfax Tour)
• This one is probably one of the best, possibility because it is one of the few that enables the residents to interface with the street; residents use these balconies
• The building towers above the surrounding buildings; it doesn’t respond to its context.

General Discussion
• Impacts to neighbors
  o It’s problematic when immediately adjacent to a small bungalow, but not when it is adjacent to a similar building, so, as these areas change, the impacts may be temporary
  o All the other elements of the problem statement can be related back to other types of new development; this one might be the only one that is unique to slot homes.
  o Impacts are not just experienced on the side of the property, but the alleys as well.
• Public Realm engagement
  o Alleys along with the interior “slot” are a part of the public realm and should be integrated under public realm engagement.
• Contextual Design needs to be better differentiated from Mass and Scale
  o Contextual design is more about clearly differentiating the neighborhoods.

V. Evaluation Criteria

Starter List: Effectiveness, Equity, Flexibility and Predictability
• Effectiveness – Possible changes to the code address the problem statement effectively
• Equity – Serves the interests of all stakeholders – residential neighborhoods, adjacent owners/residents, builders, landowners, business districts, etc.
• Flexibility – Promotes the ability to respond to the circumstance of an individual property and promotes creative designs that can be applied to a variety of neighborhood contexts
• Predictability – Produces a code that is readily understood; different review staff would reach the same conclusion
Task Force Discussion
- The evaluation criteria should include Vision; the code revisions should promote the vision we have for each neighborhood and for the kind of city we want to create
- Predictability is important
- The solution should be no more complex than it needs to be; this is already a very complicated code, and we shouldn’t add to the complexities

VI. Look Ahead – Some of the Zoning Tools that Can Address the Problem Statement
- Tools that can Change Public Engagement – Transparency requirements, building entry standards, limiting allowed street-level use
- Tools that can Change Contextual Design – Lot configuration and lot coverage requirements, setbacks
- Tools that can Impact Building Mass & Scale – Building height limits, upper-story setbacks, bulk planes
- Tools that can Change Vehicle-Oriented Design – Parking standards, parking location limitations, access requirements, screening standards
- Tools that can Reduce Impacts on Neighbors – Side setback requirements, roof deck location limitations, design requirements

VII. Messaging for the Task Force regarding the Length of the Process
- Important to allow time for all interested parties to engage in the process
- Important to take the time for staff to consider carefully the possible changes to the code
- Important to give the task force time to consider the options and possible changes
- Formal adoption process with Planning Board and Council – with public notice requirements for hearings – takes time
- Additionally, the city has already made headway regarding some of the problems associated with slot homes in recent years – Task force requested to see images/plans of slot homes that could be built today under existing standards

VIII. Upcoming Meeting
Staff is working to schedule a public open house to confirm the problem statement with the public. Once the date/time/location has been finalized, staff will send out notification to the task force members.

The next task force meeting will take place on Thursday, March 16th, 2017 2:00-5:00 at a location to be determined. The meeting will begin to examine potential solutions.
I. Public Meeting and Public Input

Staff provided an overview of the public comments received at the Public Open House on March 8, 2017. Open house comments generally expressed concerns over a loss of neighborhood identity and character through the development of slot homes that do not positively engage the public realm, respect the existing mass and scale, and negatively impact the traditional street character and adjacent properties. Full summary has been provided to task force members and is posted to website at www.denvergov.org/slothomes

The task force offered these observations on the public meeting and the summary of public comment:

- We haven’t heard from those that live in slot homes and may want to hear from them
- The privacy concerns are not particular to slot homes. If the same land were developed as an apartment building, the apartment units would have windows on the side of the building facing adjacent homes (though not doors facing adjacent homes with people coming in and out)
- Participants seemed to prefer orderly facades with materials and color palettes that matched the existing neighborhood
- There were many positive reactions to the photographs of buildings with setbacks and landscaping; these created a more pedestrian-friendly street and sidewalk edge
- It isn’t always clear whether the public concerns are about density generally or about slot homes in particular
- As a follow up to the meeting, a task force member requested that staff find ways to integrate this effort with public works

Staff offered a one-sentence version of the problem and project as a way of summarizing the problem statement and the criteria. The task force noted that the sentence didn’t speak to the garden court moratorium and the question about whether garden courts are an appropriate form in some districts.

II. Problem Statement

The task force concluded its discussion of the problem statement, considering public comment, and suggested these changes:

- The problem statement needs a clear reference to the impact on commercial streets from buildings that are exclusively residential (The staff noted that this is captured in the neighborhood design section)
- Blueprint Denver reference – the statements needs a brief clarification that “area of change” doesn’t mean just any change, it means that the change needs to considered in light of the zoning context, neighborhood plans, and neighbors’ expectations
- Add reference in the problem statement to the idea that Desired Future Condition is expressed in the intent statements, in neighborhood plans, in neighborhood transportation plans and in the link
between those plans and development proposals; (The next phase of the process will examine zoning standards to create better alignment with the zoning code intent statements)

- Vehicle-oriented design – this is not simply a problem because people don’t want to look at these elements – it is more important to focus the problem statement on pedestrian safety, on the pedestrians’ experiencing the street as something that is safe, active, drawing them along the street, and that this is about make the public and semi-private spaces welcoming and active; emphasize walkability
- Emphasize solar access in the section on impacts on neighbor

The task force discussed two topics that will require additional reflection, and not simply an edit to the problem statement:

1. Might there be unintended, negative consequence that stems from the pattern of subdivision in the slot homes?
   - Could there be some future complication or problem in redeveloping these sites?
   - Is the pattern of ownership and the absence of HOA’s going to create a problem for near-term operation and maintenance and for redevelopment that wouldn’t otherwise exist and that doesn’t exist for other parcel arrangements (condominiums, traditional duplexes, etc.)?
   - Is there a negative, unintended impact on the city or on the slot home owners from the parcel configuration, from the ownership arrangement and from the absence of a condominium organization or HOA for shared responsibilities?

2. The idea that these units are more attainable than a duplex or a single-family house on the same site (assuming the same land costs) --- The question of attainability could be part of the evaluation of the new code changes rather than the problem statement – Would the proposed code changes significantly impacting attainability (the ability of homebuyers who are in the market to purchase the home)?

At this point in the task force deliberation, the group will turn away from the problem statement and begin moving toward potential changes to the zoning code.

III. Staff Presentation - Zoning Tools to Address Slot Homes

Staff provided an overview of zoning tools in the Denver Zoning Code that could be used to address the problem statement. Many of the tools presented do not currently apply to the forms in which slot homes are commonly built. (See Chapter 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes of the Strategy Report)

IV. Break-Out Sessions

The task force worked in 4 groups, reviewing the tools and looking for those that have the potential to improve 1). Neighborhood Design, 2). Public Realm Engagement, 3). Vehicle-Oriented Design and Impacts to Neighbors and 4). Mass and Scale. Each group discussed the advantages/disadvantages of each tool and identified those tools with the greatest potential to address the problem statement.

1. Neighborhood Design
   - Upper-story setback is a tool that can make the building more readable from the street. It also would enable active uses such as a rooftop deck to be located at the front of the building which is more appropriate.
   - Transparency is good when tied to active use requirements.
   - Encouraging entrances located on the side of the property to be more pronounced (with entry features) will create a more readable building.
• Promoting/requiring front porches is a more effective way to engage the public realm than the existing active-use requirement in a residential only building.

2. Public Realm Engagement
• Street Level Active uses are important, especially when tied to transparency standards.
• Active use standards need to be relevant to the use and the context.
• It is important to use incentives to encourage a greater setback; create an incentive for developers to set the buildings back and engage the public realm.

3. Vehicle-Oriented Design & Impacts to Neighbors
• Active use requirements are a good way to prohibit vehicular uses at the front of the building.
• Zero-foot setbacks are a disadvantage and affect privacy.
• Minimum parking standards do not have a significant impact on vehicle-oriented design.
• Building heights and upper-story setback can help with solar access and can reduce the perceived height of the building from the street.
• The upper story setback could also promote activity at the 2nd story, however it can reduce living space for the front unit.
• Explore ways to remove the dog house but still provide rooftop access

4. Mass and Scale
• Transparency standards should be reviewed more to manipulate apparent size of building facade.
• Explore a slight building height reduction to make more compatible without reducing number of stories.
• Upper story setback is important in being able to create buildings that keep in scale with lower rise buildings
• Bulk plane would be a good tool to help with mass and scale
• Block sensitive setback is a good tool to improve mass and scale
• Zone lot standards-biggest impact. Looking at other allowable forms on other lots and sizes Building coverage standards-medium level tool that would impact mass and scale, but this is a topic for to community members. Coverage of the lot is too much.

V. Upcoming Meeting
The next task force meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 12, 2017 2:00-5:00 at the Webb Building (201 W Colfax) on the second floor, room 2.1.1.

VI. Small Group Summaries

The following is a summary of the comments received on the tools reviewed to address the problem statement. The tools are generally listed in order of effectiveness as ranked by the groups.

- - - High Impact tools to address problem statement - - -

1. Primary Street Setback Standards:
Advantages:
• Open house participants felt that more setbacks were (almost) always good
• Can create the space for pedestrian entry features
• Can enable for landscaping
Disadvantages:
- Setbacks can make it more difficult for the architecture to engage the public realm; generally, this small group’s members don’t support mandatory setbacks unless they are required for neighborhood context (i.e. structures on at least one side of the lot have them)

Potential Revisions/Applications:
- Perhaps require a minimal (5-10 ft) setback if utilities are going to be located on the front of the building or if the applicant is using any of the alternatives to transparency or access.
- Incentivize a larger than 5-ft setback to allow porches

2. Pedestrian Access Standards and Alternatives

Advantages:
- When each unit is required to have a street-facing entrance in the row house form, it goes a long way to engage the street.
- Improves activity and public realm.
- A “door” relates to the street level active use.
- Real doors that people walk through to get in and out of the house enhances the public realm and enjoyment.

Disadvantages:
- Cost

Potential Revisions/Applications:
- Enable for pedestrian entries to “express” themselves with canopies or other features that could encroach into the setback.
- Relate to Active Use Standards

3. Transparency

Advantages:
- When located adjacent to a truly active use, it can engage the public realm
- Can contribute to façade design and massing of the building to feel human scale

Disadvantages:
- When no active use is required, it results on windows on garages. Hard to ensure that the standard leads to activation. Hard to avoid the misuse (windows into garages does not work)

Potential Revisions/Applications:
- Change code to allow for windows placed at 5’ high to count towards transparency. This might incentivize more windows on residential uses such as bedrooms.
- Relate the standard to the parking location

4. Street Level Active Use Standards

Advantages:
- Promotes activity between building and the sidewalk/street. Could prohibit access to street (comments might not fully understand standard as described).
- Relates to pedestrian access and can help to engage the public realm when ties to pedestrian access.

Disadvantages:
- Poor tool for this type of housing, which can visually turn its street ends into something more engaging, but forcing a different use into the space seems difficult.
- It’s a joke that stairwell and utility closets can count toward the active use standard
- Residential privacy concerns at a zero setback
- Forces the front unit to have a tandem garage (not always a bad thing however).

Potential Revisions/Applications:
- With current understanding, not interested in further exploring tool.
- Should be strengthened in MS and MX zone districts.
• In MU districts, this standard does not make sense, enabling/encouraging for porches is much more effective in creating an “active” space.
• May not make sense in districts with a greater setback.
• Revise the list of uses.
• Incentive program to get projects that engage the public realm.

5. Upper Story Setback/Setback
   Advantages:
   • A potential compromise between requiring the zoning max heights and the “overlooking”/backyard privacy issue. Third floor users would not always have a direct view into the back yard.
   • This is among the best tools – having a deck on the front on the second or third story would put eyes on the street and force the building back at the second floor.
   • Helps with solar access
   • Reduces the height as viewed from the street.
   • Could allow for upper story street facing porches.
   • Buffers rooftop activity and visibility.
   Disadvantages:
   • Tends to erode development potential to protect a scale of development on nearby lots that is inconsistent with the intended character reflected in the zoning district.
   • Reduces living space and creates a less viable product when there is ground level parking.
   • Stepbacks may lead to roof decks in those areas, which could be worse (in terms of noise and activity) than just viewing a backyard from inside.
   Potential Revisions/Applications:
   • Look at this as a potentially useful tool and see if it needs to be refined.
   • Stepbacks should align with the active use dimensions.
   • Allow for roof decks in this area, then the activity is focused to the front of the building where it belongs.

6. Building Height:
   Advantages:
   • Most powerful tool to address the “looking over into my backyard” problem. Requiring a greater setback for building elements that pierce the height limit would help
   Disadvantages:
   • Weakening the current tools tends to protect a scale (low-rise) that is not called for in the zoning district – probably counterproductive
   Potential Revisions/Applications:
   • Maybe consider context more specifically in Areas of Stability.
   • Reduce the maximum allowable height in 2-story districts.
   • One thing that could be addressed here is that the floor-to-floor heights of many new buildings are greater than those of the historic buildings, so the building is even more massive because of floor heights; if you want less massive buildings, reduce allowable floor heights

7. Building Height Exceptions:
   Advantages:
   • May respond to the neighborhood context better in transitioning neighborhood.
   Disadvantages:
   • Currently allow for doghouse which increases mass and scale of building
   Potential Revisions/Applications:
   • Currently guard rails around the rooftop decks cannot encroach, desire to allow for as a height encroachment. Maybe don’t need to enable for penthouse.
   • The doghouse should be stepped back regardless of if it exceeds the maximum height
8. **Setback Encroachments:**  
   **Advantages:**  
   • If we are going to allow for side entries, they should look like side entries and have canopies or other distinguishing entry features. Enables for front porches.  
   **Disadvantages:**  
   • Gas meters  
   **Potential Revisions/Applications:**  
   • Enable for entry features to encroach into front and side setbacks. Get the gas meters out of the front.

9. **Landscaping Standards:**  
   • Should include streetscape standards.

10. **Zone Lot Standards:**  
    **Advantages:**  
    • This can significantly change the mass of the buildings  
    **Disadvantages:**  
    • There may be resistance from developers, builders  
    **Potential Revisions/Applications:**

11. **Building Coverage:**  
    **Advantages:**  
    • Would directly address the massing problem  
    **Disadvantages:**  
    • Lowering building coverage tends to push towards more driveways and walkways along the edges and center of the development – and wide driveways in the center is part of the problem.  
    **Potential Revisions/Applications:**  
    • Might not be a good solution

12. **Bulk Plane:**  
    **Advantages:**  
    • This could help match new buildings to existing character.  
    • Solar access  
    **Disadvantages:**  
    • If you have upper story setbacks, you don’t need bulk plane  
    • Confusing and hard to understand.  
    • Often leads to strange outcomes on sloped lots.  
    • Could deter some from developing multi-family projects  
    **Potential Revisions/Applications:**  
    • Stay with discussing revisions to the setbacks – no need to double dip with another similar tool or confuse folks by having both in play.

13. **Parking Location, Layout, Access and Circulation:**  
    **Advantages:**  
    **Disadvantages:**  
    • Restricts design, especially on a small lot  
    **Potential Revisions/Applications:**  
    • Leave as is – parking under the units is logical if the visible auto-oriented-ness of the access when viewed from the street can be addressed. Parking along the alley is visually much better, but won’t provide enough parking to make most larger sites usable. Restrict parking location based on lot depth, though parking restrictions for only the street-facing unit could address street-level active use standards, transparency, and pedestrian access standards and alternatives.
14. Perimeter Surface Parking Lot and Landscaping Standards:
   **Advantages:**
   - If the parking access drive was better buffered from the street through dense landscaping, the auto orientation would be significantly reduced
   **Disadvantages:**
   - Making these very strict may significantly discourage further slot home development of any kind
   **Potential Revisions/Applications:**
   - Worth exploring along with suggestions above – maybe not allow the parking access to come close to the street frontage and then require the gap to be densely landscaped (although that may create safety/no “eyes-on-the-street” issues that could be worse than the problem.
   - Set a range of width that is more than a “slot” but significantly reduces the “wide expanse of asphalt visible from the street” problem – narrower than most of the ones we have viewed. Or
   - Require that the central parking access not extend to within 20 or 30 feet of the front property line, so that what is viewed from the street is more like a landscaped inset or setback, which may mean that the front units do not have parking available beneath the unit.

15. Block Sensitive Setback
   **Advantages:**
   - This gives a real change from the worst cases we saw – by placing the building back from the street at the historic distance, we avoid some of the buildings that are so massive and out of scale
   **Disadvantages:**
   - Potential Revisions/Applications: Remove from MU districts, setbacks should be calibrated to meet existing and future context.

16. Build to Standards:
   **Advantages:**
   - Disadvantages:
   **Potential Revisions/Applications:**
   - Don’t include the areas in the setbacks to count against the build to

17. Minimum Parking Standards & Exceptions:
   **Advantages:**
   - Reduces on-street parking impacts
   **Disadvantages:**
   - Promotes façade design with limited articulation and detail where garage is located.
   **Potential Revisions/Applications:**

18. Other Tools to Consider:
   - Offer an incentive --- give a more expedited review timing IF design recommendations are adopted
   - Design standards can prove that big buildings can be great – for many of the examples we’ve seen, they feel massive and out-of-scale because they are so poorly designed
   - Make a different set of rules for the unit that is on the street
   - Change the code to define which forms are allowed in each zoning context or zone district, more importantly, which are no longer allowed; this would allow us to prevent all-residential buildings in main street or commercial zones, etc. – this will have the greatest impact on eliminating buildings that have inappropriate mass and scale
Meeting Objectives:

- Explore additional tools proposed by consultants
- Task Force confirmation of key tools
- Provide feedback on successful developments and site designs that address the problem statement

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

I. Slot Home Resident Perspectives

Knowing that some of her coworkers live in slot homes, Sarah asked them to tell her about what they like and don’t about their new homes. One is a Rino resident and two live in West Colfax. They offered these observations:

Advantages:
- The building is a neighborhood within a neighborhood – residents of the same building see one another regularly and get to know one another
- Rooftop decks are their outdoor space – the new backyard
- Because the decks are completely visible to all others, they talk over the walls; this reinforces sense of community
- The residents are either 30-something professionals with no children or very small children or are empty-nesters – Those with children expect to need a different kind of home as their children grow up
- They feel safer within the private entry and vehicular entry than the public walkway in front of the building
- The proximity to neighbors adds to the sense of safety
- Location – easy access to the west matters

Disadvantages:
- Losing views as more slot homes are built
- Garages are small – typically park one car, use the rest of the space for storage and park one car on the street (if parking is available); no off-street parking for 2nd vehicle
- Units all look the same
- Driveway turn aisle is tight
- Neighbors are always around and noise carries through walls and windows; can always hear neighbors on roof; noise reverberates through the interior; dinners sound like parties
- The lifecycle break is good for couples, empty nesters, etc but once they have kids it is more difficult to manage
- Private alley doesn’t get trash pickup so they carry bins down the street; too many trash bins for the alley
II. Tools from Other Cities

Staff presented zoning tools that other cities have used in similar circumstances.

- Bulk Plane - Nashville
- Upper story setback - Philadelphia
- Rooftop Deck Setback from all four sides - New Orleans
- Build-to: Nashville and Fort Worth
- Rear setbacks – New Orleans, Nashville, Fort Worth, Seattle
- Alley-Access: Seattle and Nashville
- Parking Placement – Seattle, Nashville, Fort Worth and New Orleans
- Building type – Seattle, Nashville and Fort Worth
- Ground floor transparency – Seattle, Nashville
- Street Facing Entrance and entry feature – Seattle, Nashville, Fort Worth
- Articulation – Seattle and Fort Worth
- Design Review – with a review board Seattle and Fort Worth
- Ground Floor Active Use – Nashville
- Inactive ground floor screening – New Orleans

Discussion – Which Tools Seem Most Useful for Our Work?

- Design incentives
- Articulation requirements
- Design review – including quality of material
- Entry feature requirement
- Articulation (but worry about requiring certain materials)
- The deep rear setback helps with vehicle turn around, parking for 2nd car and guest parking
- The requirement that 50% of units must have a street-facing entrance
- Street-facing entrance and entry feature requirements
- A good incentive for articulation would be to encourage flexible setbacks – if 7-ft setback is the standard, allow part at 5 ft and part at 9 ft so that it meets the average
- Street-facing entry requirements and well designed and well-articulated buildings
- Street-facing entry is the best tool
- Articulation could be helpful but there are worries about the not-so-great results that could come from it
- Context-sensitivity: need design review with triggers/thresholds
- Design Review should have variance powers to give added flexibility to design review board
- Landscaping requirements
- Rooftop deck setback
- Anything that addresses building height
- Rooftop setback seems appropriate with flat roof, but not pitched roof
- Would love to know if other cities have no-site-grading requirements for landscaping and for addressing fair housing accessibility requirements
- Do other cities have open space requirements (back yards or ground-level open space)? Yes, some do

Staff is working with the consultant to finalize the report. Once the report has been finalized, it will be distributed to the task force.
III. Most Promising Tools – From the Task Force Deliberation Thus Far

Staff offered their observation that the following five tools seem to hold the most promise, given task force deliberation to this point, and the task force confirmed the list:

Discussion:
1. Front setback
   - Some neighborhoods that are entirely redeveloped have enormous front setbacks that don’t make sense
   - All-residential buildings built in main street or mixed-use zones that have zero setback don’t work – we need to set back the residential buildings in these zones if we are going to allow all-residential development in these zones
   - We will have to calibrate the specific setbacks in different contexts
   - We need to examine how block-sensitive setbacks work (or fail to)
2. A real entrance with entry features
   - Today, the code requires one entrance, but doesn’t require articulation or emphasis
   - It seems insufficient to require only one
   - Apartment buildings have only one entrance
   - The flat front is problematic – the entry feature must be real, and substantial
   - The number of street-facing entrances is the most crucial question
   - Seattle’s requirement that 50% of the units face the street produced a new form with one set of units along the street, then a second set on the back half of the lot
   - We should require front porch or entry feature and allow it to encroach into the front setback or, at least, count toward active use requirement
3. Measuring height in feet
4. Expanded garden court and
5. Landscaping requirement
   - This is a good start, but doesn’t settle the question of whether the garden court form is inappropriate for some districts

Discussion – Other Concerns:
Building a connection between the two halves of a slot home development to cover the slot
   - This would address some of the mass and scale questions
   - Developers are exploring ways to do this – it results in some interesting vehicular access questions

Parking
   - The biggest issue is parking
   - The list of above is a good start, but we must deal with the car – vehicle access and parking

Naming conventions including the height in stories
   - For RNO members and for the public – the name of the zone district and how we measure building heights is confusing – we are seeing a 6-story building in MS-5 district. Is so confusing to public that it is zoned for this number of stories and then they can count that they are higher. These slot homes and building forms should look like that zone district to pedestrians at street level.

Rooftop setbacks
   - How do we govern a form that isn’t designated – there is no slot home form in the code
   - We apply things to the apartment or shop front form when the reality is these aren’t apartments or shop fronts
   - The task force will need to address the question: which forms are allowed in which district?
IV. Photo Activity

The task force looked for photos that demonstrated an effective response to some element of the problem statement — engaging public realm, mass and scale, vehicle-oriented design, impact on neighbors, neighborhood context

Each task force member spoke to one photo:

- A low-income housing project with lots of front doors facing the street — a successful and affordable project where you can always see kids playing out front
- A building that engages the public realm, has character and appropriate mass
- Front doors on the street and variety of setbacks, two-story
- A zero-lot-line building that is articulated so that doesn’t feel like its falling over into the public realm, with plane breaks; it steps back subtly from the street; it has garages that open to one of the street faces, but that doesn’t dominate; it is an interesting example of minimal setbacks without being overwhelming
- Row house with porches on the first, second and third level; hides vehicular access; variety of scales
- A 3-story row house that doesn’t feel like 3 due to the articulation and the entrances
- Sloping site helps with massing. Even though there is concrete and not much landscaping it feels friendly and not modern or foreign
- Contextually appropriate architecture with sloped roof, delineated 3 stories, traditional windows, modern materials integrated into structure. Looks like rowhome but only have 2 doors on street side, and that’s okay in this kind of composition and materials
- Commercial uses on the ground floor in a commercial context
- Multi-gabled row house; it is the next generation high density version of craftsman bungalows; easy to maintain units, one material on roof (all shingle), every façade is defined, playing with brick massing and bringing it out to make a deck or balcony; long-term this form could easily incorporate the changes we want to make to slot home regulations.
- Public realm engagement – putting in three stories that aren’t in-your-face
- The problem with these pictures – they aren’t on lots with the dimension of Denver’s zone lots; we’re going in a direction that we can’t go
- Street-facing orientation, articulation on the street-side; follows the sloping contour of land; nice transparency; front setback, but without the street facing requirement it could look different
- We want to produce buildings with all street facing units but we’re limited by the lot sizes and some buyers don’t care, will buy with or without street facing entry
- Engages the public well, looks like a single-family home at the front and may have more units behind
- Everyone’s said they like the front entrances – recessed/covered, entry features, we can do that

V. Next Steps

- Next meeting – June 8 – 2:00-5:00
Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment Task Force  
Meeting 5 – June 8, 2017 – Summary  

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

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

I.  Staff Presentation  
Staff presented an overview of the project scope and purpose for each of the upcoming task force meetings.  
Staff provided an overview of the intent of Mixed Use (MX) and Main Street (MS) districts.  
- Mixed Use (MX) districts are applied more broadly and intended to create mixed, diverse neighborhoods while promoting safe, active and pedestrian-scaled areas.  
- Main Street (MS) districts are more strategically applied to areas with a higher degree of pedestrian activity while promoting safe, active and pedestrian-scaled areas.  

Staff provided an overview of the previously confirmed primary tools:  
1. Minimum primary street setback  
2. Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry  
3. Decreased maximum building height in feet  

Staff presented the existing outcome for a U-MX-3 zone district in the general building form and then presented four strategy options for review, including the staff recommendation. The staff recommendation included the application of the following tools:  
- Minimum primary street setback  
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry  
- Decreased maximum building height in feet  
- Requirement for units at the street to be oriented to the street  

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

The task force concluded that the staff recommended strategy option was the correct option to pursue further for MX, RX, and MS districts.
III. **Overview of Additional Tools**  
Staff provided an overview to the application of the following additional tools:  
- Entry Feature (stoop, canopy, porch) examples  
- Primary Street Setbacks (4-10’) examples  
- Active Use (Existing, increased, 100%) examples  
- Build-To (Existing with alternatives, existing, increased, 90%) examples  
- Units at the street (2-6 units) examples  

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

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

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

**Group 3:**  
- **Entry Feature:** The partial enclosure is important whether above or below. Always requiring a porch doesn’t seem consistent with Mixed Use districts character or intent.  
- **Build-to:** The discussion focused on the street wall and the location and visibility of parking.  
- **Active Use:** Somewhere between options 1 and 2 is good. Requiring complete active use is too great a standard for mixed-use areas.  

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

V. **Next Meeting – July 20 – 2:00-5:00 – Webb 4.F.7**
Meeting Objectives:
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy for Multi-Unit (MU) zone districts
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy the Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy for the Row House building form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts
- Discuss additional tools that may be necessary to fully address the problem statement

Task Force Members in Attendance: Nathan Adams, Enrico Cacciorini, Anne Cox, Anna Cawrse, Scott Chomiak, Don Elliot, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Jane Crisler, Christine Franck, Maggie Miller, Heather Noyes, Sarah Kaplan, Councilman Wayne New, Melissa Rummel

Not in Attendance: Dave Berton, Ty Mumford.

CPD Staff: Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Morgan Gardner

I. Staff Presentation: Multi Unit

Staff presented an overview of their recommended strategy for the multi-unit zone districts. The staff recommended applying of the following tools:
- Unit orientation to the street
- Require entry feature for street-facing entries
- Revise side setback
- Revise block-sensitive setback
- Reduced height in feet

II. Task Force Discussion

The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:
- If the intent is to have a 3-story building, building height in feet might not be the best tool. There is a need to consider upper story setbacks or other tools that address the appearance.
- Rule of measurement and sloping lots need to be considered in the review of this tool. It is important to maintain flexibility.
- The entrance and the entry features need to open into real living spaces and not just a garage.
- Unit orientation to the street is good, however we need to think about how to get enough units at the street so they read as a row house or a town house from the front.
- The rooftop deck issue persists and will need to be discussed.
- The back-out space for at least one unit is limited. We need to discuss potential revisions to the vehicular access.
- Concern over allowing too much flexibility – everyone – landowners, neighbors, developers – should know what to expect.
- The code needs to address parcels that abut a public open space/park and treat that edge of the private development as part of the public realm, as if the development were facing a public street.
- If you conclude that you only need four of these five tools to accomplish the goal, remove the fifth to reduce complexity; simpler is better.

The task force concluded that the staff recommended strategy option was the correct option to pursue further for MU zone districts.

III. Staff Presentation: Garden Court Building Form

Staff presented an overview of the recommended strategy for the Garden Court building form – eliminating this form from the Row House and the Town House zone districts. To clarify their thinking, staff also presented an alternative – a set of potential revisions to the Garden Court building form.
These revisions could be applied in the Row House or Town House zone districts if the task force chooses not to eliminate the form in these two zones:

- Increase courtyard width,
- Require landscaping in courtyard,
- Enclose the garden court with residential units on three sides, and
- Setback unenclosed driveways and drive aisles.

Although the revisions could improve the form, they also make it highly unlikely that a developer would use the form in Row House and Town House zones. The staff concludes that the best course of action is to remove the form from all RH/TH zone districts.

IV. Task Force Discussion on the Garden Court Building Form

The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:

- Concern over removing the garden court form from the code altogether. Country Club Gardens and other garden apartments are good buildings. Staff Note: The examples provided by the task force are within multi-unit districts. The staff recommendation is to remove the form only from the Row House and Town House zone district, not to eliminate the possibility of garden apartments in multi-unit districts.

- It is useful to require landscaping for garden courts, in a way that can benefit the street.

- The current moratorium requires a courtyard width greater than the height of the building, prohibits stacking and requires a 50% permeable courtyard surface.

- There is room for the form, but the issue that we are specifically talking about is the RH/TH district. Those who live in R-2 have accepted the idea that RH or TH zoning can be compatible with their neighborhood only to get something completely out of character – a slot home development. In some cases, those buildings come with a below-ground level parking, which is visible from the street or from adjacent properties and is out of character with the neighborhood.

- When you go around Denver, there is typically a pattern of orientation, but isn’t always consistent. We should avoid removing the natural flexibility occurring over time. We have courtyard apartments on streets that are otherwise very densely built. The sudden shift to a beautiful courtyard is welcome.

- We have very different forms of garden courts. Perhaps we need to look at traditional apartments and garden court units and better calibrate option A and look at how historical examples map in city (not new garden courts).

- Where do historic garden court exist in city, and does it occur as an apartment, town house, etc.? Staff Note: The large majority of existing courtyard buildings in Denver are apartments, which are in higher intensity multi-unit zone districts which can still be built under the apartment building form.

- Some of the task force agreed that because garden courts are higher density, they do not belong in RH/TH districts.

- Sunken driveways not appropriate in these districts.

- It seems like the type of recalibrating we want to do will make development impossible. Removing it might be best option. Focus the form in high density apartment areas; it doesn’t belong in RH and TH zone district.

- A garden court building form is not appropriate in RH district, the form conflicts with intent statement.

- As much as I love the true garden court look, I agree to remove the building form in RH/TH district.

- I agree with getting rid of the form on RH and TH. The garden courts I love are in higher density multifamily zones.

The task force did not come to a consensus on the staff recommended option to remove the garden court building from in the RH/TH zone districts. Staff will consider this discussion as they produce a draft for task force consideration.
V. Staff Presentation: Row House and Town House Building Form
Staff presented a recommended strategy for the Row House and Town House building form in RH/TH zone districts. The recommended tool would require side-by-side units oriented to the street.

VI. Task Force Discussion on the Row House and Town House Building Form
The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:
- The saw-tooth form in the problem-statement slide is acceptable. It relates to the street.
- Others disagree, seeing this as not on par with a true row house or town house.
- The RH and TH zones are clearly established with the expectation of a real entry on the street. If you’re building a four-plex, units might have entries on the side or share and entry. The problem with four townhouses facing the side, not the street, is that you get units all the way to the back of the lot. This is very different from the existing pattern. In favor of having RH and TH building forms be what their names says.
- Maintaining flexibility is important. Garden court breaks the pattern much more than this four-plex form does.
- This form brings people’s doors all the way to the back of the lot. It feels wrong for RH and TH. Garden courts correct this by giving a buffer.
- An entire block of four-plex buildings or staggered multi-unit buildings in an RH or TH zone is not what makes sense in the RH/TH districts.
- A full block of row houses is unified. Allowing the four-plex or the stagger breaks the pattern.
- No other section of code is this specific. RH has a distinct connotation. The staggered or four-plex forms are not rowhomes. They fit into multi-unit districts.
- The four-plex building can reasonably be called a town house.
- Others disagree, indicating that a four-plex should not be called a town home.
- If a zone lot is sufficiently deep, we should promote primary residences in the front and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in the back.
- In the code update process, the issue of form not matching the name has caused many problems at the neighborhood level. We should be mindful of that during this process, even if ensuring continuity between zone district names and building forms doesn’t necessarily fall within the purview of this process.
- A RH and TH zone district is not a description of the form. RH and TH zones don’t have only RH and TH forms. Maybe we should change the name of the zone district to allow variety.
- There are other forms allowed in RH district – the nomenclature is to describe the highest intensity form allowed.
- If we exclude this opportunity, the developer will find another way to create the same outcome.
- This is exactly what this task force has to prevent – the code should not create opening for developers to work around the intent.
- The code needs to require actual, live-able, useable space on the ground floor on units facing the primary street, and the parking requirements are part of what is driving the problem.

The task force did not come to a consensus of the staff recommended option to revise the row house and town house building form to require side-by-side units oriented to the street.

VII. Bike Rack -- Items for Future Discussion
- Timing – the effect of the text amendment on current or future projects.
- Accessory Dwelling Units as accessory to other uses beyond single family residential.

VIII. Break Out Discussion
The task force broke into three groups to review design outcomes produced by these four additional tools:
- Side setback encroachments
- Rooftop stair enclosures and heights
- Build-to percentages
- Entry features
Side Setback Encroachments

- **Group 1** – Something between B & C are appropriate. Allow (not require) encroachments such as shading devices that create ownership of the space. Do not need to go as far as a multi-story porch.
- **Group 2** – Canopies should be allowed, but possibly not upper story encroachments. Porches might be okay, however is it possible to have a quality space and a porch in 10-feet.
- **Group 3** – Allow for something and encourage some acknowledgment of the entryways but don’t allow for enough to really encourage gathering and things that might increase perceived mass and scale. No closer than 5 ft from property line. C is too far. This is in a G-MU district.

Rooftop Stair Enclosures and Heights

- **Group 1** – These features should be pushed away from the street and neighboring properties. There is no need to remove, however some minor revisions may be appropriate.
- **Group 2** – Same as first group. Needs to be something greater than today but not prohibit doghouses. Don’t create a standard that eliminates them all together. Upper story setback might be different way to approach this question.
- **Group 3** – Lots of talk of doghouses being as invisible as possible while preserving ability of street-oriented buildings to still have a roof deck. MU and RH/TH context applies here too. If height is measured to the top of the roof deck, and open railings are required (important that roof decks and railings appear open and light), the height can be lower. It is possible to create context-sensitive heights that allow 3-story buildings.

Build-To Percentages and Alternatives

- **Group 1** – Having a consistent street frontage is appropriate and alternatives should only be permitted when necessary or when the alternative supports an enhanced public realm. Also, discussed need to revise vehicular access standards and active use.
- **Group 2** – with street-orientation of units, build-to is less important – market will determine, keeping build-to may not be a bad thing. Garden wall does not add anything to public realm engagement. Encourage public realm engagement. Increase width of drive aisle.
- **Group 3** – Alternatives such as garden wall are not same as build-to and not as meaningful. Either get build-to right or get rid of the alternative. In terms of where percentage is set, some thought D’s leftover space is awkward, maybe go closer to B or C. C’s high build-to might be too restrictive. Handicap accessibility might become an issue.

Entry Features

- **Group 1** – Examples ABCD and E are good. The details of the entry feature are less important than what is required.
- **Group 2** – The market could decide entry features. Maybe a menu approach – a series of elements that are required to add up to a feature. Landscaping and trees are important. Too much of a setback takes away from street engagement. The features should create a sense of ownership for the units.
- **Group 3** – A is good. Make sure there is a real entry feature. Landscaping is key. In C, might not be a problem in terms of setback dimensions, but entry feature might end up not being substantial enough.

**IX. Next Steps**

- Next meeting – Apologies for moving from the 10th to the 24th of August
- The meeting will be August 24, 2:00-5:00 Webb 4.F.7
Meeting Objectives:
- Reconsider strategy for Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts
- Consider definition of Row House building form
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy for Multi-Unit (MU) zone districts
- Discuss additional tools that may be necessary to fully address the problem statement

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

I. Opening Discussion

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

II. Garden Court Building Form

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

### III. Row House Building Form

The task force reviewed the definition of a “row house” considering how to interpret the idea that all row house units must face the street and not have units located behind other units. Their discussion included the following:

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

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

### IV. Upcoming Public Meeting

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

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

V. Improvements to the Draft Strategies Prior to Testing

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

Setback

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

- Staff agreed to explore these comments with the testing group.

Decrease Vehicle Parking area dimensions

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

- The task force agreed that reducing the dimensions is the right approach

Defining a New Form

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

VI. Multi-Unit District - Strategy

Revise block-sensitive setback

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

Revising side setback

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

Increase build-to percentage

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

VII. Testing and Next Steps

- Public Meeting on September 7th, 5:30, Colorado Health Foundation
- Testing begins now – we need task force members to run tests and explore the questions posed by the task force
- Results in the October 19th meeting from 2-5pm
Meeting Objectives:
- Review approach for effective date/pipeline projects; confirm staff recommended approach
- Review revisions to existing proposed tools based on testing; confirm revisions for inclusion in Final Strategy report
- Review new tools proposed by testers and/or community; determine which tools should be included in Final Strategy report

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

I. Staff Presentation: Effective Date Approach
Staff presented an overview of three different approaches to the effective date and the impacts of each approach on existing projects. The staff recommendation is an effort to balance effectiveness and equity. The recommended approach allows for existing projects (with a formal SDP submitted prior to the effective date) to continue under existing regulations and new projects (where a formal SDP has not been submitted by the effective date) must adhere to new regulations upon the effective date. Staff highlighted the benefits and disadvantages for each of the different approaches.

II. Task Force Discussion
The task force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:
- There has been a lot of discussion about this project, the development community is aware that the change is coming – so the effective date should trigger project review under the new code for all projects
- The community should be provided with the same level of “rights” as the developers
- The staff recommended solution feels like a fair compromise, but it will still impact some developers negatively
- These changes and impacts happen all of the time with the building codes – in the case of building code changes, there is a 6-month window to use either set of rules. Following the 6-month transition period, everyone must adhere to the new regulations. This is an approach to explore.
- There seems to be a clear reduction of density, which will impact how much developers will pay for land; that’s acceptable as long as buyers and sellers know the new rules and can make buying and selling decisions accordingly
- The staff recommended approach is the most logical approach and a fair solution

The task force concluded that the staff recommended option (2) was the best approach. Staff committed to extensive outreach and asked task force members to assist in getting the word out now that the code will change.

III. Staff/External Tester Presentations: Testing Results
Staff and the external testers presented the results of their efforts to apply the zoning tools to a variety of zone lots and zone districts. Details of the testing results can be found in the attached Testing Results PDF.
IV. Staff Presentations: Revisions to existing tools
In review of the community comments from the September 7th community open house, external testing and internal testing, staff recommended these revisions to the existing proposed tools:

- **Require units oriented to the street.** Staff recommended revisions to better address corner lots and ensure appropriate outcomes on all street frontages. The discussion centered on how to designate the primary street. **The task force confirmed this approach, highlighting the need to give additional attention to the primary street.**
- **Entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry.** Staff recommended adding a mininum depth of 5’ to the porch or patio definition, and a minimum depth of 3’ to the canopy definition. **The task force confirmed this approach.**
- **Decrease maximum building height in feet.** Staff recommended maintaining the proposed heights (30’ for 2-story, 35’ for 3-story in MU/RO, 38’ for 3-story in MX/MS/RX), however for pitched roofs, allowing greater heights of (35’ for 2-story, 40’ for 3-story in MU/RO, 45’ for 3-story in MX/MS/RX). **The task force agreed that this concept was good, however the draft code should promote more a substantial pitched roof than was depicted in the staff recommendation graphic.**
- **Increase minimum side street setback.** Staff recommended a 10’ side street setback in alignment with the primary street setback. The task force felt that a side street setback was necessary, however considering that the side street typically has smaller setbacks than the primary street, **many of the task force agreed that a 7.5’ side street setback was appropriate; some task force members suggested that a 5’ side street setback would be adequate.**
- **Allow side street setback encroachments.** Staff recommended allowing for vehicle back-out areas (max of 5’) to encroach into the side and side street setbacks when screened. **The task force confirmed the approach, stating that more flexibility for vehicle use areas is beneficial.**
- **Introduce build-to exception.** Staff recommended adding a build-to exception for the vehicular access drive when no alley is present. **The task force confirmed this approach.**
- **Revise off-street vehicle parking area dimensions.** Staff recommended maintaining the internal drive access width of 12’ and revising the drive aisle width to 20’. Staff also recommended that these standards should be allowed for any side-by-side residential projects, including row houses. **The task force concurred.**

V. Staff Presentations: Additional Tools for Task Force Consideration
In review of the community comments from the September 7th, external testing and internal testing, staff presented additional tools for the task force to consider.

- **Standards addressing protected districts.** External testers and community comments suggested additional standards when adjacent to a protected district. Staff recommended the following proposed standards:
  - Proposed standard: Limit rooftop and second story decks in the rear 35% when adjacent to a protected district with the same standard.
  - Proposed standard: Increase the rear setback for the primary structure to align with the protected district building form standards.
  - **The task force expressed support for these provisions, ensuring that the protected district standards effectively work together with the adjacent zone districts.** The task force also acknowledged the challenge this will pose to 38th Avenue and other MX districts abutting protected districts as well as the reduction in units or value to the rear units without a deck.
- **Increase transparency standards.** Staff recommended increasing the primary street and side street transparency standards. **The task force agreed with this recommendation, however encouraged staff to look at upper story transparency as well.**
• **Introduce residential street level use requirement in MU/RO.** Staff did not make a recommendation for the inclusion of this standard in the final strategy. The task force provided the following comments:
  o It’s difficult for zoning to control the interiors of the buildings, therefore we should focus on what can be controlled and experienced from the public realm, like transparency and porches.
  o Forcing people to live on the ground floor is not the role of the city or the developers.
  o This also puts significant constraints on the site design and layout.
  o Transparency to a garage or a small hallway with stairs does not sufficiently activating the public realm.

  **The task force was unable to come to consensus and make a recommendation to staff. This tool will not be included in the strategy report.**

• **Introduce side interior setback in MX/MS/RX districts.** Staff did not make a recommendation for the inclusion of this standard in the final strategy. The task force provided the following comments:
  o This is where a protected form would be a useful tool.
  o If someone is needing to access the side interior to access the unit, this is an extension of the public realm and should be addressed.
  o 5' would align with fire code access, however it may not be sufficient.

  **The task force agreed that a setback of at least 5' should be required when providing pedestrian access to rear units. This tool will be included in the strategy report.**

• When staff asked about any other tools for inclusion into the final strategy report, reductions to side setbacks for drive aisles was considered as a way of disincentives the cantilevered buildings above the driveways.

**VI. Next Steps**

• The next task force meeting will be November 16th 2-5pm. The purpose of the meeting is to review the final strategy report before staff distributes the report for public review
• Planning Board Informational Item on November 1st
• Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Informational Item on November 28
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On the evening of March 8, 2017, the City of Denver hosted a Community Open House to kick off the Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project. The purpose of the open house was to:

- Introduce the project scope;
- Gain public insight into, and feedback on, problems associated with slot home development; and
- Promote continued public engagement throughout the process

Over 70 community members attended the workshop in northwest Denver, including Councilman Rafael Espinoza and 6 other members of the Slot Home Task Force. The Department of Community Planning and Development promoted the event with a special edition newsletter and notified Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs). The Task Force engaged with their community to invite interested members of the public.

Open house comments generally expressed concerns over a loss of neighborhood identity and character through the development of slot homes that do not positively engage the public realm, respect the existing mass and scale, and cause for negative impacts to the traditional street character and adjacent properties.

The Open House began with a welcome and presentation by City staff. The presentation addressed:

- Project Scope
- Existing Conditions
- Problem Identification Statement
- Criteria for Successful Solutions

The presentation is online and attached to this open house summary.

Following the presentation, the attendees were directed to participate in the open house. The open house consisted of 12 different boards with content related to the project, slot home types, problem statement and criteria. Attendees were encouraged to move throughout the room and provide comments and engage in discussion with other attendees.

In addition to the open house activities, individual worksheets were provided to all open house participants to submit additional comments and feedback. A smaller portion of participants utilized individual comment sheets. Comments provided via way of the worksheet have been integrated into the comment summary.
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Key comments and themes are summarized below:

Garden Court Moratorium: The majority of comments felt that language in the garden court moratorium relating to the width of the “garden court” was appropriate and should be kept.

Comments on the slot home types (single row, center drive, center court, detached parking): Comments focused on specific issues relating to the photos shown. All forms received comments that a front setback is good and features such as porches and landscaping should be integrated. The detached parking type had the least negative comments, with positive comments relating to the location of the parking off the alley respecting the traditional layout of the neighborhoods. Participants found that buildings with all or most units facing the primary or side street, the outcome was the best.

The majority of comments provided were related to the problem statement elements:

- For those concerned about poor street activation, lack of front porches for socialization to develop “community among neighbors,” or a connection to the street, these topics are captured in the public realm engagement element of the problem statement.
- Comments calling for neighborhood-specific solutions that maintain the character of the neighborhood as opposed to destroying the existing character of the neighborhood are captured in the neighborhood design element of the problem statement.
- Comments relating to the incompatible building scale (height), need for setbacks, and lack of human scale are topics captured in the building mass and scale element of the problem statement.
- Comments described the need for driveways to be hidden from street view as it can impact character of the street and sidewalk, these problems are captured in the vehicle-oriented design element of the problem statement.
- Comments highlighted the need to respect the existing adjacent properties with special consideration to a loss of sunlight and privacy with an increase in noise often a result from rooftop decks. These topics are captured within the impacts to neighbors element of the problem statement.

Comments on the criteria for successful solutions were minimal, however comments reinforced that the criteria are important and while it should result in predictable outcomes, it should not result in a “cookie cutter approach” for the entire city that fails to respect the neighborhood character. Comments also highlighted the need to be respectful of property owner rights affirming the predictability criteria.

Additional comments not specifically addressed in the problem statement are summarized here:

- Concerns about construction quality and inspection services, comments comparing these homes to “slums”
- Comments calling for design review to promote higher architectural quality

Additional comments were received that may be outside of the scope of the Slot Home Evaluation and Text amendment, but related to the Denver Zoning Code (DZC) are summarized here.

- Confusion regarding the relationship between DZC building forms and what can be built using those forms (i.e., the DZC Shopfront building form allows for construction of slot homes and rental apartments)
- Confusion about difference between ownership parcels and zone lots
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- Comments highlighting the need for density along with opposing comments against density.
- Comments stating the need for commercial streets to have commercial ground floors.

Additional comments were received that related to broader city or state-wide topics:
- Increased development requires more city services, such as fire and police.
- Affordable Housing is a concern
- State of Colorado construction defects laws discourage condo construction

Following the Open House segment of the meeting, staff, task force members and attendees were provided the opportunity to report back to the entire group of participants.

Comments shared to the group during the report back:
- Slot Homes should not be allowed in Denver
- The density of slot homes is not appropriate
- The way in which lot homes are happening is unpredictable, these are not “apartments”
- Neighborhood impacts include noise, sunlight and privacy
- The better, more pleasant slot homes are set back and have landscaping
- The way the lots are subdivided as fee-simple town homes is changing the land use pattern
- Slot home development is leading to a loss of neighborhood identity and character
- Development without yards, decks or porches, does not engage the public realm
- Additional standards need to be applied to slot homes
- The construction quality appears to be lacking
- Slot homes may have adverse impacts on infrastructure
- Slot homes do not provide adequate open space for the character of the neighborhood
- Slot homes are having adverse impacts on neighborhood commercial streets
- Denver is losing “community” through the development of buildings that do not engage with neighbors
- There are significant challenges with developing affordable for-sale housing at the state level
- Trees and landscaping are an important component of the neighborhood context

At the conclusion of the meeting, city staff encouraged the public to stay engaged throughout the process moving forward. Methods for continued public engagement include:
- Upcoming open houses in Phase 2 & 3 of the project – Open house meetings will be noticed a minimum of 2 weeks prior.
- Task Force Meetings – All open to the public, agendas are posted to the website 7 days prior
- RNOs and Community Meetings – City Staff will come to RNO and other community meetings as requested
- Slot Home Website – All meeting summaries and content will be posted to the website
- Slot Home Newsletter – Sign-up to receive updates and notice of upcoming meetings
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All written comments received are provided below:

Comments related to Garden Court Moratorium
- Keep these amendments! (pointing to current moratorium language)
- “Projects that Have a street-facing courtyard width equal to or greater than the height of the associated buildings” <-keep these amendments!
- If going to be called “garden court” they should be required to include grass/greenery/unpaved inter-courts.
- The current zoning and use seems reasonable – there’s no need for a moratorium
- Space between should be equal to height of building
- Only fifteen feet separation between buildings is ridiculously inadequate
- Should not be allowed in RH districts where front doors facing the street are expected

Comments on Single Row
- If on a corner, should respect setbacks of both streets
- Cantilever is horrible, if adjacent to homes
- Impersonal and future slum-like buildings
- Like less dense land use, but needs more greenery

Comments on Center Drive
- Image 4 is best of these because it nods at least to the concept of a welcoming lawn with entryways that face street. Lose the gas meters. Images 1, 2 and 3 look like office buildings. Unfriendly, soulless, that have been squeezed into too little space.
- All canyons in asphalt and concrete – more problems with heat islands and no place for a family in a multi-family
- Not quite as pretty as a cinderblock and less windows
- Awful...
- (pointing to center drive), great place for crime, trash, fire and vermin
- Inhospitable, turns shoulder to street

Comments on Center Court
- Need larger courtyards where the sun will reach air circulate
- Stepped building might help with transition to street
- Image #3 is absolutely horrible. Looks like an ominous cave – stay away! Image #2 is best of these with front lawn, neutral colors, logical roofline. Images #1 and #4 at least have front lawns but the towers on #1 and the jetty tops on #4 are unpleasant.
- If building in mixed-use are the center-court, require storefront from activation
- The ones with front setbacks that are landscaped with greenery, things are better but calling these “courtyards” is a travesty
- This looks like a dog yard – excusable unless its back doors (Image #5)
- Image #5 – urban canyon, no air or light or reason to be in space
- Only works if pedestrian area is generous; 2 aisles for parking is wasteful

Comments on Detached Parking
- Yes to detached garages in historic neighborhoods – respects alley-centric land use
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- This seems to be the best of all the forms. Street-facing units, transparency on street-front, alley access for parking. Not built up next to sidewalk. Green/outdoor space/setback on street.
- Better but with required setback but with required setback and responsible landscaping. No rocks!
- Puts living space at street level and possibility for even postage-stamp yard.
- Picture #3 is the best of these with lawn and a bit of landscape. #1 is the worst; ugly office building lurking behind fence. #2 is okay but not as welcoming as #3.
- Best option – parking appreciated and looks good from the street.
- Best looking option yet, worst return on investment.
- The only acceptable form is the corner type with detached parking. The other three share same design/functional/disrespect of public street
- Only reasonable solution, if rooftop decks are eliminated
- Must activate pedestrian frontage
- By far my preference, if new construction wants to take the majority of the lot, detached parking is compatible with the alley garages in most historic neighborhoods

Public Realm Engagement
- Designs that have all units facing the main streets or side streets works well
- Exempt front porches from max lot coverage. Move tops back.
- Front porch street activation and inviting design from street side
- Walkway from sidewalk to front door
- Street activation and inviting design from street
- There are no active facades on slot homes
- This does not connect to the street, balconies are up, not street level
- Entry on the street should be prominent-porch, large canopy look
- Sustainability and safety, long term evolution, heat islands, no solar access, no outdoor space, no defensible space, no eyes on the street
- I see the lack of engagement with the street as one of the main problems. By turning their “shoulder” to the street, it cuts off neighborhood engagement. These remind me of a series of Army barracks that the neighbors outside of the barracks can’t interact with those inside.
- Consider how neighbors engage with/meet/see each other in the neighborhood
- Walkways to front doors are dark and narrow, not welcoming
- Street-side units should be oriented to face the street – may two units should face the street to look like duplex
- If -MS and -MX zoning is to be used for all residential these must be a residential front setback, landscaped. They may lose a unit but that is just tough
- Why can’t meters be screened?
- All gas meters should be located on side of building
- Utilities shown in the front need to be reworked.
- Street activation. 4hr vs 8hr vs 24hr presence of community and neighborhood
- No social interaction
- Eyes on the street? Defensible space?
- Exempt front porches from max building coverage. Require front porches and move mechanical and taps to alley side.
- Setbacks, landscape improvement, negotiate use of street facing unit to something more friendly
- Some setback is good
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- Yes to front lawns/generous setbacks that is in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood.
- Require 3-5 ft setback on front street and exempt side porches from max allowed lot coverage
- Too close to sidewalks
- All Slot homes need setbacks unless they are retail
- If all residential in -MS or -MX, should require a residential setback
- Respect front setback of street – right now allowed to be too close to sidewalk
- Important- Setback! Uniform with neighborhood, not necessarily with zoning requirements
- Tree Lawns (not rocks) with grass and trees

Neighborhood Design
- These forms encourage the destruction of single family homes to put more units on the property. This is ruining the character of our old neighborhoods.
- Lack of permeable surface. Lack of Vegetation
- This kind of development destroys the character and scale of historic neighborhoods
- Neighborhood killers. Big blank walls of nothing along sidewalks
- Needs a functional transition to neighborhood instead of wall for all 4 configurations
- As a Denver native, I see that the charm of many neighborhoods change, not a big fan.
- Neighborhood specific solutions, rather than general (blanketed) solution
- The lack of green space with these properties being built lot-line to lot-line is a big issue. This pushes the issues of pet waste from this property into the rest of the neighborhood that does have green space.

Building Mass and Scale
- Development should be in scale with Neighborhood
- Very incompatible. Slot homes stacked do not contribute to the character of this [next-door] home
- A 50' wall on the street is too large without breakups – not enough glass
- Building feels imposing because it’s zero-lot line and 3 stories and a plain wall
- Why flat roof in Colorado?
- Need Human Scale and set backs on street facing units

Vehicle-Oriented Design
- Insufficient Parking for residences and guests
- No guest parking for units. 2nd car or guest takes street parking from local small businesses
- Most slot home owners/renters have more than 1 car-no place to park 2nd car
- Driveways should be hidden from street view. Really unpleasant looks
- Parking off alley, street activation, affordable

Impacts on Neighbors
- Great consideration should be given to existing adjacent properties- light and privacy
- Guard Tower Effect- The historic 1 Story home gets a 3-story neighbor, creates a loss of privacy and probably loss of property value for the 1 story owner.
- Sunlight for Slot Home residents and neighbors
- Blocks neighbors light and view shed
- Great consideration should be given to existing adjacent property light and privacy
- Do not allow roof top decks or other compromises of privacy of existing neighbors
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- Should not be able to build any looking into existing neighbor’s yard, unless you plant a tree line at least 3-stories tall first.
- Decks are a must for our amazing climate and must not be hindered
- No privacy and no sunlight for neighbors
- Blocks sun and robs privacy of traditional home with backyard
- What do they do with snow? Where do they shovel snow to?
- No guest parking? Odd they take parking from the small local businesses
- Drainage into main roads
- Living next door to a single row. Autos, living space and rooftops overlook my yard. All noise projects into my home and outdoor space. Privacy severely limited. Building is also out of scale and proportion of surrounding properties when single pops up it creates a very chaotic feel and appearance. (provided pictures)
- Neighborhood character is being trampled
- Sounds and sightlines need to be addressed for neighbors.

Other Comments not specifically addressed by the problem statement

- This design belongs on alley-side – design review is necessary
- Constructive Quality Issues should be addressed
- Will these be the slums or the ghettos of the 21st century? Configuration not unlike main cell house at Alcatraz
- Long-term viability, short term – yay for businesses!
- Ten years from now these buildings will be throwaways
- Calcutta slum – but at least the residents ruin their own privacy and not the neighboring lot
- Not affordable for middle class family at $600k per unit
- No place to shovel/plow snow if unit has no green space
- Landscape treatments need greenery and maintenance
- Need design review, especially for 0’ setback
- They are (f)ugly
- A-toddler with blocks seems to be the guiding aesthetic
- No mix of age, economic, family size etc. demographics
- Not promoting livable sustainable communities. These are transitional temporary units where people do not intend or become long-time civically engaged residents
- Too many already. Need new zoning laws to stop all slot homes. Brings in too much traffic into the ‘hood...cars and people.
- Developers have limited options! Regulatory costs and trade costs are too high and growing (affordable housing fee) thus, have no choice but to max out square footage for a moderate return, at the cost of design.
- Be conscientious of private property owner’s rights
- Does not respect property rights on traditional home layouts
- Be careful about removing rights from individual property owners

Comments related to criteria

- Equity- “apply equally in neighborhoods across the city”.
- Predictability- Cookie cutter appearance that fails to respect neighborhood character
- Good Points- Buildings should be for long term these aren’t addressed here
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Other comments on the Slot Home Evaluation & Text Amendment
- I smell contradiction. Do you really think slot homes logically fulfill this purpose [statement]?
- No slot homes in G-MU-3 (perhaps no apartment form)
- These need to be in higher-density zones
- Promotes Smart density to support business
- Why is the 5 or 6 deep, 2-3 story unit assumed? Can we live with 1 story, 2-3 unit slot homes? Is density level part of the problem?
- This should not have been approved by CPD

Other comments related to Denver Zoning Code
- Confusing that building form names do not control architectural style
- Lots subdivided for individual town houses cannot be put back together, do not allow this subdivision of lots
- Specifics from residential zones should be applied to residential use buildings in mixed zones
- We need a min lot size for all of Denver and every lot must have direct street access
- Spotting zoning is a problem. There should be a better transition between zone districts while allowing moderate density everywhere while the city grows.
- If less units allowed the land price would go down
- Encourage density. Keep existing use and form intact.
- On commercial streets, the first floor should be required to be a storefront, at least the part that meets the street
- On commercial streets, should have ground floor commercial uses
- Need shop fronts on retail streets
- Green incentives and requirements for builders and homeowners
- MX-Zone = Mixed Use, right? We are not experiencing mixed-use, just future slum

Other comments related to City of Denver
- What would an independent Fire Protection Expert say? Slot homes represent a significant fire risk increase, yet where are the new fire stations or the enlarged fire stations? F I R E  R I S K
- Density requires increase in Fire and Police Services, increase in City Services
- It disrupts the traffic flow as they are being built with all required utilities vs a single house
- Current fire code limits window opening % and restricts balconies making them 100% opening. Update code to allow for reasonable amount of windows and designs will get less boxy.
- How is 600K per unit affordable for the average family?
- Long term vs short term goals. What does Denver want to be now and in the future?

Other comments outside of City of Denver
- Spend energy and political capital to promote condo construction
- Work to revise condo defect. Problem solved!
- Promote Condo construction
- Promote condos! Problem solved!
- Promote Condo construction
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Additional Comments

- Calcutta slum
- How about the flat roof “garden” in heavy rain or snow, we can do better.
- Howe about the flat roof “garden” in heavy rain or snow, we can do better.
- Imagine you walk up to a person and this is their facial expression (blank face)
- I expressed my concerns to the city and had a kind follow-up, thanks; but I was basically told “it was too late for me, but hey, join a task force and help others.”
- Shame, shame greedy developers; shame, shame Denver for feeding the monsters.
- Deny all slot home proposals, it’s insulting that we have to be so analytical with the obvious.
- It would have been nice to have been part of a task force before ruining the block where my business/property is thanksnotreally
- Frank Lloyd Wright would be disgusted with all slot home styles designed by current developers and American architects.
- Stucco task force needed
- You, the city, by allowing Tennyson (44th-46th) have ruined the long term character and viability of MY investments
- Selling “slot homes” which are not sold as condos is developer driving to avoid class action lawsuits. Denver needs better inspection and construction liability laws. Don’t give the keys to the kingdom to developers. Get better inspection laws and inspectors. Give builders a longer time to be responsible for construction defects and this division of ownership perhaps even ugly slot home themselves might just go away. Protect the eventual buyer not the virtually anonymous developer. Already a bad idea for urban Denver. Build it and run. Buyer beware.
- Question, at 8AM when everyone wants to leave the single drive land all at once, what do you do. Howe about the flat roof “garden” in heavy rain or snow, we can do better.
- These do not belong to some neighbors as they do not fit in architecturally
- Fire danger, constructing wood frame buildings within in close proximity is unconscious irresponsibility
On the evening of September 7, 2017, the City of Denver hosted a Community Open House to review the proposed solutions to address slot home development for the Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project. The purpose of the open house was to ask the community, “does the proposed solutions solve the problem?” (as described in the problem statement)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Key comments and themes are summarized below:
The majority of comments provided were related to the proposed zoning tools within the proposed solutions.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments specific to proposed tools:

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

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

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

Reduce Building Height in Feet and Revise Height Exceptions
- Yes to reduced building heights!
- Buildings are still bulky, plus the rooftop “hats” are still as issue
- Building height reductions help al lot with the mass and scale
- Mass and scale is still off
- Reduce height is a good idea
- Limit stair enclosure size
- Roof top access
- Much better engagement/scale/mass
Reduce Drive Aisle Width
- Have you considered reducing the drive aisle width? Yes. The drive aisle width is proposed to reduce from 23’ to 18’.
- Want to make sure that off-street parking is still available. Current off-street parking would still apply
- 23’ is too wide for drive aisle- people just park in it. Its good to reduce it
- Study the encroachment of the drive aisle into the side setback
- I wonder if some of these solutions consider “realistically” sided units and wonder if there is any way of reducing the areas dedicated to vehicular transit, perhaps by reducing the drive aisle width, wish we could rezone more lots for higher density. Drive aisle width is proposed to be reduced from 23’ to 18’.
- Love the no-visible drive lanes.

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

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

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

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

## Slot Home Testing – MX/MS/RX Urban Townhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing</th>
<th>OVERALL QUESTIONS</th>
<th>TOOL SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Design Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Require units oriented to the street | N/A | When Required: Any dwelling unit meeting the build-to requirement on the primary street shall be oriented to the primary street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature.
Oriented to the Street: Units shall be arranged side-by-side with at least one dwelling unit with shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth of the unit. No part of any unit shall be located between another dwelling unit and the street. |
| Require entry feature for units oriented to the street | One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required. | Each unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street-facing facade that is designed to be visually prominent through the use of a porch, patio, or canopy. (Such features will be allowed to encroach into the setbacks) |
| Reduce maximum building height in feet | 2-story district: 35’
3-story district: 45’ | 2-story district: 30’
3-story district: 38’ |
| Revise building height exceptions | Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet. | Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet or stories. |
| **Site Design Tools** | | |
| Introduce minimum primary street setback | 0’ | 10’ |
| Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback | 0’/5'-15’ (Max range varies by neighborhood context) | Increase range by 5’ (10-15’)
| Allow primary street setback encroachments | N/A | As permitted in MU districts |
| Revise build-to alternatives | Garden wall: 25%
Garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola: 30% | Eliminate garden wall, garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians, and pergola.
Allow courtyard alternative at 30% |
| **Parking Design Tools** | | |
| Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units) | Drive Aisle Width: 23’
Internal Access Drive: 20’ | Drive Aisle Width: 18’
Internal Access Drive Width: 12’ |

---

| 1. Does the proposed standard limit design flexibility in any way that precludes buildings that would meet the design intent? If so, what rule within the standard is the most problematic? |
| 2. How does this standard function on corner lots? |
| 3. Is this flexible language sufficient, or do minimum dimensions need to be established for the entry feature (porch, patio, canopy)? |
| 4. Though few projects build sloped roofs, does the proposed standard reduce the ability to design sloped roofs? |
| 5. Does the reduced height in feet become problematic on sloping lots? If so, at what minimum slope? |
| 6. Does a the 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts? |
| 7. Is the primary street setback an appropriate dimension to provide a transition and enhance the public realm with an adequate entry feature, landscaping and maintain the neighborhood character? |
| 8. On zone lots without an alley, is a driveway alternative a necessary alternative? If so, what is the appropriate dimensions? |
| 9. Will the proposed minimum width make access too difficult to the point where they are not used for vehicular parking? |
## Comment Summary

| C-MX-3  
| 80 S Madison Street  
| (Internal)  
| 18-unit options  
|  |
| U-MX-3  
| 3708 N Tejon Street  
| (Bill M.)  
| 11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)  
|  |
| U-MS-2  
| 1459 S Pearl Street  
| (Nate J.)  
| Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking  
|  |
| Other Comments  
| (not associated to any specific site or outcome)  
|  |

Evaluated two options, one with side street units facing the street, one without which creates Slot Home character on side street.

How do you address the corner unit and frontage? Does narrow side still need to face primary street?

Encouragement to break down built form (also look at not allowing the same material for X amount of feet).

A reduction to the built form at the rear of the site should be considered (no matter the adjacencies). Establish neighborhood datums.

Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback? Would this apply to the furthest out edge, what happens when the building elevation steps in? Would a canopy roof count or does the roof have to cover a living space?

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

Current proposed standards cause concerns on corner lots. If tied to Build-To, then this potentially allows undesired side facing units on side street where no or limited build-to exists. Also issue with overlapping units on corners if intent is still achieved. Consider requiring all units within 10' of setback to face corresponding street. Allow overlapping units by requiring minimum 10' of frontage on street (with entry).

Does this match the porch encroachment?

No rooftop decks in rear 35% of lot.

Intent is good but need to consider turning movements and vehicular access (particularly with 18' drive aisle width)

I also think that this side setback would be appropriate for urban Townhouses that are in the MX and MS zones as well. All units in all Zonings should be required to have defined entrances even on the side interiors.

Consider allowing for drive way back up space (3') to encroach into setback if screened with garden wall and/or landscaping

If this site could use the reduced drive way dimensions, a few more (or larger) units could occur on the lot.

There might need to be a unit limit due to possible traffic volume.

| Internal Access Drive Width: 12'  
| Drive Aisle Width: 18'  
| Consider allowing for drive way back up space (3') to encroach into setback if screened with garden wall and/or landscaping  
| If this site could use the reduced drive way dimensions, a few more (or larger) units could occur on the lot.  
| There might need to be a unit limit due to possible traffic volume.  

| Internal Access Drive: 20'  
| Drive Aisle Width: 23'  
| Garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians, and pergola.  
| Allow courtyard alternative at 30%  
| Encourage to break down built form (also look at not allowing the same material for X amount of feet).  

| Garden wall: 25%  
| Does a the 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts?  
| Increase range by 5' (10-15')  
| Establish neighborhood datums.  

| N/A As permitted in MU districts (Max range varies by 0'/5-15'  
| A reduction to the built form at the rear of the site should be considered (no matter the adjacencies). Establish neighborhood datums.  
| Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback? Would this apply to the furthest out edge, what happens when the building elevation steps in? Would a canopy roof count or does the roof have to cover a living space?  
| The proposed standard ("stories") requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.  

| N/A  
| Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback? Would this apply to the furthest out edge, what happens when the building elevation steps in? Would a canopy roof count or does the roof have to cover a living space?  
| The proposed standard ("stories") requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.  

| N/A  
| Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback? Would this apply to the furthest out edge, what happens when the building elevation steps in? Would a canopy roof count or does the roof have to cover a living space?  
| The proposed standard ("stories") requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.  

| N/A  
| Can roof access be at perimeter if less than max height or on interior units? Can roof access be within build-to if complies with setback? Would this apply to the furthest out edge, what happens when the building elevation steps in? Would a canopy roof count or does the roof have to cover a living space?  
| The proposed standard ("stories") requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.
SLOT HOME TESTING – MU/RO URBAN TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing</th>
<th>OVERALL QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Standard</td>
<td>Proposed Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature. Oriented to the Street: Units shall be arranged side-by-side with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth. No part of any unit shall be located between another dwelling unit and the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required.</td>
<td>Each unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street-facing facade that is designed to be visually prominent through the use of a porch, patio, or canopy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>3-story district: 40’</td>
<td>3-story district: 35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet.</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet or stories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise block sensitive setback</td>
<td>Applies (no min or max setback)</td>
<td>Block sensitive setback shall not exceed 20 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise side setback</td>
<td>Side Interior: 7.5’ Side Street: 5’</td>
<td>When the unit is oriented to the side interior, the side interior setback shall be 12.5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow side setback encroachments</td>
<td>Entry features are not permitted</td>
<td>Single-story porch, patio, canopy, stoop may encroach 7.5’ Off-street parking areas may encroach 2.5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase build-to percentage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td>Garden wall: 25% Garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola: 30%</td>
<td>Eliminate garden wall, garden wall with covered seating for pedestrians, and pergola. Allow courtyard alternative at 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 23’ Internal Access Drive: 20’</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 18’ Internal Access Drive Width: 12’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Does the proposed standard limit design flexibility in any way that precludes buildings that would meet the design intent? If so, what rule within the standard is the most problematic?
2. How does this standard function on corner lots?
3. Is this flexible language sufficient, or do minimum dimensions need to be established for the entry feature (porch, patio, canopy)?
4. Though few projects build sloped roofs, does the proposed standard reduce the ability to design sloped roofs?
5. Does the reduced height in feet become problematic on sloping lots? If so, what at minimum slope?
6. Does a 1:1 stepback from the perimeter of the building become problematic to floor layouts?
7. On zone lots without an alley, is a driveway alternative a necessary alternative? If so, what is the appropriate dimensions?
8. Will the proposed minimum width make access too difficult to the point where they are not used for vehicular parking?
## Comments and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-MU-3 50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C-O.)</th>
<th>G-MU-3 1714 N Grove Street (Eric B.)</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-unit options with detached parking (Townhouse and Garden Court)</td>
<td>Two 4-unit options (one with active use at street)</td>
<td>(not associated to any specific site or outcome)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The language is flexible; however, a minimum 3-foot depth porch may be helpful. In the two cases I studied, 5-foot is doable, but 8-foot may be too much.

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

Didn't test this feature, but the standard makes sense with the addition of "or stories."

In both cases I only Tested the 10-foot setback.

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

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

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

Did not test garden walls or pergolas.

Disagree with providing internal driveways that extend onto the fronting 80 percent of a zero lot of this size, in this zone district. The test I performed made the point of leaving parking as close to the alley as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MU/RO Urban Slot Home</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Access Drive:</strong> 20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive Aisle Width:</strong> 23’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden Wall:</strong> 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden Wall with Covered Seating for pedestrians and Pergola:</strong> 60% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Features are Not Permitted When Required:</strong> Any dwelling unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test:</strong> How might they be modified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Not, What Tools Might Be Added?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test:</strong> How might they be modified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Not, What Tools Might Be Added?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL STRATEGY REPORT - 11/29/2017**

Appendix | 137
## Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing

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

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

## Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Design Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require units be oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When Required: Any dwelling unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature. Oriented to the Street: Units shall be arranged side-by-side with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth. No part of any unit shall be located between another dwelling unit and the street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017
### Proposed Tools and Standards for Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-MU-3</td>
<td>50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C-O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-unit option with detached parking</td>
<td>6-unit option with detached parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed minimum 30’ courtyard is not feasible on 62.5’ wide lots with side setbacks.</td>
<td>Proposed minimum 30’ courtyard is not feasible on 62.5’ wide lots with side setbacks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-RH-3</td>
<td>501 N Steele Street (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-RH-2.5</td>
<td>929-931 E 23rd Avenue (Bob H.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway</td>
<td>Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not look at corner lots, but my opinion is the proposed and existing rules are acceptable. The side view would be a larger structure, probably a gap and a smaller structure (garage). In any event, the rear 35% is protected with a 19ft. height limit.</td>
<td>I did not look at corner lots, but my opinion is the proposed and existing rules are acceptable. The side view would be a larger structure, probably a gap and a smaller structure (garage). In any event, the rear 35% is protected with a 19ft. height limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current proposed standards cause concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.</td>
<td>Current proposed standards cause concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12’/18’) Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional side setback when units face the side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further downsizing the project (height and depth)</td>
<td>Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12’/18’) Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional side setback when units face the side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further downsizing the project (height and depth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
150’ x 125’, alley, flat with 2’ step-up from sidewalk

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

**Building Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>If unit orientation is not required on both streets, the outcome leads to a slot home on the side street. Consider revisions to ensure outcome to the right with regard to unit orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td>The proposed standard (&quot;stories&quot;) requires setback regardless if within height limit. Interior units can impact neighboring lots and should also comply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce minimum primary street setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback</td>
<td>Consider allowing for the drive way backup area to encroach 5’ into setback if screened with garden wall and/or landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow primary street setback encroachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Design Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td>If this site could use the reduced drive way dimensions, a few more (or larger) units could occur on the lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse C-MX-3 80 S Madison Street 18-unit options

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

- Require entry feature for units oriented to the street

- Reduce maximum building height in feet

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

Site Design Tools
- Introduce minimum primary street setback
- Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback
- Allow primary street setback encroachments
  - Consider allowing for the driveway backup area to encroach 5' into setback if screened with garden wall and/or landscaping.
- Revise build-to alternatives

Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
  - If this site could use the reduced driveway dimensions, a few more (or larger) units could occur on the lot.
# Slot Home Testing - 3708 N Tejon St (U-MX)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tools and Standards</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>U-MX-3 3708 N Tejon Street (Bill M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design Tools</td>
<td>11-unit option with corner unit (long side facing side street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

- **Reduce maximum building height in feet**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Design Tools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce minimum primary street setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Allow primary street setback encroachments**

- **Revise build-to alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Design Tools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL TESTING
# SLOT HOME TESTING – 1459 S PEARL ST (U-MS-2)

50’ x 125’, alley, flat

## Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</th>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-MS-2&lt;br&gt;1459 S Pearl Street (Nate J.)</td>
<td>Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools

- **Require units oriented to the street**

  - Encouragement to break down built form (also look at not allowing the same material for X amount of feet).

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

- **Reduce maximum building height in feet**

  - A reduction to the built form at the rear of the site should be considered (no matter the adjacencies). Establish neighborhood datums.

- **Revise building height exceptions**

  - No rooftop decks in rear 35% of lot.

### Site Design Tools

- **Introduce minimum primary street setback**

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

- **Allow primary street setback encroachments**

- **Revise build-to alternatives**

### Parking Design Tools

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

Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse
U-MS-2
1459 S Pearl Street (Nate J.)

Two 6-unit options and one 4-unit option with detached parking

Building Design Tools

- Require units oriented to the street
- Require entry feature for units oriented to the street
- Encouragement to break down built form (also look at not allowing the same material for X amount of feet)
- Reduce maximum building height in feet
- A reduction to the built form at the rear of the site should be considered (no matter the adjacencies)
- Establish neighborhood datums

Revise building height exceptions

- No rooftop decks in rear 35% of lot

Site Design Tools

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

Parking Design Tools

- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
SLOT HOME TESTING – 1459 S PEARL ST (U-MS-2)
50’ x 125’, alley, flat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>U-MS-2 1459 S Pearl Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Parking Design Tools**
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017

50’ x 125’ , alley, flat

PROPOSED TOOLS

AND STANDARDS

COMMENTS

AND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Tool for MX/RX/MS Urban Townhouse U-MS-2

1459 S Pearl Street

Building Design Tools

Require units oriented to the street

Require entry feature for units oriented to the street

Reduce maximum building height in feet

Revise building height exceptions

Site Design Tools

Introduce minimum primary street setback

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

Allow primary street setback encroachments

Revise build-to alternatives

Parking Design Tools

Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
# SLOT HOME TESTING – 50 S CLARKSON ST (G-MU-3)

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

## Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>G-MU-3 50 S Clarkson Street (Ignacio C-O.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Require units oriented to the street</th>
<th>For the Townhouse form, it is imperative that the street-orientation requirement be observed, it makes the design much stronger. Did not try the corner lot scenario.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td>The language is flexible; however, a minimum 3-foot depth porch may be helpful. In the two cases I studied, 5-foot is doable, but 8-foot may be too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>Townhouse form: it seems that the height is geared toward a three-story structure with a garage in the ground level. What if there was no garage at the ground level? For a developer, this may be better leasable/sellable space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td>Didn’t test this feature, but the standard makes sense with the addition of “or stories.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Design Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revise block sensitive setback</th>
<th>In both cases I only tested the 10-foot setback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise side setback</td>
<td>Disagree with allowing dwelling units to have front doors facing the sides of other dwellings. The urban design principle is that there is a logic of front-and-back. The Townhouse test I performed turns some fronts to the alley, in my opinion, a better configuration that activates the alley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow side setback encroachments</td>
<td>I did not test porches on the side of the zone lot. Townhouse form: I used the zero-lot line allowed for detached garages. Court form: with surface parking, I didn’t need to encroach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase build-to percentage</td>
<td>Townhouse form: 70 percent is a better build-to ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td>Did not test garden walls or pergolas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Design Tools

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

**MU-3)**

**Urb. Townhouse Option**

**Garden Court Option**

Note: This garden court does not meet the proposed 30' garden court width.
62.5’ x 125’, alley, flat with 3’ step-up from sidewalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>G-MU-3 50 S Clarkson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Design Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for units oriented to the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce maximum building height in feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Design Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise block sensitive setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise side setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow side setback encroachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase build-to percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Design Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse

G-MU-3
50 S Clarkson Street

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

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

Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
### Slot Home Testing – 1714 N Grove St (G-MU-3)

62.5’ x 125’, no alley, ~2% slope down front to back

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

#### Building Design Tools

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

- **Require entry feature for units oriented to the street**  
Entry feature helps solve human scale. Flexibility should be provided to allow for project specific design solutions, appropriate for a given project within a given context.

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

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

#### Site Design Tools

- **Revise block sensitive setback**  
20’ is generous enough to meet the design intent and allow context-appropriate yards.

- **Revise side setback**  
Benefits residents of the interior units and reduces potential impacts on neighboring properties. Rather than encouraging an entry feature at the interior units through the allowable encroachment, I recommend a requirement for this feature as it helps to break down the scale of the 3-story wall plane.

- **Allow side setback encroachments**  
See previous comment(s)

- **Increase build-to percentage**  
Helps address the problem along with the requirement for street-oriented units and still allows reasonable void space along the street.

- **Revise build-to alternatives**  
Increased build-to is an improvement, however, a driveway alternative is necessary on smaller lots of 50’ and 62.5’ widths. 70% build-to is not possible with setbacks and 12’ access drive on this test site. A driveway alternative of 10% of build-to should be sufficient.

#### Parking Design Tools

- **Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)**  
With the desire to continue allowing the interior units in the MX and MU districts, reductions are beneficial to allow other proposed requirements to be addressed, while reducing the burden on the interior portion of the site. Interior units would be much more challenging on some of the smaller lot sizes.
Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse G-MU-3 1714 N Grove Street (Eric B.)

Two 4-unit options (one with active use at street)

Building Design Tools

Require units oriented to the street

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

Require entry feature for units oriented to the street

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

Reduce maximum building height in feet

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

Revise building height exceptions

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

Site Design Tools

Revise block sensitive setback

20’ is generous enough to meet the design intent and allow context-appropriate yards.

Revise side setback

Benefits residents of the interior units and reduces potential impacts on neighboring properties. Rather than encouraging an entry feature at the interior units through the allowable encroachment, I recommend a requirement for this feature as it helps to break down the scale of the 3-story wall plane.

Allow side setback encroachments

See previous comment(s)

Increase build-to percentage

Helps address the problem along with the requirement for street-oriented units and still allows reasonable void space along the street.

Revise build-to alternatives

Increased build-to is an improvement, however, a driveway alternative is necessary on smaller lots of 50’ and 62.5’ widths. 70% build-to is not possible with setbacks and 12’ access drive on this test site. A driveway alternative of 10% of build-to should be sufficient.

Parking Design Tools

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

With the desire to continue allowing the interior units in the MX and MU districts, reductions are beneficial to allow other proposed requirements to be addressed, while reducing the burden on the interior portion of the site. Interior units would be much more challenging on some of the smaller lot sizes.
SLOT HOME TESTING – 1714 N GROVE ST (G-MU-3)

62.5’ x 125’, no alley, ~2% slope down front to back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse | G-MU-3
1714 N Grove Street |

**Building Design Tools**

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

**Site Design Tools**

- Revise block sensitive setback
- Revise side setback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revise side setback</th>
<th>Determining when side setback is 7.5 ft or 12.5’ might be difficult to determine on some configurations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Allow side setback encroachments
- Increase build-to percentage
- Revise build-to alternatives

**Parking Design Tools**

- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017

SLOT HOME TESTING – 1714 N GROVE ST (G-MU-3)

62.5’ x 125’ , no alley, ~2% slope down front to back

CPD TESTING

PROPOSED TOOLS

AND STANDARDS

COMMENTS

AND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Tool for

MU/RO Urban Townhouse

G-MU-3

1714 N Grove Street

Building Design Tools

Require units oriented to the street

Require entry feature for units oriented to the street

Reduce maximum building height in feet

Revise building height exceptions

Site Design Tools

Revise block sensitive setback

Revise side setback

Determining when side setback is 7.5 ft or 12.5’ might be difficult to determine on some configurations.

Allow side setback encroachments

Increase build-to percentage

Revise build-to alternatives

Parking Design Tools

Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions

(up to 6 units)
### Proposed Tools and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse</td>
<td>G-MU-3 1841 &amp; 1849 Hooker Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

#### Parking Design Tools
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
DENVER SLOT HOME EVALUATION TESTING RESULTS – OCTOBER 10, 2017

SLOT HOME TESTING – 1841 & 1849 N HOOKER ST (G-MU-3)

140’ x 150’ , alley, Denver hill

CPD TESTING

PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS

COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Tool for MU/RO Urban Townhouse G-MU-3 1841 & 1849 Hooker Street

Building Design Tools

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

Site Design Tools

- Revise block sensitive setback
- Revise side setback
- Allow side setback encroachments
- Increase build-to percentage
- Revise build-to alternatives

Parking Design Tools

- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (up to 6 units)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</strong></td>
<td><strong>U-RH-2.5 929-931 E 23rd Avenue (Bob H.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Design Tools**

**Require units be oriented to the street**

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

Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12'/18')

Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:

- Additional side setback when units face the side
- Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
- Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
SLOT HOME TESTING – 929-931 E 23RD AVENUE (U-RH-2.5)
62.5’ x 125’, no alley, flat

EXTERNAL TESTING

PROPOSED TOOLS
AND STANDARDS

COMMENTS
AND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House U-RH-2.5
929-931 E 23rd Avenue (Bob H.)

Two options with side driveway, one option with central driveway

Building Design Tools
Require units be oriented to the street

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

Include reduced drive aisle dimensions on RH (12’/18’)

Half-story rule is too generous and perceived as full story. Consider:
• Additional side setback when units face the side
• Preventing roof decks in the rear 35%
• Further downsizing the project (height and depth)
## Building Design Tools

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

**G-RH-3**  
501 N Steele Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current proposed standards with requirement for no unit to be behind street-facing units, causes concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SLOT HOME TESTING – 501 N STEELE ST (G-RH-3)
50’ x 125’, alley, flat, corner lot

CPD TESTING

PROPOSED TOOLS
AND STANDARDS
COMMENTS
AND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House
G-RH-3
501 N Steele Street

Building Design Tools Require units be oriented to the street
Current proposed standards with requirement for no unit to be behind street-facing units, causes concerns on corner lots. Consider requiring all units to face either primary or side street with entry and shared common walls.
## SLOT HOME TESTING – 929-931 E 23RD AVENUE

62.5’ x 125’, no alley, flat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TOOLS AND STANDARDS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House</td>
<td>U-RH-2.5 929-931 E 23rd Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design Tools</td>
<td>Require units be oriented to the street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

side setback above 25’
SLOT HOME TESTING – 929-931 E 23RD AVENUE (U-RH-2.5)

CPD TESTING

Proposed Tool for RH/TH Row House

U-RH-2.5
929-931 E 23rd Avenue

Building Design Tools Require units be oriented to the street.