



BID Character, Building Heights, and Density Survey Results
 295 Resident Participants - 1/24/12

1. Street and 2. Block - All CCN residential streets and blocks were represented in the survey.

3. BID Character - Other than the high rise buildings along 1st Avenue, existing lower density and low intensity should be preserved as the unique character of the CCN BID as recommended in the 2000 Cherry Creek Plan.

Strongly agree with character of lower density and intensity	87.8% Agree	72.5%	214
Mostly agree with character of lower density and intensity		15.3%	45
No opinion		1.0%	3
Mostly disagree with character of lower density and intensity	11.2% Disagree	6.8%	20
Strongly disagree with character of lower density and intensity		4.4%	13

4. Unique BID Businesses: BID development planning indicates a shift from the historically small independent retail businesses to more national chain retail stores. This trend may significantly diminish the BID's reputation and the consumer attraction of unique shopping and entertainment opportunities. Also, it may potentially encourage the creation of small unique business competition outside of the BID.

Strongly feel that the loss of unique retail businesses will detrimentally affect BID character	89.9% Agree	69.2%	204
Mostly feel that the loss of unique retail businesses will detrimentally affect BID character		20.7%	61
No opinion		2.4%	7
Mostly feel that the loss of unique retail businesses will not detrimentally affect BID character	7.8% Disagree	5.8%	17
Strongly feel that the loss of unique retail businesses will not detrimentally affect BID character		2.0%	6

5. Present Un-Utilized Allowable Building Height: A significant percentage of all present BID buildings are 1 or 2 stories rather than being built to use the allowed 4 story maximum building height of CCN Zoning. The proposed changes would increase BID building heights above 4 stories before utilizing the building heights allowed under the present zoning code.

Strongly agree with first developing unused building height allowed under CCN Zoning	86.1% Agree	75.6%	223
Mostly agree with first developing unused building height allowed under CCN Zoning		10.5%	31
No Opinion		3.7%	11
Mostly unconcerned about first developing unused building height allowed under CCN Zoning	10.2% Disagree	5.1%	15
Strongly unconcerned about first developing unused building height allowed under CCN Zoning		5.1%	15

6. Development Return on Investment and Zoning Changes: Before the recent economic recession and with a full understanding of the current CCN Zoning height, density, and use limitations, some developers still purchased BID site land at significantly increased costs. These developers thought then and are proposing now that CCN Zoning should be changed to allow their desired returns on investment goals to be met.

Strongly agree with changing CCN Zoning to allow return on investment goals to be met	13.2% Agree	6.8%	20
Mostly agree with changing CCN Zoning to allow return on investment goals to be met		6.4%	19
No Opinion		3.7%	11
Mostly disagree with changing CCN Zoning to allow return on investment goals to be met	83.1% Disagree	15.3%	45
Strongly disagree with changing CCN Zoning to allow return on investment goals to be met		67.8%	200

7. Residential Quality of Life: A significant increase in building height and density will create an increase in vehicular traffic, changes in traffic flow, parking needs, and support (truck and bus) traffic, especially related to CCN streets closest to the BID. With the present high 1st Avenue traffic and the access impediments at York and Josephine, car drivers may choose to access 1st and 6th Avenues by moving through the CCN and Country Club neighborhoods. Additionally, increased building heights will also mean less sun and more icy conditions for pedestrians and cars.

Balance - The 2000 Cherry Creek Plan strongly encourages a concept of "balance" between residential quality of life and commercial development, which is currently protected by CCN District Zoning. The proposed increased building heights and density issues as described earlier could detrimentally alter this important concept of "balance".

Strongly agree to maintaining the "balance" of CCN Zoning	89.8% Agree	81.0%	239
Mostly agree to maintaining the "balance" of CCN Zoning		8.8%	26
No Opinion		2.0%	6
Mostly disagree to maintaining the "balance" of CCN Zoning	8.1% Disagree	5.4%	16
Strongly disagree to maintaining the "balance" of CCN Zoning		2.7%	8

8. Present BID Building Heights: The 2000 Cherry Creek Plan encouraged a building height transition that called for 8 to 10 story high rise buildings only on 1st Avenue and then a lower intensity of 4 stories or 55 feet height from 2nd Avenue to the CCN neighborhood. Increased building heights above the 4 stories or 55 feet in height allowance are being proposed in the BID between 2nd and 3rd Avenues and from Steele to Josephine Street and York Street / University.

Present CCN Zoning Height Allowance - The BID building height should be maintained at the present CCN Zoning of **4 stories or 55 feet** for its maximum height allowance.

Strongly agree with maintaining CCN Zoning building height of 4 stories or 55 feet	88.8% Agree	78.3%	231
Mostly agree with maintaining CCN Zoning building height of 4 stories or 55 feet		10.5%	31
No opinion		0.7%	2
Mostly disagree with maintaining CCN Zoning building height of 4 stories or 55 feet	10.5% Disagree	6.8%	20
Strongly disagree with maintaining CCN Zoning building height of 4 stories or 55 feet		3.7%	11

9. Proposed Increased Heights (Part 1) - On the following streets, increases in the maximum allowable BID building heights are being proposed:

(Part 1) 2nd Avenue to 3rd Avenue and Clayton Street to Steele Street Proposed: Present height of **4 stories** (55 feet) to new height of **5 - 7 stories** (70 to 98 feet)*. Do you agree with a proposed height increase to 5 - 7 stories from Steele to Clayton?

* 5 stories proposed by Planning and 7 stories being considered by BID Board.

Strongly agree with the proposed increased height	11.6% Agree	5.8%	17
Mostly agree with the proposed increased height		5.8%	17
No Opinion		2.0%	6
Mostly disagree with the proposed increased height	86.5% Disagree	12.9%	38
Strongly disagree with the proposed increased height		73.6%	217

10. Proposed Increased Heights (Part 2) - On the following streets, increases in the maximum allowable BID building heights are being proposed:

(Part 2) Columbine Street from 2nd Avenue to 3rd Avenue Proposed: Present height of **4 stories** (55 feet) to new height of **5 - 8 stories** (70 to 112 feet). Do you agree with this proposed height increase to 5 - 8 stories (70 to 112 feet) on Columbine?

Strongly agree with the proposed increased height	15.6% Agree	6.1%	18
Mostly agree with the proposed increased height		9.5%	28
No Opinion		2.7%	8
Mostly disagree with the proposed increased height	81.7% Disagree	12.5%	37
Strongly disagree with the proposed increased height		69.2%	204

11. Proposed Increased Heights (Part 3) - On the following streets, increases in the maximum allowable BID building heights are being proposed.

(Part 3) York Street, Josephine Street, and University from 2nd to 3rd Avenue Proposed: Present height of 4 stories (55 feet) to new height of 8 stories (112 feet). Do you agree with this proposed height increase to proposed height of 8 stories (112 feet)?

Strongly agree with the proposed increased height	21.1% Agree	5.8%	17
Mostly agree with the proposed increased height		15.3%	45
No Opinion		4.7%	14
Mostly disagree with the proposed increased height	74.2% Disagree	16.6%	49
Strongly disagree with the proposed increased height		57.6%	170

12. Building Density or Floor Area Ratio (FAR): Presently, CCN Zoning for FAR primarily allows buildings to have a base limitation of one square foot of floor space to one square foot of land lot space (1:1 ratio) with incentives allowed in increase to a 1.5:1 ratio. The FAR limitation was designed to maintain the low density and low intensity character of the BID. Changes could allow densities north of 2nd Avenue to exceed the densities or sizes of present 1st Avenue high rise buildings, which is close to a 2.0:1 ratio. Since some density would be more preferable to increased building heights, the next two questions address maintaining the current limitation (**Part 1**) or allowing some modification closer to the FAR / density of 1st Avenue buildings (Part 2).

Present CCN Zoning FAR Requirement (Part 1) - The present 1:1 ratio for density in CCN Zoning allows lower intensity and density buildings from 2nd Avenue to the neighborhood. This ratio is much less than the scale and density of present 1st Avenue high-rise buildings and should be maintained.

Strongly agree with present CCN Zoning on density	73.2% Agree	54.2%	160
Mostly agree with present CCN Zoning on density		19.0%	56
No Opinion		14.6%	43
Mostly disagree with present CCN Zoning on density	12.2% Disagree	7.8%	23
Strongly disagree with present CCN Zoning on density		4.4%	13

13. Density (FAR) Modification (Part 2): Instead of increasing building heights, modifying CCN Zoning to increase the FAR allowance for greater density closer to the 2.0:1 ratio density of 1st Avenue buildings. This may allow greater development opportunity.

Strongly agree with modifying CCN Zoning to allow greater density	31.8% Agree	6.4%	19
Mostly agree with modifying CCN Zoning to allow greater density		25.4%	75
No Opinion		19.3%	57
Mostly disagree with modifying CCN Zoning to allow greater density	48.8% Disagree	11.2%	33
Strongly disagree with modifying CCN Zoning to allow greater density		37.6%	111

14. Residential Economic Impact: Economic Effect on Neighborhoods - The changing BID character with higher density and higher height buildings could have a future negative economic effect on the residential neighborhood property values due to increased car traffic, parking, and congestion difficulties in the neighborhood.

Strongly concerned about potential economic effect on property values	82.4% Concerned	72.2%	213
Mostly concerned about with potential economic effect on property values		10.2%	30
No opinion		3.7%	11
Mostly not concerned about with potential economic effect on property values	13.9% Not Concerned	10.5%	31
Strongly not concerned about with potential economic effect on property values		3.4%	10

Resident Comments: 95 residents gave written comments.