

City and County of Denver
Community Planning & Development
Planning Services
201 West Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80202
www.denvergov.org

Subject: NNW Steering Committee Meeting #26
Meeting Date: Tuesday, October 24th, 2023
Meeting Time: 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Meeting Location: In Person (Aztlan Recreation Center-
Community Room)

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

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

Steering Committee Attendees: Ramon Bargas, Mike Blake, Tíme Boers, Rafael Espinoza, Michael Guiietz, Renee Martinez-Stone, Nola Miguel, Garrett Phillips, Linda Jo

Consultant Staff: Grace Herbison

AGENDA & NOTES

1. Community Feedback and Timeline

- 495 page views, 51 comments
- Many comments on protected bike lanes and other mobility ideas
- Some comments on building heights at Diamond Hill redevelopment area in Jefferson Park

2. Plan Content

- **Jefferson Park Height Recommendations**
 - Southeast area fronting along Mile High Stadium Rd, with a steep downward slope
 - Currently zoned for 5 stories (C-MX-5), near I-25
 - Current Plan Recommendation (future place): Community Center with 8 stories and complete neighborhood elements
 - Provide transitions to neighborhood from stadium as well as interstate – was discussed between Jefferson Park Steering Committee members back in May
 - Recent Feedback
 - Some support as is, appropriate area for density
 - Some disagree with concerns around on-street parking, traffic, obstructed views, lack of connectivity
 - Options to Consider Based on Feedback
 - Option 1 – Leave as is – Community Center, 8 stories

- Option 2 – Change back to 5 stories – and make additional height conditional on infrastructure improvements
- Discussion
 - Question to clarify infrastructure improvements – if northern end of the stadium redevelops, it would include better street connections.
 - Councilwoman met with owner recently and redeveloping the northern end of the stadium was not mentioned.
 - Existing regulations include TOD subject to parking reductions – has capacity in geographic/topographic elements – but doesn't have great pedestrian access to rail stops
 - Note: Staff has double checked this statement and found that parking reductions do not apply for this property
 - Concerns for unintended consequences with additional density such as parking and traffic
 - Photos provided of ground level views from Mike Blake of the property
 - Blueprint Denver currently (without updated plan guidance from NNW Area Plan) recommends a Local Center – recommendation from the Near Northwest Area Plan is Community Center
 - Grace facilitated discussion on strengths and concerns for these different options
 - Strengths
 - Option 1 - Current, Leave as is, 8 stories
 - Currently a blighted parking lot, unlikely to be developed at 5 – a 2015 development didn't succeed – but nearby areas did – this site would finish off the block
 - With the slope, the height may be level with other nearby structures – and would be nearby highway and room for commercial opportunities
 - Need to be sure there isn't a disconnect between planning documents and regulating the outcomes we want – no issue of height and concerns of impact
 - Option 2 - 5 Stories with additional height condition on infrastructure improvements
 - Currently zoned C-MX-5 – past request not supported by neighbors due to view – but because of other recent developments, the view is gone
 - Lower height will be better to manage access/parking since there is limited east-west connection and limited on street parking --- if bridge is added then it makes more sense
 - 5 story is a neighborhood-friendly scale, consistent with surrounding area
 - Seems well zoned as is but other factors might not make it developable (developer/owner may be sitting on property)
 - Likes the conditional elements – gives flexibility, not giving extra entitlements
 - Strengths
 - Option 1 - Current, Leave as is, 8 stories

- Dramatic Transition to northwest, potential shading – needs to step down
- .75 parking spaces per unit required – neighborhood has no say in outcome and on street parking can change overnight – need other requirements to address this impact
- 23rd provides limited connections. Downtown area plan discussed bridge at 26th where better connectivity/density/height should be focused
- Stadium hosting events April – January, impacting traffic and parking more (not just during game times)
 - Quieter and less busy now than when the McNichols Arena & original Mile High Stadium were both located here and hosted events more frequently
- Option 2 - 5 Stories with additional height condition on infrastructure improvements
 - Stadium District or relocation – can't table to, if and when a situation occurs, if it's kept at 5, nothing will happen
- Consistent with existing zoning but need clear conditions related to other plans (increase parking requirements, mass transit, affordable housing) more specific requirements
- General
 - Many find benefit to be near stadium as a neighborhood
 - Cannot manufacture streets just to park
 - Not opposed to development but concerns on increasing parking demands to the area
 - Jeff Park plan – recommended density/height especially with topography
 - Could it be mapped at 5 but connect to other stronger policies to allow an increase in height?
 - Need to clarify what redevelopment of stadium district includes - primarily better street grid in surrounding area
 - If previous document/proposal of developing the site was provided – what language would make it a use by right? Incorporate mixed use, affordable housing, and encourage better design of the building. CDOT owns land across street - could be overflow for parking and improve sidewalk
- Vote to get a pulse check on preferred direction by committee members
 - Option 1: Leave as is at 8 stories with complete neighborhood elements, 2 votes
 - Option 2: 5 stories, contingent on infrastructure, 1 vote
 - Option 3: Leave as is at 8 stories with complete neighborhood elements, prioritizing improvements for better design, affordable housing, and mobility to address concerns around impacts to on-street parking and having more cars in the area, 3 votes
 - Several stated they would like to see a follow-up on the approach and language
- After taking a break from discussion, staff announced that the plan will need to incorporate recommendations that are realistic and implementable. This means prioritizing the desired

complete neighborhood elements, outlined in L1 of the land use and built form section, for this property, which include affordable housing, quality design, and more robust TDM strategies to address concerns around having more cars in the area.

- Updates to Better Address S. Platte River
 - Align with Waterway Resiliency Program for Ecological restoration and Urban Design
 - Example from West and Downtown Amendment Plans will be incorporated into the plan

3. Letter of Support

- Request for volunteer, tentative to review and approve next meeting
- Staff to send examples from recent plans

4. Remaining Schedule

- Close 2nd Public Review – November 3
 - Note: The public review draft on Konveio will now be open through Monday, November 13th
- Steering Committee – November 8
- Planning Board Hearing – December 6
- LUTI Committee – December 19
- City Council 1st Reading – January 8
- City Council Public Hearing – January 22

5. Public Comment

- Kim – Additional concerns come from changes related to parking and having unintended impacts. For example, when parking was removed for a new bike lane, general parking was removed, and this was also often a convenient location for work vehicles for residents.