



Gold Corridor Housing Strategy

Prepared for the Gold Corridor
Working Group

GOLD CORRIDOR HOUSING STRATEGY

This report was prepared for the members of the Gold Corridor Working Group as part of the DRCOG Sustainable Communities Initiative.

Gold Corridor Work Group Members

Jeanne Shreve
Joelle Greenland
Don May
Chris Auxier
Mike Elms
Kevin Nichols
Jessica Prosser

Clark Walker
Michelle Pyle
Jenn Hillhouse
Steve Gordon
Alan Feinstein
Patrick McLaughlin
Steve Art
Sally Payne

Ken Johnstone
Steve Nguyen
Jeff Romine
Emily Silverman
Michelle Claymore

Funding for this report provided by a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Contributors

University of Colorado Denver

Carrie Makarewicz, Ph.D.
Austin Troy, Ph.D.
Debra Bristol
Jennifer McGinnis
Laia Mitchell
Gregory Roy

Consultants

Andrea Garcia, Atkins North America
Rocky Piro, Ph.D.
Eric Ross, Five Points Geoplanning

Report Design

Debra Bristol

University of Colorado Denver, Department of Planning and Design, Fall 2014 Planning Project Studio

Sulaiman Almazroua
Debra Bristol
Josh Ellsworth
Anne Kuchenmeister
Michael Hall
Jennifer McGinnis

Laia Mitchell
Yelena Onnen
Gregory Roy
Tori Tillquest
Ranae Tunison
Kevin Osborn

Copies of this document may be obtained by contacting:
Denver Regional Council of Government

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	7	II.g.Summary of Existing Conditions.	47
Gold Corridor Working Group Vision and Goals	8		
Vision	8		
Supporting Goals	8		
Overview	9	Section III: Site Opportunities	48
Objectives for the Housing Strategy	9	Site Selection Methodology	49
Approach	9	Station Area Opportunities	49
Key Findings	10	Gold Star Sites	50
Development Opportunities	11	41st and Fox	52
Summary of Key Outcomes	11	Pecos	56
		Clear Creek-Federal	60
		Gold Strike-Sheridan	64
		Olde Town Arvada	68
		Arvada Ridge	72
		Ward Station	76
		Environmental Contamination of Sites	80
		Opportunities to improve land use compatibility	81
		Summary of Opportunity Sites	83
Section I: Introduction	12		
Location of the Gold Line	13		
The Regional Context	14		
The need for a housing strategy	15		
Approach	19		
Section II: Existing Conditions	20	Section IV: Goals Policies Actions Measures	84
II.a Land Use.	21	Index of Policies	86
II.b Existing Housing Conditions.	24	General Policies	89
Population in households.	24	Policies	89
What is housing currently like in the Corridor?	25	Implementation Actions	89
What is the condition of housing along the Gold Line?	28	Measures	89
What does it currently cost to live in the corridor?	29	Land Use And Development Patterns.	90
What is the existing supply of affordable housing along the Gold Corridor?	30	Policies	90
How might the new transit line affect home affordability in the corridor?	32	Implementation Actions	90
What housing types are in demand in the Gold Corridor?	34	Measures	91
What is the future demand for affordable housing (2015-2030)?	36	Housing.	92
What types of units will be needed by 2030?	36	Policies	92
II.c. Jobs and Housing.	38	Implementation Actions	92
II.d. Accessibility and Mobility.	40	Measures	93
II.e. Environment.	44	Mobility and Accessibility.	94
II.f. Existing Plans.	46	Policies	94
		Implementation Actions	94
		Measures	95
		Environment.	96

Policies	96
Implementation Actions	96
Measures	97
Other Services	98
Policies	98
Implementation Actions	98
Measures	98
Appendix A	99
Existing Conditions: Background Details	99
Existing Conditions: Plan Analysis	104
Appendix B	107
Site Opportunity Details	107
Appendix C	114
Complete Housing Toold Kit of Housing Best Practices	114
Brief Descriptions of Tools	115

Tables, Maps and Figures

Table 1 Developable Acres of Potential Development Sites identified for each Station	9
Table 2. Percentage Change in population, households, housing units, and tenure by station (2000-2010)	24
Table 3. Total Housing: broken down by SF & MR & MHP/Owner & Renter/Market & Subsidized (2010)	25
Table 4 Housing Expenditure-to Income ratio	29
Table 5. Area Median Income Limits by Household Size (2014)	29
Table 6. Subsidized Affordable Housing in the 1 mile Corridor & Half-Mile Station Areas	30
Table 7. Estimate of new housing units by tenure and income in half-mile station areas by 2030	37
Table 8. Two Estimates of Household & Population Projections	37
Table 9. Number of Station Area Jobs by Average Annual Wage	38
Table 10. Number of Opportunity Sites and Potential Housing Units by Station Area	49
Table 11. Percentage of Households by Income & Half-Mile Station Areas (2005-2009)	99
Table 12. Housing Unit Projection from Gold Line Corridor Market and Community Services Analysis	77
Table 13. Station area population in 2010 by 5-year age cohorts	101
Table 14. Five-year pipeline estimate of multi-family unit projects along the Gold Corridor	103
Table 15. Summary of Analysis of Planning Documents from Jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor	104
Map 1. Gold Corridor Regional Context	13
Map 2 Land Uses along the Gold Corridor (DRCOG 2010 Parcel Data)	22
Map 3 Gold Corridor Zoning by Parcel (DRCOG 2010 Built Environment)	23
Map 4. Gold Line Housing Units by Type (DRCOG 2010 Parcel Data)	26
Map 5. Year Built of Residential Structures along the corridor	27
Map 6. Affordable Housing in the Gold Corridor	31
Map 7. Gold Line Certificates of Occupancy, Entitlements & Permits in the half mile and one mile buffers	33
Map 8. Commercial Land Uses relative to station areas	39
Map 9. Half and One Mile Walksheds from Gold Line Stations	42
Map 10. Contaminated Sites near the Gold Line and Station Areas identified by the EIS and ESA	45
Map 11. Gold Line Potential Sites with Contamination	51
Figure 1. 2010 & 2030 Population by Age Cohort Gold Corridor Half Mile Station Areas	15
Figure 2. Jobs that Pay Workforce Housing Qualifying Incomes For a Family of Four	16
Figure 3. Number of Jobs Paying Workforce Qualifying Housing Incomes For a Family of Two	17
Figure 4: Change in Household Size 1990-2010 in the Gold Corridor Station Areas	35
Figure 5. Bus Service to the Gold Line Stations as of 2014	43
Figure 6. Vacant Site near the Federal-Clear Creek commuter rail station (Photo: Anne Kuchenmeister)	44
Figure 7. Adams County housing building permits for single-family and multi-family units (1997-2013)	100
Figure 8. Jefferson County housing building permits for single-family and multi-family units	100
Figure 9. Station area population in 2030 by 5-year age cohorts	102

Executive Summary

Overview

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy is an interjurisdictional action plan for addressing housing needs and opportunities along the FasTracks Gold Line in Adams, Denver, and Jefferson counties. For the metro area's \$7 billion investment in FasTracks to be successful, much needs to also happen beyond the railbeds and train platforms. The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy is designed to address what needs to happen in transit communities around stations, as well as in adjacent areas along the corridor, to create vibrant and livable districts for current and future residents.

The Strategy is an integrated approach for accommodating growth and development, while promoting the well-being of people and communities, economic vitality, and a healthy environment. It provides information on existing conditions of housing, transportation, land use, infrastructure, and the environment within the corridor and outlines opportunities for guiding growth and development in a manner that will create vibrant and complete communities around transit stations with housing for all types of households. A policy framework is provided, guided by overarching goals, as well as implementation actions and measures to monitor progress.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy is designed both as a resource and implementation plan to guide growth and development in a manner that advances local and regional goals to create vibrant and complete communities at transit stations. The Strategy is intended as a tool for elected officials and other decision-makers, for planners and community developers, for investors and real estate developers, and for residents and the public at large.

Gold Corridor Working Group

Vision and Goals

In September 2013, the Gold Corridor Working Group established the following vision and supporting goals. These are used to guide the policy recommendations in this strategy.

Vision

The Gold Rail Line Corridor connects unique and historic transit centered communities with a range of housing choices and easy access to job centers, recreation, educational and development opportunities. Served by diverse transportation modes for a wide range of socio-economic populations, the Gold Line Corridor supports active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles.

Supporting Goals

- Improve connectivity to the stations and between transit service lines to provide safe, easy, multi-modal access for people of all ages and abilities.
- Create and preserve a range of quality housing choices throughout the corridor for new and existing neighborhoods and residents of all incomes, age groups and abilities.
- Identify, attract, sustain and expand a diverse and unique economic base of jobs along the corridor.
- Develop jobs at existing employment bases and build on the existing economic strengths of the corridor to create new jobs.
- Leverage public investment to attract private development along the corridor and create unique places.
- Attract and enhance access to amenities and services such as education, family and health services, and healthy food options.
- Provide and enhance access to parks, open space, recreation and community building opportunities along the corridor.
- Promote denser development near the stations to conserve resources and reduce the combined costs of transportation and housing.

- Gold Corridor Working Group, 9/24/13

Objectives for the Housing Strategy.

Working with local planners and housing professionals on the Gold Corridor Working Group, the following objectives and tasks were identified for the project.

Housing is a basic need for every individual.

- Document affordable housing conditions and needs in the Gold Corridor
- Analyze the short-term and mid-range housing need (i.e., 15 years)
- Identify potential development sites for affordable housing
- Document the current planning and regulatory mechanisms that may enable or impede the preservation and development of affordable housing
- Develop specific strategies to promote affordable housing within the corridor, drawing from regional, state, and national models
- Develop an evaluation process to track the progress of affordable housing preservation and development.

Approach.

Several methods and sources of information were used for the analysis of the existing housing stock, the demographics, employment, accessibility, and strategy development. Data from municipalities, counties, state agencies, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, commercial sources on businesses, and the U.S. Census, were used to assess housing conditions, needs, and potential development sites. Field work, assessors' data, local planning documents, and geographic information systems were also used to identify potential sites. Interviews with planners, developers, and housing professionals, along with the review of local plans and regulations, provided the content for review of the regulatory mechanisms. Case study research on best practices also guided the technical review process and development of the housing strategy.

Key Findings.

The following findings are key conclusions from the assessment of demands and needs, and development potential at Gold Line station areas.

Of the station area jobs, 49% pay less than \$45,000 annually. These are necessary jobs to support the local economy, tax base, and TOD, but these wages will not pay for higher market-rate housing being developed.

Current development is not meeting the current and future demand for affordable housing; one in three households in the corridor are spending more than 35 percent of their income on housing.

Most existing residents leave the corridor for work, and most workers commute in from other parts of the region.

There is no permanent subsidized affordable housing within 6 of the 7 station areas.

Land use compatibility needs to be addressed to improve the conditions for housing, especially addressing industrial land uses and residential.

Mobile home parks, which provide 1400 homes, may be at risk given development pressures near transit.

Demographics are changing. By 2030, 20-30 year olds will be the largest group of residents. Other population groups that will increase in numbers include: teenagers, early middle age, and seniors. This change will influence the demand for housing, work, and services in the corridor.

Limited Alternatives. Alternatives to driving a car to and from key destinations, both within and outside the corridor, are limited.

Existing housing is insufficient, and steps are needed to ensure that current affordable housing is preserved, and supplemented with new units.

Large sites for housing exist, but the land values and infrastructure requirements may put them out of reach for developers interested in creating affordable housing.

Active Market.

The market for multi-family housing is already active in the area, but it is nearly all market-rate.

Development Opportunities.

There were 40 sites identified along the corridor totaling approximately 350 acres as potential opportunities for housing developments. These sites are within a one mile radius from the seven Gold Line transit stations. Approximately 30 percent of each site's land area needs to be allotted for (a) infrastructure, (b) right of way, and (c) open space. Applying development densities between 18 and 35 dwelling units per acre (that is, a density level to support high-capacity transit use), approximately 3,250 to 3,300 housing units could be developed on these 40 sites.

Summary of Key Outcomes.

The following outcomes from the study are important for informing planning efforts as jurisdictions work to ensure communities along the Gold Line. are vibrant and healthy, and provide housing.

- A collaborative planning effort will advance development in the corridor – and should address compatible land use, infrastructure, open space, and environmental planning.
- There are inconsistencies in existing in local plans and policies for industrial lands.
- There is a demand for a full range of housing types, for various lifestyles, life stages, and incomes along the corridor.
- Subareas plans at station areas should be amended or updated to include affordable housing as a desired use.
- Best potential development sites for affordable housing should be identified to apply for tax credit programs.
- Transit station areas can offer improved mobility and accessibility options, including building out street and sidewalk networks, as well as better accommodate transit users and bicyclists.
- Addressing mobility and accessibility needs at the corridor-level would help to identify potential funding sources, priorities for investments, and partners.
- Connecting station areas with nearby amenities and assets, including those in adjacent neighborhoods and districts is strongly desired
- Clear Creek is an untapped amenity for managing water and providing open space.
- Red Rocks Community College at the Arvada Ridge Station could be an amenity for young adults, adults seeking a career change, and seniors all along the corridor.

Station	Number of Sites	Number of Units
41st & Fox	4	270
Pecos Junction	1	0*
Clear Creek Federal	7	1030
Gold Strike Sheridan	9	235
Olde Town	5	300
Arvada Ridge	6	360
Ward Road	8	1075
Total Units		~3,275
Total Acres: ~350		
Total Developable Acres:~260		

Table 1. Developable Acres of Potential Sites identified for each Station

*The Pecos Junction site is not proposed for housing units at this time, given the presence of hazardous materials, lack of infrastructure, and few nearby services.

Section I

Introduction

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy reflects the Working Group’s vision and goals and is designed as a shared action plan for addressing housing needs and opportunities along the FasTracks Gold Line Adams, Denver, and Jefferson Counties, and the Cities of Denver, Arvada and Wheat Ridge. As an interjurisdictional action plan, it relies on the combined efforts of individuals, governments, organizations and the private sector to realize the vision for the the corridor.

The Strategy provides information on existing conditions for housing, infrastructure, and the environment within the corridor, and outlines opportunities for guiding and for accommodating growth and development, while promoting the well-being of people and communities, economic vitality, and a healthy environment around transit stations. A suggested policy framework is guided by overarching goals, and includes implementation actions and measures to monitor progress.

As the Denver region and the Gold Corridor grow and change, it is important to residents, workers, and visitors alike that what is most valued about this place continues into the future. The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy recognizes that business as usual will not be enough. New actions and steps are needed to create great communities for today’s residents and future generations.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy recognizes that local and state governments and agencies are all challenged to keep up with the needs of a growing and changing population. The Strategy is designed to guide decisions that help to make wise use of existing infrastructure, services, and resources — and ensure that new investments help to create great communities in which to live, work and play, both today and into the future.

Housing is a basic need for every individual. With the challenges that come with growth, we must be attentive to how we address the housing needs of a changing population, maintaining a healthy economy and enhancing our communities. Success depends on ensuring the availability of a variety of housing types, including an adequate supply of housing affordable at all income levels.

Location of the Gold Line.


Opening in 2016, the eight station Gold Corridor commuter rail line will stretch through four jurisdictions, from Union Station in downtown Denver, to western unincorporated Adams County, before it heads further west to Arvada and Wheat Ridge.

More specifically, the route roughly follows Interstate 25 heading north, then bends west and runs along freight rail tracks paralleling Interstate 76 to the south.

Along with the Gold Corridor, five other lines are also schedule to open between 2016 and 2018; the East Rail Line to the airport, the Northwest Rail Line to Westminster, the North Metro Line to Thornton, Northwest Bus Rapid Transit line to Boulder, and the I-225 Line through Aurora. Unlike the existing lines in the system, the West, Southwest, Central, and Southeast, the line will have commuter rail technology, but it is scheduled to operate at similar frequencies; 15 minutes at peak and 30 minutes at off-peak (earning morning, late evening). There will be transfers to other lines at Union Station but not at other stations along the route.

Despite its location along the railroad tracks and through industrial areas, already, the prospect of a direct rail line

to downtown Denver from these established urban and suburban locations has led to increased development along the route, particularly at the 41st & Fox, Olde Town, and Arvada Ridge stations.



Map 1. Gold corridor regional context

The Regional Context.

The heightened demand for housing near transit in the Gold Corridor is reflective of the demand near most stations throughout the growing regional system. A share of this demand is coming from new entrants into the housing market, as well as existing residents as they move through life stages— from teen to young adult, to family, to senior.

By the year 2035, one million new residents are expected in metro Denver along with more than 400,000 new jobs. Along with this population increase, will be a change in the demographic composition of households. By 2035, more people will be living in single-person dwelling units, and there will be more seniors, start-up households, and single-parent homes. Together, these four groups will outnumber traditional family households, i.e., the home with two adults plus children.

How do we best accommodate additional people, while maintaining the character of our neighborhoods and providing new housing that is attainable for all without overstressing our resources?

In addition to demographic changes, the market for housing near transit also is affected by regional and national economic conditions and the characteristics of the existing housing stock in neighborhoods surrounding the transit. Demand for new development in these areas will create both new opportunities for the cities, as well as potentially negative impacts on existing residents.

The existing and new transit corridors provide an opportunity for individual communities within a rapidly growing and changing region to accommodate not only newcomers, but also ensure that the region is building

more complete communities that allow prosperity for all citizens. But how do we ensure that this opportunity allows for sufficient and viable housing choices, enabling all individuals and families to find desirable housing that is affordable and accessible to them in their communities of choice as their economic or life circumstances change?

Metro Denver has received national recognition for investing in 21st century mobility through the FasTracks program. Taking advantage of this new infrastructure by surrounding it with complete communities that include a range of housing options, first and last mile multi-modal infrastructure, community facilities, goods and services, is the next major opportunity for the region. Metro Vision 2040, the long range growth and transportation strategy for metro Denver, offers a strategy to take advantage of this opportunity, proposing that 50 percent of new residents and 75 percent of new jobs are directed to designated urban growth centers. Many of these urban centers identified through Metro Vision have rail stations on the FasTracks system.

The Gold Corridor is growing and has the potential to develop into a chain of communities that combined provide housing, employment, shopping, dining, entertainment, education and health care opportunities for households at each stage of their life and with a wide range of incomes. But to capture this opportunity, it is necessary to have a strategy backed up by a detailed action plan. Establishing complete communities requires advanced coordination over a long period of time among a range of partners in the public, private and nonprofit sectors. This includes partners at the regional and state level as well.

The need for a housing strategy.

Housing development is occurring in Gold Corridor ahead of the opening of the commuter rail line, but few affordable units are being constructed.

Families and individuals who may want to live in close proximity to their workplaces find both home ownership and rental opportunities, out of reach. For communities developing in and around transit stations along the Gold Line, their vibrancy and success depends on providing a range of housing types for different income levels, different household sizes, and for different home preferences. Providing a good mix of housing by quality, tenure and cost, will be accomplished through both new construction and preservation.

This strategy supports the Denver region's Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). SCI is led by the Denver Regional Council of Governments in partnership with the private and nonprofit sectors to implement the region's Metro Vision and leverage the region's multi-billion dollar investment in the FasTracks system expansion. The SCI program promotes planning, policy and implementation steps that lead to greater access to job opportunities; lowered combined transportation and housing costs; reduced consumption of fossil fuels and strain on natural resources; and development of mixed-use, pedestrian, and bicycle-friendly communities along

transit lines. The desired result is to allow residents to easily access their daily needs through multiple transport options.¹

Figure 1 depicts the age range of residents in the half mile station areas in 2010 and as projected to 2030. Age is one determinant of household income, as well as household size. As the age distribution of the residents shifts through the next 15 years, the jurisdictions in this corridor will need to work collaboratively to identify the housing needed by type, size, price, tenure, and location.




Figure 1. 2010 & 2030 Population by Age Cohort Gold Corridor Half Mile Station Areas

¹ DRCOG. Sustainable Communities Initiative, <https://www.drcog.org/planning-great-region/sustainable-communities-initiative>.

We all need housing we can afford. Housing and Education.

Residents of affordable housing, especially near transit, experience a variety of benefits that also benefit the entire community. Extensive research has proven the benefits of well-located affordable housing for health, education, the economy, and neighborhood stability. Investments by jurisdictions and developers along the Gold Line in affordable housing will positively impact the community through lower costs for public health, better student outcomes, increased taxes, and a stronger business climate (Housing Colorado, 2014).

In addition to improving health, educational outcomes for children are greatly improved by access to affordable housing. Affordable housing provides stability and reduces the frequency of unwanted moves due to increasing rents and poor conditions. The ability to stay in the same school district has been shown to have significant impacts on a child's early success. A study by the US Government Accountability Office found that among third graders who attended three or more schools since first grade, 41 percent demonstrated below-average scores in reading compared with 26 percent of those who never changed schools; 33 percent of mobile students were below average

in math, as opposed to 17 percent of stable children, (U.S. GAO, 1994). Children who changed schools four or more times by eighth grade were at least four times more likely to drop out than those who remained in the same school (U.S. GAO, 1994). Dropouts are less likely to find jobs that pay well enough to keep them off public assistance, which has significant implications for the public budget. In addition to instability, cramped and inadequate study areas impede the ability of children to complete homework.

Parents who need to work multiple jobs and long hours in order to afford housing may be unable to provide a satisfactory level of involvement in their children's studies. Housing in noisy buildings and areas, or overcrowded sit-

Housing and Health.

According to a Center for Housing Policy (CHP) report on the benefits of affordable housing on health, residing in a stable home "can reduce stress and related adverse health outcomes," (Center for Housing Policy, 2007). Some of the stress reduction comes from having enough resources to purchase other necessities, such as nutritional foods, utilities, and health care. When families dedicate most of their financial resources to housing, research has shown they necessarily cut back on these other important needs, leading to stress and adverse health outcomes (Mueller & Tighe, 2007). Children in low income families paying more than half their income for housing were found to be more likely to have fair or poor health in comparison to children in low income families with lower housing costs (Lipman, 2005).

Well-constructed affordable housing can reduce health problems associated with poor quality housing, such as asthma, by limiting exposure to allergens and neurotoxins. Stable affordable housing can also improve health outcomes for the elderly and chronically disabled because it provides an efficient platform for ongoing delivery of health care and services.




Figure 2.
Gold Corridor jobs paying wages that qualify for housing assistance for a family of two

uations, can lead to broken sleep and an inability to have quiet study time, as well as increased absences (Young 2001). On the other hand, housing in stable, mixed-income communities allows children to enjoy stronger school systems and can increase access to afterschool programs that benefit social development. The psychological benefits of having a safe, affordable, stable place to live are immense, and can lead to higher self-esteem and a higher sense of security and control, important traits for parents and children.

Housing and Economy.

The local and regional economy also benefits from affordable housing. Affordable housing increases the ability of a household to purchase goods in the local economy. A household's savings from what it would be paying for housing can now be spent on other household needs, including groceries and clothes. Businesses benefit from more productive workers; when workers don't have to commute long distances, they are more invested in the area. In a 2004 national forum of business leaders and affordable housing advocates hosted by the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University (JCHS) and the Center for Workforce Preparation (CWP), both groups agreed that "when workers find themselves with no choice but to move further and further away from their place of employment in order to afford housing or live in stable neighborhoods with good schools, quality of life measures come into play," and that "when individuals face such tradeoffs, communities ultimately pay the price." (JCHS, 2005). Interviews with businesses revealed that some workers had reduced working hours to compensate for long commute times that cut into their other daily responsibilities. High cost housing also reduces employers' abilities to recruit and retain talent. The costs of this, in addition to turnover, can be extremely high. Businesses may need to pay higher wages to attract employees from greater distances; have increased costs from more training, errors, and overtime, which are all associated with staff turnover; and may lose business due to lack of staff.

Housing that is close to transit can also save households money on transportation costs as they may reduce car ownership and related expenses by supplementing or replacing car use with lower cost transit, biking and walking (Haas, Makarewicz, et al., 2008). When households save money on housing and transportation, the economic benefits of transit and affordable housing are increased for the household and the community. In a 2007 report by the Center for Transit Oriented Development, researchers noted that low-income households in Denver are four times as likely to use transit as higher-income households (Belzer, Hickey, Poticha & Wood, 2007). Placing affordable housing near rail transit will allow lower-wage workers, who make up a large percentage of metro area workforce, to access 30% of the region's jobs that are within a half mile of a light rail transit station.

How much can workers in the Gold Corridor pay for housing?

The charts (figures 3 and 4) on these two pages show the average wages at different types of businesses in the corridor and how they relate to housing prices and eligibility for affordable housing.




Figure 3.
Gold Corridor jobs paying wages that qualify for housing assistance for a family of four

Why a Corridor Approach?

While the Gold Line crosses jurisdictional boundaries at several points, in many respects its route serves a common sub-region of the metropolitan area, what the Gold Corridor Market Readiness study termed, “West Denver Market Area” (EPS, December 2014). Land use patterns, commute patterns, and environmental systems converge across city and county lines within this sub-area of the regional housing market and economy. The introduction of commuter rail into this subarea will no doubt further unify communities, districts, and localities in the Clear Creek valley and north central metro Denver, as residents, workers, and visitors, begin to view and use the area as the Gold Line corridor.

Each station area also has unique characteristics. Although all the half-mile station areas will have some mix of housing, jobs, schools, goods and services, and some public uses, the types of housing, jobs, goods and services will vary across areas, and certain uses will not be in the immediate half-mile area for some stations, such as grocery stores and higher education. **For this reason, it is necessary to coordinate across jurisdictions to understand how household and employer needs will be met at the corridor level, rather than at each station. Coordination among the jurisdictions also can allow for joint funding of strategic infrastructure, targeted economic development, and strategic applications for grants from regional, state, and federal programs.**

Why Address Issues Beyond Housing in a Housing Strategy?

Issues of housing, jobs, and mobility are interrelated. Residential areas support retail, and commerce; business creation, retention, and expansion require housing for employees and their families; and residents, consumers, and employees all require efficient and effective mobility and accessibility. Contemporary approaches to urban and regional planning have evolved to become more integrated and comprehensive to address the complexity of modern cities and regions. **Providing housing—especially affordable housing—that maximizes individual well-being requires an integrated view of jobs and employment, services and mobility, and health and the environment.** This need is clearly reflected in the Gold Corridor Working Group’s vision and goals.

Approach.

To develop the Strategy, several methods and sources of information were used for the analysis of the existing housing stock, the demographics, employment, accessibility, and strategy development.

Data from the municipalities, county, state, DRCOG, commercial sources on businesses, and the U.S. Census, were used to complete the first three goals; field work, assessors and other data in GIS, and document review were used to identify potential sites; plan review, document analysis, and interviews provided the content to analyze how the existing planning regulatory mechanisms support or impeded affordable housing; and research on best practices guided the development of the strategy and evaluations. Specifically, the following data sources were used:

- Existing housing conditions: 2006 and 2013 Parcel Data, 2010 and 2012 Assessor's data from each county, decennial U.S. Census (1990, 2000, 2010), American Community Survey (ACS) 2005-2009, and real estate market websites, e.g. Trulio, Zillow, and Red Fin.
- Housing demand: State and county historical and projected population; 1990, 2000 and 2010 decennial U.S. Census, 2005-2009 ACS.
- Identification of potential sites: Site visits, phone calls, local plans, 2006 and 2013 Parcel Data, 2010 and 2012 Assessor's Data, Google Earth, Environmental Impact Statement for the Gold Corridor, and the U.S. Geological Service data on flood plains and topography.

- Current planning and regulatory mechanisms: Plans and reports from the involved jurisdictions were collected and reviewed for content related to housing, including housing plans, comprehensive plans, TOD studies and plans.

Additional details on methods of analysis are provided in the respective sections and the appendices.

Organization of the Strategy.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy includes four sections, plus a set of detailed appendices. **Section 1 Introduction** provides an overall context for the Denver urban region and the growth expected to take place over the next 20 years. An overview of the Gold Corridor, its history, its evolution, and its role in the Denver region is then presented.

Section 2 focuses on **Existing Conditions and Future Demand** in the Gold Corridor. Information is provided on current land uses, existing housing and infrastructure, and the present state of the environment. Special attention is given to existing affordable housing and pressures from new development. An overview of current long-range and subarea planning is also included, including how existing plans support the demand for a range of housing types and prices. The section ends with an estimate of the future demand for affordable housing at the corridor and station levels, and by unit type, tenure, and price in relation to income.

Section 3 presents the **Opportunities** to meet that demand. The opportunities include both potential development sites and ways to improve accessibility between existing and future housing, amenities and the station areas.

Section 4 provides the **policies and evaluation**

mechanisms with 37 policies in six planning areas broken into **Goals | Policies | Actions | Measures**. The goals and policies provide direction for achieving the overall vision of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy. In keeping with the intent of creating an integrated framework for guiding growth and development in a manner that results in more complete communities with a range of housing types, policies are organized around the themes of land use, housing, accessibility, environment, and other infrastructure. A set of “overarching” policies introduces the section. To ensure successful implementation and desired outcomes, each policy area also includes a set of actions and measures.

The appendices provide a wealth of information developed as part of the process for creating the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy. This information includes additional background tables on housing and population, commute patterns, detailed analysis of current planning documents, and a “Tool Kit” of best practices for affordable housing and related issues. The “toolkit” will be further refined to become a stand-alone guide for jurisdictions to use in refining existing programs for providing housing, as well as creating new programs.

Section II

Existing Conditions

The Gold Corridor: An Overview

The corridor in which the Gold Line commuter train will operate traverses three metropolitan counties – Adams, Denver, and Jefferson – and two suburban cities Arvada and Wheat Ridge. Arvada actually straddles the Adams and Jefferson county line. Formally incorporated in 1904, the City of Arvada’s population now exceeds 100,000. Its historic downtown is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Wheat Ridge incorporated as a city in 1969 and has a population of 30,000. The Denver portion of the Gold Line is technically in the neighborhood of Globeville. Its early industries focused on ore smelters, railroads, and meatpacking. Today Globeville is bisected by interstate highways and rail lines that create barriers from one portion of the neighborhood to the next.

Along the east west portion of the rail line is the Clear Creek valley. Because of the fertile soil and available water, this was a desirable site for farming. Before it became more urbanized, Arvada was touted as the “Celery Capital of the World.” The creek’s floodplain eventually became the location of sand and gravel extraction – which still remains an active industry in portions of the corridor. Some agricultural land also remains. However, many gravel pits became trash disposal sites after their materials were extracted, particularly in the area between Federal Boulevard and Interstate 25. Today, the area in Adams and Jefferson counties just north of the City of Denver limits (52nd Avenue) is characterized by industrial and distribution uses.

Interstate 76 traverses the corridor, with its western terminus at the interchange of Wadsworth Boulevard and Interstate 70. Together with Interstate 225 along Sand Creek (to the east of Interstate 25), the highway forms an “inner-belt” for east-west traffic in the metropolitan area.

Clear Creek has a linear bicycle path along its banks, and several parks dot the route. Segments within the City of Wheat Ridge are particularly well developed for various recreational activities.

As noted above, the route of the Gold Line commuter rail train follows an old train line that used to link downtown Denver with communities in Jefferson County to the west. When the Gold Line opens in 2016, it will provide new opportunities to connect this part of the metropolitan area with the rest of the Denver region. These following sections provide an overview of the conditions according to the following 6 categories:

- A. Land Use
- B. Housing
- C. Accessibility
- D. Environment
- E. Infrastructure
- F. Existing Plans

II.a

Land Use.

The alignment of the Gold Line rail corridor is characterized by low density development.

This creates challenges in connecting housing, jobs, and amenities in the area to the rail, and in fostering new transit oriented development. In some areas along the corridor, such as Olde Town Arvada and 41st and Fox, the rail line will run through already developed, somewhat dense, mixed-use areas. In other parts of the corridor, such as Ward Road, there are more vacant parcels.

This development pattern has made the area attractive for industrial and warehouse uses. East of Olde Town, much of the land in the half mile station area is both zoned and used as industrial. The substantial amount of industrial land along the line provides a significant number of jobs. However, the large block sizes and areas with traditional Euclidean zoning—residential districts separated from commercial—results in land use patterns that require an automobile to get to work, shopping and services.

Heading west from the Sheridan Station, the stations become more dominated by residential and commercial land uses. Single-family houses exist throughout, with multifamily housing available along major streets. There also are several manufactured housing parks along the corridor; most are located on Federal Boulevard. The housing pattern in proximity to industrial uses has resulted in a lower density than other subareas in metro Denver.


The commercial corridors exist primarily along the north-south arterial boulevards: Kipling, Wadsworth, Sheridan and Federal. These commercial thoroughfares coincide with station locations; enhancing and densifying commercial and mixed-uses along these boulevard. These commercial thoroughfares do coincide with station locations, and enhancing and densifying commercial and mixed-uses along these boulevards would support a more transit-oriented environment.

The following maps, (Maps. 2 and 3) show this distribution by land use in 2010, based upon the DRCOG 2010 Built environment dataset, which includes land use and zoning.¹ Mapping these land uses, shows the direct interface between industrial and residential uses in some areas, particularly the Sheridan and southeastern portion of Olde Town, and the lack of commercial in other areas, such as the northern half of the Sheridan and Arvada Ridge stations.


The map also shows the street layout in relation to uses and the station areas. Only the downtown Olde Town and the west side of the 41st and Fox Station areas have a more fine grained mix of uses and smaller block sizes.

¹ Note the zoning and land use are from the DRCOG 2010 Built Environment dataset. Some of the zoning and land use categories have been combined for simplification, such as the types of industrial.

Map 2. Land Uses along the Gold Corridor (DRCOG 2010 Parcel Data)



Map 3. Gold Corridor Zoning by Parcel (DRCOG 2010 Built Environment)



II.b

Existing Housing Conditions.

This section addresses the first two goals of the Strategy by documenting the current affordable housing conditions and needs, and to estimate the need to the year 2030.

Population in households.

Between 2000 and 2010, a number of demographic changes occurred in each of the transit zones. Population declined in the 41st Avenue, Sheridan and Ward Road stations and average household size declined in all but the Federal station (Table 1). The other noticeable trend was the increase in the percentage of rental units at all but the Ward station. Ownership units also increased but not nearly at the same rate, and in the Federal and Sheridan station areas, the percentage of ownership units actually declined, by 16% and 9%. This could be from rental units increasing at a faster rate, thereby making a larger percentage of all units, and possibly from some ownership units converting to rental. **Shifts in household size and tenure mix are early signs of the changing market in the area.**

Similar to the trend in the West Metro Denver region, in some station areas, households increased more than population. This is due to an increase in the formation of smaller households. Seniors who are widows or no longer have children at home, couples that are divorced, and single persons who remain single and/or live alone make up these smaller households. On the other hand, at some household income levels, household sizes are increasing, due to larger immediate families, as well as multi-generational households.

In each station area, more than the majority of households earned less than \$75,000, from 92% of households in the Pecos area, to 55% in the Ward station area (see Appendix B).

Table 2. Percentage Change in population, households, housing units, and tenure by station (2000-2010)

Station	Population	Households	Housing Units	Owner Units	Renter Units	Average Household Size	Median Household Income
41st Avenue	-3%	6%	9%	1%	10%	-20%	13%
Arvada Ridge	19%	37%	46%	27%	51%	-12%	47%
Federal	11%	7%	-1%	-16%	102%	3%	-7%
Olde Town	7%	20%	24%	10%	25%	-11%	10%
Pecos	57%	65%	68%	45%	146%	-5%	-10%
Sheridan	-12%	-5%	-5%	-9%	21%	-7%	9%
Ward Road	-19%	-5%	-5%	7%	-23%	-2%	53%

What is housing currently like in the Corridor?

Much of the housing in the corridor was built by the middle of the 20th Century. The average and median year built for the corridor the mid-1950s, but average year built by station varies from 1915 at 41st & Fox to 1975 at the Ward Road Station.


The housing is also split between owner and renter. In 2010, 47% was owner-occupied and 53% was rental. However, the dominant type of construction is single family (Table 3). Given lower and moderate household incomes in many sections of the station sub-areas, the age may be indicative of maintenance. The older median year stock also indicates little new development has taken place until more recently (see Map 4 on the following page for the distribution of housing by type along the corridor, and Map 5 for the distribution of housing by year built).

Table 3. Total Housing: broken down by Single Family & Multi-Family & MHP/Owner & Renter/Market & Subsidized (2010)


Station	Housing Units by Structure Type (DRCOG, 2010)					Housing units by Tenure (Census 2010)			
	SF Detached	SF Attached	Multifamily Apt.	Multifamily Condo	Total Units	Owner Occupied Housing Units 2010 (12)	Renter Occupied Housing Units 2010 (14)	Total Occupied Housing Units 2010 (10)	% of Transit Corridor
41st Avenue	387	0	763	4	1154	335	595	929	16%
Arvada Ridge	598	0	804	226	1628	662	525	1,187	20%
Federal	218	0	49	0	267	281	168	448	15%
Olde Town	758	2	1084	156	2000	678	1,487	2,164	27%
Pecos	6	0	0	0	6	18.28	7.54	26	3%
Sheridan	457	0	0	16	473	406	73.75	480	10%
Ward Rd	180	0	230	64	474	274	124	397	9%

Note: The unit totals do not match between the two sources of data, DRCOG Regional Buildings, 2010, and the Census 2010. The differences are due in part to timeframe and geographic scale. The Census 2010 is collected in 1999 and may not have captured recent developments, e.g. in the 41st & Fox and Arvada Ridge stations. Also, the Census data is based on apportionment of block group data to the half-mile station areas, whereas the data from DRCOG is at the building and parcel level, allowing for greater accuracy.

Map 4. Gold Line housing Units by Type (DRCOG 2010 Parcel Data)



Map 5. Year Built of Residential Structures Along the Corridor (DRCOG 2010 Built Environment)



What is the condition of housing along the Gold Line?

The condition of affordable housing along the corridor varies. Many units have been renovated by their owners through county and city housing renovation programs. The housing stock is aging; 75% of the units are greater than 40 years old.

The best method for assessing the condition of a housing unit is in-person inspection. However, this is noted in the housing industry as a limitation to assessing housing conditions at a scale beyond a block or neighborhood. Without the ability to conduct these inspections, we relied upon parcel level assessors data to provide information on housing characteristics and the current assessed value. We then compared these values to a sample of nearby recent home sales in the area.

We used a replacement cost methodology to compare the current assessed value with a market estimate of what it would take to replace the housing. The measure, “ratio of market value to unit value”, or the Replacement Cost Ratio, uses assessor data and Colorado construction market costs per square foot in a formula developed by

Smith, Murray, and O'Dell in their 2003 paper, “Estimating the Need for Single Family Rehabilitation”. The goal is to identify housing in need of rehabilitation based on its age, size, assessed value, and tenure of unit. If the cost to rebuild a replacement home with similar characteristics is less than half the cost of the assessed value, then the home may be in need of repairs. The assumption is the higher value in the assessed value is likely reflecting characteristics of the property or location rather than the quality and amenities of the structure itself. This method is based on similar methods used in firm valuation studies, wherein the higher price of the stock or firm net worth is attributed to management, reputation, etc. rather than the tangible assets of the firm.

The results of the Replacement Cost Ratio were inconclusive due to inaccuracies in assessors data related to number of units per parcel. For parcels and units/buildings with common ownership, the unit is often listed with a single parcel rather than the parcel on which it sits. However, we were able to use the ratio to identify: 1) areas with collections of single family homes with low replacement costs (<0.5), and 2) many of the units in poor condition in the corridor are in multi-family buildings. To understand whether homes with low replacement costs may be targeted for replacement in the market, e.g. through scrapes, tear downs, etc., 99 homes were selected with the lowest ratio and then checked for nearby

home sales using free online real estate tools including Trulia, Red Fin and Zillow. Google Streetview was used to assess the exterior condition. These sources are limited in information but the analysis revealed the current market in corridor neighborhoods with older homes that are potentially in poor condition:

- Recent sales near older, smaller homes are starting to reflect the heated housing market. While these types of homes (with a ratio of less 0.51) to the south and west of the line from 41st & Fox to Olde Town were valued at less than \$200,000, nearby recent sales of similar homes ranged from \$250,000 to \$450,000.

The importance of this finding is that it seems to support anecdotal evidence from planners in the area that housing prices are already rising. For existing homeowners to stay in their homes as prices and property taxes rise, these families may need assistance with their operations and maintenance costs through housing rehab and other programs. For modest income households looking for “starter” or affordable ownership opportunities, there will need to be programs that offer downpayment assistance, loan assistance through lower cost loans, or second mortgage programs in which the other mortgagee is a public or nonprofit entity that assists with the downpayment or provides credit backing.

Nearly 1400 households have a housing-expenditure-to-income ratio exceeding 30%.

What does it currently cost to live in the corridor?

In 2014, the Area Median Income (AMI) in the Denver Metro Region (Denver-Aurora-Broomfield) was \$76,700 for a family of four, and \$61,400 for a family of 2.

As reported in the Gold Corridor Profile by Reconnecting America (June 2014), the 2005-2009 American Community Survey identified a large share of the households in the station areas earned less than the Area Median Income for a family of four.

Despite these relatively lower incomes, because housing prices are generally lower than the rest of the Denver Metro region, this area has typically been relatively more affordable for households with lower earnings. This affordability is due in part to the types of housing as well as their current conditions.

However, housing has not been affordable for all households; expenditures on housing consumed more than 35% of expenditures for one in three households (American Community Survey 2005-2009). Data is not available at this level of geography to determine the cause of the high expenditures, whether it is from low household incomes, high housing prices, or a combination of the two. But, as home prices increase, while wages remain stagnant, it is likely the expenditure ratio could increase, putting the households and their communities at risk.

Depending on a household's total income and other necessary expenditures, high payments for housing can force difficult trade-offs, such as housing payments in lieu of health care, food, or education. The recent report commissioned by Housing Colorado, "Driving a Vibrant Economy: Housing's Role in Colorado's Economic Success" (December 2014) on the impact of affordable housing on local municipalities showed the decline in municipal tax revenues and the increase of municipal expenditures when households are unable to afford other necessities due to high housing prices.

Table 4. Percent of households with a high housing expenditure-to-income ratio

Station Area	30% or more	35% or more
41st & Fox	41%	27%
Arvada Ridge	43%	28%
Federal	51%	18%
Olde Town	45%	30%
Pecos	62%	28%
Sheridan	41%	22%
Ward Rd	31%	21%
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	1,382	1,006
% of HOUSEHOLDS	43%	31%

Source: ACS 2005-2009, retrieved from <http://www.toddata.org>.

Table 5. Area Median Income Limits by Household Size (FY 2014)

# of Persons in household	120%	100%	Low (80%)	Very Low (50%)	Extremely Low (30%)
1	\$64,440	\$53,700	\$42,950	\$26,850	\$16,100
2	\$73,680	\$61,400	\$49,100	\$30,700	\$18,400
3	\$82,920	\$69,100	\$55,250	\$34,550	\$20,700
4	\$92,040	\$76,700	\$61,350	\$38,350	\$23,850
5	\$99,480	\$82,900	\$66,300	\$41,450	\$27,910
6	\$106,800	\$89,000	\$71,200	\$44,500	\$31,970
7	\$114,240	\$95,200	\$76,100	\$47,600	\$36,030
8	\$121,560	\$101,300	\$81,000	\$50,650	\$40,090

Source: <http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il/il2014/2014summary.org> for Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO MSA

What is the existing supply of affordable housing along the Gold Corridor?

In 2009, between 50 and 80 percent of households in each station subarea along the Gold Corridor were earning less than \$49,000, which is the current area median income for a 2-person household.

Even before the recent spike in rents and home values, this area was experiencing a shortage of affordable housing. As the number of homes has increased in the station areas, they have not included affordable units for households.

Subsidized Housing.

As of 2014, there were 380 permanently affordable units in the station areas, but all of them were in the 41st & Fox station area in the Quigg Newton Homes owned by the Denver Housing Authority. Within a mile distance throughout the corridor, the number increases dramatically to 5,500 units of subsidized housing. However, many of these units, and other types of housing in the corridor are aging and in need of repairs and upgrades.

In fall 2014, three households with Housing Choice Vouchers were able to find housing in the station area near Federal Station. Interviews with housing authority administrators indicate that finding housing with a voucher has become increasingly difficult. Fewer landlords are willing to accept vouchers in a strong market in which other potential tenants are willing to pay above market rents.

Mobile and Manufactured Homes.

In addition to the single family and multifamily market rate homes that provide affordable housing, the corridor also has several mobile and manufactured home parks that provide affordable housing and close-knit neighborhood communities to nearly 1,400 households, and approximately 5,000 persons (assuming an average household size of 3.5).

Map 6 on the following page shows the distribution of subsidized homes by type of subsidy throughout the corridor, including in the half-mile station area, one-mile buffer, and areas just outside the corridor boundary.


Table 6. Subsidized Affordable Housing Type in the 1 Mile Corridor & Half Mile Station Areas

Housing Type	Half-mile station areas		
	Units	Properties	Station
Section 8- choice voucher Single Family	2	2	Federal
Section 8 -project based-Multi Family			
Senior housing			
Senior housing - assisted living			
Public housing – Multi Family	383	1	41st & Fox
Below market rate – Multi Family			
LIHTC – Multi Family			
TOTAL SUBSIDIZED UNITS	385	3	

Source: Gold Line Corridor Affordable Housing Units, Adams County Housing Authority, September, 2014.

Map 6. Affordable Housing in the Gold Corridor

Gold Line Affordable Housing Options



Note: The data do not include voucher holders from Denver, Arvada, Wheat Ridge, or Jefferson County

How might the new transit line affect home affordability in the corridor?

Local residents and planners in the area are concerned about the impact the new transit line will have on the affordability of entry-level homes in the corridor.

Immediately to the south of the corridor, homes are being bought and sold quickly after speculative renovations, i.e. “flipped”, and others are being demolished and replaced with higher value units. Around the country, housing near fixed-guideway transit has been increasing dramatically for the last two decades.

To investigate the possible threat to the affordability of homes in the Gold Corridor, as noted above in the conditions section, the sales prices of recently sold homes were compared to the values of their neighboring homes. The observed sales prices were on average \$104,278 greater than the Total Assessed Value of nearby homes. About 30% of the homes sold for \$50,000 more than the value of similar homes nearby, but 40% sold for more than \$150,000 above neighboring homes. This is not a precise measure, but it is an indication that some homes in the

area are starting to sell for much higher prices than the homes have been valued.

As realtors and buyers identify this market as a relatively affordable area for home ownership in comparison to the nearby Highlands neighborhood in Denver, more of these higher priced sales may be expected. The affordability of these homes will be lost in the event of these types of sales and subsequent remodels or demolitions. At the same time, some of these homes are in poor conditions and may be in need of substantial upgrades. For the households that are buying them, they provide relatively affordable single family homeownership. The jurisdictions in this corridor will need to take a balanced approach to mediating this trend.

Mobile Home Parks.

The mobile home communities are within walking distance of the Federal Station, Federal Boulevard bus routes, the proposed Clear Creek Village TOD, and


freeway access. This convenient location makes them vulnerable to new housing marketed as convenient rail access to downtown Denver. Mobile home park owners are required to give residents just six-month notice if they decide to sell the park. A sale of any of these parks would displace hundreds of people in a short amount of time. Given the tight housing market in the region, with a near zero vacancy rate for affordable housing, these households could become homeless or displaced from the neighborhoods where they have lived, shopped, and attended school for years. This would have severe consequences for the families, the county, the school district, nearby stores, and employers.

Map 7 on the following page depicts recent building permits, entitlements, and certificates of occupancy along the corridor. While the station area activity is low in most stations, the activity around the 41st and Fox station is heavy and appears to be advancing northward as households looking for housing near the Denver neighborhoods to the west and north of the 41st & Fox station, Highlands and Sunnyside, move further north for more affordable prices.

(Note: activity outside the one mile buffer is not displayed since data was not available for Jefferson County.)

400 manufactured homes in the Federal station area may be at risk of redevelopment.

Map 7. Gold Line Certificates of Occupancy, Entitlements & Permits in the half-mile and one-mile buffers



What housing types are in demand in the Gold Corridor?

Based on supply and demand side methods using historical household and population trends, fertility and survival rates, and the current actual and proposed residential pipeline, the half mile subareas around the stations could add 7,500 households by 2030.

Demographics Are Already Changing.

In 2010, 57 percent of households in the Gold Corridor station areas were one person, and an additional 21 percent were two-person, leaving just 22 percent of the households with three or more people. Between 2000 and 2010, the average household size for the corridor's transit shed decreased from 2.6 persons to 2.3 persons per household.

Nationally, current demographic changes, as well as the Gold Corridor projections to 2035, reveal that the majority of the population will be a part of much smaller households by 2035. Urban writer, Mark Hinshaw¹, has referred to them as “The 4 S’s”:

- Seniors
- Single person households
- Start-ups
- Single parent households

The implications for housing types and housing location are many. Households with one adult worker have more to manage and finance per person, thereby making smaller units more attractive, affordable, or practical for many of the households that fall into one of these four categories. Proximity to amenities and services is also important for these groups. As seniors become less comfortable or lose their ability to drive, distances to services cost them more time and money and could cause delays in their health care, or lead to social isolation and a less active lifestyle. Singles, start-ups, and single parents, often have lower incomes due to their single income or career stage. Right-sized, universal housing in a convenient location with multiple transportation choices would benefit these growing sectors of the population.

¹ Mark Hinshaw, *True Urbanism: Living in and Near the Center*, Chicago: APA Planners Press, 2007.




Figure 4. Change in Household Size 1990-2010 in Gold Corridor Station Areas

Past trends reveal that the majority of households will be much smaller by 2035.

What is the future demand for affordable housing (2015-2030)?

Between 3,500 and 4,000 of the projected 7,500 units would need to be affordable to households earning less than \$75,000; 2,400 of these units would need to be affordable to households earning less than \$50,000.

Building upon the estimate by EPS for the Market Readiness analysis, two additional analyses were used to estimate population and household growth in the station areas by income level.

In the first approach, the estimate is based on the past rate of growth and capture rate of this area within the larger area, plus recently completed, under construction, or planned units within the half mile transit adjacent areas. The current pipeline totals roughly 3,600 actual or potential units by 2017. The 3,600 units were used to establish the current base period, 2014 to 2017, by adding these units to the 2010 Census estimate. The expected capture rates for the Gold Corridor were then applied to

the 2017 estimate. The result was 8,174 new units by 2030 for a total of 13,805 units. The estimate of 8,174 units is comparable to the projection by EPS for 8,552 new units in the larger half mile study area, including the corridor between the stations.

To test the first method, a second projection uses the five-year cohort survival and fertility rate model, based on Colorado female fertility rates and county death rates translated to survival rates. Using this method based on the male and female population in the half mile station areas in 2010, the estimated population by 2030 is 23,862 persons. Using 2010 average household sizes, the estimated number of new households is 9,982. However, 2030 household sizes are likely to be lower given the shift in household types due to trends in birth rates and a shift in the age distribution. Reducing the average household sizes from 2010 to 2020 and 2020 to 2030 by the same percentage they declined from 2000 to 2010 sizes, except for in the 41st Avenue area, results in 6,944 new households. 41st was not reduced as much due to the larger household sizes currently, which is assumed to affect future fertility rates. The estimate of 6,944 is within 1,100 households of the other projection and within 600 households of the EPS projection for the corridor. Since the fertility and survival rate method does not take into account the current market and in-migration, it follows that the cohort method estimate is lower.

Table 7 compares these two estimates by station area (See Appendix B, table 10 for the EPS table of projections of total housing units by type).

To summarize the three methods, with the EPS projection applying to a slightly larger geography, the increase in households is approximately 8,000 within the half-mile transit adjacent areas and 8,500 in the half-mile corridor.

What types of units will be needed by 2030?

Household age and size distribution will vary from the current.

Women of child-bearing age now will be in their middle years and their children will be in elementary and middle school, but there will be fewer births. Seniors will be a higher share of the population, reflecting the rapid growth in seniors in the rest of the state and U.S. For a more detailed breakdown at the station area level of population by age (see Appendix A, Table 11 and Figure 6 for more detail).

Assuming no changes in the income distribution for existing households, or for future households, only 17% of the new housing should be in single family units, and most of it would need to be affordable based on the existing income distribution. Table 8 shows how the projected income distribution and the projected number and types of households translates into the needed number of affordable housing units, and the number by either rent or own. The remaining 83% of non-single family units should be distributed across single-family attached, multi-family apartments and multi-family condos.

Table 7. Two Estimates of Household & Population Projections to 2030

	Captured of Area Growth	Cohort Survival				
	2030 Households	2030 Population	2010 Avg. Household Size	2030 Households (based on 2010 Avg. Household Size)	2030 Estimated Avg. Household Size	2030 Households (based on Est. 2030 Avg. Household Size)
41st Avenue	2,143	11,366	2.7	4,273	2.0	5,683
Arvada Ridge	2,793	3,156	2.2	1,422	1.7	1,832
Federal	2,083	1,446	2.7	539	2.0	508
Olde Town	3,756	5,148	1.9	2,695	1.4	3,384
Pecos	377	85	2.8	30	2.1	33
Sheridan	1,354	1,629	2.8	576	2.1	669
Ward Rd	1,299	996	2.2	447	1.7	467
Total Units by 2030	13,805	23,826		9,982		12,575
Existing Units in 2010	5,631			5,631		5,631
Additional Units by 2030	8,174			4,351		6,944

Source: Household projections based on the current pipeline of development, capture rate of the station areas using 2010 Census data on households aggregated to the station sub areas by the Center for Transit Oriented Development (www.toddata.org), and EPS projections for the one mile corridor study area in 2014. Population projections are based on 2010 Census data on population by age and sex in the half mile station areas, state of Colorado fertility rates (National Vital Statistics Report, 2013), and county death rates for Adams, Denver, and Jefferson Counties (Health Statistics and Evaluation Branch, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, 2013).

Table 8. Estimate of new housing units needed by 2030 by affordability & tenure in half-mile station areas

	Single Family Detached	Single Family Attached	Multifamily Apt.	Multifamily Condo	Total
Total New Units	972	216	4,162	216	5,567
% Affordable	17%	4%	75%	4%	100%
# Affordable	627	139	2,681	139	3,587
Total New Units by Tenure					5,567
Own	778	108	-	216	1,103
Rent	194	108	4,162		4,464

II.c

Jobs and Housing.

As the projected 7,000 new units by 2030 are developed, an estimated 300,000 square feet of retail is expected to follow. These new businesses will provide more jobs and goods for area residents.

However, in 2014 retail and service jobs pay between \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year in Adams, Denver, and Jefferson Counties. In the Gold Corridor station areas, 43% of jobs pay less than \$45,000 per year (see Table 9). The map of commercial areas (map 8) shows the location of jobs in relation to the stations, and thus the need for comparable housing.

At these wages, workers in these new jobs will not be able to find housing in the corridor unless new affordable housing is built. If workers are imported from other areas and transit doesn't service the areas where they can afford to live, it will be difficult to develop the corridor in a transit-oriented design. Businesses require parking for employees and customers and with additional parking comes auto traffic, less walkability, and fewer riders to support frequent local transit.

Workers with long commutes and low wages also have a hard time maintaining employment. As their transportation becomes costly, overly time-consuming, and unreliable it becomes impractical or uneconomical to keep the job. This causes obvious hardship for the household, as well as the employer. For employers, high employee

turnover is expensive and cuts into already thin margins, which could lead to business failure or relocation. Whether businesses fail or relocate, the result is vacant storefronts, a decline in tax revenue for the municipality, and difficulty in attracting new businesses and developments to the space.


In the Gold Corridor station areas, 43% of jobs pay less than \$45,000 per year.

Table 9. Number of Station Area Jobs by Average Annual Wage

Stations	<\$15,000	\$15,000 to \$24,999	\$25,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$44,999	\$45,000 to \$54,999	\$55,000 to \$64,999	\$65,000 to \$74,999	>\$74,999	Wages N/AV	Total	Total
41st & Fox	222	284	294	543	643	295	36	149	107	168	2,741
Arvada Ridge	42	522	104	63	317	522	253	50	32	84	1,989
Federal	83	71	70	19	145	167	9	7		12	583
Olde Town	162	1215	657	433	933	395	92	320	226	100	4,533
Pecos	63	10	24	28	456	982	4	8	4	3	1,582
Sheridan	737	76	163	344	420	305	27	458	47	66	2,643
Ward Rd	198	235	875	365	985	445	71	599	94	98	3,965
Total	1,507	2,413	2,187	1,795	3,899	3,111	492	1,591	510	531	18,036
	8%	13%	12%	10%	22%	17%	3%	9%	3%	3%	100%

Census QCEW 6-digit Industry Codes by County and State of Colorado for 2013 Annual Average and Q1 2014 matched to Businesses from InfoGroup USA 2012 and Esri Business

Map 8. Commerical Land Uses relative to station areas



II.d

Accessibility and Mobility.

The ability to move through the corridor by various modes of transport, and to access business and services conveniently, will be crucial in the success of the corridor.

This section explores access and mobility for motorists, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

What are the current conditions for mobility and accessibility along the Gold Corridor?

Overall development patterns in the corridor presently are auto-centric. Many land uses, such as warehousing and industry, create large blocks that are difficult to navigate on foot or by bike, and existing bus routes serve only a portion of the Gold Corridor.

for Motorists?

Auto access is well developed along the corridor. Frequent interstate access gives residents and businesses access to I-70 and I-76, as well as I-25 in the case of the 41st and Fox station. Wadsworth Blvd and Federal Blvd provide major regional north-south routes, as do Kipling and Sheridan, but to a lesser degree. Rail tracks and the Platte River create some barriers for motor vehicle connectivity in the 41st and Fox station area, and some north-south routes are truncated along the corridor by Interstates 70 and 76. Motor vehicle access to future Park-n-Ride stations is important to consider when examining transit success.

for Transit-Riders?

The Federal Blvd area, Olde Town Arvada, and some areas around 41st and Fox currently enjoy bus service with headways of 15 minutes during peak times. However, the majority of the corridor is either at some distance from bus service, or the bus services have headways of a half-hour to one-hour, making it difficult to rely upon transit for time-sensitive travel. Many buses in the area do not offer night or weekend service.

Additionally, there are physical barriers that make accessing bus stops difficult, such as inconsistent sidewalks, large block sizes, and stops without protection from the elements or from traffic. Linking bike and pedestrian improvements to transit, and bus routes to the Gold Line, when necessary, is critical for success.

for Pedestrians?

Many streets around the Gold Line stations have incomplete sidewalks or lack sidewalks altogether. Large lots from warehousing and industrial uses create large blocks that severely decrease connectivity and lengthen routes to the station. Interstates, rail yards, and the waterways also create physical barriers to connectivity along the corridor. Some of the stations also fall along major auto thoroughfares, such as Federal Boulevard. Pedestrian level amenities such as wider sidewalks, crosswalks, and traffic-calming devices are missing in some areas and would increase safety in the walking environment.

The Clear Creek Trail does offer a bike and pedestrian route in some areas in the corridor. With additional access points, the trail could be linked to the Gold Line and serve as a local transport route, as well as a transit-accessible natural amenity with regional draw and appeal.

for Bicyclists?

The bike network along the corridor is currently incomplete. The DRCOG Regional Bike Map shows on-street bike lanes and bike routes in multiple areas and jurisdictions along the corridor. However, bike lanes appear fragmented and lack medium and long distance connectivity, decreasing their utility for some users. The Clear Creek trail is a notable exception, connecting east to west along portions of the corridor. The 41st and Fox area, with the major physical barriers present, has a significant lack of bike infrastructure, though improvements have been planned by the City of Denver. There are new bike lanes connecting the area to the east via 44th St/46th street, including wayfinding signage for cyclists.

for Public Transit-Dependent Individuals?

According to the Federal Transit Administration, nearly one-third of the population in the United States does not drive a car. The estimate is similar for the metropolitan Denver region. Included are seniors who no longer drive, people with disabilities who depend on transit or other transportation services, lower-income people who cannot afford a car, children under the driving age, and those who simply choose not to drive. Mobility options along the corridor are currently limited for these populations due to the lack of safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and limited or non-existent bus service.

Access to amenities throughout the corridor and by station.

Amenities that are available to residents within a one-mile radius of the Gold Line stations vary widely along the corridor. The services and amenities to analyze were selected after considering vital daily needs of residents. The services analyzed were childcare, healthcare, schools, food sources and social services. Food sources were further broken down into specialty grocery, big box grocery, convenience stores, ethnic stores, supermarkets and organic grocery. No organic stores were identified along the corridor. The research team also considered if the services are clustered in one area of the half-mile transit station areas, or spread throughout, and if they are accessible by current and planned transit routes. This allowed the team to consider which areas currently have access to the services; identify large barriers; and evaluate ease of access by transit.

The 41st and Fox Station offers a somewhat sufficient offering of education and childcare options scattered throughout the transit zone. All food sources are to the west of the station and are mainly convenience stores. Healthcare is loosely clustered around the station.

The Pecos Station transit zone is devoid of services.

The Federal Station has only one food source. All other services are absent.

The Sheridan Station offers few services, but does offer a supermarket, education, and healthcare in close proximity to the station.

The Olde Town Arvada Station shows a robust offering of services and offers healthy food choices, many health care services, and childcare and education options. The services of all sectors are more readily available in the western half of the corridor.

The Arvada Ridge Station offers only one non-convenience food source in the far northeastern portion of the transit zone. Healthcare is clustered around the station and education and childcare services are scattered sparsely throughout.

The Ward Road Station offers plenty of healthcare options, but very few education or childcare services. The food source options are specialty grocery and convenience and located to the west of the station.

(See Section III for more detailed descriptions and maps of amenities at each station.)

Map 9. Half and One Mile Walksheds from Gold Line Stations





Figure 5. Bus Service to the Gold Line Stations as of 2014



NOTE: The RTD bus service shown here and throughout this report is a snapshot taken in December 2014. RTD service planners are currently working on drafting bus service changes to feed the stations along the Gold Line. These bus service changes will be implemented when the commuter rail line opens in 2016. Starting in about April or May 2015, RTD will begin a series of public hearings to obtain feedback from the communities along the corridor regarding the proposed bus service changes. The RTD Board of Directors will vote on the changes in Summer 2015.

II.e

Environment.

The Gold Line goes through land that has been used by industry and for landfills, and in many areas the land is contaminated to varying degrees. At certain station areas there are also floodplain and water supply issues. In order to assess the viability of parcels for development of affordable housing, the research team referenced recently completed environmental assessment studies, flood plain maps and water district information.

The environmental factors considered in the housing site opportunities analysis were taken from the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) done by Walsh Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC. Specifically, data on site contamination was used to vet potential sites and to inform policy. The ESA limited its search for contamination to 1,000 feet of the station footprints and 500 feet from the rail line center. This data was used by the research team to visually compare the addresses to the potential development sites.

There are several areas along the corridor that are contaminated to a degree that they should be avoided for residential or commercial use. In the longer term, with substantial funding for cleanup, these areas may be redeveloped, but in the short term, some will remain industrial or unused, and others could be restored as natural areas.


Detailed environmental analysis of the selected sites is in Section III.

The following map shows an overview of contaminated sites along the corridor.



**Figure 6. Vacant Site near the Federal-Clear Creek commuter rail station
(Photo: Anne Kuchenmeister)**

Map 10. Contaminated Sites near the Gold Line and Station Areas identified by the Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Site Assessment



II.f

Existing Plans.

Jurisdictions along the Gold Line are planning for transit. Collectively, there are a total of at least 19 plans, ranging from comprehensive plans to housing plans, to subarea plans for stations, all of which provide different types of guidance for development.

Some jurisdictions have detailed station area plans, while others do not. Some of the plans reviewed designated specific station areas as either an employment center or for mostly residential uses.

When it comes to affordable housing, the City of Denver's 41st and Fox Station Area Plan is presently the only one to address the issue in detail. That plan outlines specific recommendations for how affordable housing would be incorporated into the station area's development. City of Denver planning documents address regulatory barriers to affordable housing, an assessment of housing needs, economic strategies, and detailed goals and objectives for supplying low-income housing at station areas.

Adams County has prepared several plans that address transit-oriented development (TOD) principles and goals. The County has adopted a TOD Zone District

and has detailed plans for the Clear Creek Transit Village (at Federal Boulevard). However, affordable housing is not directly addressed. Arvada's comprehensive plan details affordable housing strategies and policies, however, they are not related to transit-oriented development. Wheat Ridge has identified overall housing needs within the city itself, but not specifically for the Ward Road station area.

Each community has a HUD Five-Year Plan but these are not specifically linked to the jurisdictions' TOD Plans.

Overall findings related to planning within the Gold Corridor:

- Each jurisdiction recognizes the importance of having affordable housing, a variety of housing types, and mixed income housing to help support their jurisdiction-wide economic goals.
- Not all plans for station areas and/or transit-oriented development explicitly address housing, or specifically affordable housing needs.
- Each jurisdiction endorses rehabilitation and redevelopment of older distressed properties as a way to maintain affordable housing, supplemented by new development.

Recommendations for future development or update of station area plans:

- Create or maintain consistency between comprehensive plans, HUD Five-Year Housing Plans, and Station Area plans regarding housing.
- When station area plans are amended or updated, each needs to explicitly address (1) a range of housing types, (2) potential for mixed-income housing, and (3) housing affordable to different income levels in order to address changing demographics, earnings, and income.
- Station Area Plans should include ways of maintaining and preserving affordable housing, as well as providing new affordable housing.

II.g

Summary of Existing Conditions.

- Growth is already taking place along the Gold Line corridor. Initial research and anecdotal evidence indicate home and rental prices are increasing as a result of the increased demand and interest from developers.
- Existing affordable housing is insufficient, and steps are needed to ensure that the current affordable housing is preserved and future development adds to the affordable housing stock.
- Jurisdictions need to be proactive to ensure the housing situation does not become volatile and that existing market-rate affordable housing is lost.
- There are many incompatible land uses throughout the corridor that need to be addressed through design, zoning changes, and property development, in order to promote mixed-use transit-oriented development and health affordable housing.
- Segregated land uses has created land use patterns that promote auto-dependency.
- There are areas of environmental concern, requiring environmental restoration, clean-up and/or mitigation
- Open space and green areas exist, but lack connectivity

Section III

Site Opportunities

A major component of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy is identifying and securing key sites for housing development. Through an extensive site selection process, the 2014 Fall Planning Project Studio in the Department of Planning and Design at CU Denver identified 40 residential sites totaling 350 acres within one mile of the stations along the Gold Corridor. These include several sites that were also identified by EPS in the Gold Corridor Market Readiness Study. A number of these sites are already in the early stages of the development process.

Sites were selected based on the site characteristics, as well as their access to transportation and proximity to necessary services and amenities. The site search included the one-mile radius around stations in order to capture more opportunities that are just beyond the typical half-mile walk shed around stations, but within a reasonable distance by bike or connecting bus service. Also, because of the present industrial uses and contamination in several of the station areas, it was necessary to expand the search beyond the half-mile radius in order to find an ample number of potential sites for residential development. There were some sites within the more industrial and contaminated areas, but they were determined to be better suited for commercial, open space, or other non-residential uses.

Using moderate densities of 18 to 35 dwelling units per acre, depending on the site location and context, and considering 70 percent of the total acreage is developable after accounting for infrastructure, right of way, and open space, approximately 3,250 to 3,300 new housing units could be developed on these sites. The team used 25 percent as the Gross Land Adjustment Factor based on national averages, as reported in the “Planner’s Estimating Guide” by Arthur C. Nelson (p. 87), published in 2004 by Planners Press.

These densities are within the existing density range for other attached and multi-family developments in the corridor and surrounding region. They also provide high enough densities to support relatively frequent connecting bus service. The following table and map shows the number of sites and units at each of the station areas. Only six of the stations have residential opportunities within one half mile of the station.

Site Selection Methodology.

The opportunity sites were selected by the Planning Project Studio team based on site visits and an extensive selection criteria.

The criteria included: (a) proximity to station area, (b) environmental and flood plain considerations, (c) access to childcare and education, (d) access to food sources, (e) access to transportation, (f) access to health care, (g) parcel information (ownership, use, size), (h) land-to-improvement ratio values, (i) zoning, (j) appropriate uses, and (k) potential speed of acquisition (multiple owners, current use).

To estimate the potential quantity of affordable housing on each site, the team first determined which parcels could potentially support residential use (surrounding uses, absence of contamination). The team then reduced the site acreage by 25 percent to determine an approximate developable area, and established a potential density, ranging from 18 to 35 dwelling units per acre. This density range was taken from interviews with Gold Corridor professionals, as well as best practices for transit oriented development. In the case of 25 dwelling units per acre or higher density, developable area was reduced by 30 percent to account for additional needed green space or parking.

In a few cases, parcels were recommended for mixed-use, employment, or mixed income housing. In those cases, the acreage was included in the overall totals, but only the land recommended for affordable housing was used to

calculate the recommended units. If all of the opportunity sites below were built as recommended, they would yield a total of over 3,200 affordable housing units along the corridor. With an estimated need of more than 56,000 units for the entire region, this would be an appropriate share for this corridor.

Station Area Opportunities.

This section provides a description of each station area, its amenities, and accessibility, followed by a description of each site within the half mile and one mile radii of the station area. Site descriptions include the site's street intersection, jurisdiction, zoning and a short statement about the site's potential. Some sites are noted with a gold star. These "gold star" sites are ranked as the top locations in the corridor for affordable housing development. The station profiles include both an amenities map, which shows childcare, food sources, schools, and transportation in the station area, and a site selection map, which provides a closer look at surrounding housing and environmental considerations. The site selection map is numbered to correspond with the site descriptions.

The Station Profiles include two tables. The Site Characteristics table provides a ranking of each individual site for three areas: Amenities, Environment, and Access. These three categories are further broken down and rated on a three-tier system. Amenities were ranked based on location, quality, and variety of service. Environment was ranked based on level and risk of contamination, and whether the site was in the floodplain.

Access was ranked based on whether infrastructure was available, safety, and distance to station. The site recommendations table shows if the site is recommended to be mixed-use, the density as measured units per acre, and the total number of recommended affordable housing units.

The top ten sites were picked to fulfill a corridor-wide vision. They represent the sites with the most potential in terms of units built, proximity to the station, access to services and access to transportation, while also providing affordable housing at each station.

For an at-a-glance detailed summary of all sites, including acreage, ownership, current zoning and land use, level of contamination, etc., see Appendix B. Summary of Potential Housing Sites.

Table 10. Number of Opportunity Sites and Potential Housing Units by Station Area

Station	Number of Sites	Number of Units
41st & fox	4	270
Pecos	1	0
Clear Creek Federal	7	1,032
Gold Strike Sheridan	9	235
Olde Town	5	304
Arvada Ridge	6	359
Ward	8	1,075
Total Units		3,275
Total Acres: 350		
Total Developable Acres: 259 ¹		

¹Based on 25% of land for right-of-way, infrastructure, and open space

Gold Star Sites

The Gold Star sites are the top eight priority sites for affordable housing along the corridor. The designation is based on multiple factors: availability of parcels, proximity to station area, presence of amenities, connectivity with bike and pedestrian infrastructure, lack of contamination/risk, and the distribution of affordable housing along the corridor. Each Gold Star site can be referenced for additional information on its corresponding station area page and in Appendix B.

No. 1

**Kipling St. & Ridge Rd.,
Arvada Ridge Station Area,
City of Arvada**

This priority site is located directly across from the Arvada Ridge station, making it a prime transit oriented development (TOD) site. It is close to a multi-use trail on Kipling, making it friendly for pedestrians and cyclists. The site is along Kipling St. and is serviced by bus 100. The land is currently vacant and is one parcel with a single owner.

No. 5

**Ridge Rd. and Quail St., Ward
Station Area, City of Arvada**

This extensive, 55-acre priority site is located in an area with open land and low-density residential homes. The site is located a half-mile from the station and holds great potential for mixed-use transit oriented development with affordable housing. It is located adjacent to skyline park. There is one public and one private owner.

No. 2

**52nd Ave. & Ward Rd., Ward
Road Station Area, City of
Wheat Ridge**

This priority site is directly adjacent to the Ward Station. It is also close to Van Bibber Open Space and has major health facilities nearby. This site is currently vacant, and is the former site of old the Jolly Rancher factory. The site is one parcel and has only one private owner.

No. 6

**Grandview Ave. and Wad-
sworth Blvd., Olde Town
Station Area, City of Arvada**

This smaller priority site is located very near the lively Olde Town Arvada Business Improvement District and close to the station. The site is currently used as mini-storage and is one parcel with a single owner.

No. 3

**Sheridan Blvd. & 60th Ave.,
Gold-Strike Sheridan Station
Area, City of Arvada**

This site is located directly next to the Gold Strike Sheridan Station. There is a nearby grocery store, a school, and several parks in the area. There are two parcels and two owners.

No. 7

**62nd Ave. and Beach Ct., Clear
Creek Federal Station Area,
Unincorp. Adams County**

This large, 14-acre priority site is located 0.7 miles from the station. The site is right by the scenic Clear Creek Trail and has the potential to give residents of the area a direct bike or pedestrian path to and from the station.

No. 4

**Ridge Rd. & Miller St., Arvada
Ridge Station Area, City of
Wheat Ridge**


This site is located only 0.2 miles from the station, and is an unused portion of the Wheat Ridge Regional Disability Development Center. This is a single parcel with a public owner. The site is close to Red Rocks Community College and a shopping center including a Super Target, Apex Recreation Center, and some health facilities.

No. 8

**43rd Ave. and Cherokee St., 41st
and Fox Station Area, City and
County of Denver**

This small priority site is located 0.3 miles from the station. The site is close to several new, high-density housing buildings geared toward students, and could be an ideal location for higher-density affordable housing. The site does require consolidating parcels and there are five homes on the site.

Map 11. Gold Line Potential Sites (Red denotes sites with contamination)



41st and Fox.

This station area has a mix of residential homes, commercial uses, and some industrial uses. There is a long-established residential community here primarily to the west of the station area, the Sunnyside neighborhood, but mainline rail lines create a barrier.

The station is technically in the Globeville neighborhood of Denver, but is divided from the rest of Globeville by both I-25 and I-70 with poor roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian connections to the other segments of Globeville. New housing construction near the station has included units geared to students attending school on the Auraria Campus. The area is also located near the rapidly changing River North (RiNo) district, and the arrival of commuter rail may create more movement between this area, RiNo, and downtown Denver.

Amenities.

This station area offers a very robust menu of services. There are several childcare programs and community centers and a broad selection of medical services. Childcare, education and health services are spread throughout the zone, while social services are concentrated to the west of the station. There is one supermarket on the northwest edge of the transit zone. Aside from this, the food sources are limited. The majority of services are a half mile or greater from the rail station. It will be important to ensure that future development does not displace the currently robust selection of services.

Accessibility.

Transit. There are three bus routes that make stops in this one-mile transit area, however, none currently make stops within a half-mile of the station.

Parkways and Boulevards. West 38th Avenue is a major thoroughfare from Wheat Ridge to this area. In the 41st and Fox Station area, 38th transitions into Park Avenue, a diagonal street that traverses the north side of downtown Denver and on to Colfax Avenue. Both 38th Avenue and Park Avenue are good candidates to become complete streets with improved sidewalks for pedestrians and transit users.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. The transit zone has some regional trail connections including the South Platte River Trail to the South of the transit zone that could potentially provide access to the station area for cyclists and pedestrians.

Site Statistics.

Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 189













Number of Potential Sites:
4 affordable housing sites

Site Acreage:
16 total acres, 11 developable acres of land










Potential Financing Tools:
4% or 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), Regional TOD Fund


41st and Fox Amenities.

Legend

-  Bus Stops
-  Businesses
-  Childcare
-  Health Care
-  Social Services
-  Childcare
-  School
-  Specialty Stores
-  Supermarkets
-  Ethnic Stores
-  Convenience
-  Big Box Stores

Bus Routes

-  EXP
-  LOC
-  REG
-  SKY
-  Gold Line
-  Regional Trail Connections
-  Half-Mile Buffer
-  Contaminated Sites
-  Development Sites



41st and Fox Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: 43rd Ave. and Cherokee St.

This is located near two existing student housing buildings and is only 0.3 miles from the station. As it might be small for tax credit financing, this site would be a good candidate for the regional transit-oriented development (TOD) fund. Recommended for higher density affordable housing. Zoned industrial.

SITE 2: Washington St. and Ringsby

The site has major barriers to the west from I-70, I-25, Platte River and freight rail lines. It is close to the Platte River trail and Globeville Landing Park. Recommended for affordable housing. Zoned industrial.

SITE 3: 29th St. and Brighton Blvd.

This site is located beyond the one-mile area of the station, with a longer walking distance due to physical barriers. However, the site is also close to downtown and additional transit options and would be an excellent area for affordable housing.

SITE 4: 30th Ave. and Fox St.

This site is located closer to downtown Denver and is adjacent to a new multi-use development and Coors Field. This site is also only 0.8 miles from Union Station and could be mixed-use and mixed-income housing. Zoned PUD General Mixed-Use.


Site Characteristics.

	Site 1	2	3	4
Acreage	2.0	6.5	5.6	1.7
Distance from Station (mi.)	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.7
AMENITIES ● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality				
Education	●	●	●	●
Health Care	●	●	●	●
Fresh Food	●	●	●	●
Child Care	●	●	●	●
Recreation	●	●	●	●
ENVIRONMENTAL ● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination				
Contamination	●	●	●	●
Flood Plain	●	●	●	●
ACCESS ● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away				
Bicycle	●	●	●	●
Pedestrian	●	●	●	●
Bus	●	●	●	●





Recommendations.

Site	1	2	3	4
Mixed Use Y/N	N	N	N	Y
Density (du/acre)	35	25	25	35
No. of Units	48	114	99	14

41st and Fox Half-Mile.



41st and Fox One-Mile.



Pecos.

The Pecos Junction station area is primarily an industrial area with few residential homes. Because of the employment focus of the area, this transit station area was not evaluated for affordable housing siting.

Though not a residential location, this transit zone is an important piece of the overall corridor because of its north-south connections via Pecos Street and is examined in terms of development potential beyond housing.

Amenities.

The Pecos Junction transit zone offers very few services to residents. There are no food sources or grocers in the area. There are no licensed child care services. One parochial school (Roman Catholic) is in this area. There are no health care services. There is a vocational rehabilitation program offering social assistance services. Those services that are available are located in the extreme south west quadrant of the transit zone. The lack of services and amenities in the area creates an opportunity for intentional growth of needed services.

Accessibility.

Transit. There are two local bus routes that run north-south through the Pecos Station one-mile transit area. The East 6th Avenue / North Pecos Route (6) has four bus stops within a half mile of the station zone, though the headways are limited with half-hour service during peak hours.

Parkways and Boulevards. There are no parkways or boulevards currently in this area, however, Pecos Street is a thoroughfare to the north and connects to Thornton and Northglenn. To the south, Pecos Street is primarily a residential arterial in north Denver neighborhoods, including Chaffee Park and Sunnyside. The station area itself is bisected north and south by Interstate 76, and a rail yard borders the west side of the Gold Line alignment. Pecos Street could become a complete street to provide better connectivity to the transit station.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. This area has some regional trail connections to the north including Clear Creek Trail but no trail access to the station area. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are generally lacking in the area.













Site Statistics.

Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: None at this time, however sites selected for the Federal station overlap with this station.










Potential Financing Tools: Regionally-managed TIP funding for transportation infrastructure.



Pecos Amenities.

Legend

-  Bus Stops
-  Businesses
-  Childcare
-  Health Care
-  Social Services
-  Childcare
-  School
-  Specialty Stores
-  Supermarkets
-  Ethnic Stores
-  Convenience
-  Big Box Stores

Bus Routes

-  EXP
-  LOC
-  REG
-  SKY
-  Gold Line
-  Half-Mile Buffer
-  Regional Trail Connections
-  Contaminated Sites
-  Development Sites



Pecos Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: 56th Ave and Pecos Street

This site is located 0.6 miles to the southwest of the station, with industrial uses to the north and east. There are possible contamination concerns, which make the suitability for housing unknown and/or unlikely at present. In its current state, the site is recommended for continued industrial/ commercial use. It is zoned industrial.


Site Characteristics.

	Site 1
Acreage	48.5
Distance from Station (mi.)	0.6
AMENITIES ● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality	
Education	●
Health Care	●
Fresh Food	●
Child Care	●
Recreation	●
ENVIRONMENTAL ● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination	
Contamination	●
Flood Plain	●
ACCESS ● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away	
Bicycle	●
Pedestrian	●
Bus	●


Recommendations.

	Site 1
Mixed Use Y/N	N
Density (du/acre)	N/A
No. of Units	N/A



Pecos Half-Mile.



Pecos One-Mile.



Station	Single-family (1 unit)	Half-Mile Station Area
Gold Line	Single-family (2 units)	One Mile Station Area
Interstate	Multi-family (3-9 units)	Development Sites
Bus Routes	Multi-family (10+ units)	
Bus Stops	Mobile Homes	



Clear Creek-Federal.

The area surrounding Clear Creek-Federal transit station is a mix of residential and industrial uses. Federal Boulevard is a major arterial that runs north-south through the area and provides a commercial corridor, which is largely low-density.

Vehicles travel at high speeds along Federal Boulevard and there are limited pedestrian amenities. Long blocks with few cross streets mean that traffic lights are spaced widely and crossing the boulevard can be difficult. Along Federal Boulevard there are also a number of mobile home parks, as well as single-family residential homes, small commercial establishments, vehicle sales/services, and industrial parks. Some of the station area is located within a floodplain, and retention ponds and flood mitigation features exist along the Clear Creek channel. Interstate-76 bisects this transit zone, along with the Clear Creek waterway. Vacant and underutilized parcels exist throughout the transit zone.

Amenities.

The Clear Creek-Federal Station offers very limited services and amenities. All health care services are to the northwest of the station and do not include an urgent care center. Social services facilities are clustered to the east of the station. There is one convenience store, which represents the only food source option for residents with-

in this transit zone. There are no childcare options. There are no public parks within the transit zone, except for a segment of the Clear Creek Trail. Currently there are few businesses near the station.

Accessibility.

Transit. There are two local bus routes, the Federal Blvd Route and the East 6thAve./North Pecos Route, which both run North-South through this one-mile transit area. The Federal Boulevard route (31) is more centric and frequent, with 6 bus stops within a half mile of the station area. The headway for the route is 15 minutes during peak hours.

Parkways and Boulevards. Federal Boulevard is a designated parkway within the City and County of Denver, and there are parkway treatments south of 48th Avenue to 20th Avenue. Segments of Federal Boulevard in Westminster have a suburban parkway treatment. In unincorporated Adams County, Federal Boulevard has inconsistent sidewalks and does not offer bicycle infrastructure. Having complete street treatments along Federal Boulevard will facilitate connectivity to, and use of, the Clear Creek Federal station.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. This transit area is bisected by Interstate 76, making station access from the southeast on foot or by bike impractical and unsafe. The transit zone has some regional trail connections, including Clear Creek Trail. Additional trail access points would enhance use and station access for cyclists and pedestrians.

Site Statistics.


Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 921

Number of Potential Sites: 7 affordable housing sites

Site Acreage: 85 total acres, 64 developable acres of land

Potential Financing Tools: 4% or 9% LIHTC, Regional TOD Fund, Regionally managed TIP funding (for improvements to Federal Blvd. and surrounding infrastructure)

Clear Creek-Federal Amenities.



Clear Creek-Federal Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: 64th Ave. and Irving St.

This site is located in a residential neighborhood with primarily single family homes. Recommended for lower-density affordable housing. Zoned residential.

SITE 2: 56th Ave. and Federal Blvd.

This larger site is located to the south of the station in a primarily low-density residential area. The site is recommended for lower-density affordable housing. Zoned industrial.

SITE 3: 62nd Ave. and Beach Ct.

This site is located along the Clear Creek trail, and there is potential for a direct trail route to the station if access is improved. Zoned PUD, industrial, commercial.

SITE 4: 66th Ave. and Federal Blvd.

This site is located in a primarily residential area that is approximate to commercial uses along Federal Boulevard. Zoned residential and commercial.

SITE 5: 56th Ave. and Pecos- See Pecos Station

SITE 6: 56th Ave. and Federal Blvd. (SE corner)

This area is primarily residential with a mobile home park to the west. It could be developed as lower density affordable housing. Zoned residential and commercial.

SITE 7: 58th Ave. and Hooker St.

This site is situated just south of the station close to Clear Creek Trail with possible station-trail access. Zoned industrial.

SITE 8: 64th Ave. and Beach Ct.

This site is near a new industrial development with residential uses nearby. The site could be mixed-use commercial/light industrial and affordable housing. Zoned PUD, residential.


Site Characteristics.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Acreage		9.4	24.5	14.1	2.4	48.5	7.5	18.2	8.9	
Distance from Station (mi.)		0.8	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.3	0.5	0.3	1	
AMENITIES		● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality								
Education		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Health Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Fresh Food		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Child Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Recreation		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
ENVIRONMENT		● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination								
Contamination		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Flood Plain		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
ACCESS		● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away								
Bicycle		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Pedestrian		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Bus		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	





Recommendations.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mixed Use Y/N		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Density (du/acre)		18	18	21	21	N/A	18	21	21
No. of Units		127	331	222	38	N/A	101	143	70

Clear Creek-Federal Half-Mile.



Clear Creek-Federal One-Mile.



Goldstrike-Sheridan.

The Gold Strike-Sheridan Station is located in the City of Wheat Ridge, with parts in Arvada. It is split into two distinct types of land use: residential to the north of the Gold Line and light industrial to the south.

The transit zone around the Sheridan Station overall has good infrastructure for supporting a mixture of residential and employment. This makes the Sheridan Station an excellent location for increased transit-oriented development. Recommendations for the transit zone are consistent with current land uses and include increased multi-family residential and light industrial use to support employment. As transit-oriented development increases the number of homes in the area, locating additional services will offer residents greater options and enhance the attractiveness of the area.

Amenities.

The Gold Strike Station offers a mix of all crucial services in the transit zone, but with low frequency. Most of the amenities are to the north of the transit zone along Sheridan Blvd. They are easily accessed by bus, but are outside the distance most will walk from the commuter rail station. The services located near the station include schools to the north and south. Amenities are lacking to the south. Healthcare facilities are lacking in the entire

zone. The only food source is one supermarket and a specialty store. There are two parks north of the station area.

Accessibility.

Transit. There are two local bus routes that run north-south through the Sheridan Station one-mile transit area and one that runs east and west. The Sheridan Boulevard (51) has six bus stops within a half mile of the station area. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.

Parkways and Boulevards. Sheridan Boulevard serves as the county line between Jefferson County and Adams and Denver counties. It is designated as a state highway. A number of municipalities abut Sheridan, including Arvada, Westminster, Wheat Ridge, Denver, Lakeside, Mountain View, Edgewater, Lakewood, and Bow Mar. It is a strong candidate for reconstruction as a complete street, with enhanced treatments for pedestrians and transit users. The station area is bisected North and South by Interstate 76.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. The transit zone has some regional trail connections including Ralston Creek Trail that could potentially provide access to the station area for cyclists and pedestrians.

Site Statistics.

Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 235











Number of Potential Sites:
5 affordable housing sites, 4 industrial/commercial

Site Acreage:
22 total acres, 16 developable acres of land









Potential Financing Tools:
LIHTC, Regional TOD Fund, City of Arvada TOD Fund


Goldstrike-Sheridan Amenities.

Legend

-  Bus Stops
-  Businesses
-  Childcare
-  Health Care
-  Social Services
-  Childcare
-  School
-  Specialty Stores
-  Supermarkets
-  Ethnic Stores
-  Convenience
-  Big Box Stores

Bus Routes

-  EXP
-  LOC
-  REG
-  SKY
-  Gold Line
-  Regional Trail Connections
-  Half-Mile Buffer
-  Contaminated Sites
-  Development Sites



Goldstrike-Sheridan Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: Wellington Pkwy. & Ames St., Arvada

This site has an existing building, but has potential for multi-family housing. Zoned Low Density Residential and Commercial.

SITE 2: Sheridan Blvd. & 66th Ave., Arvada

Nearly a mile away from the station, this site is proposed to be high-density multi-family housing. Zoned Professional Office.

SITE 3: Sheridan Blvd. & 60th Ave. Station Area, Arvada

This site should be mixed-use with commercial space and dense mixed-income housing. Zoned Industrial.

SITE 4: 60th Ave. & Wolff St., Arvada

This is the site of a church; the pastor has expressed interest in developing a portion of their property. Zoned Low Density Residential.

SITE 5: Tennyson St. & 61st Ave., Adams County

Located between a single-family neighborhood and the Jim Baker Reservoir, this site is proposed to be developed as lower-density housing, such as townhomes. Zoned Residential and Commercial.

SITE 6: Sheridan Blvd. & Ralston Rd., Jefferson County

This site is proposed to be developed as light industrial. Zoning Unavailable.

SITE 7: Depew St. & 60th Ave., Arvada

This site is proposed to be developed as light industrial. Zoned Industrial and Commercial.

SITE 8: Sheridan Blvd. & 62nd Ave., Arvada

This site is proposed to be developed as commercial space. Zoned PUD-Business/Professional.

SITE 9: Sheridan Blvd. & 58th Ave., Arvada

This site is recommended to be mixed-use industrial and commercial space. Zoned Industrial.


Site Characteristics.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Acreage		2.5	1.5	9	3	5.5	4	3.5	6	2.5
Distance from Station (mi.)		0.4	1	0.1	0.2	1	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.8
AMENITIES ● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality										
Education		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Health Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Fresh Food		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Child Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Recreation		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
ENVIRONMENT ● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination										
Contamination		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Flood Plain		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
ACCESS ● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away										
Bicycle		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Pedestrian		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Bus		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●


Recommendations.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Mixed Use Y/N		N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Density (du/acre)		21	25	35	18	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No. of Aff. Units		40	30	77	14	74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a



Goldstrike-Sheridan Half-Mile.



Goldstrike-Sheridan One-Mile.



Station	Single-family (1 unit)	Half-Mile Station Area
Gold Line	Single-family (2 units)	One Mile Station Area
Interstate	Multi-family (3-9 units)	Development Sites
Bus Routes	Multi-family (10+ units)	
Bus Stops	Mobile Homes	



Olde Town.

The Olde Town Arvada Station had received well-focused transit-oriented planning and development efforts by the City of Arvada. The area around the station is alive with a main street corridor and newer multi-family housing.

This area has already seen considerable development, and it is important that affordable housing be prioritized and constructed as businesses and higher income residents also seek the convenience of, and proximity to, reliable transit.

Amenities.

The Olde Town Station has a strong existing mix of amenities and services. There are numerous food sources and health services to meet a wide range of needs. Education and childcare services are present, though there are few licensed childcare providers. Services are well dispersed throughout the transit zone, though there is a notable lack of education and childcare services to the northeast side of the station. There is an opportunity to connect affordable housing with this robust selection of services. It is important that key services are not displaced and that there are service offerings for a variety of income levels.

Accessibility.

Transit. The transit zone for the Olde Town Station

provides multiple options for accessing the commuter station from almost any direction. There are four local bus routes and an express route that all make stops within a half-mile of the station area. The local buses have 30 minute headways during peak hours, and 60 minutes (or no service) during off hours. There are 18 total stops within a half-mile of the station area.

Parkways and Boulevards. Wadsworth Boulevard traverses the east side of the station area as a grade-separated bypass with minimal sidewalk treatments. Old Wadsworth Boulevard is designed with street calming features, broad sidewalks and street furniture to enhance pedestrian movement. Grandview Avenue provides east-west connectivity through Olde Town and is a good candidate for enhanced complete street treatments.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. The transit zone has some regional trail connections, including Ralston Creek Trail to the north and an interurban trail to the south. There is a lack of bicycle infrastructure around the station area. As TOD continues to develop in Olde Town, there is a need for safe and convenient crossing options at Wadsworth Boulevard Bypass, the rail tracks, and Grandview Avenue to increase pedestrian accessibility.

Site Statistics.


Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 189

Number of Potential Sites:
4 affordable housing sites

Site Acreage:
25 total acres, 17 developable acres of land

Potential Financing Tools:
City of Arvada TOD fund, LIHTC, Regional TOD Fund

Olde Town Amenities.



Olde Town Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: Grandview Ave. & 121 (west)

This prime site is located close to the station and the lively Olde Town main street area, which has many restaurants and shops with pleasant pedestrian infrastructure. The area is a TOD Pilot Program Site designated by the Regional Transportation District (RTD) and the City of Arvada. The EPS report indicates that the site is intended for mixed-use, with Trammell Crow as the master developer. If possible, dedicating one third of the site to affordable housing would expand the diversity of the housing stock in the area, benefiting the households and the community. Zoned PUD.

SITE 2: 55th Ave. and Vance St.

This site is also close to mainstreet Olde Town and is adjacent to a proposed parking structure and plaza. The site is currently occupied by the active and operating Landmark Theatre and a large corresponding parking lot. This is a longer-term potential site. If re-developed, it is recommended that one third of the developable land be used for affordable housing. Zoned PUD.

SITE 3: W 55th Ave. & Olde Wadsworth Blvd.

This site is located near the Watertower Village and Flats residential complex and is close to Olde Town main street. The EPS report refers to the site as the Old Brooklyn's Bar Site and describes plans to develop a hotel on the land. If this does not come about, the site could be an excellent location for affordable housing. If it is developed as a hotel, it increases the need to provide affordable housing at the other Olde Town sites as the hotel will likely have many workers with below-average wages. Zoned PUD.

SITE 4: Grandview Ave. & 121 (east)

This site, southeast of the station, currently operates as a mini-storage business. The area is adjacent to a residential neighborhood and could be redeveloped as affordable housing. Zoned PUD.


Site Characteristics.

	Site 1	2	3	4
Acreage	9.0	9.9	3.0	2.9
Distance from Station (mi.)	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
AMENITIES ● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality				
Education	●	●	●	●
Health Care	●	●	●	●
Fresh Food	●	●	●	●
Child Care	●	●	●	●
Recreation	●	●	●	●
ENVIRONMENTAL ● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination				
Contamination	●	●	●	●
Flood Plain	●	●	●	●
ACCESS ● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away				
Bicycle	●	●	●	●
Pedestrian	●	●	●	●
Bus	●	●	●	●





Recommendations.

	Site 1	2	3	4
Mixed Use Y/N	Y	Y	Y	N
Density (du/acre)	21	25	21	25
No. of Units	44	57	38	51

Olde Town Half-Mile.



Olde Town One-Mile.



Arvada Ridge.

The Arvada Ridge Station has been the focus of many planning efforts by both the City of Arvada and the Arvada Urban Renewal Authority. The station area is split almost evenly between the jurisdictions of Arvada to the north and Wheat Ridge to the south.

The station area consists of a unique mix of residential, retail, industrial, and warehouse coexisting in the ½ mile radius. The area adjacent to the station has seen recent aggressive development and has a plethora of retail and services. There are a number of large, vacant parcels which provide the opportunity to create mixed-use multi-family and commercial developments. The majority of these sites are located within a designated Urban Renewal Area, giving them access to urban renewal funds, the attractiveness of the area.

Amenities.

The Arvada Ridge Station offers a mix of primary services, including health care, social assistance, food sources, education, recreation and childcare. These services are fairly well distributed on the east side of the station, but the suburban residential area to the west of the station is lacking in all services. If the Gold Line brings additional housing units and TOD, there will likely be an increased demand on day care service near the station. Major amenities include Red Rocks Community College, Apex

Recreation Center, and a shopping center anchored by a Super Target.

Accessibility.

Transit. The Kipling Street route (100) has 35 bus stops and 16 are within a half mile of the station area. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and no service on Sundays and holidays.

Parkways and Boulevards. Kipling Street Parkway is a major thoroughfare that connects to Wheat Ridge, Lakewood, and south Jefferson County communities, including Ken Caryl. Major portions of Kipling have complete street treatments with sidewalks and segments of bicycle trails. Having complete street treatments along Kipling Street Parkway will facilitate connections to and use of the Arvada Ridge station.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. The transit zone has several regional trail connections including bike paths on 48th Avenue and Garrison Street to the south in Wheat Ridge and Van Bibber Creek Trail to the North of the transit zone that could potentially provide access to the station area for cyclists and pedestrians.

Site Statistics.


Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 306

Number of Potential Sites:
4 affordable housing sites

Site Acreage:
27 total acres, 20 developable acres of land

Potential Financing Tools:
Regional TOD Fund, Arvada TOD Fund, LIHTC, HOME, TIF, Urban Renewal

Arvada Ridge Amenities.



Arvada Ridge Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: Kipling St. & Ridge Rd., Arvada

Located directly across from the station and near Red Rocks Community College, this large vacant site would make an excellent mixed-use, mixed-income development. Zoned PUD- Business Professional Residential.

SITE 2: Ridge Rd. & Miller St., Wheat Ridge

Home to an abandoned section of the Wheat Ridge Regional Center for Disabilities, this would make an excellent site for redevelopment, possibly for senior housing. Zoned Agricultural.

SITE 3: Ridge Rd. & Quail St., Arvada

This large site is located in between single-family neighborhoods and is recommended as mixed-use, including mixed-income housing and commercial space, such as a daycare. Zoned PUD-Residential and PUD- Industrial. (This site also is listed under the Ward Road Station Sites).

SITE 4: Kipling St. & W. 58th, Arvada

This small site could be used for townhomes and is adjacent to a multi-family development and is close to many amenities, including a grocery store, recreation center, and park. Zoned Professional Office.

SITE 5: Ridge Rd. & Robb St., Arvada

See description in the Ward Station site profiles

SITE 6: W. 53rd & Field Cir., Arvada

This small site is located in between single-family homes and could be used for townhomes. Zoned PUD Residential.

Site Characteristics.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6
Acreage		11	9	55	2.5	17	4.5
Distance from Station (mi.)		0.1	0.2	0.8	0.7	1	0.8
AMENITIES		● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality					
Education		●	●	●	●	●	●
Health Care		●	●	●	●	●	●
Fresh Food		●	●	●	●	●	●
Child Care		●	●	●	●	●	●
Recreation		●	●	●	●	●	●
ENVIRONMENT		● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination					
Contamination		●	●	●	●	●	●
Flood Plain		●	●	●	●	●	●
ACCESS		● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away					
Bicycle		●	●	●	●	●	●
Pedestrian		●	●	●	●	●	●
Bus		●	●	●	●	●	●


Recommendations.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mixed Use Y/N		Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Density (du/acre)		35	25	18	21	25	18
No. of Units		92	113	247	39	321	62



Arvada Ridge Half-Mile.



Arvada Ridge One-Mile.



Station	Single-family (1 unit)	Half-Mile Station Area
Gold Line	Single-family (2 units)	One Mile Station Area
Interstate	Multi-family (3-9 units)	Development Sites
Bus Routes	Multi-family (10+ units)	
Bus Stops	Mobile Homes	



Ward Road.

The Ward Road station area is primarily in the City of Wheat Ridge, with a portion in unincorporated Jefferson County.

The area around the station primarily consists of light industrial and commercial uses, with single-family residential to the north and a large cemetery to the southwest. The area contains several vacant or underutilized parcels, making the station area an excellent candidate for affordable housing. Larger parcels could incorporate affordable housing into mixed-use developments and provide locations for some of the services that are currently missing. Additional amenities, such as grocery stores, and pedestrian infrastructure will need to be developed along with housing to fully serve residents.

Amenities.

The area lacks many critical services and amenities. The exception is medical services, of which the choices are robust and include long-term care, private practices, emergency care, dentists and chiropractors. These medical services are clustered along Ward Road. Food sources are very sparse in this transit zone and consist solely of convenience and specialty stores. There are also few childcare facilities, presenting difficulties for working parents who live or work in the area. The Van Bibber Open Space is close to the station and provides a recreational amenity.

Accessibility.

Transit. The Quaker via Ward Road Express route

has two bus stops within a half-mile of the Ward Road Station area. Its service only operates on weekdays every 15 minutes in the morning between approximately 5:20 a.m. and 8:45 a.m. and in the evenings from 3:00 p.m. to 7:15 p.m. at 20 minute intervals. There are two local bus routes that run through the one-mile transit area and potentially could have revised routing to connect with the station: the 44th Avenue route (44) and the West 52nd Avenue / South Bannock (52).

Parkways and Boulevards. Ward Road traverses the western edge of the metro area and connects to State Route 72, which runs through Coal Creek Canyon, and State Route 93 which connects to Boulder. West 44th Avenue connects to Golden and is a minor arterial through Wheat Ridge and north Denver neighborhoods. These roadways are good candidates for certain complete street treatments to improve pedestrian safety.

Bicycle and Pedestrian. The transit zone has several regional trail connections including bike paths along 48th Avenue, Tabor Street, Robb Street, 52nd Avenue, and Van Bibber Creek Trail that could potentially provide access to the station area for cyclists and pedestrians.

Site Statistics.


Recommended Number of Affordable Housing Units: 1075

Number of Potential Sites:
7 affordable housing sites, 1 industrial/commercial

Site Acreage:
108 total acres, 80 developable acres of land

Potential Financing Tools:
Regional TOD Fund, LIHTC, HOME, TIF, Urban Renewal, Jefferson County Housing Authority, Fund for land purchase of non-county sites

Ward Road Amenities.



- Legend**
- Bus Stops
 - Businesses
 - Childcare
 - Health Care
 - Social Services
 - Childcare
 - School
 - Specialty Stores
 - Supermarkets
 - Ethnic Stores
 - Convenience
 - Big Box Stores
- Bus Routes**
- EXP
 - LOC
 - REG
 - SKY
 - Gold Line
 - Regional Trail Connections
 - Half-Mile Buffer
 - Contaminated Sites
 - Development Sites

Ward Road Proposed Sites.

SITE 1: 52nd Ave. & Ward Rd., Wheat Ridge

This large vacant site would make an excellent mixed-use, mixed-income development, including commercial space and affordable apartments. Zoned Mixed-Use Commercial TOD.

SITE 2: 52nd Ave. & Tabor St. (South), Wheat Ridge

Consisting of five separate parcels, this site would need to be acquired and combined, but is currently vacant land. It could be used for multi-family housing. Zoned Low Density Residential.

SITE 3: Ridge Rd. & Quail St., Arvada

This large site is located in between single-family neighborhoods and is recommended as mixed-use, including mixed-income housing and commercial space, such as a daycare. Zoned PUD-Residential and PUD-Industrial.

SITE 4: 52nd Ave. & Taft Ct., Wheat Ridge

This site could be developed as dense affordable apartments or condominiums. Zoned Industrial.

SITE 5: 52nd Ave. & Tabor St. (North)

Surrounded by single-family homes, this site is currently vacant except for one home on the southern edge. It could be an excellent mixed-use space with offices and housing. Zoning Unavailable.

SITE 6: Ridge Rd. & Robb St., Arvada

Next to an industrial use, this site has the potential to yield a great number of affordable units. Zoned PUD-Industrial.

SITE 7: 50th Ave. & Ward Rd., Wheat Ridge

This site consists of five parcels, but could be developed as high-density multi-family housing. Zoned Commercial.

SITE 8: Ridge Rd. & Tabor St., Wheat Ridge

This site is recommended for commercial and office space. Zoned Industrial.

Site Characteristics.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Acreage		14	8	55	2	5	17	6.5	4.5
Distance from Station (mi.)		0.1	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.1
AMENITIES ● = accessible, high quality ● = somewhat accessible, ok quality ● = inaccessible, poor quality									
Education		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Health Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Fresh Food		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Child Care		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Recreation		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
ENVIRONMENT ● = no contamination ● = low-risk contamination ● = high-risk contamination									
Contamination		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Flood Plain		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
ACCESS ● = safe infrastructure, close to station ● = ok infrastructure, fairly close ● = poor infrastructure, far away									
Bicycle		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Pedestrian		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Bus		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●





Recommendations.

	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mixed Use Y/N		Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Density (du/acre)		35	25	21	25	21	21	35	n/a
No. of Aff. Units		112	154	247	43	40	321	157	n/a

Ward Road Half-Mile.



Ward Road One-Mile.



Environmental Contamination of sites.

41st & Fox.

Of the sites analyzed for housing suitability around the 41st and Fox Station there are currently four sites that have contamination.

The site located near 45th Ave. and Fox St. is located within the half-mile buffer of the station. This site was not selected as a final opportunity site, but it is adjacent to Opportunity Site One. This site is currently listed as a “Small Quantity Generator” and “Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator” meaning that the site still produces small amounts of pollution and has a risk level of “moderate”. The generation comes from a trucking company and a newspaper company that occupy the site.

The site at the corner of 31st Ave. and Fox St. was chosen as Opportunity Site Four. It is south of the station and within the one mile buffer. This site has a risk level of “high” because previously located on the site was an industrial land use that operated before the current OPS and RCRA regulations.

Located just down the street from the above site is another site used as an industrial site prior to OPS and RCRA regulations but only has a “moderate” risk level because remediation measures have been approved.

The last site in the 41st and Fox area that is contaminated is at the corner of 29th St. and Delgany St., and extends to Brighton Blvd. It is known as the Feinstein Property #1. This is the 41 St. and Fox St. Opportunity Site Three. This site is listed twice because there was a known tank leak on the site as well as one unknown underground storage tank (UST). Both these tanks are closed and are listed with a “low” risk level.

Federal.

The Federal Station has three development sites that were found to have contamination. All three are within the half-mile buffer, two of which are directly adjacent to the station on 60th Ave. After analysis, none of these sites were selected as Opportunity Sites, however, due to their proximity to the station, they may become desirable areas for future transit oriented development.

The development site located at 2710 W 60th Ave. is currently a “Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator” and has a “moderate” risk level. This address was also the old site for Westminster Iron and Metal that was also listed as a contaminator and has a closed tank on site. Right next to this the previous site is a site that was P&P Engine Corps. This is listed as a “low” risk level also for

having a closed tank on site.

The site located near 61st Ave and Federal Blvd is not a generator, but also was a non-notifier of contaminants and poses a “low” contamination risk.

Sheridan-Gold Strike.

The Sheridan-Goldstrike Station’s Opportunity Site Nine is the only one selected that is contaminated. It poses a “low” contamination risk as a former solid waste landfill.

Ward.

At the Ward Station, Opportunity Site Eight is contaminated by an above ground diesel storage tank and former transportation activities that occurred on the site. It is listed as a “low” level risk of contamination.

Opportunities to improve land use compatibility.

The Gold Corridor's existing density combined with the area's current land uses creates a unique opportunity for jurisdictions to find innovative ways to promote transit-oriented development and affordable housing.

Jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor have the opportunity to:

- Create complete communities by establishing an innovative mix of uses.
- Encourage a mix of land uses that will increase the possible range of industries and jobs to locate in the area, providing even more opportunities for residents to live and work in close proximity.
- Minimize land use conflicts by creating transitional zoning and landscape buffers.
- Broaden the range of land uses to promote industry diversity.
- Create new public spaces for recreation and amenities.

Mixed-use development is usually associated with commercial, business, office and residential development. But as heavy industrial uses have become less dominant along the corridor and more types of light industrial land uses expand, possible integration of light industrial uses with more sensitive land uses could be an alternative to traditional mix-use zoning. Depending on the type of industry, its intensity and how the use is classified, certain uses

maybe found as compatible and even supportive of transit oriented development. Many of the industrial uses identified in the EPS Report, and by the CU Denver Research team, account for much of the corridor's economic diversity and a large percentage of job types and employment. Assuming future industry and employment demands set forth by the Gold Corridor EPS Report, transitional and industrial-mixed use would provide for the much needed residential and industrial space, accommodating the predicted growth in existing industries and projected population growth (EPS, 2014).

A challenge with establishing residential uses within current industrial areas is the ability to attract additional services and densities that support transit-oriented developments, such as grocery stores and childcare facilities (EPS, 2014). Minimum density requirements for mixed-use and industrial areas can help foster the density needed to support both TODs and supportive services.

Industrial-mixed use can also aid in the development of mixed-income housing. Industrial land tends to maintain a lower land value costs. This allows certain industries to exist in an area. Lower land value costs can also aid in the reduction of initial development costs for affordable housing. Industrial areas are also capable of accommodating a range of industries. This allows industrial areas to maintain a diversity of job types and incomes (Montgomery, 2007).

Existing station area plans reviewed for this study, included several stations as being identified by local jurisdictions as employment centers or residential neighborhoods. The Ward, Gold Strike, and Arvada Ridge transit areas were found to have a substantial percentage of industrial type land uses within the transit zone. The plans recognize the need to preserve areas that have supported the creation of industrial type jobs and to provide housing to those who work within those industries through policy development.

With proper zoning and land use policies, the ability to incorporate appropriate industrial uses with residential uses can help support transit-oriented development.

Some example mixed-use policies:

- Commercial uses can be used as transitional zones to buffer more intense industrial uses and more sensitive land uses.
- Mixed-industrial developments can broaden and sustain a range of industries and employment options, increasing the potential for affordable housing opportunities.
- Innovative land use controls and policies can broaden the capacity of TODs and introduce a wider range of land uses.
- Land use diversity provides further economic stability and increases the opportunity for mixed-income housing.

How have other regions accommodated industrial uses near transit or residential uses?

Cities and counties across the country have found ways of integrating industrial uses with residential uses. In some cases, cities have found industrial uses can be supportive of transit oriented development and encourage affordable housing development.

- **Montgomery County, Maryland**, has developed transit mixed-use zoning allowing for a range of uses including light industrial and residential. To further encourage mix-income development,

new development or redevelopment, the County has included incentives for the inclusion of affordable housing and creation of public space (Montgomery County, 2007).

- **Fort Lauderdale's** land use code has incorporated neighborhood compatibility and preservation ordinances to protect existing employment and maintain neighborhood character with mixed-use development (CCA, 2005).
- Affordable housing incentive programs in the **State of Washington** have expanded areas of for low-income housing development to include industrial where appropriate (Washington, 2009).
- The **City of Cedar Hill, TX** incorporated industrial-mixed use as part of mixed-use transit oriented development zone district standards.
- In the **San Jose area**, the city established policy that amended their current development plan to allow for the preservation of the existing light industrial uses as an Industrial Core Area and applied a Transit/Employment Residential District zoning overlay to allow for higher density residential development (CCA, 2005).
- The **Fortune Center, East Valley Commerce Center, and Fiesta Ranch, located in Arizona**, are all current industrial-mixed use developments that are characterized as light manufacturing and live-work developments.

Summary of Opportunity Sites.

There is a significant amount of developable and available land within the Gold Line corridor for transit-oriented projects. If developed properly, there is potentially enough land to supply the needed number of affordable units over the next 15 years, and beyond, and at moderate transit-oriented densities that coincide with the existing character of the area.

If all of these opportunity sites were developed as recommended, they would yield approximately 3,250 to 3,300 affordable housing units of the total 3,500 projected to be needed. While these particular sites may not be available or feasible to acquire for affordable housing, as part of this opportunity assessment they provide an example and a road map for how affordable housing could be distributed along the corridor.

There are challenges to developing these sites. Several sites are contaminated to varying degrees; most of the sites currently lack adequate infrastructure in terms of roads, sidewalks, and water and sewer; and because of development pressures in the corridor and larger region, land values are high and increasing.

The most favorable sites should be pursued as soon as possible in order to secure the best locations for affordable, mixed-income and mixed use sites nearest to transit. Emphasis should also be placed on sites with connections to other important destinations, such as schools, groceries, bus stops, parks, and health care.

Section IV

Goals | Policies | Actions | Measures

To advance the development of vibrant and healthy transit-oriented communities along the Gold Corridor, an integrated, collaborative policy framework provides direction to guide growth in a manner that: (a) ensures that housing is being built where it is needed; (b) impediments for preserving or developing housing are removed; (c) amenities and infrastructure are in place where they are needed the most; and (d) resources are being leveraged to advance mixed-use development in and around station areas.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy policies provide an integrated framework for addressing housing within the context of land use, jobs, the environment, mobility, and other infrastructure. These policies are based on the analysis of needs and outcomes identified in the assessment of housing, development, planning, and land use, including contamination along the Gold Corridor.

Policies to implement the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy, need to occur through a series of specific actions and measures. They should reflect the commitment in the vision statement for the Gold Corridor to support active, healthy, and sustainable lifestyles” by connecting “unique and historic transit centered communities with a range of housing choices and easy access to job centers, recreation, educational and development opportunities, served by diverse transportation modes for a wide range of socio-economic populations.” (Gold Corridor Working Group Visions and Goals, September 2013).

Goals. Policies. Actions. Measures.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy policies are presented in a four-part framework with: (1) goals, (2) policies, (3) actions, and (4) measures.

This framework is organized first for guidance for corridor-wide implementation, and secondly for local level station area implementation.

Goals.

Goals speak to the desired outcomes for the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy. Although they are presented by each policy topic area, collectively they set the tone for the integrated approach and common framework.

Policies.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy policies provide overall guidance and direction for planning processes and decision-making at both corridor and local levels. Given the strong integration across the various policy sections in the Strategy, the full body of policies is to be considered in decision-making for various programs, projects, and planning processes.

Actions.

The Gold Corridor Housing Strategy includes actions that relate to implementing each policy section. These actions lay out responsibilities and tasks for implementation. The actions include a wide range of items — some directed at the Denver Regional Council of Governments, others geared to jurisdictions along the corridor, and others to partner agencies and groups. Short-term generally refers to a one- to two-year time period. Mid-term refers to a three- to five-year time period.

Measures.

The measures included in the Strategy are for assessing how well the corridor is meeting the goals and provisions of the policies. The purpose of these measures is to track whether actions are occurring and whether the region is achieving desired results. This information will assist policymakers as they assess policies and actions over time.

The Strategy's monitoring effort is based upon two major components: implementation monitoring and performance monitoring.

- **Implementation monitoring** attempts to answer the question, "Are we doing what we said we would do?"
- **Performance monitoring** addresses, "Are we achieving the desired results?" Answering these questions provides the guiding framework for the Gold Corridor monitoring program.

The measures selected for the Strategy are not intended to be entirely comprehensive or to provide all of the answers. Rather, they have been selected to provide the corridor's decision-makers a broad view of the state of the corridor, with a high-level perspective about whether key implementation actions are being accomplished, and if the region is seeing desired results.

Measures were selected to provide decision makers a broad view of the corridor.

Index of Policies.

Land Use and

Development Patterns

1. Provide a mix of land uses that promote vibrant and healthy transit communities, allow for diverse choices in housing types, establish a high degree of connectivity in the street network for working, bicycling and using transit, and incorporate sufficient public and civic spaces.
2. Promote efficient use of land in station areas by establishing a minimum density threshold for each transit community.
3. Coordinate planning efforts among jurisdictions, special districts, and agencies to facilitate a common vision for the Gold Line Corridor.
4. Monitor implementation of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy to evaluate progress in achieving the goals, policies and actions contained within the Strategy.
5. Explore new and existing sources of funding for services and infrastructure, recognizing that such funding is vital if local governments are to achieve the

Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

6. Identify – and where needed, revise – regulatory, pricing, taxing, and expenditure practices, and other fiscal tools within the region to implement the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.
7. Develop density standards within industrial areas to help foster an increase in density to support transit and promote transit oriented development.
8. Establish housing and job targets within the corridor, focusing on transit communities, including targets for affordable housing.
9. Streamline development standards and regulations for affordable housing in mix-used areas by minimizing additional costs of development by decreasing parking requirements, creating density bonuses, and accommodating a broader range of project types.
10. Identify, protect and enhance those elements and characteristics that give communities along the corridor their identity, including significant historic, visual and cultural resources, such as public views, landmarks, historic and cultural landscapes, and areas of special character.
11. Identify and protect economically viable industrial lands within the corridor, especially those that allow for the

establishment of transit and affordable housing development.

12. Allow, where it is compatible and appropriate, industrial-mixed use and transitional zoning in transit station areas.
13. Sustain and enhance arts and cultural institutions in station areas and centers to foster an active and vibrant community life.
14. Design station area communities to provide an improved environment for walking and bicycling.
15. Incorporate provisions addressing health and well-being into corridor-wide, local planning and decision-making processes.
16. Support uses that enhance the food system along the corridor, both production and delivery.

Housing.

17. Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups, in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and provides opportunities to live in proximity to work.
18. Achieve and sustain – through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development – a sufficient supply of housing within the corridor to meet the needs of

low-income, moderate-income, middle-income, and special needs individuals and households.

19. Identify funding sources for maintaining, updating, and constructing affordable housing in station areas, including interjurisdictional programs and public-private partnerships.
20. Create incentives for creating affordable housing in station areas, including fee-reduction programs. Allow Accessory Dwelling Units to qualify for funding.
21. Include a percentage of affordable units in new housing development projects in station areas, especially those receiving funds through housing and/or urban renewal authorities.
22. Work with residents of mobile and/or manufactured home parks to explore preservation and improvements.
23. Concentrate a significant amount of economic growth in station areas and centers and connect them to each other in order to promote economic opportunity.
24. Use incentives and investments to create a closer balance between jobs and housing.

Mobility and Accessibility.

25. Increase the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone.
26. Prioritize investments in transportation facilities and services that support pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented densities and development within station areas.
27. Recognize and give local and regional funding priority to transportation facilities, infrastructure, and services that explicitly advance the development of housing in station areas and centers. Give additional priority to projects and services that advance affordable housing.
28. Improve connectivity between the station area and adjacent communities and neighborhoods, including providing continuous bicycle and sidewalk connections, as well as circulator buses.

Transportation and Urban Design

29. Promote coordination among transportation providers, local governments, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed in a way that improves overall mobility and accessibility to and within such development.

30. Apply urban design principles and context-sensitive design guidelines to transportation programs and projects for station areas and centers.

Environment.

31. Improve air and water quality, soils, and natural systems to ensure the health and well-being of people, animals, and plants.
32. Ensure that all residents, regardless of social or economic status, live in a healthy environment, with minimal exposure to pollution and contaminants.
33. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.
34. Support and provide incentives to increase the percentage of new development and redevelopment – both public and private – to be built at higher performing energy and environmental standards.

Contaminated Soils

35. Identify and evaluate contaminated soils within the corridor. Determine level of effort required for clean-up for redevelopment and/or use.

Brownfields and Greyfields

36. Support the transformation of key underutilized lands, such as brown-

fields and greyfields, to higher density, mixed-use areas to complement the development of centers and the enhancement of existing neighborhoods.

Water Quality

- 37. Maintain natural hydrological functions within ecosystems and watersheds and, where feasible, restore them to a more naturally functioning state.
- 38. Promote improved conservation and more efficient use of water, as well as the increased use of reclaimed water, to reduce wastewater generation and ensure water availability.

Open Space

- 39. Identify, preserve, and enhance significant open space networks and linkages across jurisdictional boundaries.
- 40. Designate, protect, and enhance significant open spaces, natural resources, and critical areas.
- 41. Take positive actions to reduce carbons, such as increasing vegetation along the corridor.

Other Services.

- 42. Time and phase services and facilities to guide growth and development in a manner that supports the affordable housing strategy.
- 43. Site or expand public facilities in a manner that (1) reduces adverse social, environmental, and economic impacts,

(2) equitably balances the location of new facilities, and (3) addresses corridor-wide and station area planning objectives.

- 44. Design public infrastructure and facilities that contribute to a sense of community and a sense of place.

General.

Goal: Jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor will achieve the vision of the Gold Corridor Working Group.

Policies

1. Coordinate planning efforts among jurisdictions, special districts, and agencies to facilitate a common vision for the Gold Line Corridor.
2. Monitor implementation of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy to evaluate progress in achieving the goals, policies and actions contained within the Strategy.
3. Explore new and existing sources of funding for services and infrastructure, recognizing that such funding is vital if local governments are to achieve the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.
4. Identify – and where needed, revise – regulatory, pricing, taxing, and expenditure practices, and other fiscal tools within the region to implement the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

Implementation Actions

Coordinate Corridor Infrastructure Plan

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions in the Gold Corridor, along with special service districts in the north metro area, the Regional Transportation District, the Colorado Department of Transportation, state and local agencies responsible for environmental planning and restoration, water districts, transportation and environmental organization and groups, and community groups should develop a set of integrated infrastructure plans for the stations and areas in between. The integrated plans could and should include the corridor-wide transportation, industrial lands, and environmental plans called for under implementation actions (listed below under specific topics). The plan's success should be measured by its emphasis on state-of-the-art, 21st century solutions to mobility, water management, and reducing the carbon footprint.

Timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Outreach Program

Jurisdictions should collaborate in developing an outreach program to communicate with officials, partners, and the public to advance the goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

Timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Monitoring Program

The Denver Regional Council of Governments and its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, in consultation with the Regional Transportation District, should convene an advisory group to evaluate and recommend

measures for monitoring growth and development along the corridor.

Timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Investigate Funding Sources

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, the Urban Land Conservancy, Enterprise Community Partners, and other partners, should investigate existing and new sources of funding for facilities and services to assist local jurisdictions in accommodate housing and jobs in transit communities.

Timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Measures

Implementation

Have officials and the public been informed of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy?

Measure: Information distributed through a corridor-wide outreach effort.

Performance

Outcome: Planners and decision-makers are receiving information on growth and development within the corridor.

Measure: A corridor-wide monitoring program is in place.

Outcome: New revenue is coming into the corridor for affordable housing, facilities and infrastructure.

Measure: New funding sources have been identified.

Land Use And Development Patterns.

Goal: The Gold Corridor will focus growth within walkable, transit-oriented communities that maintain unique local character. Centers and station areas will continue to be a focus of housing and economic development.

Policies

1. Provide a mix of land uses that promote vibrant and healthy transit communities, allow for diverse choices in housing types, establish a high degree of connectivity in the street network for working, bicycling and using transit, and incorporate sufficient public and civic spaces.
2. Promote efficient use of land in station areas by establishing a minimum density threshold for each transit community.
3. Develop density standards within industrial areas to help foster an increase in density to support transit and promote transit oriented development.
4. Establish housing and job targets within the corridor, focusing on transit communities, including targets for affordable housing.

5. Streamline development standards and regulations for affordable housing in mix-use areas by minimizing additional costs of development by decreasing parking requirements, creating density bonuses, and accommodating a broader range of project types.
6. Identify, protect and enhance those elements and characteristics that give communities along the corridor their identity, including significant historic, visual and cultural resources, such as public views, landmarks, historic and cultural landscapes, and areas of special character.
7. Identify and protect economically viable industrial lands within the corridor, especially those that allow for the establishment of affordable housing development and transit connectivity.
8. Allow, where it is compatible and appropriate, industrial-mixed use and transitional zoning in transit station areas.
9. Sustain and enhance arts and cultural institutions in station areas and centers to foster an active and vibrant community life.
10. Design station area communities to provide an improved environment for walking and bicycling.
11. Incorporate provisions addressing health and well-being into corri-

dor-wide and local planning and decision-making processes.

12. Support uses that enhance the food system along the corridor, both production and delivery.

Implementation Actions

Targets Methodology

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should develop a corridor-wide approach to setting housing and job targets in transit communities, including targets for affordable housing.

Timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Track and Evaluate Development

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should develop a process to study, track and evaluate growth and development occurring along the Gold Corridor in terms of meeting the goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

Timeframe: short-term (1-2)

Buildable Lands Methodology

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should develop methods for data collections and analysis of buildable lands. This task will help with evaluating opportunities for infill and redevelopment, as well as to

assess the sufficiency of plans, regulations, and land use designations in accommodating growth needs along the corridor according to the goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy. The task will include an identification of underused lands (such as brownfields and greyfields) for future redevelopment or reuse.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Establish Minimum Densities

Local jurisdictions should establish minimum densities in station areas that support frequent high-capacity transit service. They shall also revise minimum lot size and maximum densities where they preclude affordable housing.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Station Area Plan

Each jurisdiction with a transit station area should develop a transit community plan for the station subarea. The subarea plan should be a complete and integrated document that addresses all aspects of station area development, including areas of economic importance, land use and zoning opportunities, and areas where land use could help foster affordable housing development.

timeframe: mid-range mid-range (3-5 years)

Compatible Land Use

Each jurisdiction should review its classification of industrial land uses to determine compatibility with less intense land uses, including residential. Establish mechanisms that support industrial-mixed uses, where appropriate.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Streamline Regulations for Development within Station Areas

Local jurisdictions should revise zoning and development regulations with their station area(s) to ensure consistency with the station area plan. The regulations themselves,

along with the development review process, should be streamlined to prioritize development within transit communities.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)*

*concurrent with or sequential to subarea plan update

Industrial Lands – Inventory and Strategy

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, along with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should conduct an inventory of industrial lands within the corridor. The inventory should be supplemented with a corridor-wide strategy for industrial uses.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Food Supply

Local jurisdictions, in partnership with food producers and suppliers, should identify opportunities and areas to grow, produce, and sell fresh and healthy food within the corridor. Opportunities can include community gardens, farmers' markets, and retail grocers.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Measures

Implementation

Has the corridor developed complete communities around transit stations?

Measure: Number of permits within transit communities by use

Have targets been set for housing and jobs? Have targets been set for affordable housing?

Measure: Adopted local housing unit targets and job targets

Performance

Outcome: Development occurring through infill and redevelopment.

Measure: Number of vacant or underutilized parcels is decreasing

Outcome: Development is at density levels that support transit.

Measure: Minimum transit-supportive densities have been established

Outcome: Developers constructing in station areas are able to expedite their projects.

Measure: Streamline planning policies and regulations

Outcome: Land uses are compatible.

Measure: Subarea plans, zoning, and land use

Outcome: Residents have access to healthy food.

Measure: Number of providers of food goods

Housing.

Goal: The housing stock will be preserved, improved, and expanded to provide a range of housing types and choices to all people. An adequate supply of housing within transit station areas and adjacent communities, with good access to jobs and services, will be provided to support job creation and economic growth.

Economy Goal to Support Housing: The Gold Corridor's economy prospers through the creation of great central places, complete communities, and high quality of life that integrates transportation, the economy, and the environment.

Policies

1. Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups, in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and provides opportunities to live in proximity to work.
2. Achieve and sustain – through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development – a sufficient supply of housing within the corridor to meet the needs of low-income, moderate-income, middle-income, and special needs individuals and households.
3. Identify funding sources for maintaining, updating, and constructing affordable housing in station areas, including interjurisdictional programs and public-private partnerships.

4. Create incentives for creating affordable housing in station areas, including fee-reduction programs. Allow Accessory Dwelling Units to qualify for funding.
5. Include a percentage of affordable units in new housing development projects in station areas, especially those receiving funds through housing and/or urban renewal authorities.
6. Work with residents of mobile and/or manufactured home parks to explore preservation and improvements.

Housing and Job Policies

7. Concentrate a significant amount of economic growth in station areas and centers and connect them to each other in order to promote economic opportunity.
8. Use incentives and investments to create a closer balance between jobs and housing.

Implementation Actions

Housing Strategy for Transit Communities

Each jurisdiction should develop a housing strategy for its transit station area(s). (The strategy may be a component of the jurisdiction's station area plan.) The strategy should include a housing needs assessment, and address housing diversity, housing affordability, retention and rehabilitation, special needs housing, workforce housing, and innovative techniques. Prioritize housing development at opportunity sites identified in the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Identify Funding Sources for Affordable Housing

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions within the Gold Corridor, along with local housing agencies and authorities, non-governmental organizations, and housing advocacy groups, should determine a mechanism for identifying and leveraging funding for the development of affordable housing within the Gold Corridor. Sources could include federal and state grants, public and private financing programs, private activity bonds, and newly created regional and local funding efforts.

timeframe: short term (1-2 years)

Housing Toolkit

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should develop a program to encourage best housing practices, including affordable housing, by providing and maintaining a toolkit. The toolkit should provide model housing provisions for subarea plans and development regulations, as well as strategies for meeting housing goals and targets.

timeframe: 2015*

***The Toolkit is a product of this Strategy.**

Fee Reduction

The creation of affordable housing could be supported through incentives, such as reduced permit fee programs.
timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Identify a Proportion of New Housing Units as Affordable

Local jurisdictions shall develop provisions to establish a required proportion of new housing units in housing development projects at station areas to be affordable. During strong housing markets, or in areas that are of high demand, such as in TODs, developers often are able to include some portion of affordable units and cover their costs. However, it may be necessary to pair this policy with policies and tools that help developers to include affordability and maintain a profit, such as density bonuses, subsidy, tax abatements, low-cost loans, TIF subsidy, fee waivers, etc.
timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Corridor Economic Strategy

Counties and their municipalities, economic development agencies, and employment partners should develop an economic development strategy for the Gold Corridor.
timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Jobs-Housing Balance

Local jurisdictions, in collaboration with regional and corridor-wide economic efforts, through their economic development programs, should take steps to retain existing jobs and establish of new employment opportunities in station area and centers.
timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)*

***Could be addressed as part of the housing and jobs targeting process – see action.**

Retrofit Commercial Corridors for Housing

Development in the corridor's commercial areas is in low density often 1-story buildings surrounded by parking. During the timeframe of this study (2015-2030)¹, many of these buildings will be prime for redevelopment. Rezoning these areas now to allow for mixed-use, higher densities, and lower parking requirements will allow them to be developed as affordable housing in the near future.
timeframe: mid-term (3-5 years)

Accessory Dwelling Units

Data suggests ADUs could offer affordable housing, but they require additional policy and technical assistance. First, Jurisdictions along the corridor should permit their creation by adapting their zoning code. The State Department of Housing, DRCOG, and jurisdictions could support their development through outreach and data collection on homeowners who have or are considering ADUs; design assistance through pre-approved architectural plans appropriate to the local contexts; technical assistance for development approval; and financial support such as grants, low or no interest loans, tax breaks, or loan backing.

Home Purchase Programs

Jurisdictions can assist interested homebuyers through establishing, encouraging, and promoting home purchase programs, such as employer assisted mortgages (EAMs), downpayment assistance from the state, and other low-cost mortgage assistance programs. Downpayment assistance is offered by the Department of Housing (DOH)

¹ Using estimates from the Energy Information Administration's periodic Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey, Nelson (2012) estimates the average life of a one- or two-story commercial structure is about 40 years.

and generally takes the form of a deferred mortgage loan. CHFA offers a variety of mortgage programs to all buyers, with some specifically geared toward first-time homebuyers. Jurisdictions should consider using some of their CDBG, HOME or other funds to support local home purchase programs. They should also help to actively promote the programs from the State and other sources by working with local realtors, non-profits, and neighborhood groups.

Home Rehab Programs

Home repair programs can be an excellent way to improve conditions using existing housing stock. Englewood supported a home repair loan program with its county CDBG funds until recently. Preservation compacts, such as the Cook County Preservation Compact in Illinois and the Ohio Compact can be an effective model. Jurisdictions should work with Enterprise Community Partners, Urban Land Conservancy, Mile High Connects, Piton, CHFA, DOH, and the County Housing Authorities to participate in the development of the region's Early Warning System.

Measures

Implementation

Has the corridor developed a coordinated program for housing?

Measure: Existence of a coordinating mechanism and housing strategy.

Performance

Outcome: Housing is located in a manner consistent with the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

Measure: Distribution of issued housing permits within the corridor, in order to assess jobs-and-housing balance and other issues.

Outcome: Housing in the corridor is meeting residents' needs

Measure: Supply and distribution of ownership and rental housing units at all income levels and for all types, including ADUS; affordable housing availability by amount and location; review of housing provisions in local subarea plans; reporting on success and challenges; amount of loans given for home repair; and number of housing units purchased by income-qualifying households in the homebuyer assistance programs

Outcome: There are ample employment choices offering a variety of jobs, including family-waged jobs.

Measure: Number of jobs and real wages per worker by employment/industry categories by station area, jurisdiction, and corridor. Unemployment rates at subarea.

Mobility and Accessibility.

Goal: The Gold Corridor will have clean, seamless, and highly efficient multimodal transportation that supports housing and jobs in transit communities, promotes economic and environmental vitality, and contributes to better public health.

Policies

Coordinate state, regional, and local transportation planning efforts in the corridor to evolve and operate a highly efficient, integrated multimodal system that supports the mobility and accessibility needs of all users. Ensure mobility choices for people with special transportation needs, including persons with disabilities, the

elderly, the young, and low-income populations. Assess, design, construct, and operate transportation facilities to serve all users safely and conveniently, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. Improve local street patterns – including their design and how they are used – for walking, bicycling, and transit use to enhance communities, connectivity, and physical activity.

9. Increase the proportion of trips made by transportation modes that are alternatives to driving alone.
10. Prioritize investments in transportation facilities and services that support pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented densities and development within station areas.
11. Recognize and give local and regional funding priority to transportation facilities, infrastructure, and services that explicitly advance the development of housing in station areas and centers. Give additional priority to projects and services that advance affordable housing.
12. Improve connectivity between the station area and adjacent communities and neighborhoods, including providing continuous bicycle and sidewalk connections, as well as circulator buses between well-traveled destinations not served by local or regional fixed routes

Transportation and Urban Design

13. Promote coordination among transportation providers, local governments, and developers to ensure that joint- and mixed-use developments are designed in a way that improves overall mobility and accessibility to and within such development.
14. Apply urban design principles and context-sensitive design guidelines to transportation programs and projects for station areas and centers.

Implementation Actions

Corridor Transportation Systems Plan

DRCOG, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, in partnership with the Regional Transportation District, the Colorado Department of Transportation, other transportation providers, and transportation interest groups should develop an integrated, holistic, multimodal transportation plan for the north metro subarea that includes the Gold Corridor. The transportation plan should address safety, transportation choices, commute trip reduction, mobility and needs for all people, freight and goods movement, first and last mile connections to station areas, alternative energy and clean transportation, context-sensitive design, and low-impact development practices. The plan should also address improved connectivity to station areas and explore the need for more frequent bus service within the corridor. (Note: This plan could be incorporated in the above-recommended Corridor-Wide Infrastructure Master Plan.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Mode Split Goals for Station Areas

Each jurisdiction with a transit station area shall establish mode split goals for the transit community.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

with a greater share of trips by non-auto means, transit boardings increase at a greater rate than the population growth, vehicle miles traveled within the corridor, measured through road counts, do not grow at the same rate as population growth.

Outcome: Station areas have a complete network of streets, sidewalks, and bikeways.

Measure: Evaluation of transportation network in each station area

Transportation Funding Sources

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor, should investigate existing and new sources of funding for transportation programs and services to assist with developing transportation facilities to support transit communities and the goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Measures

Implementation

What types of transportation investments are being made in the corridor and where? How much is being invested in which locations, and for what types of projects?

Is the transportation network in the corridor evolving into a multimodal system focusing on connectivity to station areas?

Measure: Denver Regional Council of Governments project priorities, funded projects, completed projects.

Performance

Outcome: The Corridor's residents have a variety of transportation choices and improved mobility.

Measure: Travel mode splits become more diverse

Environment.

Goal: The Gold Corridor will care for the environment by protecting and restoring natural systems, conserving habitat, improving water quality, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants, and addressing potential climate change impacts.

Policies

1. Improve air and water quality, soils, and natural systems to ensure the health and well-being of people, animals, and plants.
2. Ensure that all residents, regardless of social or economic status, live in a healthy environment, with minimal exposure to pollution and contaminants.
3. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.
4. Support and provide incentives to increase the percentage of new development and redevelopment – both public and private – to be built at higher performing energy and environmental standards.

Contaminated Soils

5. Identify and evaluate contaminated soils within the corridor. Determine level of effort required for clean-up for redevelopment and/or use.

Brownfields and Greyfields

6. Support the transformation of key underutilized lands, such as brownfields and greyfields, to higher density, mixed-use areas to complement the development of centers and the enhancement of existing neighborhoods.

Water Quality

7. Maintain natural hydrological functions within ecosystems and watersheds and, where feasible, restore them to a more naturally functioning state.
8. Promote improved conservation and more efficient use of water, as well as the increased use of reclaimed water, to reduce wastewater generation and ensure water availability.

Open Space

9. Identify, preserve, and enhance significant open space networks and linkages across jurisdictional boundaries.
10. Designate, protect, and enhance significant open spaces, natural resources, and critical areas
11. Take positive actions to reduce carbon, such as increasing vegetation along the corridor.

Implementation Actions

Corridor Environmental Assessment and Strategy

Counties and their municipalities, environmental agencies, and environmental groups should collaborate in a comprehensive assessment of environmental issues within the corridor. An outcome of the assessment should be a strategic plan for addressing restoration and clean-up, critical areas and habitat protection, and water quality with goals, prioritization, implementation, and monitoring.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Contaminated Lands Assessment

Identify contaminated lands within the corridor to determine clean-up requirements and potential development opportunities. Focus on those sites in station areas that complement the development of affordable housing with other housing services, and to improve existing neighborhoods.

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Corridor Green Space Planning

Counties and their municipalities, open-space organizations and interest groups should develop a corridor-wide green space strategic plan. As a component, the strategy should address corridor trail development. (Note: This plan could be incorporated in the Corridor-Wide Infrastructure Master Plan called for under the General Policies actions above.)

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Measures

Outcome: Natural systems are cleaner and functionally restored.

Measure: Monitor designated restoration areas for improved native vegetation and increased biodiversity. Improved natural vegetation in identified restoration areas.

source: <http://cwmi.css.cornell.edu/sourcesandimpacts.pdf>

Outcome: Water quality is improved.

Measure: Test nearby water sources, such as Clear Creek, for appropriate levels of turbidity, PH, dissolved oxygen, hardness, suspended sediment, etc.

source: <http://water.usgs.gov/edu/waterquality.html>

Outcome: Air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced.

Measure: Track local transit and bike ridership for increases in alternative travel modes. Also monitor traffic counts around station areas and vehicle ownership for residents in proximity to the station. Track local transit and bike ridership, monitor traffic counts around station areas and vehicle ownership in new developments.

Outcome: Increased access to green spaces and recreation.

Measure: Meet benchmark goals for additional green space and recreation areas identified in a locality's comprehensive plan or the nationally recognized standards. Some national standards recommend 2 acres of Neighborhood Parks and 6.5 acres of Community Parks per 1000 persons.

source: NRPA amounts and USDA amounts

Other Services.

Goal: The Gold Corridor will support development with adequate public facilities and services in a coordinated, efficient, and cost-effective manner that supports local and regional planning objectives.

Policies

1. Time and phase services and facilities to guide growth and development in a manner that supports the affordable housing strategy.
2. Site or expand public facilities in a manner that (1) reduces adverse social, environmental, and economic impacts, (2) equitably balances the location of new facilities, and (3) addresses corridor-wide and station area planning objectives.
3. Design public infrastructure and facilities that contribute to a sense of community and a sense of place.

Implementation Actions

Coordinated Planning for Infrastructure

The Denver Regional Council of Governments, together with its member jurisdictions in the Gold Corridor, along with special service districts in the north metro area, and community groups should develop an integrated infrastructure plan for surface water management, sewer and

water provision, and other services. (Note: This plan could be incorporated in the Corridor-Wide Infrastructure Master Plan called for under the General Policies actions above.)

timeframe: mid-range (3-5 years)

Special Service District Planning

Counties and their cities should work with special service districts, including school districts, to provide guidance for facilities and services planning to ensure that districts develop long-range plans that implement the goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Facilities Siting and Design

Local jurisdictions and special service districts should establish siting and design criteria for public facilities to ensure that goals and policies of the Gold Corridor Housing Strategy are addressed.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Facilities Location

Local jurisdictions and special service districts should collaborate to identify opportunities to co-locate facilities and services, such as workforce training centers and libraries.

timeframe: short-term (1-2 years)

Measures

Implementation

Are special service districts' plans aligned with local jurisdictions' strategies for station areas along the Gold Corridor?

Measure: Up-to-date long range plans for special districts consistent with local station areas plans

Performance

Outcome: Station areas have adequate infrastructure and facilities to serve new residents and jobs.

Measure: inventory of public facilities and services

Appendix A.

Background details for Existing Conditions

Table 11. Percentage of Households by Income & Half-Mile Station Areas (2005-2009)

Income Levels	Transit Shed	41st & Fox	Pecos	Federal	Sheridan	Olde Town	Ridge	Ward
Less than \$25,000	28%	47%	39%	35%	19%	28%	17%	13%
\$25,000-\$50,000	34%	36%	40%	36%	30%	35%	35%	27%
\$50,000-\$75,000	15%	5%	13%	16%	16%	19%	22%	15%
Over \$75,000	22%	12%	8%	13%	35%	17%	26%	45%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% earning <4-person 100% of AMI (\$76,700)	78%	88%	92%	87%	65%	83%	74%	55%
% earning <2-person 80% of AMI (\$49,100)	61%	83%	52%	71%	64%	78%	48%	40%
TOTAL Households	5,715	914	1,132	468	1,600	224	805	572

Source: American Community Survey, 2005-2009 ACS aggregated from the block group to the half mile station areas, retrieved from www.toddata.org.

Figure 7.
Adams County housing building permits for single-family and multi-family units (1997-2013)




Figure 8.
Jefferson County housing building permits for single-family and multi-family units




Table 12. Station area population in 2030 by 5-year age cohorts

Age Groups	41st Avenue	Arvada Ridge	Federal	Olde Town	Pecos	Sheridan	Ward Rd	Total	Total %
0-4	812	147	79	225	4	87	43	1,398	6%
5-9	924	156	77	273	4	90	41	1,565	7%
10-14	993	176	77	340	4	91	39	1,719	7%
15-19	1,034	194	78	378	4	90	38	1,817	8%
20-24	561	173	96	253	5	75	37	1,200	5%
25-29	511	142	79	231	3	81	55	1,102	5%
30-34	488	149	91	177	6	100	53	1,063	4%
35-39	712	165	81	208	5	107	55	1,333	6%
40-44	821	180	82	439	4	93	33	1,653	7%
45-49	785	258	81	540	3	94	49	1,811	8%
50-54	631	252	102	360	6	105	46	1,502	6%
55-59	542	200	98	326	9	99	38	1,313	6%
60-64	472	179	91	266	7	92	46	1,153	5%
65-69	493	205	83	266	4	99	76	1,226	5%
70-74	428	191	75	266	5	92	60	1,116	5%
75-79	431	159	59	211	2	80	76	1,018	4%
80-84	314	100	58	187	4	74	75	811	3%
85+	413	129	58	203	6	79	137	1,025	4%
	11,366	3,156	1,446	5,148	85	1,629	996	23,826	100%

Figure 9. Station area population in 2030 by 5-year age cohorts




Table 13. Five-year pipeline estimate of multi-family unit projects along the Gold Corridor

Station	Development	Potential or Actual Units	Estimated Delivery
41st & Fox	Villas at Regency	360	2014
Arvada Ridge	multiple	378	2013
Arvada Ridge	Proposed redevelopment of RTD Parking lot	150	N/AV
Federal	The TOD Group, Clear Creek Transit Village (Federal & 63rd)	998	2018
Olde Town	Park Place at Olde Town (RTD parking lot redevelopment)	152	N/AV
Olde Town	Solana Olde Town development, MKS Residential, LLC	352	2016
Olde Town	Trammel Crowe, 9-acre site at the Transit Hub	280	2016
Ward	Proposed (units are approximate based on site characteristics)	200	N/AV
41st & Fox	Denver Post redevelopment	643	N/AV
Total Estimate		3513	

Existing Conditions: Plan Analysis

Table 14. Summary of Analysis of Planning Documents from Jurisdictions along the Gold Corridor

Jurisdiction	Document Name	Description of Document
Denver	41st and Fox Station Area Plan - Vision and Goals - 2009	This station area plan was prepared by the City of Denver to guide future land use and infrastructure decisions to foster transit oriented development at the 41st and Fox Station area. The plan articulates the vision and goals, examines opportunities and constraints, analyzes alternative concepts for land use, and provides recommendations for implementing the preferred land use, urban design, and circulation concepts.
	Denver Department of Human Services community Services Block Grant Needs Assessment: Report of Findings October 2012	The Denver Department of Human Services (DHS) conducted a community needs assessment to evaluate current, unmet and future needs for education, emergency services, employment, health, housing, income management, linkages, nutrition and self-sufficiency. This report summarizes the findings that will help inform decision makers in development and improvement of community services that reflect the needs, interests, and priorities of community member.
Wheat Ridge	Envision Wheat Ridge: A Plan for a Bright Future - Comprehensive Plan -2009	The Wheat Ridge Comprehensive Plan is the blueprint for the future of the city. This document provides guidance on where the community will invest and change over the next 20 years. There are goals and policies that address land use, economics, transportation and community services.
	Wheat Ridge Northwest Subarea Plan 2006 (amended 2013)	The Wheat Ridge Northwest Subarea Plan details potential
City of Arvada	Arvada Station Area Plan - 2007	This Plan addresses the opportunities at the proposed Olde Town, Kipling and Sheridan stations. Arvada planners listened to public opinion about its desires and needs for the community, and developed land use and transportation concepts that apply Transit Oriented Development (TOD) principles by creating mixed-use, compact walkable development near the stations. Arvada's Stations are very different places, and how TOD is planned at the stations reflects those differences
	Arvada Comprehensive Plan - 2014	This Comprehensive Plan articulates Arvada's shared values and vision for the future. Goals and policies help guide development and investment decisions that have a direct bearing on the quality of life in Arvada. The Comprehensive plan covers land use, commercial and economic development, historic preservation, community design and character, transportation, neighborhoods and housing, parks and open space, education/culture/human resources, city services/facilities, and resource conservation/environment.

Jurisdiction	Document Name	Description of Document
City of Arvada	Findings and Recommendations for a Housing Investment Fund Using Recycled City of Arvada Housing and Community Development Loan Payments - 2012	This study documents research to determine the need for various affordable housing programs in Arvada. In addition, this research concludes with recommendations on how local funds could be more effectively managed to address the broad range of housing and community needs in the City.
	City of Arvada Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (2015-2019) - 2014	Through citizen participation, Arvada decides where housing and community development funds may be spent and what actions are appropriate and reasonable for the development process of the Consolidated Strategy and plan Submission for Housing and Community Development Programs. This plan identifies the objectives and outcomes in the Plan Needs Assessment, evaluates past performance, and summarizes citizen participation processes and documents public comments.
	City of Arvada Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice - 2012	This analysis was conducted to provide a summary of demographic and housing profiles, fair lending review, community input, review of public and private practices, and understand impediments and fair housing action plan.
Jefferson County	Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan - 2013	This housing element of the Comprehensive Plan was prepared to assess future needs for housing in Jefferson County. Using existing residential patterns, demographic trends, and projected population growth, the County identified needs, policies and recommendations for safe, affordable and decent housing options for County residents.
	Jefferson County Community Development Plan 5 Year Strategic Plan- 2010 - 2015	This Plan was prepared to analyze the needs within the Urban County (Edgewater, Golden and Wheat Ridge, Lakeside and Mountain View and Unincorporated Jefferson County) and to determine the goals, objectives and priorities for the next five years.
	Analysis of impediments of Fair Housing Choice (prepared for City of Arvada, City of Lakewood and Jefferson County) -2012	In 2012 the Cities of Lakewood, Arvada, and Jefferson County completed an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice to review fair housing barriers in a city or county. This analysis is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a condition for receiving federal housing and community development block grant funding.

Jurisdiction	Document Name	Description of Document
Adams County	Adams County Transit Oriented Development and Rail Station Area Planning Guidelines (Jan 2007)	In anticipation of the arrival of improved transit from RTD's FasTrack Plan, the Adams County Planning and Development Department prepared these guidelines and policies to update the Transportation Plan and the Adams county Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the guidelines is to outline a strategy for developing TOD projects near rail stations that will be constructed by RTD.
	Balanced Housing Plan Adams County, Colorado-May 2009	Adams County prepared this balanced housing plan to answer two questions. What will the County housing growth look like in the future? What should the County do? To begin answering these questions, the County declares that there are currently two distinct gaps in housing provision in Adams County: 1) The county lacks affordable rental housing for its lowest income renters; 2) The county has very few homes priced to serve high-income residents (earning more than \$100,000).
	Imagine Adams County: Comprehensive Plan Adopted Dec 2012	The Adams County Comprehensive Plan establishes goals, policies, and strategies for implementing the County's objectives for future development within unincorporated areas of the County and in municipal growth areas.
	Adams County Clear Creek Valley TOD Plan of 2009.	Adams County prepared this plan for the two transit stations planned for Southwest Adams County – Clear Creek at Federal station, and Pecos Junction station. The plan presents planning principles, describes the existing framework/setting, considers development viability, and provides implementation strategies.
	The Federal Boulevard Framework Plan – A Long Range Vision for the Corridor within Unincorporated Adams County -2014	This framework plan was prepared to provide an understanding of the existing conditions and explore future opportunities that could materialize with the 2016 opening of two new commuter rail transit lines in unincorporated Adams County. Existing conditions, issues, and opportunities to guide efforts for a corridor master plan, were addressed in this conceptual plan.
	The Southwest Adams County Framework Plan-2005	This framework plan was prepared by Adams County to outline future planning and redevelopment efforts in the southwest part of the county. Included is an inventory of current conditions and needed improvements in the area. The plan will serve as a guiding document for the process and players involved in revitalizing and redeveloping this part of the county.

Appendix B.

Site Opportunity Details

The following table provide the detailed analysis for each of the potential sites in section III according to the following fields.

Station Name	Access: Transit
Studio Site Number	Zoning
Site Location	Within URA?
Environmental Contamination: Type and Extent	Recommended Use (mixed-use, mixed-income, senior, family, etc)
Jurisdiction	Mixed Use: Y/N
Amenities	Site Density Justification (18du, 21du, or 25du and why)
Surrounding Character and Density	Site Acreage
Near Major Roads?	Reduced by developable area
Current Ownership	Acres used for affordable housing
Likelihood and Expected Timeline of Acquisition	Number of potential units
Access: Auto	Number of recommended affordable housing units
Access: Bicycle	
Access: Bike Share	
Access: Pedestrian	

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
41st & Fox #1	43rd and Cherokee St.	Denver	5 homes on site	4 Private Owners, 1 Public Owner	General Industrial	No	Potential air and sound condition concerns due to proximity to I-25; previous industrial uses	Has some commercial amenities, but lacks grocery store/ fresh food	Mix of single family, multi-family, commercial, and industrial.	Good access to the station, but some barriers exist to major roads. Close to I-25 and minor arterial 44th St.	0.3 miles from station, sharrow on 44th/46th giving access east	0.3 miles- Lacks sidewalks, but otherwise well connected to station	Three blocks from station, bus stop directly in front of site (bus line 8)	multifamily affordable apartments	N	35 du/acre. Dense Regency Student Housing already in the area.	2.0	1.4	1.4	47.8	47.8
41st & Fox #2	Washington St. and Ringsby Ct.	Denver	Warehouse	1 Private Owner	Heavy Industrial	No	Potential air and sound condition concerns due to proximity to I-25 and I-70; previous industrial uses	Has some commercial amenities, but lacks grocery store/ fresh food and childcare	Major barriers to the west (and to the station) from I-70/ I-25, Platte River and freight rail. Close to Platte River trail and Globeville Landing Park.	1.3 miles to station. Major barriers to the west (and to the station) from I-70/ I-25. Located on major road 38th Ave.	1.3 mile bike route over 45th St overpass which has a sharrow	1.3 mile walking route, must go over 45th St overpass which has limited shoulder and no sidewalks. Currently unsafe.	Close to bus stop, (bus line 12)	multi-family apartments	N	25 du/acre. Proximity to downtown and changing RiNo	6.5	4.5	4.5	113.6	113.6
41st & Fox #3	29th St. and Brighton Blvd	Denver	Warehouse	1 Private Owner	Heavy Industrial	No	N/A	Has some commercial amenities, but lacks grocery store/ fresh food and childcare. Close to downtown and new Denargo Market Place.	Major barriers to the west (and to the station) from I-25 and freight rail. Located on major roads Brighton Blvd. and Broadway	1.8 miles from the station by car (freight rail, river, and interstate form major barriers)	1.5 miles from the station by bike (uses trail)	1.5 miles from the station on foot- inconsistent sidewalks	Bus stop directly adjacent to parcel (bus line 48)	multi-family apartments	N	25du or higher. Proximity to downtown.	5.6	3.9	3.9	98.5	98.5
41st & Fox #4	30th Ave. and Fox St.	Denver	Parking	1 Private Owner, 1 Public Owner	PUD General Mixed-Use	No	Moderate: prior industrial use, but approved remediation measures.	Close to City of Cuernavaca Park. Close to downtown. Some barriers to accessing other amenities.	Surrounded by new multi-use development and Rockies Stadium.	1.1 miles from the station. Street connections to downtown and interstate. Located on major roads Park Ave and Fox St/23rd.	1.1 miles from station, however, high traffic streets make biking potentially unsafe	1.1 miles from station on foot along high traffic areas, primarily has sidewalks available.	Bus and rail access, close to downtown connections- only 0.8 miles from Union Station	mixed-use- 1/3 affordable housing	Y	25du or higher, proximity to downtown.	1.7	1.2	0.4	40.9	13.5
41st & Fox TOTAL																	15.7	11.0	10.2	300.8	273.4
Pecos #1 (CCF#5)	56th Ave and Pecos St	Adams County	Vacant land and industrial building	1 Private Owner	Industrial	No	Possible contamination concerns	Lacks most basic amenities	residential to the southwest, with industrial uses to the north and east.	Fairly good, but barriers to the east. Located on Pecos St.	0.6 miles along Pecos- lacks bike infrastructure	0.6 miles to station along Pecos- lacks pedestrian infrastructure	Fairly good, on 6 Bus Line, headways 30min	Possibly mixed use, with commercial/offices	Y	May not be housing appropriate	48.5	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
PECOS TOTAL																	48.5	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Federal #1	64th Ave and Irving St	Adams County	Mobile Home Park	4 Private Owners	Residential	No	N/A	Clear Creek trail. Lacks grocery store.	Directly surrounding the site is a residential neighborhood with primarily single family homes. The Aloha Beach neighborhood is located to the south, with some commercial and light industrial storage uses.	0.8 miles to the station. Located near major road Federal Blvd with easy access to I-76.	1.1 miles, requires some time on Federal Boulevard, which is not an ideal biking environment.	0.8 miles to station, primarily along Federal Boulevard with fair conditions	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	Affordable townhomes	N	18 du/acre. Surrounding single family residences.	9.4	7.1	7.1	126.9	126.9
Federal #2	56th Ave and Federal Blvd	Adams County	Parking, storage, one residential home	3 Private Owners, 1 Public Owner	Industrial	No	N/A	Clear Creek trail and school. Lacks grocery store.	Primarily residential uses with some commercial and industrial uses. Backs up to Clear Creek Trail.	0.5 miles to the station. Located on major road Federal Blvd.	0.5 miles on Federal with underpass of I-76, or much longer Clear Creek Trail option.	0.5 miles to station. Fair- requires underpass of interstate on Federal Blvd.	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	Affordable townhomes, possibly mixed income	N	18 du/acre. Surrounding single family residences.	24.5	18.4	18.4	330.8	330.8
Federal #3	62nd Ave and Beach Ct	Adams County	Storage facility	3 Private Owners	PUD, industrial, commercial	No	N/A	Clear Creek trail and school. Lacks grocery store.	Underutilized commercial/ industrial with residential to the north and west.	0.7 miles to station. Easy access to major road Federal Blvd down 62nd and to I-76.	0.7 miles to station. Could have scenic and direct Clear Creek trail route if punch through access is created.	0.7 miles to station. Could have scenic and direct Clear Creek trail route if punch through access is created.	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	Multifamily affordable housing	N	21 du/acre. Currently low density, but potential for changing character.	14.1	10.6	10.6	222.1	222.1
Federal #4	66th and Federal Blvd	Adams County	Unused parking lot	1 Private Owner	Residential and Commercial	No	N/A	Some commercial uses nearby, but lacks grocery store	Surrounded primarily by residential, but with some commercial uses.	0.8 miles to station. Located on major road Federal Blvd. with easy access I-76.	0.8 milesto station along Federal Blvd- not ideal bike route	0.8 miles to station. Fair-walking route along Federal Boulevard.	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	Multifamily affordable housing	N	21 du/acre. Currently low density, but potential for changing character.	2.4	1.8	1.8	37.8	37.8

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
Federal #5 (see Pecos)															X						
Federal #6	56th Ave and Federal Blvd (SE)	Adams County	Commercial parking lot	2 private owners	Commerical and Residential	No	N/A	Some commercial uses nearby, but lacks grocery store	Surrounded primarily by residential. Mobile home park to the west.	0.5 miles to station. Located on major road Federal Blvd. with easy access to I-76.	0.5 miles on Fed. Blvd- not ideal bike route	0.5 miles to station. Fair- walking route along Federal Boulevard.	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	Affordable townhomes, lower density apartments	N	18 du/acre. Single family homes nearby.	7.5	5.6	5.6	101.3	101.3
Federal #7	58th Ave and Hooker St	Adams County	Vacant land, storage, one mobile home residence	7 owners	Industrial	No	Low: Potential floodplain issues	Clear Creek Trail and lake.	Primarily industrial/ commercial, some nearby residential.	0.3 miles to station. Located near major road Federal Blvd with easy access to I-76.	0.3 miles, partially on Federal. Could have Clear Creek Trail direct route if access was opened around hooker St.	0.3 miles to station. Fairly good route that utilizes underpass on federal.	Good- 31 Federal Boulevard Bus- The headway for the route is fifteen minutes during peak hours during weekdays and thirty minutes	1/2 affordable housing and 1/2 mixed use	Y	18-21 du/acre. Primarily industrial area, but potential for change in character over time.	18.2	13.7	6.8	143.3	143.3
Federal #8	64th Ave and Beach St	Adams County	Vacant land, industrial ownership	2 Private Owners	PUD, residential	No	N/A	Clear Creek Trail and lake.	Industrial and residential, with some commercial nearby. Close to new industrial development.	1 mile to station. Located close to major roads Federal Blvd. and Pecos St.	Approx. 1 mile to station with choice of street or trail.	Approx. 1 mile to station. Good- Choice of street or trail.	Good- access to 31 Federal Boulevard Bus. Also, Bus 6 on Pecos St. 1.3 miles from the Pecos Station.	1/2 affordable housing, 1/2 commercial use	Y	18-21 du/acre. Primarily industrial area, but potential for change in character over time.	8.9	6.7	3.3	70.1	70.1
FEDERAL TOTAL																	85.0	63.8	53.6	1032.2	1032.2
Sheridan #1	Wellington Pkwy & Ames St	Arvada	single-family residential- one house on south side of site	2 Private Owners	Low Density Residential, Commercial	No	N/A	2 parks, some schools, and a grocery store somewhat nearby	single-family residential and commercial, including a storage facility.	0.4 miles from the station. Near major road Sheridan Blvd with easy access to 76.	0.4 miles to station. No infrastructure, have to take busy Sheridan. Proposed path to the south on 60th	0.4 miles to station along 60th and Zenobia. 60th does have a sidewalk, but Zenobia does not, leaving pedestrians to walk in parking lots	Sheridan route (51) running north-south has a bus stop at 60th and Sheridan about 0.1 miles away. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	whole site for multi-family affordable apartments	N	21 du/acre. Proximity to station but surrounded by single-family homes and low-density business.	2.5	1.9	1.9	39.8	39.8
Sheridan #2	Sheridan Blvd & 66th Ave	Arvada	abandoned barn, empty land	1 Private Owner	Professional Office	No	N/A	Two daycares nearby, movie theatre, near Westminster High School	tightly-packed SF homes to north, large commercial building directly south, surrounding area is mostly SF neighborhoods. Located on major road Sheridan Blvd.	1 mile from station, easy access down Sheridan, and to 76.	1 mile to station, have to take busy Sheridan. Sometimes a wide path, but varies significantly.	1 mile walk down Sheridan, sidewalk conditions vary immensely, then Zenobia through parking lot or 60th which is out of the way	Two bus stops for Sheridan route (51) running north-south located on eastern edge of site. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	whole site for multi-family affordable apartments	N	25 du/acre, Adjacent to major road and large-scale commercial.	1.6	1.2	1.2	29.6	29.6
Sheridan #3	Sheridan Blvd & 60th Ave, Station Area	Arvada	Commercial	1 Private Owner, 1 Public Owner	Industrial	No	N/A	near grocery store and Early College of Arvada, fairly close to two parks	row of SF homes to north, surrounded by industrial looking business. Located near major road Sheridan Blvd	Station area, easy access to Sheridan and 76	Station area	Station area	Sheridan route (51) running north-south has two bus stops at northwest corner of site. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	mixed-use with multi-family apartments and commercial	N	35 du/acre. Station area.	8.9	6.6	2.2	232.3	77.4
Sheridan #4	60th Ave & Wolff St	Arvada	2 single-family homes and outbuildings	1 Private Owner	Low Density Residential	No	N/A	near Early College of Arvada, grocery store, fairly close to two parks, church,	in between church and the Early College of Arvada, very close to station (across road)	0.2 miles from station, easy access to Sheridan and 76	0.2 miles to station. Would take 60th (with sharrows) to Zenobia or a connection could be created through sites north of station.	0.2 miles to station. Good pedestrian infrastructure along W 60th Ave, but a pedestrian crossing would be needed	No bus runs directly past site, but Sheridan route 51 running north-south is located 0.2 miles away. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	small part of site available for affordable housing	Y	18 du/acre or lower. Church already on site.	3.2	2.4	0.8	43.3	14.4

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
Sheridan #5	Tennyson St & 61st Ave	Adams County	single-family residential	1 Private Owner	Residential/Commercial	No	Low: Potential floodplain issues	Tennyson Knolls Park and Jim Baker Reservoir, close to grocery store, easy to get to daycare	surrounded by single family neighborhoods and the Jim Baker Reservoir	1 mile to station, fairly easy access to Sheridan and 76.	1 mile to station along residential streets and then 60th with sharrow.	1 mile to station through neighborhood. Sidewalks exist along Tennyson, 61st, and Wolff	No bus runs past site. Bus stop for Sheridan route 51 is 0.5 miles away. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	affordable townhomes	N	18 du/acre. Surrounding SF residences.	5.5	4.1	4.1	73.6	73.6
Sheridan #6	Sheridan Blvd & Ralston Rd	Jefferson County	Industrial, storage yard, parking, bar	3 Private Owners, 2 Public Owners	Unavailable	No	N/A	near Home School Center, some health care facilities nearby	Surrounded by industrial uses.	0.6 miles to station. Located on major road Sheridan Blvd. with easy access to 76.	0.6 miles to station to station by bike. Protected path on Sheridan to lightly trafficked Zenobia.	0.6 miles to station to station. Protected path on Sheridan to lightly trafficked Zenobia.	Two bus stops for Sheridan route 51 running north-south located on eastern side of site. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	Light Industrial	N	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sheridan #7	Depew St & 60th Ave	Arvada	Vacant land	2 Private Owners	Industrial and Commercial	No	N/A	near grocery store and two parks	Office/Commercial to south, single-family residential to north.	0.6 miles to station. Located near major road Sheridan Blvd. with easy access to 76.	0.5 miles to station along 60th with sharrow to lightly trafficked Zenobia	0.5 miles to station. Sidewalk conditions vary along 60th.	No bus runs past site. Bus stop for Sheridan route 51 is 0.3 miles away	Light Industrial	N	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sheridan #8	Sheridan Blvd & 62nd Ave	Arvada	Office/Commercial	1 Private Owner	PUD-Business/Professional	No	N/A	close to two parks	large office building directly east, surrounded by single-family residential.	0.5 miles to station. Located on major road Sheridan Blvd. with easy access to 76	0.5 miles to station. Have to take heavily trafficked Sheridan Blvd.	0.5 miles to station. Have to take heavily trafficked Sheridan and sidewalk conditions vary.	Two bus stops for Sheridan route 51 running north-south on eastern side of site. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	Light Industrial/Commercial	Y	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sheridan #9	Sheridan Blvd & 58th Ave	Arvada	Commercial	1 Private Owner	Industrial	No	Low: Former solid waste landfill	hard to get to amenities within transit zone	Surrounded by industrial uses. Located near major road Sheridan Blvd.	0.8 miles to station, easy access to Sheridan and 76	0.6 miles to station. Protected path on Sheridan to lightly trafficked Zenobia.	0.6 miles to station. Protected path on Sheridan to lightly trafficked Zenobia. Have to take roundabout way depending on where you are on site	Two bus stops for Sheridan route 51 running north-south located on western side of site. Depending on where you are on the site, may be a long distance to walk. The headway for the route is 30 minutes during peak hours during weekdays and Saturdays and sixty minutes on Sundays and holidays.	Light Industrial/Commercial	N	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SHERIDAN TOTAL																	21.6	16.2	10.2	418.7	234.9
Olde Town #1 EPS	Grandview Ave & 121 (West)-RTD/City Opportunity Site	Arvada	Parking	1 Public Owner	PUD-Business Professional Residential	No	N/A	Many amenities are found in this station area	Just south of Olde Town BID.	Close to Wadsworth and I-70	have street access, but missing bike infrastructure	connected, but need to assure safe points to cross rail tracks and Grandview Blvd.	Multiple bus access	EPS-Mixed use, Trammell Crow is master developer	Y	21du/acre-Surrounding character and uses of area.	9.0	6.3	2.1	132.3	43.7
Olde Town #2 EPS	55th Ave and Vance St-Landmark Theater Site	Arvada	Landmark Theater	1 Private Owner	PUD-Business Professional Residential	No	N/A	Many amenities are found in this station area	Close to Olde Town BID, adjacent to proposed parking structure and station plaza.	Close to Wadsworth and I-70	have street access, but missing bike infrastructure	connected, but need to assure safe points to cross rail tracks and Grandview Blvd.	Multiple bus access-across the street from Arvada PnR	EPS-Mixed use	Y	25du/acre. Higher density TOD desired	9.9	6.9	2.3	173.3	57.2
Olde Town #3 EPS	W 55th Ave & Olde Wadsworth Blvd- Old Brooklyn's Bar Site-Near Watertower Village and Flats	Arvada	Former bar/restaurant	1 Public Owner	PUD-Business	Yes	N/A	Many amenities are found in this station area	Within Watertower Village and Flats- residential. Close to Olde Town mainstreet.	Close to Wadsworth and I-70	have street access, but missing bike infrastructure	connected, but need to assure safe points to cross rail tracks and Grandview Blvd.	Multiple bus access	EPS- Hotel. If this falls through, could be affordable housing site	N	21du/acre. Surrounding character and uses.	3.0	2.1	2.1	37.8	37.8

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
Olde Town #4 EPS	Grandview Ave & 121 (East) -Mini-storage Site	Arvada	Mini-storage facility	1 Private Owner	PUD-Business Professional Residential	No	N/A	Many amenities are found in this station area	Along Wadsworth has commercial feel, but also adjacent to residential neighborhood.	Close to Wadsworth and I-70	have street access, but missing bike infrastructure	connected, but need to assure safe points to cross rail tracks, Wadsworth Bypass, and Grandview Blvd.	Multiple bus access- close to Arvada PnR	Affordable housing or mixed income	N	25du/acre. Higher density TOD desired.	2.9	2.0	2.0	50.8	50.8
OLDE TOWN TOTAL																	24.8	17.4	8.5	394.1	189.4
Ridge #1	Kipling St & Ridge Rd	Arvada	Vacant land	1 Private Owner	Mixed-Use	Yes- Arvada	N/A	Close to Red Rocks Community College, shopping center including SuperTarget, Apex Recreation Center, health facilities	Between Red Rocks Community College and a major shopping center, directly across street from station.	0.1 miles to station. Easy access from Ridge Road to Kipling and major roads. No access directly off Kipling due to steep hill.	0.1 miles away- Directly across from station. Close to multi-use trail on Kipling. No infrastructure on Ridge Rd, but not heavily trafficked and would probably be safe to ride on.	0.1 miles away- Directly across from station. Access from multi-use path on Kipling to sidewalk on Ridge Rd. Sidewalk on Ridge needs maintenance.	Bus line 100 passes by this site and has two stops at the southwest corner. Site is too close to station to use for that purpose but route goes down Kipling.	Mixed-use with some commercial, due to surrounding character and proximity to station. Site is also quite large, lending itself to a variety of uses. Recommended 1/3 affordable housing.	Y	35 du/acre. Proximity to major roads, surrounding character and density, and proximity to station.	11.2	7.9	2.6	91.6	91.6
Ridge #2	Ridge Rd & Miller St	Wheat Ridge	Abandoned section of Wheat Ridge Regional Disability Development Center	1 Public Owner	Agricultural	Yes- Wheat Ridge	N/A	Close to Red Rocks Community College, shopping center including SuperTarget, Apex Recreation Center, some health facilities	single-family housing to east, section of Wheat Ridge Regional Disability Developmental Center to west, 4 story multi-family townhome development to south	0.2 miles from station. Easy access from Ridge Road to Kipling to get to station and major roads.	0.2 miles to station. No infrastructure on Ridge Rd, but not heavily trafficked and would probably be safe to ride on.	0.2 miles to station. No sidewalk along this site on Ridge Rd, however it is not a long walk to reach one. Can also take Miller St to walk through townhome development	Bus line 100 passes by this site and has two stops at the southwest corner. Site is too close to station to use for that purpose but route goes down Kipling.	Senior housing. Family housing cannot be built here due to special constraints	N	25 du/acre. Density can be supported here due to proximity to station.	9.1	6.8	4.5	170.1	113.4
Ridge #3: See Ward																					
Ridge #4	Kipling & W. 58th Ave	Arvada	Vacant land	1 Private Owner	Commercial	Yes	N/A	Marge Roberts Park, King Soopers, Apex Recreation Center, some medical offices nearby	park to east, multi-family apartments to north.	0.8 miles to station. Located at intersection of two busy roads Kipling St and 58th Ave. Easy access off 58th to Kipling and other major roads.	0.8 miles to station. Can use multi-use path along Kipling the whole way.	0.8 miles to station. Can take multi-use path along Kipling.	Bus line goes east-west along 58th and has three stops near site (2 at southwest corner, 1 at southeast corner). This line connects to the Kipling St. route that goes north-south. This line could take you to the station, but would take a significant amount of time.	multi-family townhomes	N	21 du/acre. Small site but located on major road.	2.5	1.9	1.9	38.9	38.9
Ridge #5: See Ward																					
Ridge #6	W 53rd & Field Cir.	Arvada	Vacant land	1 Private Owner	Low-Density Residential	No	N/A	Close to park, daycare, a variety of education and health facilities. Somewhat close to shopping center.	surrounded by single-family homes	0.8 miles to station. Well connected through residential neighborhood	0.8 miles to station. No formal bike infrastructure, however there is access through a quiet residential neighborhood which connects to multi-use path on Kipling	0.8 mile walk through residential neighborhood. All roads have sidewalks.	No bus line is convenient for this site.	townhomes	N	18 du/acre. Character of surrounding development.	4.6	3.5	3.5	62.2	62.2
RIDGE TOTAL																	27.4	20.0	12.5	362.8	306.1

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
Ward #1	52nd Ave & Ward Rd	Wheat Ridge	Vacant site of old Jolly Rancher factory	1 Private Owner	Mixed-Use-Commercial TOD	Yes- Wheat Ridge	N/A	Close to Van Bibber Open Space and health facilities nearby.	surrounded by commercial uses, including a storage facility. Some residential to the northwest.	0.1 miles to station. Adjacent to major road Ward Rd. Good access from Ward to rest of area and to I-70	0.1 miles to station. Directly next to station, but if coming from northeast corner, would have to take heavily trafficked Ward Rd. Will need bike infrastructure developed through site.	0.1 miles to station. Directly next to station. Lacking sidewalks on surrounding roads.	Express bus goes down Ward and has two stops at the northwest corner of the site.	mixed-use, mixed-income, commercial and residential	Y	25 du/acre. Proximity to station.	13.8	9.6	3.2	336.9	112.3
Ward #2	52nd Ave & Tabor St (South)	Wheat Ridge	Vacant land	1 Private Owner, 1 Public Owner	Low Density Residential	Yes- Wheat Ridge	N/A	Fairly close to Skyline Park and Van Bibber Open Space. A number of health facilities nearby.	surrounded by SF residential to west, and north, station to east, separated by rail tracks on south	0.2 miles to station. Well connected from 52nd to Ward, to I-70. Can also take Ridge to get to station. If taking 52nd, Taft needs to be connected.	0.2 miles to station. Directly next to station. Will need bike infrastructure developed through site.	0.2 miles to station. Directly next to station. Will need ped infrastructure developed through site.	No bus line goes directly by this site, but Ward Express route (north-south) is fairly close	multi-family	N	25 du/acre. Proximity to station	8.2	6.2	6.2	154.3	154.3
Ward #3	Ridge Rd and Quail St	Arvada	Vacant land, some power lines running through east side of site	1 Private Owner, 1 Public Owner	PUD-Industrial and PUD-Residential	Yes- Arvada	N/A	adjacent to Skyline Park	surrounded by single-family homes, and vacant land	0.5 miles to station via Ridge Rd, but another connection to 52nd Ave through middle of site would be optimal. Close to I-70.	0.5 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No bike infrastructure on Ridge. Not heavily trafficked now, but may be once station area develops. Could use another connection through site on 52nd.	0.5 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No sidewalks.	No bus line passes by this site	mixed-use and mixed-income. Site is huge. Could be a good spot for a daycare as there is not one on this side of the station area.	Y	18 du/acre. Lower because of single-family homes surrounding the site.	55.0	41.2	13.7	742.0	247.3
Ward #4	52nd Ave & Taft Ct	Wheat Ridge	RV park and outdoor storage	1 Private Owner	Industrial	Yes- Wheat Ridge	N/A	Fairly close to Van Bibber Open Space and a number of health facilities nearby.	station is south, light industrial to west office building to north, mostly vacant land to east.	0.1 miles to station directly south of site. Near major road Ward Rd. Good access to I-70 via 52nd to Ward Rd	0.1 miles to station. Directly next to station. Connection needs to be made with development	0.1 miles- directly north of station. Connection needs to be made with development	No bus line passes directly by this site, but a stop for the Ward Express Route is only 0.2 miles away.	affordable multi-family	N	25 du/acre. Proximity to station.	2.3	1.7	1.7	42.9	42.9
Ward #5	52nd Ave & Tabor St (North)	Arvada	Vacant land, except for one house located on south part of site	1 Private Owner	Unavailable	No	N/A	Fairly close to Van Bibber Open Space and Skyline Park. A number of health facilities nearby.	surrounded by single family residential.	0.3 miles to station. Would need to connect Taft Rd through to station. Near major road Ward Rd.	0.3 miles to station. No bike infrastructure, can take residential Taft and 52nd, but Taft needs to connect through on other side.	0.3 miles to station. Sidewalk on Taft, but not 52nd. Taft needs to connect through on other side.	No bus line passes directly by this site, but a stop for the Ward Express Route is only 0.2 miles away.	mixed-use, residential and offices	Y	21 du/acre, due to surrounding SF residential	5.0	3.8	1.9	79.1	39.5
Ward #6	Ridge Rd & Robb St	Arvada	Vacant land	1 Private Owner, 1 Public Owner	PUD-Industrial	Yes- Arvada	N/A	A number of health facilities fairly nearby.	surrounded by vacant land and industrial	0.4 miles to station via Ridge Rd. Close access to I-70	0.4 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No bike infrastructure on Ridge. Not heavily trafficked now, but may be once station area develops.	0.4 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No sidewalks.	No bus line passes by this site	affordable multi-family		25 du/acre	17.1	12.9	12.9	321.4	321.4
Ward #7	50th Ave & Wheat Ridge	Wheat Ridge	Light industrial/storage	4 Private Owners, 1 Public Owner	Commercial	Yes- Wheat Ridge	N/A	Close to Van Bibber Open Space and a number of health facilities nearby	Located on major road Ward Rd	0.1 miles to station. station to east, commercial to west, vacant to north, separated by rail to south. Good access to I-70 via Ward Rd	0.1 miles to station. Directly adjacent. Can use Ridge Rd or create a bike path through site with development. No sidewalks on surrounding roads	0.1 miles to station.	Ward Express Route passes by this site. Bus stop is 0.1 miles north	multi-family	N	25 du/acre. Proximity to station.	6.4	4.5	4.5	156.8	156.8

Station & Site #	Site Location	Jurisdiction	Current Use	Current Ownership	Zoning	Within URA?	Contamination: Type and Extent	Amenities	Surrounding Character and Density	Access: Auto	Access: Bicycle	Access: Pedestrian	Access: Transit	Recommended Use	Mixed Use: Y/N	Site Density Justification	Total Acres	Acres reduced by developable area	Acres for affordable housing	Number of potential units	Estimate of affordable housing units
Ward #8	Ridge Rd & Tabor St	Wheat Ridge	Truck parking/storage	1 Public Owner	Industrial	Yes- Wheat Ridge	Low: Former transportation activities and above ground tank	A number of health facilities fairly nearby	vacant land to east, surrounded by office/industrial	0.1 miles to station via Ridge Rd. Close access to I-70.	0.1 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No bike infrastructure on sidewalks	0.1 miles to station via Ridge Rd. No sidewalks	No bus line passes by this site	mixed-use, commercial, office	Y		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
WARD TOTAL																	108	80	44	1833	1075
TOTAL ALL STATIONS																	331	245	139	4342	3111

Appendix C.

Complete Housing Tool Kit of Housing Best Practices

The purpose of the Complete Housing Toolkit is to expand and introduce different types of housing that provide more options as well as increased affordability. The range of tools presented fall into seven categories: Housing Development types, Regulatory Tools, Education & Outreach, Incentives, Financing Tools, and Project Level Tools. For each tool, there is a brief description and links to more information. This tool kit is in process and will be expanded with more information and links.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT TYPES			
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS	COTTAGE HOUSING	MICRO-HOUSING	MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT
MANUFACTURED & MOBILE HOMES	MULTIFAMILY HOUSING	PRESERVATION & REHABILITATION	SMALL LOT DEVELOPMENT
REGULATORY TOOLS			
FLEXIBLE REGULATIONS SF OR MF AFFORDABLE HOUSING	TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAYS	MINIMUM DENSITIES	STATION-AREA PRE-DEVELOPMENT PLAN "PRIME-THE-PUMP"
PERFORMANCE ZONING	REGULATORY STREAMLINING	SHORT PLATS	UPZONING
LOT SIZE AVERAGING	INCLUSIONARY ZONING		
EDUCATION & OUTREACH			
COMMUNITY OUTREACH PLANS	EDUCATING PERMITTING OFFICIALS	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NIMBYISM	STRATEGIC MARKETING
INCENTIVES			
FEE WAIVERS OR REDUCTIONS	DENSITY BONUSES	MULTIFAMILY TAX EXEMPTION	PARKING REDUCTIONS
			PERMIT PRIORITY
FINANCIAL TOOLS			
REGIONAL TOD FUND	LOCAL HOUSING FUND	PUBLIC LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING	DRCOG TIP FUNDS
PROJECT-LEVEL TOOLS			
AFFORDABILITY COVENANTS		DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS	
RENTER / HOMEOWNER ASSISTANCE			
DIRECT HOUSEHOLD ASSISTANCE	DISPLACEMENT RESOURCES	COOPERATIVE OWNERSHIP (MHP)	
PARTNERSHIPS			
NONPROFIT AGENCIES & PARTNERSHIPS		INTER-JURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION / IGAS	

Brief Descriptions of Tools

The information provided here is intentionally brief to offer only a short description of each tool. Appendix A includes more detailed information, including additional background on each tool, as well as examples from locations around the US where the tool is used, and useful links.

DEVELOPMENT TYPES

TOOL: Accessory Dwelling Unit

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is a self-contained residential unit built on the same lot as an existing single family home. These units may be built within a primary residence (e.g., basement or garden unit) or detached from the primary residence. They can be an effective way to add variety and affordable housing stock to existing single family neighborhoods.

TOOL: Cottage Housing

Cottage housing developments are groups of small, detached (or attached) single family dwelling units, often oriented around a common open space area, and developed with a coherent plan for the entire site. Cottage

housing is typically built as an infill development in established residential zones and can provide increased density and diversity. They can be slightly more affordable alternative to traditional detached single family housing.

TOOL: Micro-Housing

Micro-housing is a type of very small efficiency dwelling unit (as small as 200-300 square feet) which is complete home with living space and a kitchen (or kitchenette). This form of housing, along with congregate residences, is emerging and viable type of housing in many urban regions across the U.S. This housing type reducing the cost of developing new housing and can contribute to fostering an adequate and diverse supply of housing within a jurisdiction's overall program to create more complete housing, especially in or near transit station areas.

TOOL: Mixed Use Development

Mixed-use developments co-locate two or more types of land uses in a district, project, or . Through zoning, jurisdictions can foster mixed-use projects, as well as a mix of uses within a planning district, including residential, commercial, office, civic/institutional and open space.

TOOL: Mobile and Manufactured Homes

Mobile and manufactured homes offer an affordable option for single-family ownership and rental housing. Allowing placement of mobile or manufactured homes in communities can increase affordability and housing choice. Preserving existing manufactured home communities at risk of redevelopment is an effective strategy for sustaining an important component of the affordable housing stock, as well as preventing dislocation of existing residents.

TOOL: Multifamily Housing

Multifamily housing refers to a broad range of residential development types that are characterized by multiple dwelling units contained in a single building or otherwise attached by shared walls. Multifamily development may be constructed at different scales (e.g., low-rise, mid-rise, high-rise) depending on the character of the district and can be developed as rental or ownership housing.

TOOL: Preservation and Rehabilitation

Preservation and rehabilitation efforts are aimed at retaining existing affordable housing, including both subsidized and unsubsidized housing. Programs include the following:

- Preservation and/or rehabilitation of subsidized affordable units with expiring affordability covenants
- Retaining affordable housing that is at risk of redevelopment or conversion
- Repair and maintenance (including weatherization) for affordable multi-family units and single-family homes suffering from disinvestment

TOOL: Small Lot Development

Small lot development allows single family homes to be built on lots that are smaller than typically single family lots. Ordinances result in reducing or relaxing minimum lot size, setback or lot coverage regulations, which then results in allowing greater density. Ordinances can be written to apply to specific districts and/or zoning.

REGULATORY TOOLS

TOOL: Flexible Regulations for Single-Family and/or Multi-Family Affordable Housing

Flexible regulations refer to an array of strategies that permit lot size, setbacks, sidewalks, street widths, height and other development standards to vary from what is otherwise prescribed by the zoning code. Flexible standards allow for denser and more diverse development and more economical use of available land. The cost savings realized from lower land, infrastructure and other development outlays can translate into lower per-unit housing costs.

TOOL: Transit-Oriented Development Overlay

Transit oriented development (TOD) refers to residential and commercial centers designed to maximize access by transit, as well as create a built environment that is walkable and pedestrian friendly. A transit-oriented development overlay is a floating zone that implements an array of development regulations that support transit usage and create a vibrant neighborhood around a transit station. Usually, the overlay zone extends a "walkable" distance around the station (often a 20-minute walking area to the

transit station) – depending on the type of transit amenity and size of the center.

Transit-oriented development overlays implement some or all of the following characteristics:

- **Mixed uses.** Land uses are mixed and may include shops, job centers, restaurants, public services (such as schools and community centers), and a variety of housing choices, that is, complete housing that is affordable to households across the income spectrum.
- **Complete housing.** Housing that serves all income ranges, various household sizes, and a variety of housing types.
- **Compact development.** Development around station areas is compact, with medium to high densities that are supportive of transit service and use.
- **Complete community.** Transit station areas are complemented by concentrations of business, civic and cultural activities that support vibrancy and activity.
- **Parking management.** Parking in and around transit station areas serves a variety of users, including residents, shop owners, and commuters. Having an area-wide parking management strategy is important for balancing the various parking needs. Given the accessibility to the station area by transit and the walkable environment, parking requirements need to be tailored to the unique character of the station area and will be different from standard parking requirements elsewhere in the jurisdiction.
- **Pedestrian and bicycle friendly design.** Streets, building access, and ground-floor uses around transit station areas are to be designed to encourage walking and bicycling.

TOOL: Minimum Density

Desired density in urban zones if often expressed in terms of “maximum densities,” but often allow development that may be significantly lower (e.g., development occurs at four dwelling units per acre when maximum zoning allows for 10 units per acre). In order to ensure that

densities that support transit occur in station areas along transit corridors, jurisdictions should consider establishing a supplemental “minimum density.” By having a minimum density, the jurisdiction is requiring that efficient and transit-supportive land uses are occurring in the transit station area.

TOOL: Station-Area Pre-Development Plan

Unlike a traditional sub-area or neighborhood plan, the station-area pre-development plan goes the next step and addresses issues related to infrastructure, development review, and design in order to “prime-the-pump” for potential developers. As a result, many of the requirements that may be requested of developer during the project review process have already been worked out in advance. Thus a developer interested in pursuing a particular project in the station area will find the development process streamlined and expedited.

Station-area pre-development plans can be crafted in a manner that brings together all relevant jurisdictional policies, planning provisions, and zoning regulations into a single document – simplifying the process of working through key guidance and requirements for developing a project in a station area. Rather than having to go through various plans, plan elements, and code citations that reside in series of adopted documents, the station-area pre-development plan creates a one-stop volume of provisions for station-area development. This simplifies the process for citizens, decision-makers, jurisdictional staff, and developers.

TOOL: Performance Zoning

Performance zoning allows flexibility in different uses co-locating within a zone or district, as long as the development achieves specified performance criteria and planning goals. In lieu of regulating land uses, performance zoning establishes neighborhood compatibility, transportation, open space and other standards that development projects must meet. Developments are rated on their performance in addressing those standards or criteria. Projects that achieve a sufficient rating are then approved.

TOOL: Regulatory Streamlining

Regulatory complexity or rigidity can restrict a jurisdiction’s ability to attract certain types of desired development or may discourage developers from building in a community. To ensure that local regulations are supportive of adopted development and housing goals, jurisdictions should consider reviewing and streamlining their permitting processes and development regulations to eliminate unnecessary costs and barriers and facilitate development of affordable or innovative housing types.

TOOL: Short Plats

Short platting allows a jurisdiction to increase the maximum number of lots on a given plat. Increasing the number of lots allowed in a short plat allows for increased development at higher densities. Short platting is typically an administrative process – council and public involvement are not required for short plat approval. Increasing the maximum number of lots can simplify the plat approval process for relatively lower impact development, and result in cost savings for developers that can be passed to future home buyers.

TOOL: Upzoning

Upzoning can increase the range of affordable choices in market rate housing by increasing capacity for new residential development types, uses and densities. Below market rate housing can be supported through upzones that institute zone-specific inclusionary provisions requiring that future residential developments in the district include a share or number of affordable units.

Upzoning is simply an action by a jurisdiction to increase the density of a district so that more units can be built in an area. Upzones can benefit affordability by increasing the supply and range of housing choices. Higher density makes it possible for more development capacity and, therefore, more rental or sale income. The increased value of the parcel, realized by the upzoning, incentivizes the inclusion of affordable units. When upzoning is linked to affordable housing policies, it can help jurisdictions achieve diverse, mixed-income communities.

TOOL: Lot Size Averaging

Lot size averaging allows the size of individual lots within a development to vary from the zoned maximum density,

provided that the average lot size in the development as a whole meets the overall maximum. Housing can then be developed on lots smaller than otherwise permitted in a zone, allowing for greater densities in some areas and more diversity throughout the development.

TOOL: Inclusionary Zoning

Inclusionary zoning stipulates that new residential development in certain zones include some proportion of affordable housing units, or meet some type of alternative compliance. To ensure that costs are offset, jurisdictions often increase the development rights (i.e., density) of a proposed project. Adopting this combination — i.e., mandatory affordable housing and increased density — into the local code distinguishes inclusionary zoning from other types of incentive zoning. Inclusionary zoning can be tied to specific geographic areas.

INCENTIVES

Tool: Fee Waivers or Reductions

Costs associated with the development process, such as impact fees and building permit fees, can be reduced or eliminated to encourage selected types of development, such as transit-oriented development in station areas. Jurisdictions may want to consider enacting measures to reduce or waive such fees for projects that include a percentage or number of affordable housing units. Since impact or mitigation fees can increase the upfront construction cost of affordable housing, some jurisdictions have enacted measures to reduce, waive, or defer such fees for projects that include affordable housing units. Jurisdictions can also reduce or waive other development fees, like permitting and planning costs, for projects that include affordable housing units.

Tool: Density Bonuses

Density bonuses are a zoning tool that that permits developers to build more housing units, taller buildings, or more floor space than normally allowed, in exchange for provision of a defined public benefit, such as a specified number or percentage of affordable units included in the development. An affordable housing density bonus program can be designed to allow developers to contribute

to a housing fund in lieu of building the affordable units.

Tool: Multifamily Tax Exemption

Cities may exempt multifamily housing from property taxes in identified locations with insufficient residential opportunities. The city defines a residential target area or areas and approved project sites are exempt from ad valorem property taxation on the residential improvement value for a defined period of time (for example, 10 years). Cities must pass an enabling ordinance to enact the exemption and to allow for the submittal of applications.

Tool: Permit Priority

Jurisdictions can offer priority permit review and approval to developers of affordable housing and other projects that meet locally adopted housing goals. Priority processing of land use and construction permits is most effective when used selectively, to provide an incentive to develop a particular type of housing the market is not currently producing. A special team can be assembled to usher the development through the permitting and review process. A jurisdiction could also simplify or combine steps of the process for affordable developments. Permits for affordable or dense housing projects could automatically be granted priority.

Tool: Parking Reductions

Reducing parking standards can help prevent excessive parking requirements that add to the cost of housing. Jurisdictions can better match residential parking standards with parking demand by studying neighborhood and resident characteristics, transit access and mobility. This is especially appropriate in transit station areas. Once a balance is struck between standards and parking needs, maximum parking standards may be enacted to eliminate development of excessive parking.

FINANCIAL TOOLS

TOOL: Local Housing Fund

A local housing fund provides a dedicated source of funding for affordable housing projects. Jurisdictions can use the funds in a variety of ways:

- Direct loans or grants to owners or developers

of affordable housing.

- The underwriting of general obligation or councilmanic bonds sold to support low-income housing.
- Direct low-income renter or first-time home-buyer subsidies.
- Typically, a local housing fund is established through a legislative process that generates fund revenue (e.g., a special purpose housing levy enacted through voter approval, general funds, or a portion of sales tax from new development).

TOOL: Commercial Linkage Fees

Commercial linkage fees are a form of impact fee assessed on new commercial developments or major employers based on the need for workforce housing generated by new and expanding businesses. Revenues generated by the fee are then used to help fund the development of affordable housing opportunities within accessible commuting distance to the employment center. Commercial linkage fees build upon the relationship between commercial and residential development. They hinge on balancing the impact of growth in non-residential development by stimulating affordable residential development for workers or supporting demand for services.

TOOL: Public Land for Affordable Housing

Local governments can facilitate the development of affordable housing by making public land available for eligible projects. Parcels may be surplus or underutilized public properties, as well as vacant, abandoned, and tax-delinquent private properties acquired through purchase or tax foreclosure. Land banking programs can strategically acquire and preserve multiple properties for affordable housing development.

TOOL: Direct Household Assistance

Jurisdictions can establish financial assistance programs that provide direct monetary assistance to low-income renters, owners and first-time homebuyers. Forms of assistance can include monthly rent and utility support for low-income households, grants and loans for low-income homeowners undertaking weatherization and repair,

or grants and loans for first time homebuyers for down payment, closing costs and mortgage assistance.

TOOL: Regional TOD Fund

Under the auspices of an existing agency, or by creating a new regional authority, jurisdiction in metro Denver could seek funding for advancing transit-oriented development at station areas. The fund could focus specifically on ensuring that complete housing is developed around transit stations.

TOOL: Historic Preservation

Historic preservation funds can be used to help retain certain residential structures that have historic significance.

TOOL: DRCOG TIP Fund

Regionally-managed federal transportation funds could be prioritized for achieving more complete communities in and around station areas, as well as regionally designated urban centers. Funds could be prioritized for (a) last mile connections to transit stations, (b) for completing street grids in station areas to create more walkable environments, (c) for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, and/or (d) to provide mobility and accessibility improvements that advance affordable housing.

PROJECT LEVEL TOOLS

TOOL: Affordability Covenants

Affordability covenants can be incorporated into affordable housing projects to limit the resale price of ownership units or tie rents to established income thresholds to maintain the affordability of the units, either for a set period of time or in perpetuity. These controls can be set up through regulatory agreements, deed or mortgage restrictions, options or other legal agreements.

TOOL: Development Agreements

Development agreements are contracts negotiated between a developer and a local jurisdiction to specify the terms by which a proposed project moves forward. Development agreements are often used to resolve or mitigate site-specific issues that are not well addressed by standard development regulations. These issues often

arise from complex or unique projects. They can also be used to formalize an arrangement in which the developer provides certain public benefits (e.g., affordable housing) in exchange for certain concessions by the jurisdiction (e.g., regulatory flexibility, density bonuses).

PARTNERSHIPS

TOOL: Non-Profit Partnerships

Jurisdictions can establish cooperative arrangements with public or non-profit housing developers to promote low-income or special needs housing in their communities. Jurisdictions can also encourage for-profit developers to partner with non-profits to provide affordable units within larger market-rate developments.

TOOL: Interjurisdictional Cooperation

Local jurisdictions can partner with each other to pool resources and stretch funding for their housing needs. Cooperative partnerships can assist with the following:

- Support for below-market rate housing through loans, grants and surplus land.
- Development of comprehensive and neighborhood plan housing policies.
- Regulation implementation.
- Housing program implementation and administration.
- Finding affordable ownership and rental options for households.
- Education for members and the public.

EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Tool: Community Outreach Plans

Outreach plans provide a strategic road map for bringing key stakeholders and underrepresented groups into the planning process, increasing community awareness and providing opportunities for constructive citizen engagement and community input regarding a planning effort. Plans may contain a background assessment of the issue at hand, why the issue is important, public opinions on the issue and strategies to address potential barriers and community needs.

TOOL: Educating Permit Officials

The development process and timeline for affordable or innovative housing projects can differ from typical market rate projects. The administrative process will be smoother and more supportive if permit and building department staff are included in policy development and proactively kept up-to-date on affordable housing finance and diverse housing options in the city. Staff should also understand the importance of project schedules associated with subsidized projects.

TOOL: Strategies to Address NIMBYism

Affordable housing projects, increased density and other proposed regulatory changes to established neighborhoods can be contentious issues that provoke common “not-in-my-back-yard” (NIMBY) reactions from the surrounding community. Building community support throughout the planning process is essential to bridging the acceptance gap for a particular project or regulatory change. Some general strategies to build support and address NIMBY attitudes include: community outreach plans, coalition building, education, and ongoing communication.

TOOL: Strategic Marketing

Local jurisdictions hoping to attract innovative and affordable housing development can borrow tools and techniques from the field of strategic marketing to better position their communities to developers and investors, as well as to potential residents. Jurisdictions can actively promote the kind of development they desire by spreading the word that they are friendly to innovative and affordable housing, advertising the attractions and development potential of their community, and working to counter any negative or outdated misconceptions about their community.

The CU Denver team would like to acknowledge and thank colleagues at the Puget Sound Regional Council for sharing their work describing many of the affordable housing tools included in the Gold Corridor Affordable Housing Strategy. More information on the Seattle region's Housing Innovations Program and its Housing Toolkit is available at www.psrc.com

Works Cited

- Belzer, D., Hickey, R., Lawson, W., Poticha, S., & Wood, J. The Case for Mixed-Income Transit-Oriented Development in the Denver Region. Feb 2007. Center for Transit-Oriented Development.
- CCA Industrial Zone Economic Report 2005 for the City of Los Angeles
- City of Cedar Hill, TX. Mixed-Use Transit-Oriented Development Zone District Standards, Key Issues and Options, Prepared for the North Central Texas Council of Governments and the City of Cedar Hill TX. Clarion Associates in Association with Smart Growth America
- DRCOG. Sustainable Communities Initiative, <https://www.drcog.org/planning-great-region/sustainable-communities-initiative>.
- Gold Line Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), by Walsh Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC.
- Haas, P., Makarewicz, C. et. al. (2008). Estimating Transportation Costs for Households by the Characteristics of the Neighborhood and Household. Transportation Research Record of the Transportation Research Board.
- Lipman, B. Something's Gotta Give: Working Families and the Cost of Housing. (April 2005). Center for Housing Policy. Lubell, J. & Brennan, M., Framing the Issues- the Positive Impacts of Affordable Housing on Education, Center for Housing Policy. 2007.
- Lubell, J., Crain, R. & Cohen, R. Framing the Issues- the Positive Impacts of Affordable Housing on Health, Center for Housing Policy. 2007.
- Mark Hinshaw, True Urbanism: Living in and Near the Center, Chicago: APA Planners Press, 2007.
- Montgomery County, Maryland. Transit-Oriented Mixed Use Zoning in Montgomery County, Maryland, Nikosi Yearwood, Community-Based Planning Division, Montgomery County Planning Department, Rail Revolution 2007, Presentation.
- Mueller, E. & Tighe, J. Making the Case for Affordable Housing: Connecting Housing with Health and Education Outcomes. Journal of Planning Literature, Vol. 21, No. 4 (May 2007).
- Nelson, A. C. (2012). The mass market for suburban low-density development is over. The Urban Lawyer, 44.
- Nelson, A. C. (2004). Planner's estimating guide: Projecting land-use and facility needs: Amer Planning Assn.
- Sloan, M. L. (2014). An exploration of accessory dwelling units as affordable housing in Colorado. University of Colorado Denver/ Housing Colorado. Driving a Vibrant Economy: Housing's Role in Colorado's Economic Success. December 2014. <http://www.housingcolorado.org/?page=economicimpactstudy>.
- Smith, M. T., Murray, M. S., & O Dell, W. (2003). Estimating the Need for Single Family Rehabilitation. Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy, 33(2), 37-52.
- Strengthening Our Workforce and Our Communities Through Housing Solutions. Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University and Center for Workforce Preparation. (2005).
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. Many Change Schools Frequently, Harming their Education. (Feb 1994).
- Washington State Legislation. RCW 36.70A.540. Affordable housing incentive programs - Low-income housing units.
- Young, P. Housing for children: A case for non-shelter policy drivers in housing assistance. Housing Imaginations. Cardiff, UK: Housing Studies Association. (2001).



Gold Corridor Housing Strategy

Prepared for the Gold Corridor
Working Group