User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Fred Glick	Not sure why you would restrict this to a single connector per zone lot. On a very large zone lot with multiple buildings, multiple connectors may be appropriate. For example, on an education campus.	Upon further discussion, we are going to go back to allowing building connectors as accessory to one- and two-unit development only (as allowed today), rather than expanding to all building form types. The expansion would require greater thought about how to make the building form work for a variety of uses. On a very large zone lot, like on an educational campus, they would typically not have an issue with creating a building connector between buildings, so long as they are on the same zone lot.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2167#page=7
Fred Glick	On a large suburban lot, not possible that a longer connector might be appropriate? Particularly in a case where it might be a mobility/ADA issue?	The 10-foot limit is for the *width* of the connector, rather than the length. We don't intend to require existing detached structures to be closer to primary structures than they are.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2168#page=7
Fred Glick	Why no Minor Detached Structures for the mixed-use commercial districts? If this form is to include utilities, for example, would it be appropriate to allow in mixed-use commercial districts?	This was a mistake and the Minor Detached Structures building form will be added to allow the form in all mixed-use commercial zone districts (and industrial and other special zone districts as well).	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2169#page=34
Fred Glick	This doesn't totally make sense to me. As I read it, Option B only allows one structure, but Option A limits to 4' in height. So you couldn't, as I understand it, have both a play structure or shed AND a ground-mounted heat pump unit. That seems to conflict with (a) the impetus to simplify code and reduce permitting requirements and (b) sustainability goals which are pushing people to do more heat pumps.	Thanks for this comment. After review, CPD will be removing the limit on the number of "minor detached structures" allowed on a zone lot, although they will count toward the allowed maximum building coverage. In this way, the code will be simplified in focusing on and permitting more impactful structures.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2170#page=41
Fred Glick	Not sure these labels correspond with the table above? B is suppose dto be the side street setback?	Thanks for this comment. The tables will be revised to match the labeling in the image.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Fred Glick	I really am not sure what this means, and without a corresponding diagram, I'm really lost.	To assist our customers, there is a diagram in the Rules of Measurement, in Section 13.1.5.12, which will be titled "Location of Structure for General and Minor Detached Structure Building Forms." This should help with understanding how to apply the standard.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Section 1.4.5.6 refers to the "following standards," but the section is empty and the contents are in 1.4.5.7.B. Section suggested for deletion.	Thanks for this comment. This section will be revised.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2173#page=6
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Most?	We are comfortable with the word 'more' in this case.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Change nomenclature since A is now an empty section?	Thanks for your attention detail here. All numbering will be updated when the 'clean' draft of the code is prepared.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	It is not clear what determines options A and B.	The size and location of the structure determine which option a structure should use. If it can't fit within these two options, it would be classified as a General Detached Structure.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2176#page=34
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Option A may include structures like mechanical equipment, and therefore a roof form is not warranted, however, in Option B, at 14 feet max. height with no roof form standards, an unintended consequence is a massive box filling its entire building envelope. I suggest a roof form standard be applied.	We don't have a roof form standard on other accessory structures; rather, the bulk plane, height, and setbacks control the mass of the structure.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2177#page=41
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	See Article 3 for suggestion on same standard.	Thank you for this comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2178#page=54
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	See Article 3 for same suggestion on this standard.	Thank you for this comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2179#page=43
Fred Glick	Still concerned about having access to only option A or B. Also, while I can understand a concern about "too many" minor structures, seems a bit ridiculous that a property owner would have to choose between having a playhouse OR a garden shed OR a small greenhouse. Is this really a level of regulation the City should be undertaking?	Thanks for this comment. Upon further consideration, the limit on number of structures will be removed. I also want to clarify that a property owner has access to both A and B and if the structure falls outside the parameters for these minor structures, they could use the General Detached Structure building form.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2180#page=54

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Fred Glick	I'm a bit unclear now how this works in Lower Downtown, since the LDDRC is a deciding body, not a recommending body. Does this mean that the zoning administrator has the authority to rescind the LDDRC's decision?	This section is focused on projecting signs in the downtown districts. Now that a comprehensive sign plan is no longer required for projecting signs in downtown (as proposed in the bundle), LDDRC will continue to make a final decision on a sign's compliance with Landmark rules for LoDO but the Zoning Administrator (CPD staff) will be the final decision-maker on the zoning permit. A zoning permit will not be issued without LDDRC approval for Landmark compliance.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2182#page=52
Fred Glick	This new requirement seems to conflict with what is shown in Figure 11.10-5. For example, wouldn't this now require that the spacing between the seating elements on the left side have 5' of spacing, not 3' as shown?	In this case, the 3' shown is correct. The pedestrian pathway that requires 5' is the area on the sidewalk where people would walk outside of the OGA.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2183#page=78
Fred Glick	I find it a bit confusing that this is included in both 11.10 and 11.11. 11.10 would imply that it is not a temporary use, but by its nature a mobile food truck is temporary, unless you are suggesting they might be allowed to park there permanently? But the First Friday example sort of implies that it is temporary, or at least itinerant?	In the Bundle, a food truck may operate on private property either as an accessory use (new) or as a temporary use. As an accessory use operating to support or complement a different primary use on the same private property, food trucks will be allowed greater freedom to operate and rotate on a continuing permanent basis, with a one-time zoning permit review and approval. As a temporary use of private property, an independent food truck will enjoy greater freedom to operate with the bundle changes, but will still be time-limited and subject to shorter operating hours. The Bundle is accommodating two different business models for operating food trucks in Denver.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2184#page=82
Fred Glick	I think that the intent is to simplify the food truck requirements, but have to admit that I'm left pretty confused by the bulk of text here. I would suggest going back, starting by asking what you hope to achieve (and/or prevent here) and evaluate what in here is really necessary and what might be eliminated.	See response above.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2185#page=86
Fred Glick	Just confirming that this does not create a conflict with the existing signs in the Theatre District?	Thanks for this question. The Theatre District has its own, more specific sign regulations, which would prevail in this case because the most specific rule always applies when two rules conflict. Further, any existing signs would be allowed to continue as a nonconforming sign.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2181#page=44
Fred Glick	Does this still apply? I think all PB involvement with SDPs has now been removed?	We have removed all Planning Board participation in approval of SDPs from the code as part of the Bundle.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2186#page=9
Fred Glick	I'm trying to understand if the intent her eis to eliminate mezzanines completely, and if so, why?	We've received several similar comments. CPD will maintain the existing standard for mezzanines but may explore modifying it in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2187#page=77
Chuck Boncordo	So now a single user in a multi tenant building in the listed zones may now have a projecting sign w/o the requirement of a CSP provided they meet all other requirements? Please confirm. Thank you	Yes, that's correct.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2188#page=51
Bryan Gunn	I do not understand the logic behind changing where the base plane is calculated to 20' from Primary Street in all cases, whereas before it was calculated at the minimum block-sensitive front setback? This change seems like it will have unintended negative consequences for lots that have a minimum front setback, for example, at 25' or greater or for example at 15' or less, because often times a minimum front setback relates to a significant change in grade or contours of a lot - for example the "Denver Hill". This may also significantly disadvantage lots that slope significantly up or down from the street to the alley.	The purpose of this change is to provide a simplified, standard point where the base plane is taken from because the primary street setback can change from place to place depending on what adjacent neighbors have done with their primary structure. The Denver Hill typically starts at about 10 feet from the primary street zone lot line. Taking the base plane from 20 feet . Finally, 20 feet is the default setback when a block-sensitive primary street setback cannot be established.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2190#page=73
Cindy Pedrioli	Is this correct? Residential rear setbacks (all previous sections) are greater than those noted with drive-thru use setbacks when adjacent to a protected district (typically residential)? i.e. Broadway adjacent to residential on the other side of the alley along Lincoln.	That is correct. We are not proposing to change these setback in the Bundle; instead, we're reorganizing tables for better ease of use. In this case, the alley provides a buffer to the protected district and a 10-foot setback is required when no alley is present.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2191#page=17
Cindy Pedrioli	Same question/concern as comment under drive-thru services next to protected districts.	See comment above.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2192#page=20
Bryan Gunn	PLEASE consider modifying definitions or "Roof, Low Slope" and "Roof, Pitched" such that Low Slope is a pitch LESS THAN 3:12 and Pitched is a slope EQUAL TO or greater than 3:12. As currently written, a minimum pitch asphalt shingle roof that is 3:12 as commonly seen in Denver Square designs falls into "Low Slope" when it should be considered pitched.	We've confirmed with the Residential review team that this is a desirable change and it will be reflected in the Revised Public Review draft. Thanks for your suggestion.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2189#page=163

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Cindy Pedrioli	These images do not correlate with the text of the section they follow	Correct. These images show the General building form, which comes after the images.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Cindy Pedrioli	Do trash enclosures count as accessory structures? Then there needs to be an allowance for accessory structures in non-residential zones.	Trash enclosures are addressed as screening devices in DZC Sec. 10.5.7.3.B, rather than as a detached accessory structure.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2194#page=34
Cindy Pedrioli	Consider whether people will try to park in the gap between the alley and the garage door. Many jurisdictions require a 0'-2' OR 20' setback next to the garage, so that either you can obviously park in the driveway at 20' deep (and with enough room to not block things outside of it) or you can't. Anything less than 20' but deeper than approximately 2' tends to result in cars being parked (parallel, head-in, etc.) in that space, partially blocking the alley, walk or private drive.	Additional revisions will be proposed in the Revised Public draft to guarantee a minimum of 21' between a garage and the furthest side of the alley when garage doors face the alley at the rear of a zone lot, which will help with maneuvering in the alley. Further, garage structures are required to be a minimum of 10' behind the primary street-facing façade, which generally prevents garages from causing these issues at the public sidewalk, at least at the primary street. At the rear and side street, the 5' setback has been the required setback in these zone districts in the past and we haven't heard that there is a desire to change them.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2195#page=38
Cindy Pedrioli	Same concern as noted below on parking occurring on the "driveway" up to the garage door blocking the walk, street, etc.	See response to previous comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2196#page=38
Cindy Pedrioli	trash enclosures in commercial, mixed use or multi-family scenarios?	Trash enclosures are addressed as screening in DZC Sec. 10.5.7.3.B, rather than as a detached accessory structure.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Cindy Pedrioli	Separate out Detached Accessory Structures and Minor Detached Structures in this section. Also, use consistent terms throughout the document, some sections reference Accessory Structures, other reference Detached Structures.	Thank you for this comment. We've revised for consistency.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2198#page=32
Cindy Pedrioli	This definition needs to be present at the beginning of the section, before the table that includes them. Additional note also added there.	Thank you for this comment. We are considering how to reformat this section for ease of use.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2199#page=41
Cindy Pedrioli	The minimum 12 SF seems small for things like planters (that's all the veggies you can grow?) Some toddler play pieces are taller than 4' as well. What problem is this section actually trying to address? Have there been issues with the addition of these items getting out of control or is it trying to eliminate them from requiring permitting? If it is the former, consider eliminating many of the items listed from regulation or eliminating the minor detached structures section (planters, ground-mounted mechanical equipment and play structures (under a certain height) and adding a note to the code to that effect. Arbors (assuming this means attached to the building or like a stand-alone pergola) could be outlined in roof structures section of building code or defined more clearly in building additions (with less restriction than an enclosed addition). Sheds fall into the category with accessory structures with its own category smaller and with less regulations than garages.	Thanks for this comment. Since receiving comments, CPD has revised to remove the limit on the number of these minor structures allowed per zone lot. In line with your suggestion, this change would remove the requirement to obtain a zoning permit for these minor structures (as described in Sec. 12.4.1).	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2200#page=41
Cindy Pedrioli	It should read latter, not former. If you are trying to eliminate it from permitting, then state that in a statement and remove the entire section. Sheds are also already in the Detached Structure section.	In our code, all structures are assigned a building form, which is why it's necessary to have a building form for these minor structures, even though they do not require a permit. This is the place where we outline the parameters for these structures, so that people know how much they can build without applying for a zoning permit. Sheds can come in a variety of sizes: the smallest ones can fit in the minor structures building form, while larger structures would fit in the General Detached Structure building form, which is why they are listed	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2200#page=41
Cindy Pedrioli	Consistency in terminology. Accessory structures versus detached structures	Thanks for this comment. We'll work on ensuring consistency in the adoption draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2202#page=41
Cindy Pedrioli	Is it still accessory structures here or Detached Structures? Consistent throughout.	Thanks for this comment. We'll work on ensuring consistency in the adoption draft. Note that the lower-case 'detached accessory structures' describes the category of structures. If adopted, there will no longer be a building form called Detached Accessory Structures.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2203#page=50

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Cindy Pedrioli	Is there a building code requirement for setbacks? Otherwise, why do these need to be regulated at all?	The building code does not establish similar "setbacks" from property lines like the zoning code does. Zoning setbacks are intended to provide open and unobstructed space between buildings, which creates a community-desired aesthetic as well as provide privacy between uses. The code makes limited exceptions for "minor" structures where the intent of the setbacks is not substantially compromised. The Bundle changes align with this approach.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2204#page=66
Cindy Pedrioli	Could AC units and heat pumps noted in above sections be added to this section instead?	AC units and heat pumps will be treated as "ground-mounted mechanical equipment" that will be required to be setback behind the primary-street facing façade to mitigate aesthetic impacts if these were placed in front of a structure.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2205#page=71
Alek Miller, Senior City Planner	The rear setbacks for DADU in this section will be modified to read more like the other building form tables in other contexts. This section has an error, stating that the rear setback would be different based on the 'portion of the structure.' The setback will be set for the whole structure.	n/a - response from staff	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2206#page=37
Nick Allen	I strongly challenge a blanket elimination of this section. While often confusing, mezzanine parking decks that utilize this section allow for solutions to accommodate parking, particularly for smaller infill sites. Eliminating this opportunity effectively requires those parking stalls to be built below grade, significantly increasing construction costs. This change will increase the cost of housing, and thus should be carefully evaluated. I would encourage thoughtful modification of the section in lieu of elimination.	We've received several similar comments. CPD will maintain the existing standard for mezzanines but may explore modifying it in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2207#page=77
Cindy Pedrioli	Does this apply to attached garages as well? setbacks from garage faces are typically recommended to be either 2' or 20', so that people cannot try to park on the door apron (2'), or have enough room to park (20'). 12' is too short to park a car but long enough for many to think they can.	The garage portion of a primary one- or two-unit residential structure is proposed to be subject to the same rear setback as the remainder of the structure. The choice to set the garage door back further than the minimum required zoning setback is a design choice that may be quite rational for the reasons you state, but will not be driven by zoning standards. See also, minimum maneuvering area for vehicle paring standards added to the adoption draft, which also speak to your comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2208#page=4
Cindy Pedrioli	Same setback concern as in other previous sections - recommend 2' OR 20', not somewhere in between where a car will try to park on the driveway/apron of the garage.	See above response.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2209#page=51
Cindy Pedrioli	This indicates that there is no maximum to the amount of garages, sheds, etc. you can have on your property as long as it meets the SF restrictions in the chart below, but that you have to follow Option A (height restrictions) on small things like infrastructure units, kid play structures, arbors, etc. or only have 1 small item in your lot. This seems backwards. Also see my comment in Article 3 about the Minor Detached Structures.	The Revised Public Review draft has revised the standards for minor detached structures to allow an unlimited number of "option A" or "option B" structures, limited instead by the maximum building coverage limits applicable to the primary structure on the zone lot.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2210#page=45
Cindy Pedrioli	Also see my comment in Article 3. Option A's Max 4' in height and 12 sf in size is unusually small for some of these types of uses, like an arbor, planter, play structure or shed. Does this really need to be regulated? Regulate number and height on garages and sheds, and leave the rest out of regulation.	The goal with this building form is indeed not to sweat the smallest of stuff that is a "structure." Option A and Option B accomplishes that objective, with controls on Option B primarily to limit aesthetic impacts from cluttering up the "front yard" with larger minor structures.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2211#page=54
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Option A may include structures like mechanical equipment, and therefore a roof form is not warranted, however, in Option B, at 14 feet max. height with no roof form standards, an unintended consequence is a massive box filling its entire building envelope. I suggest a roof form standard be applied.	Thank you for your comment. The Revised Public Review draft does not contain roof form standard as you suggested. See response below.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2178#page=54
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz	Option A may include structures like mechanical equipment, and therefore a roof form is not warranted, however, in Option B, at 14 feet max. height with no roof form standards, an unintended consequence is a massive box filling its entire building envelope. I suggest a roof form standard be applied.	CPD accepts that we might get some boxes that fill the entire envelope allowed, but think that applying a roof standard to a minor structure would be in conflict with the goal of offering a low-barrier, simple building form that does not require a zoning permit.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2179#page=43
Kaylyn Kirby	I agree with Nick's comment. The whole sale removal of this section seems extremely problematic. If reviewing these conditions is the issue (ie, complicated / can be confusing) I would recommend clear guidance for what exhibits or additional drawings should be included in SDP sets for projects utilizing mezzanines. If all projects are documenting them similarly + there is a consistent interpretation from all Zoning reviewers, this should not be an issue. In addition, there is already differences between IBC and DZC on "mezzanine" - removing this section completely could cause even more confusion.	We've received several similar comments. CPD will maintain the existing standard for mezzanines but may explore modifying it in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2221#page=77

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Kaylyn Kirby	How will this text amendment affect projects already in SDP review (and in design). Pulling the rug out from underneath projects that have these incorporated could result in costly delays, redesign, etc. >> potentially increasing project costs and delaying the delivery of needed housing	We've heard concerns like yours from others in the community, as well, and we are developing a grace period for projects that are already in the pipeline.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2222#page=77
Kaylyn Kirby	Removing this option in its entirety seems like an overreaction to potential complexity in reviewing these conditions. Clear guidance and communication between Zoning and project teams could streamline documentation and review of these conditions. Many projects rely on this section to provide needed parking above grade (vs. below grade / much more costly parking) and the removal of this section could result in less usable space being provided in favor of additional parking (ie, less residential units to provide parking for what's left of the units). Understanding that generally the City is not interested in providing more parking, there is still market demand for parking and "projects won't pencil" without meeting a certain level of parking. Our public transit needs to vastly improve to help make a dent in people giving up their vehicles in Denver. In addition to actual alternative options for getting outside (ie mountains) without a personal vehicle.	We've received several similar comments. CPD will maintain the existing standard for parking structure stories but may explore modifying it in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2223#page=78
Kaylyn Kirby	Is there any consideration given for some Administrative adjustments for projects with 2-3+ Primary Street frontages to provide some flexibility for needed building functions (ie, exhaust, parking/loading entry, transformers, general building functionality). Projects can be very constrained when dealing with multiple Primary Streets to also provide basic building functionality. Is there a way to provide option for dialogue on compromise in certain situations. Perhaps not all "Primary Street" designations are treated the same if one is a "one off condition." Projects should still strive to meet the spirit of the requirement, but is there an opportunity for alternatives if 100% compliance is not possible.	While this situation is not directly addressed in the criteria, this can be considered an unusual condition in some circumstances and could be used as a justification for an administrative adjustment. Please note, there are procedures in Article 13 that allow the zoning administrator to designate the primary street zone lot line that diverges with the standards under certain conditions.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2224#page=91
Kaylyn Kirby	What about lots that have slope, but two primary streets and not a rear ZLL (Sloping site section)? Impacts to Base plane and thus height calculations. Understand this condition does not exist in the whole City, but it does exist.	When no reference lots are available, 20 feet is used as the default primary street setback. We think this is a reasonable estimate that is close to where many primary street setbacks will land and it allows applicants to plan their buildings without concern about how neighboring structures may influence the primary street setback. If there is a significant slope, an applicant can request an administrative adjustment or variance to adjust the height.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2225#page=75
Kaylyn Kirby	Misread this originally, but still have a questions of why the 20' back. This could potentially hinder projects that have significant slopes between the street and rear lot line.	When no reference lots are available, 20 feet is used as the default primary street setback. We think this is a reasonable estimate that is close to where many primary street setbacks will land and it allows applicants to plan their buildings without concern about how neighboring structures may influence the primary street setback. If there is a significant slope, an applicant can request an administrative adjustment or variance to adjust the height. Further, 20 feet is the default setback when no reference lots are available. This change will allow for simpler application of the code and for applicants to plan their building height without regard to their adjacent neighbors' structures.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2220#page=74
Kaylyn Kirby	If exterior balconies do not contribute to GFA, why would they not be permitted to count toward Incremental Mass Reduction? They are in effect "open" and not "mass"? Interior (walls on 3 sides + roof above) balconies do count toward GFA, and therefore, would think that they would NOT count toward Incremental Mass Reduction. Item iii.a above notes that if the area is not considered GFA, it CAN be considered Incremental Mass Reduction. That seems simple enough. The proposed "clarification" is confusing or should just state "interior balconies"	This rule of measurement was proposed to be changed to be more streamlined, clear and consistent with the Mass Reduction Rules of Measurement that do not support the inclusion of balconies. In this case, it's more important to be consistent across all of our massing reduction strategies than with the definition of GFA.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2227#page=115
Kaylyn Kirby	It appears "green screen" is being removed as an option, therefore this diagram is moot.	Based on additional comments, the Revised Public Review draft will propose to remove "wall design element" as a permitted design alternative to meet minimum transparency standards. The removal is intended to simplify a complex area of the code, and improve built design outcomes.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2228#page=137
Kaylyn Kirby	Why is color being removed?	Based on additional comments, the Revised Public Review draft will proposed to remove "wall design element" as a permitted design alternative to meet minimum transparency standards. The removal is intended to simplify a complex area of the code, and improve built design outcomes.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2229#page=135

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Kaylyn Kirby	Is this section essentially removing the 1' in height for every 1' setback from perimeter of building?	In the Revised Public Review draft, you'll see that many of the current standards are going to be used instead of substantially overhauling the height exceptions table.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2215#page=13
Kaylyn Kirby	Wouldn't this exception no longer exist as item G.2 (Integrated Facade) is being removed?	Yes, that's correct. This error will be corrected in the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Kaylyn Kirby	Removal of this Alternative could have significant impacts to projects that need to provide parking above grade (as below grade is very costly). Requiring all above parking levels to be wrapped with min. 15' Active Use could result in less efficient parking plates and undesirable "active use" around said plates. Could result in additional parking stories to make up for inefficient layout, resulting in less usable space within a building. Not all sites have the dimensions to be able to provide parking plates with a meaningful and usable active use zone.	In furtherance of the city's land use policy objectives to reduce the amount of parking provided in our neighborhoods, and encouraging more active uses and more housing units (vs. parking spaces), the deletion of this standard removes an incentive to provide more parking, rather than less.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2217#page=97
Kaylyn Kirby	How will this text amendment impact current projects in SDP review? I expect there are quite a lot utilizing this alternative and if this went into effect immediately / for projects in SDP, this would cause serious redesign, project timeline impacts, construction cost increases, and potentially stop projects from moving forward.	Thanks for your question. We've heard similar concerns from others and have determined that a delayed effective date for projects in the pipeline is appropriate. As of right now, we plan to propose a delayed effective date for SDPs of 2/3/2025.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2218#page=97
Kaylyn Kirby	Note, Article 13 does not appear top left drop down navigation menu. May be missing comments due to confusion on how to find it.	Thanks for your attention to detail on this. Unfortunately, the system we used to post the document only allows a certain number of files, so Articles 10 and 11 and Articles 12 and 13 are combined.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Kaylyn Kirby	What is driving the 20' from Primary Street ZLL? What about odd shaped Zone Lots? Will this create confusion as the ZLLs are drawn throughout plan and elevations, dimensions from ZLL to wall, etc.?	When no reference lots are available, 20 feet is used as the default primary street setback. We think this is a reasonable estimate that is close to where many primary street setbacks will land and it allows applicants to plan their buildings without concern about how neighboring structures may influence the primary street setback.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2220#page=74
Kaylyn Kirby	Where is 13.1.5.4 and 13.1.5.5? Are these being removed? or simply a glitch?	13.1.5.4 and 13.1.5.5 are not changing, which is why they do not appear in this markup draft. We had to strike a balance between publishing the full code and highlighting only the sections changing. Apologies for any confusion.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2230#page=92
Kaylyn Kirby	General note - it would be helpful for navigation (+ citation in SDPs) to have the full DZC section in the header or footer of the pages. This is a very long section and it's hard to tell exactly where you are... ie, 13.1.6.1.G....	We can consider doing this in the future with a more comprehensive look at the formatting of the code. It seems that this is primarily a challenge in Article 13, so the potential solution might be to add more divisions to 13.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2231#page=124
Kaylyn Kirby	"At every story above street level, exterior street facing building walls within the minimum percentage of Zone Lot Width specified in building form table shall be required to meet limitation on visible parking above street level" This is problematic as it reads as: if you have a 70% Build-to Requirement, then ALL Stories above grade must meet that same 70% Build-to requirement to satisfy the "limitation on visible parking" This does not work where buildings step back / in at upper floors from either an architectural/massing move or as required by Incremental Mass Reduction. Meaning, if you have 100' of build-to at Street level, you may have 70' at upper floors... and that would not be compliant with the way this is worded. If you are removing the "Integrated Facade" Alternate, this section needs to be cleaned up to be more in line with what I believe the intent to be. Or really it should be cleaned up regardless because its confusing. Should be % of the building length that exists at the upper floors or "100% of above grade parking" (or where parking exists above grade) needs to be wrapped / limited visibility / not visible from the street. But it should not be tied to the Zone Lot width because that doesn't make sense on upper levels. ... hope that makes sense.	This section does not state that the Limitation on Visible Parking shall meet the Build-To Min / Max Range. Therefore, if portions of the Building are stepped back in compliance with Incremental Mass Reductions, so long as those stepped-back areas still show that the building is wrapped in activated uses for the minimum depth, the Building would be in compliance with the Limitation on Vehicle Parking requirements. The Rule of Measurement for how the percentage of the Zone Lot Width is calculated is called out in 13.1.6.1.I.2.b. So for every story above the Street level, the exterior street-facing building walls within the minimum Zone Lot Width will need to comply with the 70% Limitation. The Rules of Measurement also accommodate building massing insets or limited building articulation re: 1.3.1.6.I.2.ii.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2232#page=125

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Kaylyn Kirby	Amending comment slightly, as technically the building form table does not say "Limitation on Visible Parking Above Street Level = Build-to Requirement" However, it does note (DO-7): Limitation on Visible Parking Above Street level is 70% of the Primary and Side Street-facing Zone Lot Width So same concern... 70% of the Zone Lot Width on upper stories essentially reads as the building must maintain 70% build-to for its full height.	See response above on previous comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2232#page=125
Kaylyn Kirby	See also comment on Limitation on Visible Parking above street as I believe it is written differently than expected + is confusing. If this Alt is being removed, that section needs some attention.	See response above on comment on Limitation on Visible Parking.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2217#page=97
Kaylyn Kirby	See also comment under Limitation on Visible Parking above street level (in 13). This needs to be reviewed, especially if Integrated Facade is being removed. Is this reading as follows: if parking exists above street level, than ALL Stories (even ones without parking), must be a min of 70% of the Zone Lot length (essentially matching Build-to) ? It appears to be a measurement of the Zone Lot Width and not the street facing building length, or "only where there is parking" Essentially does not allow for buildings to step back at upper floors for massing or as required for Incremental Mass Reduction. I do not think this is the intent?	See the illustration in Figure 13.1-96; In these situations, we do include the depth of a recessed area as counting toward depth for IMR.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2235#page=93
Alek Miller	Thanks for your attention to detail on this. Unfortunately, the system we used to post the document only allows a certain number of files, so Articles 10 and 11 and Articles 12 and 13 are combined. These are accessed from the drop down at the bottom below the document window. The drop-down at the top left is not wide enough to show the full title.	n/a - no response needed	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2219#page=72
Tim Boers	reducing lot coverage on narrow lots reduces the viability of developing small lots. recommend changing this back to 50% or increasing a bit to 60% to compensate for the deletion of the 50% credit for garages >15' from the house.	Thank you for the comment. We have recalibrated the maximum building coverage in the Revised Public Review draft to allow more lot coverage on smaller or narrower lots.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2239#page=4
Tim Boers	The increases in lot coverage for all three lot widths are too high, and will encourage bulkier buildings. Recommend reducing to 45% for lots between 30' wide and 75' wide, and reducing to 40% for lots greater than 75' wide. This would be consistent with what you are proposing for the Urban House form.	Thank you for the comment. We have recalibrated the max building coverage in the Revised Public Review draft to allow more lot coverage on smaller or narrower lots.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2240#page=7
Tim Boers	ALL building coverage limits have been deleted! This seems to be contrary to how you are treating other building forms.	This was a drafting error that will be corrected in the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Tim Boers	ALL maximum structure widths and lengths have been deleted. Why?	Building coverage and setbacks will still control the amount of structure built on a site, but this deletion will allow for more flexibility in laying out tandem houses on a site. Removing the length and width limits also supports the addition of a front porch where it's required or desired.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-
Tim Boers	Building Footprint limits have been deleted for Districts U-TU-B, U-TU-B2, and U-TU-C . Why?	This was a drafting error that will be corrected in the adoption draft. Unfortunately, we did not revise it in time for the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Tim Boers	Why are the RH districts deleted here?	This was a drafting error that will be corrected in the adoption draft. Unfortunately, we did not revise it in time for the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Tim Boers	Same comment as in Article 5	Please see response in Article 5.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2245#page=4
Tim Boers	You have eliminated the rear setback with no alley adjacent to a Protected District. This should remain in place!	This was a drafting error that has been corrected in the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Donna George	PSCo/Xcel Energy would like to review any ZLAMs where the electric service may be affected by the new lot line, causing the line to be in trespass of one lot or the other, depending.	The ZLAM reviewer refers to Xcel when the trigger is met. Currently, the trigger is “if zlam reviewer knows that new zone lot will be cut off from a known power or gas line.” If they’d like any adjustments to be made to the trigger, please reach out to Ryann Anderson at ryann.anderson@denvergov.org.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2237#page=31
Alisha Hammett	We would like to have a path similar to the PBG/SDP amendment language where a DRC gives the option of a single owner amending a zone lot. Not creating a provision for a single property owner to amend a zone lot will make the PBG dissolution process moot.	The adoption draft will have a parallel provision that allows zone lot amendments with less than 100% ownership, limited to zone lots that are subject to an approved SDP.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2238#page=31

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Phil Loper	Why is this language getting deleted? Why not just replace 'Detached Garage' with the new 'General Detached Structure' Building Form here? This change could have significantly negative impact on Zone Lots greater than 62' wide that don't have Alley vehicle access. Requiring a 7.5' Side Interior Setback for an attached garage in these cases seems highly, and unnecessarily, restrictive in my opinion.	That is what we're proposing. The new General Detached Structure building form incorporates the standards from the previous Detached Garage building form. The deletion you've pointed out is a proposal to remove an incentive for attached garages, which allows them to have narrower setbacks than the rest of the primary structure in many cases. We've heard similar concerns from others and will be retaining the allowance for attached garages to use detached garage standards. However, CPD may explore hanging this in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2247#page=4
Phil Loper	Why not also include 'screening roofs' for rooftop mechanical equipment as 'Non-occupiable structures and objects'? I think a sloped roof mechanical screen would be more aesthetically pleasing than a parapet wall mechanical screen that sticks up in the middle of a sloped roof.	Upon further discussion of the proposed height exceptions based on comments received, CPD is proposing to go back to the current set of height exceptions, which has specific standards for mechanical screens.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2248#page=51
harsh parikh	Language is unclear. What does 'not permitted' mean in this context? Is the stipulation stating that the GFA of the connector will not count towards the GFA of the primary structure?	In this case, 'not permitted' means that the enclosed area of the Building Connector may not be used for anything other than a pedestrian walkway between structures is not allowed. Although it references Gross Floor Area, it's not meant to indicate anything about allocating the GFA to one structure or another; rather, this just speaks to the use within the Building Connector.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2249#page=7
Megan Roper	I'm extremely concerned with the zoning changes as they pertain to carriage lots. This change in zoning laws will Impact over 1800+ current home owners/residents without awareness or consideration. Here are a few reasons why this change brings our block + other homeowners concern: - increased risk to fire hazard - our alleys are extremely narrow and no fire truck could fit in the alley. The increased fire hazard puts all of us at risk for home damage, or potentially life threatening depending on fire severity. - our resources are already strained. Every summer our entire block will lose Power during our hottest days because XCEL tells us that too many people on the grid are running their AC. If we add even more homes to such a tiny condensed area, we run the risk of having more outages. This puts our elderly even more at risk for heat related illnesses or death. - Home equity devaluation. The new buildings in the carriage lots will make our homes less desirable for many reasons. The erosion of our equity is not worth a small building crammed into a small area that doesn't even come close to addressing our actual housing crisis. I'd like to see REAL solutions to our housing crisis and not to the detriment of current homeowners and residents. Lastly, it's odd to me our representative, Sandoval, has changed position in such a short period of time. I can't imagine further lining the pockets of developers instead Of investing in our communities is the reputation our city council wants.	The change proposed to carriage lots would maintain the physical standards in place today, but would allow someone other than a homeowner and resident on the block to own the carriage lot. The proposed amendment to eliminate the requirement is not a major change from what is possible today in terms of creation of a new structure on the lot.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2250#page=1
Megan Roper	I'm extremely concerned with the zoning changes as they pertain to carriage lots. This change in zoning laws will Impact over 1800+ current home owners/residents without awareness or consideration. Here are a few reasons why this change brings our block + other homeowners concern: - increased risk to fire hazard - our alleys are extremely narrow and no fire truck could fit in the alley. The increased fire hazard puts all of us at risk for home damage, or potentially life threatening depending on fire severity. - our resources are already strained. Every summer our entire block will lose Power during our hottest days because XCEL tells us that too many people on the grid are running their AC. If we add even more homes to such a tiny condensed area, we run the risk of having more outages. This puts our elderly even more at risk for heat related illnesses or death. - Home equity devaluation. The new buildings in the carriage lots will make our homes less desirable for many reasons. The erosion of our equity is not worth a small building crammed into a small area that doesn't even come close to addressing our actual housing crisis. I'd like to see REAL solutions to our housing crisis and not to the detriment of current homeowners and residents. Lastly, it's odd to me our representative, Sandoval, has changed position in such a short period of time. I can't imagine further lining the pockets of developers instead Of investing in our communities is the reputation our city council wants.	The change proposed to carriage lots would maintain the physical standards in place today, but would allow someone other than a homeowner on the block to own the carriage lot. Fire risk and other hazards are reviewed as part of the development review process.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2250#page=1

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
harsh parikh	By removing the qualification that this limitation only applies to pedestrian access, you've placed a limitation on ALL paved surfaces. Would'nt this effectively place limitation on what percentage of a certain setbacks can be paved? This would create a big problem on a rear frontages where often the whole setback area needs to be paved in order to enter a garage. Suggest removing this item entirely. 'Flatwork' is not a building element, it's a surface finish. If you want to regulate imperviousness in setbacks there are other ways of achieving that. If you want to limit setback encroachments by exterior stairs, then that's understandable. But 'Flatwork' seems inappropriate.	In response to this and other comments, we've revised the setback encroachments to follow the current allowances. In the Revised Public Draft, you'll see that the definition of flatwork has been broadened so that it is no longer limited to pedestrian access routes. We believe there is a benefit to allowing a flatwork setback exception regardless of whether it functions as access to a building.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2251#page=68
harsh parikh	Similar comment. Imagine a 30' wide lot that requires a 12' rear setback because it has an attached garage. According to this, only 15' width (not enough for two cars) will be allowed to be paved in the rear setback to allow for a driveway. And one that limit is reach, no further paving allowed for trash, ped entry into back yard, etc. Why limit perviousness of rear setback area? Suggest removing the flatwork limit entirely, or at least remove any flatwork limitations from rear yards and side yards.	The setback exception that you'd use in this case would be the "Drive or Driveway" exception, which allows the drive to encroach any distance into the rear setback. Flatwork is for pedestrian walkways, stairs, and ramps.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2252#page=68
harsh parikh	You've already created the criteria what constitutes a minor structure. Why count such small items with limited impacts against max building coverage? I would suggest not counting Option A minor structures against max building coverage.	Thanks for your comment. We'll take it under consideration.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-
harsh parikh	Why remove this exception? An attached garage is a superior execution. Removal of this exception means that detached garages can be within 5' of the rear line but attached garages must remain 12' from the rear line. What positive outcome is achieved by pushing attached garages further back from the alley? I suggest leaving this exception in. Code should not incentivize detached garages over attached garages.	We think it's more reasonable to treat attached garages similarly to the rest the primary structure, rather than giving them the same setbacks as detached garages. This simplifies the code, improves process efficiency, and provides an easier path to reuse an attached garage for other, more active uses (e.g., an ADU) after construction. In addition, since attached garages are considered to be part of the primary structure, this change may create greater amounts of rear open space on a lot, since the primary structure would no longer extend from rear setback line to primary street setback .	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2254#page=10
harsh parikh	10' seems very short. Suggest increasing to at least 15'. There is already a precedence in the code for a 15' assumed distance between a garage and primary structure. 15' is a usable space that might allow decent natura light in. 10' is very short and will create nooks that will be poorly lit and hard to drain.	It sounds like you're thinking about the length of the Building Connector, rather than the width. The 10' is intended to limit how wide the Building Connector can be. We'll consider revising for clarity.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2255#page=7
Andy Olree	I initially thought removing this section makes sense as it is in contradiction sometimes with the building code. If it is removed, i don't think it is saying mezzanines are not allowed, it is just removing the responsibility for review. That is how i interpret the removal. If they are trying to state that mezzanines are no longer allowed and are to be classified as a story, that is a problem and will create further confusion with building construction type, allowable area, egress, real estate definitions, and other. I recommend that the definition of a mezzanine be consistent with the International Building Code and by any other definition you can find (not a story). If an apartment has a loft or mezzanine where part of the apartment has high ceilings and the other part has 2 levels, you do not count the loft or mezzanine as a separate story. Only count full stories where there are hallways and elevators serving that floor area (story). The definition of a mezzanine is pretty consistent from building codes and real estate definitions and would ease the city's review to have that same consistency.	We've received several similar comments. CPD will maintain the existing standard for mezzanines but may explore modifying it in a future text amendment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2256#page=77
Andy Olree	Electrical transformers should not be considered a structure as it relates to setbacks. Xcel locates transformers within ROWs, on properties, on a power pole in an alley or along the property easement within the back 5 feet of residential properties. This setback encroachment is commonplace throughout the city of Denver. I had never had a transformer considered as an accessory structure with respect to setbacks until recently and it is not consistent with the built environment. Equipment is not a structure and should be considered as such for site placement. This is especially true when a primary structure has zero setbacks and then a "accessory structure" like a transformer has stricter setbacks.	Understood. However, all structures are required to be assigned to a building form. We think the minor detached structure building form proposed strikes a good middle ground, as it allows for structures of a small size (like some utility equipment boxes) to be constructed without a zoning permit, but still subject to a small set of siting rules to control for aesthetic impacts.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2257#page=168

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Connor Gies	I am very concerned with the lack of community feedback and involvement in the decision surrounding carriage lots. There has not been the proper feedback and engagement with homeowners surrounding these lots to consider how these spaces can and should be used. What are the considerations for increased traffic, how will emergency services get back to these areas with the alleyways being so small, loss of urban greenery, increased fire risk with no true plans of how to mitigate that risk. Not to mention how utilities will get back to that space and the negative impact this will have on current homeowners and property values of the surrounding homes. There seems to be a lot of unintended consequences that will come from this that council and zoning are overlooking to create a few more homes in an already densely populated area. My garage is across the alley from one of these lots, has anyone in favor of this change actually visited a carriage lot and understand the consequences this would have on the neighboring homes? This will negatively impact the quality of life for every home and family surrounding a carriage lot.	All carriage lot development must go through review for fire, transportation, building and zoning code requirements. The focus of the changes is on treating carriage lot owners in the same way that we would treat other property owners by removing a requirement to reside on the surrounding block and that the ownership between the carriage lot and outer block be linked.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2258#page=6
Carlyn Shapiro	I am extremely concerned about the impact this proposal will have on carriage lots and the surrounding neighbors. I would implore the city to reconsider due to the following concerns: **Lack of Community Feedback:** - The zoning changes may advance without sufficient input from local residents, potentially ignoring their concerns and priorities. **Unaddressed Local Concerns:** - Without community engagement, issues like increased traffic or privacy impacts may be overlooked, leading to unforeseen consequences. **Limited Transparency:** **Opaque Decision-Making:** - Lack of community input can make the zoning process seem opaque, undermining public trust and perceived fairness. **Inadequate Mitigation of Potential Issues:** **Missed Opportunities for Solutions:** - Engaging with residents can reveal potential problems and solutions early, avoiding issues like increased density impacts or neighborhood changes. **Setback Issues:** **Inconsistent Setbacks:** - New developments may disrupt existing setback patterns, affecting	Given that the proposed changes do not affect the physical built outcomes, and all carriage lot development will have to go through the development review process, we believe many of these concerns can be mitigated. As for the community outreach piece, we are holding a community meeting on October 7 to further review what is proposed.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2259#page=8
Cindy Pedrioli	EV standards (EVSE EV ready and EV capable) need to be written into the dimensional sections of the design standards/zoning code and Planning staff must become familiar with the requirements and convey those early in the design process. Most site design work is not referring to the Energy Code. These spaces, outside of required ADA spaces that have EV are a significant impact on parking counts and in turn site design/layout and even viability of a project. Universally accessible spaces require an aisle between each space, which is required to be 11' wide instead of 8.5-9' wide standard. That eats into the total number of parking spaces a property can provide.	We prefer to refer to the EV standards in the energy code because it allows the energy code experts to revise and amend their code without creating new conflicts with the zoning code.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2260#page=8
Cindy Pedrioli	This section does not match the sections under specific zones where it notes a smaller distance from the face of the alley to the garage door, see my comments in article 3-5. Consistency.	Thank you for this comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Cindy Pedrioli	Is this timeframe shorter than existing? 45 days seems to be very short for turnaround of complex staff comments. I thought the current requirement was 180 days. 45 days seems like a significant hardship on consultant teams	You are correct. The final draft made that change to 180 days for responses to staff plan review comments.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Megan Gies	Hello, I am the owner of a home that surrounds a carriage lot. When we purchased our home almost 5 years ago, the carriage lot was a significant part of our due diligence process, and we were told by the Seller's real estate agent, and we independently confirmed by reviewing the zoning code, that very limited structures could be built on carriage lots only by an adjacent lot owner. These limitations made us feel conformable following through with the largest purchase and investment decision of our lives. The proposed change to the zoning code to allow individuals that do not own adjacent property to develop these parcels is of great concern to my household, as well as all of my neighbors. My concerns are outlined in more detail below: 1.Access to Garages/Setbacks: The alleyways are very narrow and I have to drive up onto a portion of the carriage lot in order to get in and out of my garage. If a structure or a fence is built on the carriage lot it will make it very challenging if not impossible for us to get in and out of our garage. 2.Construction Issues: There is very limited space on the carriage lot and surrounding alleyways. If a home is built on this parcel, there is very little space for construction vehicles, cement trucks, supplies, etc., and there is a very real risk that construction of a home that takes up the majority of the space on the carriage lot will create access issues to our homes. 3.Service Issues: Utility servicers currently use the space on the carriage lot to park when they are working on powerlines etc. in our neighborhood, and they will no longer have any space to perform these services. 4.Congestion: Building a home on the carriage lot will add significant congestion and take away all of the very little green space on the block. 5.Increased Traffic: In addition to the very significant traffic and interference created by the construction, a new home will add increased traffic through the alleyways due to an entirely new household of residents, guests and visitors. 6.Parking Issues: If the new structure being built does not have a garage, the	Thank you for these comments. The physical standards for development on carriage lots are not changing and these standards have been in place for many years. Your concerns about setbacks, construction issues, service issues, traffic/congestion, parking, and height are all addressed by the development review or multi-agency review before development is allowed.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2263#page=8
Katie Fox	s (note: comment was correcting a minor typo)	Thanks for this comment.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Katie Fox	2. In a zone lot amendment application to combine two or more lots, creation of a new nonconforming or compliant structure is allowed when it results only from noncompliance with side interior setback to the extent of not more than 40%.	We did not address setbacks because when a zone lot split occurs, most setbacks would remain the same or get smaller. In terms of a zone lot combination, a variance would need to be requested and a justifying circumstance shown.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-
Katie Fox	delete "25%"	The 25% is part of an example pulled from the thresholds in the AA table.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Katie Fox	Reword No. 2 to read, "2.In all cases for zoning relief, the Zoning Administrator shall determine the applicability of the administrative adjustment process based on whether (i) an administrative adjustment to the specific zoning standard violation that prevents approval under the zone lot amendment review criteria is within the authority granted in Section 12.4.5 of this Code, or (ii) a variance is required by the Board of Adjustment pursuant to Section 12.4.7." This makes it more clear that the Board of Adjustment has express authority as required by 12.4.7.3(A)(3)(b).	Thanks for this comment. We think we've gotten the language right in the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2267#page=32
Katie Fox	Change to 40% or amend to read "No limit, provided the adjustment results in a Side Interior Setback no less than 5 feet." Either of these changes would align the setback requirements for all other zone lots with the extent of adjustment allowed for zone lots between 30 and 40 feet wide.	We appreciate your comment and will take it under consideration for future code reform, but that change is beyond the scope of this Bundle.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2269#page=38
Katie Fox	, unless as the result of a proposed zone lot amendment.	Thanks for this comment, but we believe it is important to maintain that the voluntary decision to transact a zone lot amendment is an applicant-created condition.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Katie Fox	Add the following to the start of this sentence: "An extenuating situation exists or a hardship will result if a variance is not granted, or the variance is necessary . . .	Thanks for this comment. We moved away from hardship language in 2022-23.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Katie Fox	, unless as the result of a proposed zone lot amendment.	Thanks for this comment, but we believe it is important to maintain that the voluntary creation of a zone lot amendment is an applicant-created condition.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Katie Fox	Keep the concurring vote requirement at 3 instead of 4 members of the BOA.	This change is reflected in the Revised Public Review draft.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-

User name	Comment	CPD Response	Comment link
Keith Meyer	Removal of the requirement of Primary Residence of Owners Surrounding a Carriage Lot is very problematic. These are small spaces surrounded by pre-existing homes and owners that often share these common areas. Adjacent neighbors are in a much better place to purchase a lot and be required to discuss development plans with neighbors and come to a mutually beneficial agreement for all. This is not the case when a developer who has no interest in the neighborhood can come in and purchase the lot and is not required to reach any type of development agreement with the community before building on the lot.	Carriage lots are the only development type where the DZC regulates where a property owner lives as their primary residence. This has created poor outcomes for neighbors in the past - for example, carriage lots have become overgrown or neglected because owners could not sell or develop them. We think this is a step in a more equitable direction - of treating land uses for the same purpose in a similar manner.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2274#page=65
Trish Banks	This is an excellent point. It seems that these zoning changes are being drafted without really getting the thoughtful input of community members that actually live the area.	A community discussion is planned for October 7.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-
Trish Banks	These are very thoughtful and excellent points. They should be included in the public record on this discussion. How has the Zoning Administrator sought to solicit genuine feedback from the residents effected by these changes?	These comments will be provided to the Planning Board. Many comments have been provided on the Public Review Draft and via email. CPD is holding a community discussion on October 7.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2259#page=8
Casey Dunn	I am confused and concerned about the city's recent changes in the use of carriage lots. This change seems to have occurred with very little input from surrounding home owners and appears to have taken place through back channels. It's created a very poor perception of the city's decision making as there was no community feedback. These changes also seem dangerous as the alleyways for carriage lots are insufficient for emergency vehicles and will create considerably more traffic in areas where there is little visibility and limited space. We had hoped for years that this space would eventually become a community space for our neighbors and our family to come together and enjoy. It could become gathering spaces to bring our communities together. Turning these lots into housing does little to address the real challenges our community is facing, and seems to only benefit a select few who secretly partnered with the city to develop and profit from these lots. We really hope that the city will reconsider these changes.	Thank you for these comments. We are providing an opportunity for input on the public draft and through a hybrid meeting on October 7. All comments will also be provided to the Planning Board prior to the October 16 hearing. In addition, the physical standards for development on carriage lots are not changing and these standards have been in place for many years. Your concerns about setbacks, construction issues, service issues, traffic/congestion, parking, and height are all addressed by the development review or multi-agency review before development is allowed.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2264#page=4
Veronica Guillen	I am concerned about these proposed zoning changes. As a homeowner bordering a carriage lot, I feel like us neighbors have been kept in the dark regarding these changes. Any development in the lot behind my house would result in loss of privacy, overshadowing of my property, and be a major intrusion on our space. Developing this carriage lot would also be a hazard. The alleyways on our block are already too narrow for trash trucks to drive through so how would emergency vehicles such as firetrucks and ambulances access the lot should there be an emergency? in addition, there is already a lack of parking in the area. Trash/recycle days make this even worse. Where will parking for these structures be? Trash pick up? How will construction vehicles/equipment get back there to build without damaging surrounding properties? How will water and sewer be accessed? What are surrounding neighbors supposed to do while construction occurs? How will we access our garages? Development of these lots will only result in overcrowding, overshadowing, and decreasing the quality of living for those surrounding them.	Thank you for these comments. We are providing an opportunity for input on the public draft and through a hybrid meeting on October 7. All comments will also be provided to the Planning Board prior to the October 16 hearing. In addition, the physical standards for development on carriage lots are not changing and these standards have been in place for many years. Your concerns about setbacks, construction issues, service issues, traffic/congestion, parking, and height are all addressed by the development review or multi-agency review before development is allowed.	https://denvercpd.konveio.com/2024-text-amendment-bundle-public-review-draft?cid=2277#page=8