



## Meeting Details

<b>Meeting Name:</b>	Near Southeast Area Plan Steering Committee
<b>Date/Time:</b>	Wednesday, January 11, 2023 – 6-8PM
<b>Location:</b>	Zoom Meeting

## Attendees

Steering Committee Members, x = attended

<b>Nancy Barlow</b>		<b>Erika McCallin</b>	
<b>Dustin Browne</b>	X	<b>Miranda Meadow</b>	
<b>Scott Caldwell</b>		<b>Joe Miklosi</b>	
<b>Guadalupe Cantu</b>		<b>Jennifer Neuhalfen</b>	X
<b>Harvey Cohen</b>	X	<b>Maria Jose Torres</b>	
<b>Lisa Foreman</b>	X	<b>Spencer Stephens</b>	X
<b>Scott Kilgore</b>	X	<b>Sara E. Stewart</b>	
<b>Adrian Kinney</b>		<b>Jim Stone</b>	
<b>Judy Kriss</b>	X	<b>Chris Viscardi</b>	X
<b>Jared Mackey</b>	X		

### Denver Elected Officials and Staff

Councilmember Sawyer, Councilmember Kashmann, Councilmember Black, Elise Bupp, Logan Fry

### Denver Staff

Scott Robinson (CPD), Jason Morrison (CPD), Will Prince (CPD), Christin Brandow (CPD)

## Meeting Summary

- **Welcome** – Scott Robinson welcomed the steering committee members to the meeting
- **Plan Updates** – Scott Robinson provided an update on the overall project timeline:



- Engagement Overview
  - i. Provided numbers of various outreach numbers since beginning of process including surveys, digital media, special events, focus groups, etc
- Phase 4 Engagement
  - i. 50+ survey comments
  - ii. 90 attendees at in person workshop, 37 at virtual workshop
  - iii. Intentional engagement and office hours in progress
  - iv. 57% support , 23% mostly support
  - v. Those that don't support, top concerns on growth, traffic, safety, and affordability
  - vi. Available January 22 online
  - vii. Planning Board Info Item – March 1, additional public comments/review
  - viii. Planning Board Hearing – April 19
- Phase 5 adoption, process starts in April
- Is 183 comments good input considering area's population
  - i. Typically do not receive a statistical representation, but would like to see more comments and encourage committee to get others to participate and review/comment on the plan

#### MEETING TOPICS

- **Residential Policies**

- Plan suggests expanding option to go from single unit zoning to duplex options
- Feedback so far has been on both sides (less duplexes or more duplexes) about neighborhood character, affordability, and density
- Similar land use zoning was featured in East plan, but before Expanding Housing Affordability was adopted
- The concern is to stall scrapes that have taken place in other neighborhoods such as Sunnyside and Cherry Creek
- With upcoming change in Mayoral administration – could these be deferred ?
  - i. The recommendations have language and precedent that they will not move forward till formal policies are in place to address these concerns and issues. Rezoning require plan support, so even a new administration shouldn't be able to allow rezonings if the policies aren't in place
- Winston Downs
  - i. Adding duplexes to this area is a major concern of neighbors with issues of getting out of the neighborhood
    - Was originally mapped for connectivity but can the map can be adjusted
  - ii. It is a significant Orthodox Jewish community and spend fair amount of time walking on Friday/Saturday vs. vehicles and additional density could cause traffic/safety concerns. It is the most affordable housing area in District 5 and should be considered preservation incentive and/or remove duplex option. ADU could be another option but might also be a hard sell.
- Can the topic be called out more exclusively in the plan
  - i. It is called out in the Executive Summary, Land Use Intro and LU polices 6-8
  - ii. Additional language should be added about the best way to integrate duplexed in SU neighborhoods



- iii. Open to having a task force to specialize in missing middle housing and how to review best ways to implement this change
  - ADUs vs. Duplexes Discussed
    - i. Blueprint suggests ADUs citywide and this could be more appropriate solution in some areas
      - Less developer/profit drive
      - Duplexes would be in addition to ADU allowance
      - ADUs require primary resident requirement – Short Term Rental committee manages restrictions – as AirBnB is not desired in most neighborhoods
      - Request for concept of how duplex can be added to existing house.
        - A pattern book recommendation addresses this to create guidelines to retain character and add living space.
    - ii. Add definition about duplex and differences
    - iii. Duplexes could be split into a HOA or condo agreements
    - iv. Lot size requirements
      - The minimum lot size would match the min. size for the SU area. (6,000 sf in most areas). All legal lots would be able to build a duplex, but that doesn't make it practical, especially if the existing home must be preserved or affordability must be addressed. We're also interested in shrinking the allowable envelope prior to allowing duplexes anywhere, which would limit the size and incentive to build a duplex.
  - Committee is overall comfortable with policies and having requirements in place before development, but concerns of some geographic locations
    - i. Winston Hills – see above
    - ii. Virginia Village – preservation incentive is more appropriate Glencoe to Dahlia, affordability should be focused with mix use at Florida/Holly
      - Has been a concern on height
    - iii. Goldsmith – low residential with preservation to allow duplexes
    - iv. University Hills makes sense for some duplexes, loss of parking could be a concern – protections make sense
  - Process: Adopt plan - Community process to create processes and policies for incentives – Voted by Council as an amendment via CPD and community outreach
  - Discussed using “primarily” – to build more public support (was added as EAST amendment and in blueprint language)
    - i. Need to be more explicit on language around duplex (lot size, requirements)
  - These polices put restrictions on developers, but could it deter property/selling value? This also preserve affordability for area.
- **Infrastructure Requirements**
    - This will target an analysis of rezonings of center and corridors where height is recommended
    - Determine what infrastructure should be completed before or concurrent with development
      - i. Who decides/how is this determined?
        - Large Development Review process with city partners (multimodal elements and network connections)



- Do not want neighbors to assume concerns of traffic. To be made clear in plan language
  - Requirements should prioritize peds, bikes, and transit, reference design goals, and balance area needs.
- **Colorado Station**
  - Discussion on how to integrate different modes and safety connections for mobility throughout station area
  - Plan will encourage shared or ped/bike only streets
  - Recommendation to evaluate new streets and their types when moving forward to design
    - i. Would a development need to wait after study?
    - ii. It would trigger a LDR evaluation as part of the proposal. Plan recommendation to include smaller parcels for overall site – even just one or two acres.
- **Evans Height**
  - Suggested to update area to 5 stories with incentives 7 at centers, 3 with incentives 4 in between or 5 all the way through
  - Committee agrees with 5 stories through main corridor continued between the two centers, scale to three stories behind Evans
  - Additional explanations and statements on density on Evans will be dependent on the Evans Study for impact and infrastructure demands near light rail and interstate
  - Confusion on map labeling for incentives/legend
  - Holly/Florida could be an incentive area with 3 stories for affordable housing
    - i. This was originally proposed but adapted from community feedback, incentives don't apply to 2 stories
  - There was discussion on labeling for the incentive map. Additional parantheses were confusing if that was the maximum or could add more. Recommended to leave label at only the maximum and update for clarity.
- **University Hills North**
  - Adjusting heights near Illiff and Dahlia, Denver Academy, and Clermont Senior Housing Complex
    - i. No comments, update is supported
- **Other Comments from Recent Draft**
  - Large concern about having a bike lane on Florida (near Arapahoe County) with upcoming development, existing on street parking, and over all safety
    - i. This was brought over from existing Denver Moves/DOTI plans – would require additional study
    - ii. Better placement on nearby Iowa with connectivity to trails and other bike areas
  - Other concerns for attention to aesthetics on Quebec – needs improved designs and safety updates
- **Committee Updates**
  - Encourage others to comment and review through the plan.
  - Send photos that can be used in the plan – and will be credited. Scott will reshare the link to upload.
  - Next meeting will be in person for February 8 – at The Junction, 6PM



Meeting concluded at 8:00