




Official Map Amendment

#2017I-00123 rezoning 30-50 South Colorado Boulevard
from E-SU-D to PUD-G17

Council District 5




**Zone Map Amendment
17i-00123**

30-50 S Colorado Blvd.

Council District 5

Hilltop Neighborhood

Hilltop Neighborhood





2106 Aerial

Location and Request


- 45,900 SF (1.05 acres)
- Vacant Church Structure

Proposal:

- Rezoning from E-SU-D to PUD-G17 to redevelop property with multiple duplex structures


Existing Context: Zoning

- Subject site: E-SU-D
- Surrounding Properties:
 - North – E-SU-D
 - South – OS-A
 - East – E-SU-D
 - West – G-RH-3 & PUD




Existing Context: Land Use


- Subject Property: Vacant Church
- North: Vacant
- South: City Park
- East: Single-unit Residential
- West: Single-unit & Multi-unit Residential, Commercial



Existing Context – Form/Scale (Subject Property)




Existing Context – Form/Scale (Subject Property)



Proposal: PUD-G17

General Urban Neighborhood Context – Row House – 3 Stories Max



- Based upon G-RH-3 zone district
- Multi-unit Residential
- Pedestrian-scaled/Low scale building forms
- Lower intensity mainly residential uses

Process

- Informational Notice (Initial App.): 08/24/17
- Informational Notice (Current App.): 12/19/17
- Planning Board, by a unanimous vote (9-0)
recommended approval: 01/17/18
- LUTI Committee: 01/30/18
- City Council Public Hearing: 3/12/18

Public Outreach

- RNOs
 - Cherry Creek East Association; Cranmer Park-Hilltop Civic Association, Hilltop Heritage Association; Denver Neighborhood Association, Inc.; Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation
 - Cranmer Park-Hilltop Civic Association RNO Letter of Support for PUD/G-RH-3
- No other letters received

Review Criteria

1. Consistency with Adopted Plans
2. Uniformity of District Regulations
3. Further Public Health, Safety and Welfare
4. Justifying Circumstances
5. Consistency with Neighborhood Context, Zone District Purpose and Intent

Additional Review Criteria for Rezoning to PUD District

1. Consistent with PUD District Intent and Purpose
2. Consistent with PUD District Standards and Criteria
3. The development proposed is not feasible under any other zone district
4. The PUD establishes permitted uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses
5. The PUDs established building forms are compatible with adjacent properties, or are made compatible through appropriate transitions

Review Criteria

1. Consistency with Adopted Plans

- Comprehensive Plan 2000
- Blueprint Denver (2002)
- The Boulevard Plan (1991)

2. Uniformity of District Regulations

3. Further Public Health, Safety and Welfare

4. Justifying Circumstances

5. Consistency with Neighborhood Context, Zone District Purpose and Intent


Review Criteria: Consistency with Adopted Plans

Comprehensive Plan 2000

- Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2-F - *“Conserve land by promoting infill development within Denver at sites where services and infrastructure are already in place”*
- Land Use Strategy 3-B - *“Encourage quality infill development that is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood; that offers opportunities for increased density and more amenities; and that broadens the variety of compatible uses”*
- Legacies Strategy 3-A - *“Identify areas in which increased density and new uses are desirable and can be accommodated”*
- Housing Objective 2 - *“Encourage preservation and modernization of Denver’s existing housing stock and established neighborhoods. Support addition of housing in expansion and infill development”*


Blueprint Denver (2002)

- Area of Change
 - Channel growth where it will be beneficial
- Single Family Duplex
 - Moderately dense, primarily residential
 - Single family, duplex, townhouse & small apartments
- Street Classifications
 - Colorado Blvd.: Mixed-Use Arterial & Enhanced Transit Corridor
 - Leetsdale Dr.: Residential Arterial
 - Bayaud Ave.: Undesignated- Local



The Boulevard Plan (1991)

- *“While no wholesale increases in overall allowable development seem appropriate, some increase in development intensity may be appropriate for individual projects because of specific site or development proposal issues”*
- *“Seek to retain a diversity of land uses in the corridor”*



Review Criteria

1. Consistency with Adopted Plans
2. Uniformity of District Regulations
 - Request is consistent with a standard zone district
3. Further Public Health, Safety and Welfare
 - Implements adopted plans and allows reinvestment in a rundown site
4. Justifying Circumstances
 - Changed or Changing Conditions: Changes to nearby area, access challenges, noise, compromised safety and opportunity for redevelopment of subject property
5. Consistency with Neighborhood Context, Zone District Purpose and Intent
 - The proposed PUD based on the G-RH-3 zoning will allow low-scale residential and other compatible uses consistent with the purpose and intent of the zone district

Additional Review Criteria for Rezoning to PUD District

1. Consistent with PUD District Intent and Purpose

- Unique and Extraordinary
 - Compromised access by two major arterials and substandard local street
 - Located between major arterial and low-density residential neighborhood
- Public Benefit
 - No Garden Court Building Form
 - Exemption from “Entry Feature” for rear Structures allowing for moderate increase in density
 - Compatibility of building form and scale with existing area
 - Compatible low-intensity residential uses
 - Restoration of parkway with safe, landscaped walkway
 - Conformance with City Plan objectives

2. Consistent with PUD District Standards and Criteria

Additional Review Criteria for Rezoning to PUD District

3. The development proposed is not feasible under any other zone district, no other district modifies these standards:
 - Precludes the Garden Court form
 - Allows the entry feature requirement to apply only to structures fronting the Primary Street
 - Allows multiple duplexes on a zone lot
4. The PUD establishes permitted land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses
 - Low-intensity multi-unit residential uses with other compatible uses allowed
5. The PUDs established building forms are compatible with adjacent properties, or are made compatible through appropriate transitions
 - Same low-scale heights with building forms that transition from the Boulevard to low-scale single-unit residential forms

CPD Recommendation

CPD recommends **approval**, based on finding that all review criteria have been met

1. Consistency with Adopted Plans
2. Uniformity of District Regulations
3. Further Public Health, Safety and Welfare
4. Justifying Circumstances
5. Consistency with Neighborhood Context, Zone District Purpose and Intent
6. Additional PUD Review Criteria