

City and County of Denver  
Community Planning & Development  
Planning Services  
201 West Colfax Avenue  
Denver, CO 80202  
[www.denvergov.org](http://www.denvergov.org)

Subject: NNW Steering Committee Meeting #25  
Meeting Date: Tuesday, September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2023  
Meeting Time: 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm  
Meeting Location: In Person (Quigg Newton Community Room)

---

City Staff Attendees: Sung Han, Fernando Abbud, Scott Robinson, and Will Prince

City Council District One Attendees: Councilwoman Amanda Sandoval, Alessandra Dominguez, Andrew Blanco, and Melissa Wait

Steering Committee Attendees: Tim Boers, Lexi MacArthur (Steinhauer), Lorenzo Ramirez, Garrett Phillips, Michael Guietz, Emily Weiss

Consultant Staff: Naomi Grunditz Lacewell, and Grace Herbison

## AGENDA & NOTES

### **1. Grace shared timeline and meeting ground rules**

### **2. Update on Engagement**

- a. 18 various pop-ups/community events
- b. Draft Plan
  - i. 251 respondents
  - ii. 5,000+ view
  - iii. 800 comments
- c. Survey
  - i. 163 English
  - ii. 55 Spanish
- d. Promotora Team
  - i. 121 respondents
  - ii. Community Canvassing – focus on Chaffee Park, Sunnyside
  - iii. Schools, supermarkets, rec centers
  - iv. Co-attended special events
  - v. Feedback themes: affordable housing, access to good paying jobs, business support, health services, transportation
  - vi. Strong overall support
- e. 2<sup>nd</sup> public draft review – week of 10/9 – Close 11/3
- f. Steering Committee – 10/24 (Oct.) and Week of 11/6 (Nov. – earlier meeting to get feedback from committee before we move into public hearing process)

- g. December 6 – Planning Board Hearing
- h. City Council Review Mid Dec – January

### 3. Northeast Sunnyside Follow-Up

- a. Stabilize existing building
  - i. H9, H11, H12
  - ii. Broaden financial tools, legacy business program, community develop corp to acquire property via land trusts
- b. Control for better outcomes
  - i. NES-1
  - ii. Mindful about change, regulatory changes and programs to advance net-zero job policy
- c. Add improvements and mix of uses
  - i. Design improvements parks/safer streets, allow some residential
- d. What We've Heard from Steering Committee in August
  - i. Prioritize working class jobs
  - ii. Concerns of taller heights would accelerate redevelopment/gentrification
  - iii. Other considerations: improved design/mobility, catalyst projects
- e. Potential Refinements to Current Policy Based on Feedback
  - i. Jobs
    - 1. Current Policy – States that standards should be developed to help create physical spaces for future employment and programs to attract jobs
    - 2. Potential Changes – better prioritize jobs - state commercial and light industrial are primary use, residential is secondary, 2<sup>nd</sup> state that the desired jobs in the area are primary jobs and highly-skilled trade jobs
  - ii. Heights
    - 1. Current Policy - Current 3 stories for innovation flex
    - 2. Potential Changes – Keep at 3 and up to 5 if applicant provides more space for non-residential uses, and provides improvements that advance vision elements – affordable housing beyond current requirement and parks/open space
- f. Discussion
  - i. What would be the mechanism used to implement? Would it include an overlay?
    - 1. Instead of relying on current zoning, the city would need to establish new zone districts and standards to advance the visions. An overlay could be one tool to achieve the plan goals
  - ii. Can the plan have teeth to limit the height?
    - 1. The plan will guide future height limits. Current zoning is I-A (General Industrial) and are mostly based on FAR (floor-area ratio), no precise limit
  - iii. City Council cannot vote based on zone districts but on review criteria. City would need to create new rules to be applied to the area, less applicant driven, more city-driven
  - iv. Ideas sound good but there are concerns about implementation from CPD - overlays have been mostly led by council district in the past
  - v. There is no legacy business funding in 24-25 budget for NNW, only NEST neighborhoods. Councilwoman's request to include NNW neighborhoods as part of upcoming budget was denied.

1. The budget is not created in parallel with the plan, but the conversations with DEDO about their programs such as the Legacy Business Program, and having it in the plan helps to advocate for the future
- vi. Ideas are great, but we don't have the tools to implement the plans in the next couple of years
  1. Are there similar things written into other plans? If there is more than once voice advocating for these ideas, could it happen faster? There is power into the numbers.
- vii. Slides should be circulated so others who are interested in this topic can provide their own thoughts if desired

#### 4. Future Places (38<sup>th</sup> Avenue)

- a. 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Discuss input to create better transitions from higher intensity 5 story areas along 38<sup>th</sup> Ave into the surrounding neighborhoods and increased density. Options include:
  - i. Leave as is: Low Residential with Missing Middle
  - ii. Change one block on each direction to 5 story area from (2.5 Low Res) to Low Medium (3 story) – around nodes with affordability policies/recommendations
- b. Discussion
  - i. 5 story – would EHA be applicable? If so, 7 stories then would be more abrupt – but would still be impacted by protected districts
  - ii. Would not support changes along the corridor just to increase a few spots for more height and risk losing some potentially historic areas. We could add density in similar ways that the current version of the plan recommends through ADUs and Missing Middle Housing strategies – prefer to keep as is
  - iii. Many of these are small lots, may be difficult to reach 5 stories, regulations and better design standards need to be in place as well
  - iv. Changing one block on each direction would address community feedback for more housing and transition along 38<sup>th</sup>, while providing affordability once policies have been developed.
  - v. Most of the group recommends keeping the future places along 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue as is
  - vi. Why is there a property at Federal/38<sup>th</sup> mapped as low residential?
    1. To reflect current conditions and zoning, which is a historic district with single-family homes

#### 5. Neighborhood Priorities and Future Places

- a. Chaffee Park
  - i. Future Places
    1. Grouped discussed the potential locations to change from low residential to local center (with structure preservation recommendation)
    2. The group agreed to change the corner of Pecos and 52<sup>nd</sup> to local center since on the Adams County side already has some non-residential uses. Plus this location will help provide more spaces that serve the eastern side of Chaffee Park since the western side would be served by Federal
    3. The group decided not to change the nodes at 52/Zuni, 52<sup>nd</sup>/Tejon, and Zuni and 51<sup>st</sup> since it seemed more challenging for an active corner to occur when the side of Adams county or the park would be non-active commercial
    4. Also discussed the CDOT parcels along 48<sup>th</sup> to add recommendation that talks about “coordinate with CDOT for opportunities to use the land as a different community

serving use such as community garden, better mobility (pathway) or missing middle housing

ii. Priorities

1. The group agreed with the overall ranking of the recommendations
2. A 3 tier categorization was suggested since there are several key recommendations that can fall within the “2nd” or 3<sup>rd</sup> priority.
3. 1st priority: #4 increase access to healthy and affordable food
4. 2<sup>nd</sup> priority: #1, #2, #5, #8, #9
5. 3<sup>rd</sup> priority (not much of a priority): #3, #6, #7

b. Sunnyside

i. Future Places

1. Group discussed community feedback received about Federal Blvd. which currently recommends low-medium residential and Pecos low residential
2. Federal- Group recommend a mix of low residential and low medium. Place low-medium around Commercial and Church area
3. Pecos/Quigg Newton – Group recommends leaving as is

ii. Priorities

1. Elevate and combine housing related items
2. Overall agree with outcomes from survey
3. 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue will need key investment to move forward

c. Highland

i. Future Places

1. Conclusion: no changes from current recommendations.
2. The small interior parcel in question has been debated by HUNI in the past. They do not want to change recommendations on it because they do not want to set a precedent for increasing entitlement creeping into the interior blocks.
3. The parcels along 32nd should not be changed. They believe it is mostly a desire from the current property owner. It is suitable as-is with residential designation, not commercial or mixed use. Highland commercial areas are nodes, not corridors, and they see no purpose in extending commercial entitlements down the street.

ii. Priorities

1. Group wants to roughly combine the top four chosen priorities into two statements:
  - a. Priority 1: Encourage growth and high-quality design near major transit developments and improve the safety of these roads, transforming them from barriers into community destinations.
  - b. Priority 2: Care for the places and people that make Highland special by preserving and rehabilitating buildings and supporting residents and businesses at risk of displacement.

d. Jefferson Park

- i. Agree with focusing on connectivity makes sense, consistent with neighborhood sentiment
- ii. Stabilizing residents is kind of moot now
- iii. High quality design should be a priority
- iv. Making sure we continue to put businesses into BID, commercial areas
- v. High quality design and active ground floors, change opportunity 4 to emphasize active uses

- vi. Opportunity 3 matches CPV Auraria plan
- vii. Concern about 8 story height between Clay and Bryant north of Mile High Circle
  - 1. Parking issues and connectivity
  - 2. Look at conversation with previous reps and follow up
  - 3. Tailgate event on October 8
  - 4. Parking restrictions have been loosened
  - 5. Note to include these blocks in any future stadium area plan

## **6. Public Comment**

- a. Sunnyside Master Plan for Innovation District