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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2009, the Urban Land Conservancy (ULC) purchased the former Holly Square Shopping Center (Holly Square) from Michael Bullock. ULC is a nonprofit organization established in 2003 to preserve community assets in urban areas.

Holly Square, comprised of 2.6 acres, was built in the early 1960’s and destroyed by arsonists in May 2008. It is located in Northeast Park Hill, one of the three sub areas of the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood (GPHN). In 2008, GPHN was selected as one of the American Planning Association’s 10 best neighborhoods in the country.

Northeast Park Hill (NEPH) is located in a disinvested urban area. 2000 Census data indicates that most of the NEPH residents are African American. The area is also home to a large and growing Latino community. It has a relatively modest level of housing investment: the homeownership rate is nearly 50%, well below the state average of 67%.

According to Housing Colorado’s 2009 Fact Book, there is evidence of disparities in sub prime lending practices. Minority borrowers are more than twice as likely as white borrowers to receive sub prime mortgages. The percentage of households with sub prime mortgages in NEPH is over 22%, double the percentage for Denver. The area has seen the number of foreclosures climb from 90 in 2007 to 146 in 2009. Given the rate of subprime mortgages held by NEPH residents, foreclosure filings in the area could continue to climb in the coming year.

The incidence of crime, as evidenced by recent gang activity in the area, is of concern to the community; however, it should be noted that total crime in the neighborhood slightly decreased from 676 incidents in 2008 to 625 in 2009.

Although the State of Colorado is one of the leanest states in the country, more than half of adults are overweight or obese. In 2008, overweight and obesity rates were highest among non-Hispanic blacks and Hispanics.
These factors increase an individual’s risk for other health problems, including diabetes, hypertension and heart disease. These risks can be mitigated by physical activity and nutrition. While NEPH does provide access to a recreational facility, its access to fresh produce could be improved.

The Denver Public School Accountability Report Rating (SARs) for all of the elementary schools and the middle school educating children in NEPH range from “Unsatisfactory” to “Low.” A majority of students at these schools also qualify for free and reduced priced meals. The High Schools serving the area seem to be performing better than the elementary and middle schools.

It is due to this context that ULC identified the redevelopment of the former Holly Square as a priority. Subsequent to purchasing the site in May 2009, ULC began working with the Denver Foundation’s Strengthening Neighborhoods Program and the Northeast Park Hill Coalition Steering Committee on a “visioning” process for the Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP). The HARP includes a six-block area including and surrounding the former Holly Square Shopping Center located between 33rd and 35th Avenues and Hudson and Holly Streets.

The HARP Visioning Process is a comprehensive effort to engage residents, community based groups, and other stakeholders to address the area’s multiple issues simultaneously – in education, workforce development, public safety, and community development. The initial phase of the HARP Visioning Process included a general surveying of the community. The intent of this examination was to establish general consensus as to what describes the best qualities of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood.

The photos to the right are from the Holly Fair, which included activities and attractions for future generation. The HARP Vision Plan provides safe spaces and areas that could provide opportunity for sports, music and the arts for to the community’s rising stars.
so that these attributes could be incorporated into any reinvestment in the area. Building upon these attributes, a series of reinvestment scenarios were generated. Each of the concepts depict potential building placement based upon a theme for the overall site organization. While allowing for a range of potential uses, they are not intended to represent specific recommendations for building programs, per se. Additionally, while no specific programs have been identified as a part of the process, the community supports those that are compatible with sustainable reuse of the site. The general consensus of the community input has been support for those aligned with recognizable public benefits, including, but not limited to educational, training, civic/institutional, heritage, events, etc.). Residential use has not been considered and some limited commercial retail use has also been supported. Regardless of the final use, the community has strongly voiced its concern that any reinvestment comply with a series of “Good Neighbor Principles”, including accessibility by all, safety regardless of age, etc.

In order to implement the vision in the HARP in any of the reinvestment strategies, a phased reinvestment strategy must be developed. The strategy must include potential funding sources, including foundations, public and private lending institutions, the community, and the City of Denver. Since 2005, the Urban Land Conservancy has been a recognized leader in acquiring property in urban areas and developing effective projects to meet neighborhood community development needs. These efforts have been supported by public and private sectors. At the end of the visioning process, CB will submit a Findings Report to ULC outlining a strategy for the HARP. ULC will use the information included in the Report to solicit interest from potential reinvestment partners for the project. The challenge of ULC will be to identify resources and to continue to address neighborhood needs with the goal of improving independence and the opportunity for residents to be contributing members of their community.

The photos to the right are from the Holly Fair that showcased the community assets located throughout the neighborhood.
HARP Public Process

The reinvestment scenarios developed through the Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) Visioning Process are the result of an extensive community process. The visioning process relied heavily upon the participation of people with differing interests and viewpoints, including many who were new to the civic engagement process.

Participation took the form of a Town Hall Meeting, community workshops, a steering committee, a fair, several newspaper articles, television coverage and surveys. The primary purpose of the HARP Visioning Process is to serve as a reinvestment guide for the HARP and to support the solicitation of Letters of Interest and Requests for Proposal for the project.

In May 2008, the Urban Land Conservancy purchased the former Holly Square shopping center. Working in collaboration with the Denver Foundation’s Strengthening Neighborhood, the Northeast Park Hill Steering Committee was convened to assist in the selection of a design team and provide input on components of the process. The Steering Committee is composed of community residents from diverse backgrounds, nonprofit service providers, Strengthening Neighborhoods staff and staff from the City and County of Denver. The Steering Committee met regularly throughout the eight-month Visioning Process period and was instrumental in planning a Town Hall meeting, two community workshops, the Holly Fair Pre-Event and Holly Fair.

The Town Hall meeting was held on August 28, 2009. The meeting, facilitated by Brother Jeff Fard, was well attended by over 100 neighborhood residents and several notable stakeholders, including City Council members Carla Madison and Michael Hancock, OED Director Andre Pettigrew and State Senator Michael Johnston.

Two community workshops, held on November 7, 2009 and December 5, 2009, were also well attended by community members.

Since December 2009, there have been meetings with City and County of Denver staff, a significant amount of press coverage and various outreach efforts by members of the Steering Committee. Members of the Steering Committee also began meeting more frequently following the December 2009 community workshop to begin planning for the Holly Fair Pre-Event.
and Holly Fair.

On Friday, April 23, 2010, the HARP Pre-Event was held at the Hope Center, located adjacent to the Holly Square at 3475 Holly St. The Steering Committee hosted a panel of experts from a variety of disciplines to provide their insights, suggestions, and guidance about sustainable reinvestment opportunities, including redevelopment options, health and wellness programs and recycle and reuse initiatives.

The panelists deemed the reinvestment scenarios as viable, providing opportunity for redevelopment of a vital and vibrant neighborhood.

**Next Steps**

In August 2010, cbid will make a presentation to the Urban Land Conservancy’s Board of Directors on the HARP Visioning Process. The design team will also work with ULC to distribute Letters of Interest to potential reinvestment partners. The Letter of Interest responses will assist ULC in gauging interest in the HARP and facilitate development of short and long-term redevelopment strategies for the HARP.

ULC will meet with the City and County of Denver after it receives Letter of Interest responses to discuss the next phase of the HARP and potential funding sources. In-depth analysis of funding sources for the HARP is beyond the scope of this project. However, a list of fund sources have surfaced as potentially viable options for the project that would be valuable to explore further. Analysis of the funding streams presented in brevity will be part of the next phase of the HARP that examines the feasibility of securing funding as well as examines the alignment of the potential fund sources with the goals of the HARP.

City and County of Denver/Community Development Block Grant Funds

This is an ongoing federal U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development program which can be used for a variety of projects, including community development, historic preservation and housing for households with modest incomes. The City of Denver receives approximately $10M annually in block grant funding.

New Market Tax Credits/Colorado Growth and Revitalization Funds: The New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) program is a community development

---

**HARP Panelists**

The HARP Pre Event was intended to draw a broad range of people into the visioning process. The rich history of the neighborhood was displayed at the Pre Event, both to draw out people’s memories and to raise awareness. Panelists were encouraged to share their expertise in this climate about the market realities of the reinvestment strategies developed for the HARP.

**What We Heard at the Pre Event**

- Scenarios consistent with Denver Vision for Urban Prosperity
- A number of potential funding sources available for redevelopment, including New Market Tax Credits, City of Denver, Xcel, Denver Water, Third Party Energy Access financing
- Opportunity to incorporate 2010 Healthy People Initiative strategies in the HARP
- Green jobs potential: redevelopment could benefit from flex energy modeling tool
- Work with the City of Denver to coordinate issues such as redevelopment opportunities for the entire area and establishment of special districts for needs such as parking.

The consultant may use the data from the Pre Event and resident values to establish ‘Good Neighbor Guidelines’ to guide any future redevelopment.
lending tool intended to encourage investment in underserved communities by creating jobs and stimulating economic development. The Colorado Housing and Finance Authority, in partnership with the City and County of Denver and the Colorado Enterprise Fund, established the Colorado Growth and Revitalization Fund (CGR) in 2005 for the purpose of applying for and allocating NMTC in Colorado. The CGR fund is committed to deploying its NMTC in a manner that leverages the maximize community impact in low-income neighborhoods.

Mile High Community Loan Fund: Mile High Community Loan Fund invests in affordable housing and other assets to improve economic opportunities of low-income persons and communities. The Fund, established in 1999, has approved 114 loans totaling more than $40 million, has helped finance more than 3,500 units of affordable housing and more than 88,000 square feet of nonprofit community facilities space in the metro area.

State of Colorado Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program: The State of Colorado expects to receive $42.6 million for projects that reduce energy use and fossil fuel emissions, and improve energy efficiency. The goal is to reduce statewide energy used by 25 percent compared to 1990 use and to develop programs that will remain viable after the Recovery Act funds are spent.

Park Hill Thriving Communities Grant: This fund source works to support healthy eating and active living in Park Hill, and is also launching the Denver Healthy Retail Food Access Initiative, an effort to establish citywide policy to create a positive environment for supermarket development in Denver's food deserts.

Foundations: The HARP may qualify for grant assistance from some of the foundations in the Denver metro-area. These include:

- Boettcher Foundation
- Denver Foundation
- Gates Foundation
- Piton Foundation
May 18, 2008  Holly Square Shopping Center burned down
November 2009  Urban Land (ULC) goes under contract on Holly and meets with NE
March 2009  NE Park Hill successfully defeats the liquor license across the street from the Holly
April 2009  Urban Land Conservancy is able to purchased the Holly with support from the Denver Office of Economic Development (OED)
April & May 2009  Balance of the Holly building is environmentally removed.
May 17, 2009  Gardens planted by Feed Denver
May 20, 2009  Mayor Hickenlooper/Carla Madison hold press conference to acknowledge ULC purchase of Holly and community victory in defeating liquor license application.
June 1, 2009  Northeast Park Hill residents initiate Holly redevelopment
July/August 2009  Senator Johnston opens office and Community Center with Prodigal Son, directly across the street from the Holly site
* August 28, 2009 Holly Redevelopment Town Hall meeting held; over 100 residents attend
  September 2009 community by design hired to assist with visioning process

* November 7, 2009 Over 60 residents attend first visioning process meeting at Hiawatha Davis Rec Center

* December 5, 2009 Over 40 residents attend second visioning process meeting at Hiawatha Davis Rec Center

January 2010 Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) Committee established by NE Park Hill residents and stakeholders

January-April 2010 HARP Committee meets every week to plan Holly Fair (over 20 stakeholders attend)

* April 23, 2010 HARP Pre Event: Brother Jeff Fard delivers keynote address; Panelists with expertise in a number of disciplines provide input and review redevelopment scenarios, answer questions from community and other stakeholders.

* April 24, 2010 HARP Fair Community event to invite neighborhood comment on the redevelopment scenarios. The event builds on the pride and passion of the neighborhood and includes historical perspective on Northeast Park Hill, information on neighborhood agencies, food, raffle, and other activities for all age.

June 2010 Draft HARP Vision Plan Presentation

End of May 2010 community by design delivers HARP Plan Report to Urban Land Conservancy City of Denver, Office of Economic Development

ULC solicits partners for future redevelopment of the site
Reinvestment Concepts

The planning area for the Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) extends from 33rd Ave. to 35th Ave. and Hudson St. to Ivy St. While the focus of this Vision Plan is specifically the vacant Holly Square site (that is the ULC parcel, see Site Map, page 5), it also anticipates that coordinated reinvestment with the Pauline Robinson Library, Hiawatha Davis Jr. Recreation Center and the Hope Center will eventually trigger needed revitalization of the immediate interface area as well.

The initial phase of the HARP Vision Plan included a general surveying of the community. The intent of this examination was to establish general consensus as to what describes the best qualities of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood so that these attributes could be incorporated into any reinvestment on the Holly Square site (see HARP themes). Building upon these attributes, a series of reinvestment scenarios were generated. Each of the concepts, as illustrated, depict potential building placement based upon a theme for the overall site organization. While allowing for a range of potential uses, they are not intended to represent specific recommendations for building programs, per se. The site layouts intensify in terms of potential use resulting in higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR). As illustrated, Concept A has the lowest FAR and Concept D the highest. Also, each of the concepts has an option demonstrating the benefits of incorporating the southwest corner property (i.e., Mr. Johnson’s parcel) when and if appropriate. Other assumptions and understandings incorporated into the presented concepts include:

The Holly Square and Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) is located in the Northeast Park Hill Neighborhood. The community has been adamant in conveying its desire that the HARP become the entry of the City of Denver.
- Redevelopment will require a phased approach.
- Redevelopment will most likely require multiple uses and redevelopment partners.
- Linkages between the ULC parcel, Hope Center, the Library and Hiawatha Rec Center are encouraged.
- The Hope Center will likely, in time, be redeveloped (with dedicated space for continued Hope Center programming).
- The existing on-site structure currently housing the Taqueria will be demolished.
- The Post Office is to remain operational (at least for the near term).
- Reinvestment should include best sustainable building practices.
- Reinvestment of the ULC site will, in time, help stimulate reinvestment of interface blocks.

While no specific programs have been identified as a part of this process, the community supports those that are compatible with sustainable reuse of the site. The general consensus of the community workshops has been support for those aligned with recognizable public benefits (including, but not limited to educational, training, civic/institutional, heritage, conferencing, events, etc.). Residential use has not been considered and some limited commercial/retail use (i.e., not as a primary use) has also been supported. Regardless of the final use, the community has strongly voiced its concern that any redevelopment comply with a series of “Good Neighbor Principles”, including accessibility by all, safety regardless of age, etc. These principles will continue to be developed and included in the final Vision Plan.
Concept A uses a fairly traditional approach that provides commercial pads that result in a very low FAR. Auto access is provided from Hudson St., Holly St. and 33rd St. as well as a cross access easement with the Hope Center. Enhanced on-street parking supplements on site surface parking. As illustrated, Pad A and Pad B provide for a 7,000 – 8,000 s.f. footprint anticipating limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. Directly opposite the Hiawatha Rec Center entry, a central plaza is illustrated. The plaza represents space to be dedicated for civic and public use. Pad C provides a covered parking/pavilion designed to allow expansion of civic and public use after business hours and on weekends (for events such as Farmer’s Markets, Art Fairs, Heritage Fairs, etc.). Additional dedicated public space (illustrated for this concept as a playground) is also included.
Concept A
**Concept A.1** illustrates the full build out of the block, with an additional pad site (Pad D with 7,000 - 8,000 s.f. footprint for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office) is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A1 - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JLC Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Station Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hope Center Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A1 - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept B intensifies redevelopment of the site by providing for placement of larger structures organized around central public spaces.

Public and Civic Spaces
The theme of this concept is establishing central public spaces that “shape” the placement of structures and their exterior envelopes. These spaces also create view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for an enhanced sense of safety for all. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This drop off illustrates the benefit of enhanced linkage between the ULC property and the Hope Center to the north.

Central Plaza: Anchoring the core of the site is a large central plaza intended to accommodate civic and public uses. It also provides a view through the site to the Hope Center.

Holly St. Plaza: Similar to Concept A, this plaza provides a strong linkage between the ULC site and the Rec Center. It also considers the benefit of additional linkage with the Library (illustrated as a playground area for this concept). The plaza also provides for small pavilion structures (allowing limited retail and/or public use).

Community Garden: At the center of the north (33rd St.) edge of the site, another dedicated civic space is provided. In this example, a community garden is illustrated.

Parking:
Parking is pushed to the outer edges of the site with angled on-street parking. A cross access easement and shared parking with the Hope Center is also provided.

Building Pads:
With parking shifted from the center of the site, building envelopes have been increased in size. Pad A is intended to anchor the northeast corner of the ULC site and Pad B the northwest corner. Each would have frontage to existing streets as well as the new entrance drive linking the Hope Center. The approximate footprint of Pad A is 8,000 s.f and Pad B 11,000 s.f. Pad C, with a footprint of approximately 10,000 s.f., is intended to anchor the Hudson St. exposure while also providing for a backdrop to the Central Plaza. Similar to Concept A, the lower level of each structure anticipates limited retail/commercial with the option for a second level of commer-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Center Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pad A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept B

Holly Area Redevelopment Project • Draft Vision Plan
Concept B.1 illustrates the full build out of the block, including an additional pad site (Pad D with an approximately 8,000 s.f. footprint) is illustrated. This structure will anchor the southwest corner and provide for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. The building envelope is large enough to allow for some level of civic/institutional type uses as well.
Concept C builds upon the organization of the site as illustrated in Concept B. Concept C illustrates a higher density of use by providing for placement of larger structures again organized around central public spaces. The larger building footprints also allow for broader program uses (such as civic, educational, training, etc.).

Public and Civic Spaces
The central public spaces are again intended to “shape” the placement of structures and their envelopes. The spaces also establish view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for enhanced sense of safety. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This drop off intensifies the linkage between the ULC property and the Hope Center to the north.

Central Plaza: A large central plaza intended to accommodate civic and public uses again anchors the core of the site.

Holly St. Plaza: Similar to Concept A and B, this plaza again provides linkage between the ULC site and the Rec Center. Along with the Central Plaza and the east face of Building Pad C, a larger events space has been shaped. Similar to Concept B, the plaza also provides for small pavilion structures (for limited retail and/or public use).

Playground: At the center of the 33rd St. exposure another space for dedicated program use (in this example, a playground) is illustrated.

Parking:
This concept places all parking along the edges of the site (possibly requiring the establishment of a parking district). Angled on-street parking is provided on three sides. Additional surface parking (requiring a cross access easement) is provided at the Hope Center.

Building Pads:

With parking shifted to the edges of the site via angled on-street parking and surface parking at the Hope Center, building envelopes, again, have increased in size. Pad A again anchors the northeast corner of the ULC site but with a larger footprint of approximately 18,000 s.f. While the lower level will accommodate limited retail/commercial uses, the larger footprint allows for broader uses such as educational, civic/institutional as well. Pad B again anchors the northwest corner of the site but this time directly facing the new drive shared with the Hope Center. It has an approximate footprint of 15,000 s.f. This concept anticipates linkage between Pad B and Pad C (which directly faces Hudson) and has an approximate footprint of 8,000 s.f. While allowing for retail/commercial/office use, these two pads linked (either at the ground level or via a second floor) could accommodate broader non-commercial uses (including educational, training, civic types of programs, etc.). Similar to Concept B, the east façade of Pad C is illustrated as providing a backdrop to the Central Plaza, thus allowing for additional event use of the plaza for civic uses such as performance, festivals, etc.
**Concept C.1** illustrates the full build out of the block, including an additional pad site (Pad D with an approximately 7,500 s.f. footprint,) is illustrated. This structure will anchor the southwest corner and provide for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. The pad is large enough to allow for civic/institutional type uses as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept C1 - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JLC Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept C1 - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept D illustrates full redevelopment of the Holly Square site and interface areas using a campus approach. It represents a coordinated redevelopment strategy and anticipates additional reinvestments at the Library, Hiawatha Davis Rec Center and interface blocks.

Public and Civic Spaces
The central public spaces are again representative of spaces that would “shape” the placement of structures and their envelopes. These spaces also establish view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for enhanced sense of safety. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This option illustrates the drive between the Holly Square and the Hope Center to the north as an extension of the public realm. It provides a new “front door” to the site, so to speak, and builds upon “Living Streets” principles.

Central Plaza: Anchoring the heart of the site is a large central plaza. This space will accommodate both building users as well as civic uses/events involving the general public. It also serves as the central focus of smaller plazas that extend towards the Hope Center, Rec Center and the Post Office. In this initial phase (i.e., without redevelopment of southwest corner lot) additional dedicated public spaces are depicted including a playground and community garden.

Parking:
This concept also places all parking along the edges of the site (possibly requiring the establishment of a parking district). Angled on-street parking is provided on three sides. Additional surface parking (requiring a cross access easement) is provided at the Hope Center.

Building Pads:
With this campus approach, building envelopes have increased in size and taken more definitive shape. Both Pad A (approximately 18,000 s.f. footprint) and Pad B (approximately 16,000 s.f. footprint) front on the new shared drive while also including wings that wrap to the south (and engaging Holly and Hudson respectively). Similar to previous concepts, the lower level will accommodate limited retail/commercial uses. The larger footprints and form, however, consider broader uses such as educational, training, civic/institutional, etc. In this campus concept, a second level link is provided between the two buildings. This linkage would accommodate common program use between the structures while also maintaining a view corridor through to the Hope Center. Furthermore, it would allow joint use of the facility by the public if so desired. As an example, if both structures have one primary user (such as an educational and/or training entity), program areas (such as auditoriums, conferencing, etc.) could be located in one of the wings to allow greater public and joint use/access while minimizing disruption to the primary users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept D - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/yard/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept D - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT D
Concept D.1 illustrates the benefits of a coordinated redevelopment of the entire area with the ULC parcel at its core. It includes incorporation of the southwest parcel. As illustrated, the large 35,000 s.f. footprint would accommodate larger civic uses, such as a conferencing center and/or heritage center. Such a use could be linked with programs associated with Pad A and B. Also, redevelopment of the Hope Center site is represented. The linkage between the two sites is enhanced as an auto court. These enhanced spaces would allow larger events (especially with street closures) that could draw regional interest in the area.

This concept also attempts to demonstrate the inherent benefits of establishing a campus that directly involves the Library and the Rec Center. As illustrated, a small expansion of the Library is considered as well as a major expansion to the Rec Center. Both expansions could be triggered by the overlapping needs of the various “campus” users. As an example, if Pad A and B result in an educational and/or training facility, these two expansions could accommodate these new users in lieu of having to possibly duplicate “library” or “gym” space as part of the new facility. The plan also enhances the Rec Center’s capability of hosting outdoor programs on site including soccer, track, and football by the inclusion of a central field house. Also, given the loss of surface parking on the Holly site currently used by the public and possible increased use, the angled parking is extended to the west, east and south perimeter of the site.
The planning area for the Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) extends from 33rd Ave. to 35th Ave. and Hudson St. to Ivy St. While the focus of this Vision Plan is specifically the vacant Holly Square site (that is the ULC parcel, see Site Map, page 5), it also anticipates that coordinated reinvestment with the Pauline Robinson Library, Hiawatha Davis Jr. Recreation Center and the Hope Center will eventually trigger needed revitalization of the immediate interface area as well.

The initial phase of the HARP Vision Plan included a general surveying of the community. The intent of this examination was to establish general consensus as to what describes the best qualities of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood so that these attributes could be incorporated into any reinvestment on the Holly Square site (see HARP themes). Building upon these attributes, a series of reinvestment scenarios were generated. Each of the concepts, as illustrated, depict potential building placement based upon a theme for the overall site organization. While allowing for a range of potential uses, they are not intended to represent specific recommendations for building programs, per se. The site layouts intensify in terms of potential use resulting in higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR). As illustrated, Concept A has the lowest FAR and Concept D the highest. Also, each of the concepts has an option demonstrating the benefits of incorporating the southwest corner property (i.e., Mr. Johnson’s parcel) when and if appropriate. Other assumptions and understandings incorporated into the presented concepts include:

The Holly Square and Holly Area Redevelopment Project (HARP) is located in the Northeast Park Hill Neighborhood. The community has been adamant in conveying its desire that the HARP become the entry of the City of Denver.
- Redevelopment will require a phased approach.
- Redevelopment will most likely require multiple uses and redevelopment partners.
- Linkages between the ULC parcel, Hope Center, the Library and Hiawatha Rec Center are encouraged.
- The Hope Center will likely, in time, be redeveloped (with dedicated space for continued Hope Center programming).
- The existing on-site structure currently housing the Taqueria will be demolished.
- The Post Office is to remain operational (at least for the near term).
- Reinvestment should include best sustainable building practices.
- Reinvestment of the ULC site will, in time, help stimulate reinvestment of interface blocks.

While no specific programs have been identified as a part of this process, the community supports those that are compatible with sustainable reuse of the site. The general consensus of the community workshops has been support for those aligned with recognizable public benefits (including, but not limited to educational, training, civic/institutional, heritage, conferencing, events, etc.). Residential use has not been considered and some limited commercial/retail use (i.e., not as a primary use) has also been supported. Regardless of the final use, the community has strongly voiced its concern that any redevelopment comply with a series of “Good Neighbor Principles”, including accessibility by all, safety regardless of age, etc. These principles will continue to be developed and included in the final Vision Plan.

The Holly Square site is located in an area where institutions and services abound. Together, these institutions are teaching valuable lessons and skills that could benefit the economic, social and political interests of the community.
**Existing Site Areas Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ULC Site</th>
<th>Library Site</th>
<th>Service Station Site</th>
<th>Hope Center Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Gross Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>115,749</td>
<td>31,036</td>
<td>10,808</td>
<td>111,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>2.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Concept A** uses a fairly traditional approach that provides commercial pads that result in a very low FAR. Auto access is provided from Hudson St., Holly St. and 33rd St. as well as via a cross access easement with the Hope Center. Enhanced on-street parking supplements on site surface parking. As illustrated, Pad A and Pad B provide for a 7,000 – 8,000 s.f. footprint anticipating limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. Directly opposite the Hiawatha Rec Center entry, a central plaza is illustrated. The plaza represents space to be dedicated for civic and public use. Pad C provides a covered parking/pavilion designed to allow expansion of civic and public use after business hours and on weekends (for events such as Farmer’s Markets, Arts Fairs, Heritage Fairs, etc.). Additional dedicated public space (illustrated for this concept as a playground) is also included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
<th>JLC Site</th>
<th>Library Site</th>
<th>Service Station Site</th>
<th>Hope Center Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
<td>44,730</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>23,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
<th>Pad A</th>
<th>Pad B</th>
<th>Pad C</th>
<th>Pad D</th>
<th>Pad E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Concept A.1** illustrates the full build out of the block, with an additional pad site (Pad D with 7,000 – 8,000 s.f. footprint for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office) is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A1 - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JLC Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A1 - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept B intensifies redevelopment of the site by providing for placement of larger structures organized around central public spaces.

Public and Civic Spaces
The theme of this concept is establishing central public spaces that “shape” the placement of structures and their exterior envelopes. These spaces also create view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for an enhanced sense of safety for all. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This drop off illustrates the benefit of enhanced linkage between the ULC property and the Hope Center to the north.

Central Plaza: Anchoring the core of the site is a large central plaza intended to accommodate civic and public uses. It also provides a view through the site to the Hope Center.

Holly St. Plaza: Similar to Concept A, this plaza provides a strong linkage between the ULC site and the Rec Center. It also considers the benefit of additional linkage with the Library (illustrated as a playground area for this concept). The plaza also provides for small pavilion structures (allowing limited retail and/or public use).

Community Garden: At the center of the north (33rd St.) edge of the site, another dedicated civic space is provided. In this example, a community garden is illustrated.

Parking:
Parking is pushed to the outer edges of the site with angled on-street parking. A cross access easement and shared parking with the Hope Center is also provided.

Building Pads:
With parking shifted from the center of the site, building envelopes have been increased in size. Pad A is intended to anchor the northeast corner of the ULC site and Pad B the northwest corner. Each would have frontage to existing streets as well as the new entrance drive linking the Hope Center. The approximate footprint of Pad A is 8,000 s.f. and Pad B 11,000 s.f. Pad C, with a footprint of approximately 10,000 s.f., is intended to anchor the Hudson St. exposure while also providing for a backdrop to the Central Plaza. Similar to Concept A, the lower level of each structure anticipates limited retail/commercial with the option for a second level of commercial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT B
Concept B.1 illustrates the full build out of the block, including an additional pad site (Pad D with an approximately 8,000 s.f. footprint,) is illustrated. This structure will anchor the southwest corner and provide for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. The building envelope is large enough to allow for some level of civic/institutional type uses as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B1 - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking/road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Center Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept B1 - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pad E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONCEPT C** builds upon the organization of the site as illustrated in Concept B. Concept C illustrates a higher density of use by providing for placement of larger structures again organized around central public spaces. The larger building footprints also allow for broader program uses (such as civic, educational, training, etc.).

Public and Civic Spaces
The central public spaces are again intended to “shape” the placement of structures and their envelopes. The spaces also establish view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for enhanced sense of safety. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This drop off intensifies the linkage between the ULC property and the Hope Center to the north.

Central Plaza: A large central plaza intended to accommodate civic and public uses again anchors the core of the site.

Holly St. Plaza: Similar to Concept A and B, this plaza again provides linkage between the ULC site and the Rec Center. Along with the Central Plaza and the east face of Building Pad C, a larger events space has been shaped. Similar to Concept B, the plaza also provides for small pavilion structures (for limited retail and/or public use).

Playground: At the center of the 33rd St. exposure another space for dedicated program use (in this example, a playground) is illustrated.

Parking:
This concept places all parking along the edges of the site (possibly requiring the establishment of a parking district). Angled on-street parking is provided on three sides. Additional surface parking (requiring a cross access easement) is provided at the Hope Center.

Building Pads:

With parking shifted to the edges of the site via angled on-street parking and surface parking at the Hope Center, building envelopes, again, have increased in size. Pad A again anchors the northeast corner of the ULC site but with a larger footprint of approximately 18,000 s.f. While the lower level will accommodate limited retail/commercial uses, the larger footprint allows for broader uses such as educational, civic/institutional as well. Pad B again anchors the northwest corner of the site but this time directly facing the new drive shared with the Hope Center. It has an approximate footprint of 15,000 s.f. This concept anticipates linkage between Pad B and Pad C (which directly faces Hudson) and has an approximate footprint of 8,000 s.f. While allowing for retail/commercial/office use, these two pads linked (either at the ground level or via a second floor) could accommodate broader non-commercial uses (including educational, training, civic types of programs, etc.). Similar to Concept B, the east façade of Pad C is illustrated as providing a backdrop to the Central Plaza, thus allowing for additional event use of the plaza for civic uses such as performance, festivals, etc.

**Concept C - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ULC Site</th>
<th>Library Site</th>
<th>Service Station Site</th>
<th>Hope Center Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concept C - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pad A</th>
<th>Pad B</th>
<th>Pad C</th>
<th>Pad D</th>
<th>Pad E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT C
Concept C.1 illustrates the full build out of the block, including an additional pad site (Pad D with an approximately 7,500 s.f footprint,) is illustrated. This structure will anchor the southwest corner and provide for limited retail/commercial uses at grade with the potential for a second level of commercial/office. The pad is large enough to allow for civic/institutional type uses as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept C1 - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept C1 - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pad A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT C.1

HOLLY AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT • DRAFT VISION PLAN
CONCEPT D illustrates full redevelopment of the Holly Square site and interface areas using a campus approach. It represents a coordinated redevelopment strategy and anticipates additional reinvestments at the Library, Hiawatha Davis Rec Center and interface blocks.

Public and Civic Spaces
The central public spaces are again representative of spaces that would “shape” the placement of structures and their envelopes. These spaces also establish view corridors throughout the site and hence foster the neighborhood’s desire for enhanced sense of safety. The spaces include:

North Auto Drop Off: This option illustrates the drive between the Holly Square and the Hope Center to the north as an extension of the public realm. It provides a new “front door” to the site, so to speak, and builds upon “Living Streets” principles.

Central Plaza: Anchoring the heart of the site is a large central plaza. This space will accommodate both building users as well as civic uses/events involving the general public. It also serves as the central focus of smaller plazas that extend towards the Hope Center, Rec Center and the Post Office. In this initial phase (i.e., without redevelopment of southwest corner lot) additional dedicated public spaces are depicted including a playground and community garden.

Parking:
This concept also places all parking along the edges of the site (possibly requiring the establishment of a parking district). Angled on-street parking is provided on three sides. Additional surface parking (requiring a cross access easement) is provided at the Hope Center.

Building Pads:
With this campus approach, building envelopes have increased in size and taken more definitive shape. Both Pad A (approximately 18,000 s.f. footprint) and Pad B (approximately 16,000 s.f. footprint) front on the new shared drive while also including wings that wrap to the south (and engaging Holly and Hudson respectively). Similar to previous concepts, the lower level will accommodate limited retail/commercial uses. The larger footprints and form, however, consider broader uses such as educational, training, civic/institutional, etc. In this campus concept, a second level link is provided between the two buildings. This linkage would accommodate common program use between the structures while also maintaining a view corridor through to the Hope Center. Furthermore, it would allow joint use of the facility by the public if so desired. As an example, if both structures have one primary user (such as an educational and/or training entity), program areas (such as auditoriums, conferencing, etc.) could be located in one of the wings to allow greater public and joint use/access while minimizing disruption to the primary users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept D - Site Areas Breakdown (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept D - Building Sizes (G.S.F.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total G.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept D
CONCEPT D.1 illustrates the benefits of a coordinated redevelopment of the entire area with the ULC parcel at its core. It includes incorporation of the southwest parcel. As illustrated, the large 35,000 s.f. footprint would accommodate larger civic uses, such as a conferencing center and/or heritage center. Such a use could be linked with programs associated with Pad A and B. Also, redevelopment of the Hope Center site is represented. The linkage between the two sites is enhanced as an auto court. These enhanced spaces would allow larger events (especially with street closures) that could draw regional interest in the area.

This concept also attempts to demonstrate the inherent benefits of establishing a campus that directly involves the Library and the Rec Center. As illustrated, a small expansion of the Library is considered as well as a major expansion to the Rec Center. Both expansions could be triggered by the overlapping needs of the various “campus” users. As an example, if Pad A and B result in an educational and/or training facility, these two expansions could accommodate these new users in lieu of having to possibly duplicate “library” or “gym” space as part of the new facility. The plan also enhances the Rec Center’s capability of hosting outdoor programs on site including soccer, track and football by the inclusion of a central fieldhouse. Also, given the loss of surface parking on the Holly site currently used by the public and possible increased use, the angled parking is extended to the west, east and south perimeter of the site.
Good Neighbors Principles

Introduction

The HARP Vision Plan provides a community-based framework for directing reinvestment opportunities in the Holly Square area. A key component of this work has been establishing general attributes and characteristics reflecting the Pride and Passion of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood for any potential reinvestment.

As the ULC and HARP Steering Committee evaluate potential partners as to reinvestment on the Holly Square site, it is essential that common expectations be established for all participants and stakeholders. This includes finding partners who recognize these special characteristics of the neighborhood. Partners who will recognize, embrace, support and further the very tangible physical, natural and cultural environments of the neighborhood and its on-going needs.

The Photos to the right represent several aspects of the neighborhood’s Pride and Passion. The community has expressed a desire to weave the stories of such individuals into the fabric of the community’s programs, celebrations and buildings.
The following “Good Neighbor” principles summarize many of the themes for redevelopment commonly expressed by stakeholders during the HARP Vision Plan process (refer to insert to the right). They are organized within five topic areas:

- Partnership and Collaboration
- Quality of Life
- Public Realm
- Compatibility
- Sustainability

These “Principles” build upon the City and County of Denver’s standards established for permitting of new developments. They are not intended to conflict or contradict established standards, but rather, enhance those standards with qualitative elements that often exceed the limits of such regulatory standards and are found in the best neighborhoods around the world.

To better understand the community’s desires and support for the redevelopment of the Holly Square site, a survey was distributed throughout the neighborhood and presented at Workshop No. 1. The surveys were organized around four core questions:

- What best defines/describes the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood to you?
- What do you best remember about the Holly Square?
- What characteristics would you like to see included in any redevelopment?
- What type of uses would you like to see included?

Note: The neighborhood findings are presented in the attached Appendix.
1.0 PARTNERSHIP and COLLABORATION
Reinvestment in the Holly Square area should explore all opportunities for establishing strategic partnerships between all redevelopment partners, stakeholders and neighbors that result in equitable redevelopment solutions. These broad partnerships need to cultivate champions and ongoing resources to sustain the reinvestment efforts and building upon the physical, institutional, cultural and human assets of the community.

1.1 Encourage and Build Partnerships
- Understand common issues
- Plan collaboratively
- Other

1.2 Share and leverage joint assets
- Encourage public use of facility
- Host events, meetings, exhibits, events
- Provide multi-function space for public use with access to appropriate lavatory for use as election station, community meetings, etc.
- Other

1.3 Find opportunities for mutual benefits
- Share spaces
- Support programs
- Other

1.4 Respect and Reflect the Heritage of the neighborhood
- Invest in the rich traditions of the neighborhood
- Incorporate traditions in spaces, building, programs, etc.
- Other

During the preparation of the HARP Vision Plan, the City of Denver was in the process of revising its Zoning Code. These principles are based upon the assumption that the new zoning, including its General Design Standards, will be in place prior to any redevelopment of the site. More detail as to these standards are included in Section 4: Compatibility of this report. It is noted that these “Good Neighbor Principles” are intended to build upon the new zoning standards by providing additional “qualitative” principles which can not always be included in regulatory documents. Many times, such “qualitative” measures are the underpinnings for Healthy Neighborhoods.

Multi-use spaces for public and private uses are encouraged. Illustrated by the photos above is an example of flex space at the Gary Comer Youth Center in Chicago, Illinois.
2.0 QUALITY of LIFE
The residents of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood continue to demonstrate their Pride and Passion for their community. However, over time, there has been a slow erosion to some of the area’s institutional and cultural framework that have potential impact to the neighborhood’s overall quality of life. Several of these indicators have been explored as part of the HARP Vision Plan process. It is essential, therefore, that any reinvestment enhance the fundamental quality of life for the area’s residents.

2.1 Sense of safety
Redevelopment options must promote a socially cohesive neighborhood, free of crime and violence. This includes providing physical features and elements as well as encouraging and supporting programs that protect and enhance the sense of public safety.

- Programs
  - support “Drug Free” practices
  - Participation and support for community policing
  - provide multi-function space for public use with access to appropriate lavatory for use an election station, community meetings, etc.
  - Defensible space - all developed areas must consider design principles of “defensible space”:
- Establish community spaces that extend the realm of the neighborhood and reflects its sense of pride
- Establish a sense of natural surveillance
- Provide imagery that impart a sense of security
- Establish social interaction with other positive neighborhood uses
- Lighting - all building entrances, privately owned public spaces, common areas, service areas and parking must provide lighting levels that convey the sense of safety while remaining non-invasive to the surrounding neighborhoods
- Signage: User friendly informational and directory systems should be provided. Such systems should be;
  - bilingual
  - responsive to neighborhood input as to design and content
  - available to the neighborhood for appropriate public postings
2.1.b Provide elements and support programs that encourage social interaction, including:

- Public Spaces, including, but not limited to:
  - Privately Owned Public Open Space (POPOS)
  - Public and other Common areas (common maintenance)
- Linkages: provide physical linkages and connections with adjacent users, including
  - Library
  - Rec Center
  - Hope Center
  - Post Office
  - Commercial/Retail neighbors
- Programs; explore linkages between established programs provided by adjacent users
- Events: provide spaces and support programs that promote:
  - Local heritage
  - Neighborhood events
  - Public art
  - Cultural public events
  - Wellness (community gardens, food pantries, etc.)
  - Other

2.2 Welcoming to all
Regardless of age, every user should always feel a sense of being welcomed.

- Youth programming; Promote, participate in and/or support after school programs for area youth on site
- Multi-use spaces; consider access to facilities for public use
- Restrooms; provide access to safe and monitored public restrooms
- Furnishings; provide street and public space furnishings responsive to children, youth, adult and elderly
- Other

There are many new initiatives with a focus on “Wellness”. In this two sketches, space for a local growers “Farmer’s Market” is provided.
2.3. Mobility
The City of Denver establishes standards for all redevelopment as a part of its premitting process. These standards include roadways, sidewalks, curbcuts, ramps, street lighting, signage, etc. While these engineering standards provide technical specifications, redevelopment of the site should consider broader and multi-modal opportunities such as those identified in Denver’s “Living Streets” initiative.

2.3a. Accessibility
The site should remain accessible for all users. While provisions for safe environments should accommodate all modes of movement and transit, including automobile, pedestrian, bicyclists, public transit, a particular emphasis should be placed upon those who are physically challenged.

2.3b Provide a safe automobile environment:
- Access
  - Provide clearly defined access to the site
  - Coordinate automobile access with adjacent uses
- Parking
  - Minimize parking as a primary use on site
  - Provide parking that is accessible to the front of all structures and common spaces, however;
  - Parking in front of structures (other than parking on public streets and right-of-ways) should be avoided
  - Coordinate access to parking with adjacent users
  - Provide safe linkages between parking areas and other uses
  - Other

This section illustrates use of the enhanced right-of-way/events plaza as proposed between the redeveloped Holly Square (to the left) and the Hope Center (to the right) in several of the presented Concepts. In addition to providing for public use for special events, this type of street section is intended to provide what is known as “traffic calming” by allowing safe movement throughout the area by all modes of users.
2.3.c Provide safe pedestrian and bicycle environments:
- Traffic Calming: Promote traffic calming techniques both on-site and throughout the area, including:
  * ramps/curb cuts
  * Multi-use lanes
  * Signage/Directories
  * Safe and convenient bicycle storage
  * Other

- Coordinate efforts with local bicycle initiatives such as the Park Hill Bike Depot (www.thebikedepot.org)

2.3.d Promote transit opportunities:
- Provide opportunities for on-site transit use and linkages with all public transportation options
- Support programs such as the Regional Transportation District’s (RTD) Neighborhood Eco Pass (www.rtd-denver.com/NeighEcoPass.shtml
- Other

The Holly Square was once perceived as the 'anchor' of the neighborhood. Redevelopment should provide opportunities, spaces and programs for the site to once again have it serve as the neighborhood’s center.
3.0 PUBLIC REALM

Accessible spaces, be they privately owned public open spaces and/or jointly owned/ commonly maintained central areas will be essential in helping protect the neighborhood’s access to the site. Extension of the “Public Realm” throughout the site and giving shape to buildings and program areas is strongly encouraged. All public spaces should:

3.1 Project a sense of comfort and safety to people gathering and using the space

3.2 Accommodate multiple activities
Public spaces should accommodate all users and be accessible via walking, biking, or public transit

3.3 Reflect the Northeast Park Hill character and its strong traditions

3.5 Foster social interaction and create a sense of community and neighborliness

3.6 Enhance physical and natural features

3.6 Promote neighborhood involvement
Public spaces should promote social interaction

3.7 Features and Elements
All features and elements (including playground equipment, lighting, benches, signage, etc.) should reflect the unique nature of the neighborhood

3.8 Accommodate all modes
Public spaces, including public right-of-ways, should accommodate all modes of movement

WHAT IS A POPOS???

POPOS is an acronym for Privately Owned Public Open Space. It is an initiative which as roots originally in New York City. More recently, the City of San Francisco incorporated the concept into its zoning regulations. These spaces can include parks, roof top terraces, sidewalks, common areas, or any other space that is inviting to neighbors and users.

The 16th St. Mall is a well-known public space that extends the public realm and creates a sense of place accessible to all. It includes a variety of publicly owned and privately owned spaces that work seamlessly together.
3.9 Enhance the overall building design, scale, and architecture. Public spaces should reinforce building design, scale, and architecture.

3.10 All spaces should create interesting visual experiences, vistas, or other qualities.

3.11 Reflect the character of adjacent structures and neighboring facilities.

3.12 Reflect joint Maintenance, Programming and Operations. Whether privately owned or public, all spaces should be jointly maintained, programmed and operated.

Illustration of public common spaces serving as a site for hosting of neighborhood events.

Common Open Space, such as the Skyland Park, are important assets to the neighborhood’s sense of place.
**4.0 Compatibility**

Any reinvestment should consider those ways to be compatible with the existing neighborhood, including both the physical characteristics but also the cultural and social characteristics.

### 4.1 Operational Characteristics

Impacts due to the program use of the site should be kept to a minimum, this includes:

- Hours of Operation
  - Uses during normal business/retail hours are encouraged
  - Use of facilities after normal business hours are encouraged (i.e., buildings should not be dark and cold at 5 pm)
  - Curfew; however, uses exceeding normal business hours (i.e., late night) should be avoided
- Program Uses
  - Active uses of facilities and common areas during typical business hours should be considered

### 4.2 Site Layout

The redevelopment of the site should consider its overall organization as an extension of the surrounding neighborhood:

#### 4.2a Access

- All structures, parking, common areas and service areas should be easily accessed
- Consider coordination of service area needs with adjoining users
- All structures should be placed so as to provide a front to the street where possible
- Other

#### 4.2b Parking and Service

- Impacts due to parking and other service related needs should be minimized
- Other

**EXISTING ZONING**

The existing underlying zoning for the Holly Square site is B-3; Shopping Center District. The purpose of this district is primarily to provide the retailing of most commodities and the furnishing of certain personal services, satisfying all household and personal needs of the residents of surrounding residential communities. This district is normally located on major arterial or collector streets at or near the intersection with another major arterial or collector street so that is has good vehicular accessibility. This district is characteristically large, usually is entirely surrounded by residential districts, and is located a convenient driving distance from the residential districts it is designed to serve. The district regulations establish standards comparable to those of low density residential districts, resulting in similar building bulk on smaller parcels and retaining a low concentration of vehicular traffic. Building height is controlled by bulk standards and open space requirements. Building floor area cannot exceed the site area.

**CITY and COUNTY of DENVER ZONING CODE UPDATE**

At the time this Vision Plan was being prepared, the City and County of Denver was in the process of updating its zoning code. The first update in over fifty years, the proposed regulatory document is intended to provide “Form Based” Zoning. For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that the zoning update will be adopted prior to any redevelopment of the area. It is noted that prior to any reinvestment in the area, any and all applicants should consult the city standards to verify final content of the final adopted code.
4.2.4 Adjoining Uses
- Physical linkages with adjoining properties should be provided
- Outreach to adjoining properties
- Other

4.2.5 Common Areas
All common areas should:
- Promote the practices of Defensible Spaces
- Allow for movement through the site by all users
- Provide a hierarchy as to use of spaces and movement through the site
- Provide amenities for all users including:
  * Landscape furnishings
  * Lighting
  * Signage
- Be easily maintained
- Other

4.2.6 Image
All site features should:
- Project a positive and consistent image consistent reflecting the character of overall neighborhood
- Provide visibility/transparency through the site should be provided
- Other

4.3 Building Design
The redevelopment of the site should consider the physical design of all structures in such a way that evoke the positive characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood:
4.3.6 Mass and Scale
- Structures should reflect the mass and scale of the neighborhood
- Other

Providing small pavilions and/or kiosks could foster broader neighborhood use/enterprises. They could also provide local for local services including serving as a bicycle depot, lawn and garden community center, etc.
4.3.b Height
- Structures should reflect the overall height of the adjoining neighborhood.
- Taller structures should be located towards the interior of the site.
- Or, when located to the edge of the site, upper levels should be set back from the street.
- Other

4.3.c Solid to Void Ratio
- Structures should reflect the solid to void ratio of the surrounding neighborhood.
- Other

4.3.d Form
- Non-residential structures should reflect the footprint of those in the adjoining neighborhood.
- Other

4.2.e Materials
- Structures should reflect the materials used in the adjoining neighborhood.
- Other

4.2.f Image
- Structures should reflect the simple vernacular image of the neighborhood.
- Or, build upon the inherent qualities of landmark institutional styles of the neighborhood.
- Other

4.2.g Sustainable Practices
All structures should employ sustainable building practices and incorporate as many local resources and materials.

4.3.2.6 ZONING CODE UPDATE

**Relevant Sections related to Holly Square**

Within the proposed Zoning Update, the Holly Square site is zoned E-MX-3. This Zoning classification represents:

- E: Urban Edge Context
- MX: Mixed Use
- 3:3 stories maximum

This particular zoning district is addressed in Article 4 under the following Divisions:

4.1 Neighborhood Context
4.2 Districts
4.3 Design Standards
4.4 Uses and Required Minimum Parking

**Specific Intent:**
The “Specific Intent” of the Urban Edge, Mixed Use-3 district is for “areas or intersections served primarily by collector and arterial streets where a building scale of 1 to 3 stories is desired. Design standards provide for varied building placement while still offering an active street front.”

**Allowable Building Forms:**
The General Urban Neighborhood Context establishes the following Building Forms appropriate for the district: Row House, Courtyard Apartment, Drive Thru Services, Drive Thru Restaurants, General and Shopfront. Multiple buildings on any zone lot require compliance with Article 10.

**Height:**
The maximum height per the General Building Form Standards is 45 feet and/or 3 stories.

**Build To:**
A 70% “Build to Line” has also been established for the General Building Form Standard.

**Parking:**
The maximum parking for any allowed use for the district is vehicle 2.5/1,000 Gross Floor Area (GFA) and bicycle 1/20,000 G.F.A.
5.0 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN
For many, sustainable implies minimal impacts from any development and its on-going operations. This includes using eco-friendly technologies and natural systems when available, inherently efficient use of energy sources with minimal use of finite fuels. Also, the term embraces the utilization, to the extent practical, materials, resources and merchandise that are locally produced and recyclable. It may also include promoting efficient transit and movement that relies less on driving and minimizes negative impacts on the region.

Many of these terms are based in quantifications of the physical and natural environments. As examples, terms, such as form-based zoning and “transect” (or the “geographical cross-section of a region intend to reveal a sequence of environments”) are often associated with “sustainability.” Many of the terms associated with “sustainability” are technical in nature - LEEDS certified; green collar; energy efficient; eco-friendly – and not generally understood by lay persons. The term does not necessarily speak to sustaining existing communities and has, in some instances, led to the gentrification some neighborhoods both locally and nationally.

More recently, the concept of social and cultural justice has started to take root as a way of furthering the notion of sustainability. A recent United Nations report promotes that everyone has a right to “take part in cultural life, which may be exercised individually or collectively, subserves a right to: (1) participate in, (2) access and (3) contribute to culture” which is defined as “a broad, inclusive concept encompassing all manifestations of human existence encompassing, among other things, ‘way of life, language, oral and written literature, music and song...religion or belief systems, rites and ceremonies, sport and games, methods of production of technology...environment, food, clothing and shelter, the arts, customs and traditions.”

In addition to establishing sustainable physical and natural environments within the Holly Square area, it is the intent that any reinvestments recognize, embrace, support and further the very tangible cultural framework of the neighborhood and its on-going needs.
Reinvestments should naturally incorporate green building standards and practices, with local emphasis, and make every attempt at minimizing its “carbon” footprint. To this end and incorporating the broadest definition of sustainability as possible, redevelopment in the area should be:

5.1 Compatible and Reflective
Any reinvestment should be compatible and reflective of the character and heritage of the Northeast Park Hill Neighborhood

5.2 User Friendly
Any reinvestment should incorporate user friendly language, lexicons, techniques, etc. so as to be;

5.3 Inclusive and Participatory
Any reinvestment should reach out and engage all members of the neighborhood and make them feel the same Pride and Passion that they have demonstrated for years.

5.4 Efficient
Any reinvestment should incorporate all sustainable practices and theories while also embracing everything possible that is;

5.5 Local
Any reinvestment should incorporate all available local resources, and;

5.6 Embrace Wellness
All reinvestment should promote the overall wellness of the neighborhood, and;

5.7 Promote Learning
All opportunities for promoting education of young and old (be it teaching, mentoring, instructing, etc.) should be explored, and, finally all efforts must;

5.8 Remember the Children
All enterprises should fully recognize the constant theme portrayed by the neighborhood that all efforts ultimately are for the benefit of the next generation.

This rooftop garden at the Gary Comer Youth Center provides an urban oasis for all users. It also provides natural daylighting of interior spaces, utilizes natural water conservation techniques and provides space for community gardens which (in addition to providing fresh local produce) supplement wellness initiatives/training at the center.

Photos courtesy of Gary Comer Youth Center
NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEYS

As the initial phase of the Holly Area Redevelopment Project's (HARP) Vision Plan, a general surveying of the community's attitude regarding redevelopment of the Holly Square site was conducted. The intent of this examination was to establish general consensus as to what describes the best qualities of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood so that these attributes could be incorporated into any reinvestment on site. These attributes have served as underpinnings to a series of reinvestment scenarios that have been generated.

The surveying was the focus of the Nov. 7, 2009 Workshop No. 1 which was attended by approximately 60 people. The intent of this initial workshop was to build upon the general discussion held at the first Town Hall meeting (held on Aug. 28, 2009 and attended by well over 100 people). In the Town Hall Meeting, attendees were allowed to discuss their ideas for what the redevelopment of the Holly should look like. While quite a few ideas were discussed, the general grouping of desired uses included:

- Educational Facility/Charter School
- Wellness Center
- Heritage Center
- Training/Entrepreneurial Center
- Office/Non-Profit
- Conferencing Center

Attendees also discussed attributes and characteristics that they desired to see in any redevelopment of the site.

To better understand the community's desires and support, community by design (cbd) worked with the ULC and Strengthening Neighborhoods in the preparation of a survey to be distributed throughout the neighborhood and presented at Workshop No. 1. The surveys were organized around four core questions:

- What best defines/predicts the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood to you?
- What do you best remember about the Holly Square?
- What characteristics would you like to see included in any redevelopment?
- What type of uses would you like to see included?

The surveys were prepared in both English and Spanish and presented with a Powerpoint presentation that described the process for taking input and how the information would be used and reported back to the community. Portions of the surveys follow. They include the visual guides which were discussed with the attendees as not being a scoring device, but rather, prompts for their own input.
The many positive things that characterize the best of the Northeast Park Hill Neighborhood were discussed. From the examples/prompts provided (see samples at left), participants described those characteristics that they feel best describe what makes the area so unique. Some of the features described included:

- The charm of the neighborhood as described by its Post World War II architectural housing styles (i.e., bungalows, brick construction etc.), the well maintained yards, the landscaping and tree lined boulevards, streets and parks
- Public and civic places, including, places to meet and interact with friends, parks, playgrounds
- Churches/Places of Worship
- Services and Institutions (post office, library, health center, rec center)
- Convenience: centrally located (near major thoroughfares)
Holly Square Past

The importance of Holly Square to the neighborhood was considered and discussed. The community provided their memories and discussed what they felt worked best about the Holly Square at a personal level. Observations included:

- Gathering place to meet family and friends (the Holly used to be "the spot")
- Convenience (it was easy to walk to)
- Shopping (there are few places to buy necessities since the loss of the Holly)
- Food (there are few food options, prepared or otherwise) since the loss of the Holly

Holly Square Character

Redevelopment of the Holly Square was discussed in terms of the area once again serving as the anchor of the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood. When rebuilt, those qualities and characteristics that should be incorporated into the final redevelopment were considered. Those desired characteristics included:

- Accessible to ALL (no physical barriers)
- Available (i.e., not closed up, or "cold and dark" at 5pm with the neighborhood "locked out")
- Welcoming to Old & Young (i.e., a place where everyone regardless of age will feel welcomed!!)
- Safe Haven (safety & security at all levels and in all spaces)
- Community Oriented (i.e., not a redevelopment where users are "imported" so to speak)
- Convenience (accessible by foot, auto, bus, bike, wheelchair, walkers, etc...any means!!)
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The neighborhood was asked to describe what types of uses, spaces and activities they would like to see incorporated into its final redevelopment. The range of uses discussed included:

- Events/Festivals
- Teaching/Learning
- Educational/Entrepreneurial
- Training
- Public Spaces,
- Public Art
- Cultural and Heritage (the neighborhood is quite proud of its cultural heritage and prominent citizens)

Measuring the Community’s Input
As part of the Visioning Process, attendees at the first community design workshop were asked to think about their Northeast Park Hill neighborhood, the Holly Square, and potential redevelopment of the Holly Square site. They were asked to identify Northeast Park Hill’s best attributes, their best memories of the Holly Square, the characteristics and qualities they would like to see as part of the Holly area’s redevelopment, and the types of uses and spaces they would like to see in any future development in the Holly and surrounding community. A survey, organized around these four core evaluation criteria, was then used to inspire further discussion and to capture additional comments after the workshop. Using the responses articulated by survey respondents and workshop participants, community by design (cbd) developed four principal reinvestment scenarios for the Holly area. These scenarios were presented to the community at a second community design workshop.

At the Holly Fair, attendees provided additional input on the reinvestment scenarios. Fair participants were given a brief overview of the process to date and the four core evaluation criteria, and were then asked to rate the four reinvestment scenarios on how well they met each of the four criteria (Northeast Park Hill’s best attributes; the best of what the Holly was; the characteristics they would like to see in the area’s redevelopment; and uses/spaces they would like to see in the area in the future).
The above charts summarize the input received at the Holly Fair and community workshop on each of the reinvestment scenarios.

**Chart 1 - Rating the 4 Design Concepts - Holly Fair - Average Rating by Concept**
This chart shows Holly Fair participants' views of how well they thought each design concept meets each of the four evaluation criteria. By grouping ratings for all four evaluation criteria under each design concept, this chart allows users a quick comparison of the design concepts' relative strengths across the four evaluation criteria. While ratings and comments were diverse, Concept D, as the chart shows, was judged to be stronger than the other three concepts in representing what is best about Northeast Park Hill, what was best about the Holly, the characteristics residents would like to see, and the types of uses and spaces residents would like to see in new development in the area.

**Chart 2 - Rating the 4 Design Concepts - Holly Fair - Average Rating by Criteria**
This chart breaks down Holly Fair participants' responses according to evaluation criteria, rather than concept. By grouping ratings of all four design concepts under each evaluation criterion, this chart allows users a quick comparison of which design concept was judged to best meet each evaluation criteria. Although there was, once again, a variety of opinion, respondents gave Concept D the highest scores for representing Northeast Park Hill's best attributes; representing the best of what the Holly was; incorporating the characteristics they would most like to see in the area's redevelopment; and including uses/spaces they would like to see in the area in the future.
Chart 3 – Rating the Design Concepts – Workshop and Holly Fair Totals - Average Rating by Concept
Chart 3 extends Chart 1 by adding responses provided by participants in the community design workshops and surveys that were completed before the Holly Fair. While comments were diverse, Concept D once again receives the highest scores as the design concept that best captures the community’s vision for reinvestment in the Holly area.

Chart 4 - Rating the Design Concepts – Workshop and Holly Fair Totals - Average Rating by Criteria
Chart 4 extends Chart 2 by adding responses provided by participants in the community design workshops and surveys that were completed before the Holly Fair. Chart 4 shows that, once again, Concept D was most frequently selected as best representing the community’s desires for reinvestment across all four evaluation criteria.

A summary of all comments collected at the community design workshops and the Holly Fair are provided on the following pages.
Summary of Comments

HARP Community Planning Workshop II and Holly Fair

In addition to responding to each of the presented redevelopment options using the visual prompts provided, participants were allowed to write additional comments. The following is a summary of all comments of participants at the Planning Workshop II and the Holly Fair.

Legend:
- open dots are comments from Workshop II,
- filled dots are from Holly Fair
- # in parentheses indicates number of times comment was repeated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best of Neighborhood Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Don’t care for parking (x2), but it does make it more accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Very common, and other elements are not conserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Playground should not be near service station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Would like to see the playground in the center (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Worried Pad C and plaza will create a big dead space when no market happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Good community meeting place (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Add trees to north side – very concrete heavy (x2), don’t like layout at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Need $ store and other retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Suits neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best of Holly Square Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. May work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Seems very business friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. 2-fronted buildings and small square footage will lack an energy focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Too much traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Improvement, but use of space is too limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Pad C looks like it will block the view of Pads B and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Lots of wasted space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Skating rink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Like playground next to library, would like more open space/plaza next to library for concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Too much parking (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Neighbor Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Love the plaza – smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Has a lot of potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Maybe more business than community oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Too much parking for a good neighbor (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Human services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Playground good, food good, but not too family friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use, Space, &amp; Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Nice to have some retail – just need to control what goes in (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. May work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Too small for school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Worried Pad C will be under utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Bus service to bring youth and seniors to site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT A: USE, SPACE, ACTIVITIES, continued

- Plaza too small as a gathering place – needs amphitheater
- Gas station would need to be updated
- Senior center, grocery store
- Dislike position of playground
- Very wise use of space

General Comments
- No playground necessary – maybe enhance HDRC playground
- Not nearly enough public/open space
- Gas station needs to be redeveloped
- Less safety
- Lack of pedestrian and vehicle and connectivity (?)
- Need connectivity between HOPE and open space
- Like angle parking
- Makes no sense to keep a building structure in the new development plan if that building doesn’t fit (referring to service station perhaps?)
- Pads in middle deny center and ability to gather. Small plaza seems undersized
- Seems vehicle oriented
- Parking is necessary, and this option seems to have the most. Retail will need the parking, school/conference ctr may not
- More plaza landscaping at pads. No road through to HOPE
- Not sure more space is best for area
- Couldn’t tell what pads would be used for
- Like the least. See the need for parking, but a lot of unused space and not enough options to draw people walking in from the neighborhood
- Don’t like playground next to station
- Like angle parking and space for a lot of smaller facilities, but not drawn to this design
- Not as much action as the others, e.g., garden and expansion plans
- We need parking, so this is the only reasonable plan – would have more building coverage on western side, move playground to center, take center pad out and move parking to south, where playground is now
- Parking needs to be closer
- No garden, lots of parking, too retail business oriented

CONCEPT B

Best of Neighborhood Attributes
- Like that there would be more space for trees
- Plaza is great idea for public events, bringing people together
- More of a destination
- Like overall concept, but think plaza and pavilion is too large, and will feel empty dead. Make building bigger
- Plaza is good, but worry about negative hanging out
- Like the interactive feel with the pavilion in the center
- Serving people with special needs
- HOPE and north side seem isolated. How will this side match the style and architecture?
  - Bigger library and also places for kids and teens
  - Very good
  - Good neighbors, friendly atmosphere
  - Very community friendly

Best of Holly Square Attributes
- Big plaza may create some safety issues
- Great for open air markets in plazas and pavilions
- Maybe not enough parking, but could serve as an incentive to walk or bike
- Great if the plaza is kept up and maintained
- This concept can contribute to the square
  - Church
  - Love the plaza, garden, and pavilion and playground
  - Can move around seamlessly without passing through parking lot
  - No easy access from west
  - More for families to do
  - Like plaza, like garden, allows three larger facilities to be connected by attractive square

Good Neighbor
- Not sure if large plaza could be kept safe
- It will add new place for public
- Best location of playground, safe connection with HDRC
- Activates (?)
- Maybe cut down on traffic if plaza is smaller
- Urgent care
- Might bring hang out factor into play
- Like plaza – tied to library, would be pretty
Use, Space, Activities

- Nice to have some retail, and option for school training
- Best use
- Pedestrian-positive with parking lot
- Could be used for crime activity if taken over
- Could be great for kids/families if drug dealers keep out
- Like that we still have the park
- Large open area, lots of possibilities for activities, community events
- Like playground off plaza and away from street
- Not as effective in use of space
- Not sure there is enough play space

General Comments

- Too much like Stapleton
- Favorite
- Good for open air markets, karts, youth entrepreneur businesses
- Does well with plaza, and drop of car at N (?)
- More central playground, closer to HOPE Center
- Plaza more appropriately sized, safety improved
- Vehicle drop-off good – need another at HDRC
- Larger plaza starts to be an organizing theme
- Theater idea is great, with building as backdrop
- Like this one the best
- Like the N/S and E/W axes – continue N/S plaza all the way to HOPE. Don’t understand why there’s a drive on the S side of the HOPE property
- I like the concept
- Needs more parking (x2)
- Not sure more retail space is best for the area
- Like idea, but couldn’t tell what pads would be used for
- NO - we already have a playground at the park, and we don’t need any more schools
- Like garden (x5) – is it a community garden? – it should be
- My second favorite design (x2) – plaza is too big
- Centered plaza is beautiful, nice garden, but concerned over vandalism
- Too much parking?
- Where are Sipio Johnson and his mechanic going to go?
- Parking needs to be closer for handicapped
- Poor parking options
- Playground is in a weird place

Best of Neighborhood Attributes

- Small plaza safe
- Best suited to uses that will create new energy center for neighborhood
- Playground is right across from gang hangout
- Doesn’t seem as green as other options
- Reminds me of concept A
- Don’t like
- Might work, but need gangs and drugs out
- Neutral

Best of Holly Square Attributes

- Brings activity together
- I think we have a park at HDRC already – cut out playground
- Assume unlabeled pad sites are retail
- Room for public gatherings, but all in connection with other buildings

Good Neighbor

- Good possibility to have different types of spaces to attract different people
- More pedestrian friendly
- Neutral
- Remove service station

Use, Space, & Activities

- Maybe Pad C to go through (?)
- Good
- The smaller plaza could be better if it ends up that maintenance goes down
- Smaller area for activities, but building/facilities are expanded – prefer bigger outdoor open space
- Plaza is favorite of all the design concepts
- Don’t like having playground on the Hudson (x2) and no garden
- Too much parking?

General Comments

- Playground too close to street/playground needs to move (x1)
- Like this the best – nice mix of education; multi-use, and maybe use Pad A for retail – to be welcoming for all
- In general, great amount of plaza and public space
- Good plan
- Drop-off at post office (very busy post office) will be congested
- Best option if gas station is not acquired
- Plaza and pavilion still too large
CONCEPT C: GENERAL COMMENTS, continued.

- Education good!
- Like a lot, but not the best
- Almost my favorite layout – great mix of uses to make efficient use of available parking
- It’s better than D
- Like multi-use, education space
- NO
- C1 is my favorite design, because it best combines rec ctr with Holly Square
- Focus on family uses – HOPE is vital, but Holly Square should not be focused on that
- Garden missing (x3)
- Playground
- Remove service station and do bike depot or outdoor exercise station
- Like this concept, but not drawn to like D
- Parking is too far away

CONCEPT D

Best of Neighborhood Attributes
- Central plaza may not work
- On street parking may be an issue
- Best option if gas station IS acquired
- PERFECT
- Provides a greater opportunity for people to come and participate
- Like the inclusion of HOPE area and redevelopment on the south side
- Like the expansion of the library
- More things to keep families busy with each other
- Beautiful
- Would offer a lot more activities

Best of Holly Square Attributes
- Lack of activity
- Probably more difficult to park
- Never really seen the best of Holly
- Seems very crowded and not enough space for retail/ local businesses, not enough parking
- Yes!
- Good number of facilities and open space
- Will complement neighborhood and bring safety

Good Neighbor
- Lack of neighborhood connection
- Like the playground closer to residences
- Parking for all uses with campus project
- Redevelopment of surrounding property is great
- HOPE Center should be included in plan – everything should be included and beautified
- May let neighbors meet each other and respect one another
- Not sure tennis court embrace character of the neighborhood
- Love loading zone in front of HDRC
- Feels bustling with little room for trouble
- Will build character and attraction

Use, Space, & Activities
- Good thought
- The plaza could have multi-purpose use
- Reducing grass field space a problem
- Get rid of tennis courts and have more grass fields
Good location for new basketball courts

Better use of space

Close off Hudson and Holly between 33rd and 35th

School is great! Rec Center expansion is great

More room for small business

Still would like more public area

Educational space is very important

More for sports, and addition to HDRC is good, but will draw more traffic

Like one additional basketball court, but not three

Great use of space

Like playground in back – 35th Ave.

**General Comments**

Playground too close to service station

Keep job training included

Make sure youth, esp. gang members, get jobs to help redevelop

Don't develop as much of the park as shown here

Has most exterior parking, which is great, as it will be needed (x1)

Makes sense to include expansion and development of entire park and Rec Center

Not sure about use of 33rd Ave. for parking

Teachers' parking?

Plaza design?

Like bridge

Open up promenade – access from post office to HDRC

Best with a Boys and Girls Club added with Rec Center

Parking lot/spaces would be an issue

Plan D is absolutely the best plan, with a “Total redevelopment of the 6 block area.”

Like future ideas

Excellent for community

Especially like D1 - D1 the best (x9)

D1 is nice, compensates well for different activities

Like D1 layout the best, but the uses in the concept the least

Would like retail (coffee, restaurant, grocery)

Reduce pad C size to allow N/S axis to extend visually S of 33rd

Wastes space

Like looking forward to redeveloping more than just the Holly Square

Especially like D1, but concerned about playground at 35th and Holly – doesn't put child safety first

Preserves as many trees as possible

D1 plans to relocate garage?

NO

Not enough space for children's area

What areas will hold what # of people?

Library would need to expand with increased traffic

Like the angle parking and park and drop off in front of HDRC

Like distributing parking around park so as to have buildings east of HOPE and redevelopment of S side of 33rd

Overall redevelopment of Holly Square and park and HDRC are needed

Absolute favorite – love the non-intrusive parking as well as focus on space for retail, education, family, and entertainment

Live functional parking sports center

Garden is big plus

Educational center for children = classes for all ages

Parking may need to be reformatted to create more spaces

Plan is good, but complicated and expensive

Like garden and playground and tennis and basketball!

Like D1 with expansion of HDRC and redesign of park, use of space by HOPE, and service station being gone

BEST like expansion of HDRC library and possible expansion of HOPE

D the best

D1 the most ambitious and visionary, best for traffic and parking

Would like to see places to entertain and teach children and the elderly

Like expansion plan

Like concept – all open space is used

More parking, closer to playground and library plaza
**Northeast Park Hill Community Profile**

**Introduction**

In April 2009, the Urban Land Conservancy (ULC) purchased the former Holly Square Shopping Center (Holly Square) from Michael Bumble. Holly Square is located in Denver’s Greater Park Hill Neighborhood (GPHN). GPHN is delineated into three sub-areas - South Park Hill, North Park Hill and Northeast Park Hill. In 2008, GPHN was selected as one of the American Planning Association’s 10 best neighborhoods in the country.

Holly Square is located in Northeast Park Hill. The site, comprised of 2.6 acres, was built in the early 1960’s and destroyed by arsonists in May 2008.

As a result of the Pride and Passion of the neighborhood, community members have been actively engaged in assuring that the future redevelopment of Holly Square and the surrounding area provides a lasting, community benefit to residents.

ULC has worked with the Denver Foundation’s Strengthening Neighborhoods Program and the Northeast Park Hill Coalition Steering Committee on a “visioning” process for the Holly Square Redevelopment Project (HARP). The HARP includes a six-block area including and surrounding the former Holly Square Shopping Center located between 33rd and 35th Avenues and Hudson and Holly Streets. This work has focused on viable and sustainable alternatives that garner support from the community and establish a strategic plan for successful redevelopment in the area.

community by design (cbd) was hired by ULC to assist with the visioning process. At the end of the process, cbd will submit a Final Report to ULC. ULC will use the information included in the Report to issue a Request for Proposal for the redevelopment of the property.

---

**Northeast Park Hill at a Glance**

- **Population:** 8,794
- **Housing Units:** 2,900
- **Owner Occupied:** 48.23%
- **Family Households:** 58.86%
- **Non-Family Households:** 31.14%
- **Average Family Income:** $37,468
- **Average Home Sale Price:** $189,562
- **Households with Subprime Mortgages:** 22.35%
- **Foreclosures Filings:** 146 (2009)
- **Cost burdened Renters:** 53.1% (paying more than 30% of income on housing)
- **Percent of Families in Poverty:** 19.83%
- **Percent of Population under 18:** 30.75%
- **Percent of Population over 65:** 10.69%

**Racial/Ethnic Makeup**

- **White:** 4.68%
- **Black:** 68.5%
- **Latino:** 23.81%
- **Asian:** .4%
- **Native American:** .41%
- **Two or more races:** 2.1%
- **Foreign born:** 14.2%

**Adult Educational Attainment**

- **High School graduates:** 30.67%
- **With some college:** 19.41%
- **With college degree:** 16.42%

**Percent of Adults who speak a Language Other than English:** 11.4%

**Unemployment Rate:** 5.57%
Population and Household Characteristics

In 2007, the Denver Regional Council of Government (DRCOC) estimated the population of Northeast Park Hill at 8,794 and the population of Denver at 592,052. There were 2,760 households in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood.

Households with Children. There are slightly more families with children (36%) in the area than families without children (33%) and non-family households (33%).

Percent of Total Households
- Families with Children 36%
- Families without Children 33%
- Non-Family Households 31%
*Source: 2000 Census

Single-Parent Households.
In 2000, nearly 40% (39.7%) of households with children in Northeast Park Hill were single parent families. This figure is significantly higher than national estimate of 28% of children in single-parent households. A significant percentage of the single parent households (31.5%) are also living in poverty.

Age.
According to the 2000 Census, there are 2,704 children under 18 in the area. This figure represents over 30% of the area's total population. The combined total of children under 18 and young adults in the 18-24 age group is almost 3,600 or 40% of the total population.

The population over 65 comprises nearly 11% of the population.

Race and Ethnicity. The racial and ethnic composition of the neighborhood is presented in the following chart.

*Source: 2000 U.S. Census

The makeup of Northeast Park Hill appears to be shifting. In 2000, there were 168 births in Northeast Park Hill. Of these, nearly 46% were born in African American households and about 46% were born in Latino households. In 2007, there were 160 births in NEPH; of these 32% were in African American households and 53% were in Latino households. If this trend continues, there could be a demographic shift in the area.

It should be noted that Latino is not a "racial" category. Latinos can be of any race or combination of races. Latino is typically used as a self-identified ethnic description, based on a foundation of common culture and language. Latinos are not a homogeneous group; such households include those whose families have been here for many generations and those who are more newly arrived.
Housing Characteristics Profile

- There are 2,900 housing units in Northeast Park Hill. (source: DRCOG)
- Nearly 4% (3.86%) of the units were constructed before 1940.
- There is almost an even split between owner-occupied homes (48.23%) and renter-occupied homes (51.77%) in the area. The owner-occupied rate is lower than Denver's rate of 52.48% and the national rate of 67%.
- The average sale price of homes in the area is almost $190,000. The average sale price of homes in Denver is $278,024.
- The majority of renters in Northeast Park Hill (53%) live in unaffordable housing (pay more than 30% of income on housing).
- 14% of housing units are subsidized.
- The vacancy rate in the area is approximately 5%.

Public School Information

Below is the list of public schools located in or near Northeast Park Hill:

Elementary Schools
- Hallett
- Smith
- Stedman
- Swansea

Middle Schools
- Smiley

High Schools
- East
- George Washington

The School Accountability Report Rating (SARs) for all of the elementary schools and the middle school range from “Unsatisfactory” to “Low.” A majority of students at these schools also qualify for free and reduced priced meals.

The High Schools serving the area seem to be performing better than the elementary and middle schools (East SARs rating – “High”; George Washington SARs rating – “Average”).