

Bartleson, Debra - City Council

From: Christine O'Connor [mitz_4@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:23 AM
To: Bartleson, Debra - City Council
Cc: Susman, Mary Beth - City Council; Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager
Subject: Please forward to Neighborhoods & Planning Committee members
Attachments: OConnor4.27.2015PlanningBoard-1.pdf

Dear Members of Neighborhood & Planning Committee,

I am writing regarding Proposed Rezoning 99 Quebec Street -- currently on the Committee's May 20th Agenda.

On SIRE, there are ten documents regarding this proposed rezoning. Digesting all ten documents and the contents and attachments in those ten items will be a lengthy task. Because my letter to Planning Board is at the end of a staff report and not included in the "packets" of letters, I want to provide it directly to the Committee for your consideration.

I would ask that, in accordance with Denver Zoning Code criteria and in accordance with existing adopted Denver Plans, that the Committee either (a) recommend that Applicant explore less intense zone districts reflective or surrounding neighborhood contexts in East Denver , or (b) customize the zone district proposed to add conditions and waivers that fulfill the goal set out in Staff's own report of keeping lower-density portions of Boulevard One nearer the lower-density adjacent uses and protecting low intensity areas of stability.

I am aware that applicant and city included a small sliver of a waiver on two edges, but this proposed rezoning is for C-MX-5 over 18 acres, and either a more less intense zone district can be found, or further customization can be undertaken to reinstate the 35 foot setback referenced in may locations (including in the recorded GDP found on Denver's website) and lowering height. All these steps would reduce intensity and reduce impacts to the health, safety and welfare of area residents.

Lastly, I would ask the Committee to correct the reference to the GDP as an Adopted Plan, since it was never brought to Council for consideration, and does not contain the elements of an area plan. It is a framework for development and should be referred to in the language regarding GDPs that is contained in the Denver Zoning Code.

Thank you for considering my request to the committee and reviewing my attached letter.

Christine O'Connor
Lowry resident since 2000

Bartleson, Debra - City Council

From: pierson98@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 12:47 PM
To: Bartleson, Debra - City Council
Cc: Elizabeth Lund; Susman, Mary Beth - City Council
Subject: Boulevard One -- Neighborhood & Planning Subcommittee

Dear Debra,

Would you please forward this email to the entire Neighborhood & Planning Committee prior to its meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20th? It is from Park Heights, the Lowry Neighborhood most affected by the Zoning Application #20141-00096 by the LRA for C-MX-5 at Boulevard One.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Lund

Dear Neighborhood & Planning Subcommittee,

It is with a very heavy heart and great dismay that I write to you.

My neighbors and I live in the little subdivision of Lowry which is most affected by the pending Boulevard One Development C-MX-5 Zoning Application. We live in Park Heights, which is a small neighborhood of just over 80 single family homes zoned R-1. Our neighborhood borders the southern portion of Boulevard One. We are so small that we don't have an RNO.

Recently we met and circulated a petition to oppose this Urban Center-Mixed Use zoning application. While we had very little time, we gathered 79 signatures. We believe that the LRA could achieve its objectives without using such an aggressive high density zoning designation. We already have a Lowry Town Center, and we truly don't need another one. It is not safe for school children to cross Quebec near our neighborhood.

Our concerns are:

- Overall density
- Lack of adequate parking
- Building Heights
- Lack of adequate setback
- Traffic safety -- For starters, Quebec Street is already an overburdened and dangerous street

We believe that the process of redevelopment has been dominated by developers and related businesses which have monetary profits as their number one priority. In fact, this writer has seen the employment contract of the LRA Executive Director Monty Force, dated May 31, 2012, which clearly states that his compensation is based upon the sales price for all real estate closings within Boulevard One. With real estate developers, builders and their lobbyists surrounding, advising, and massaging the redevelopment process, the voices of Denver residents have been drowned out. Even

our Councilwoman Mary Beth Susman appears to have sided with the developers. In fact, many residents have noted their regrets to this writer that she ran without opposition in the recent election.

At the Denver Planning Board Meeting on May 6th when the zoning application was approved, the Board representative stated that of the written public comments it received, 68 comments were in favor and 171 were opposed to the zoning application. However, the overwhelming majority of Lowry residents oppose the zoning application, as demonstrated by past surveys when hundreds of residents indicated their opposition. Additionally, this writer believes that most of the comments in favor of the zoning application were from persons connected to or profiting from the developer machine, either directly or indirectly.

Please put a stop to this now. Please protect Lowry so that it remains the special neighborhood that we helped create over 15 years ago.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Lund
Park Heights (Lowry) resident since 2000

Bartleson, Debra - City Council

From: Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 1:53 PM
To: sturtz@reagan.com
Cc: Susman, Mary Beth - City Council; Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office; Burns, Andrea C - CPD Office of the Manager; dencc - City Council; Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office; Rezoning - CPD
Subject: Re: Zoning Application #20141-00096

Mr. Sturtz,

Thank you for your email. While I understand your concerns about the development at 195 South Monaco, I believe that is the project you're referring to, please know that our plans, from Blueprint Denver to the many small area and neighborhood plans are community driven. Our process is to simply facilitate a discussion that results in the documentation of our citizen's vision for their neighborhoods. We work very hard to make sure your voice and every voice is heard in that process. And then when we are given a request for a rezoning we determine if that request is within the confines of the intent of the plan. We often say no, although that is not a public process so little is ever know about those situations, but please know that 58% of the rezoning applications that come to us do not move forward because the applicant is told that we do not support them.

And also please know that of the 220,000 parcels in our city we have seen an average of 24 rezonings per year, which by the way is 50% of what we saw prior to 2010 and the adoption of the new zoning code.

In 2002 we adopted Blueprint Denver which defined areas of change (AOC) and areas of stability (AOS), AOC are only 18% of our city, thus AOS are 82%. In 2013 and 2014 we have seen investment and building permits at a ration of 5:1 and 6:1 respectively. So that means that an area less than 1/5th of the city is seeing 5 or 6 times the development than the other 4/5ths of the city. And in 2015 year to date the investment has been 11:1 in areas of change. Our plans are working.

This doesn't mean that we will never have disagreements about parcels just like the one you are emailing about, but I say all this for you to know that we do care, and that my personal opinion, or the opinion of my staff, doesn't play a role in the decision making process, its the plans that we have created as a community that makes the call.

I also know that it has been the hard work and commitment and the community voice of folks like you that have led to the developer of that site agreeing to reduce the project size from 120 units to 75 units.

What you think does matter, and I hope you're personal opinion of me won't keep you from participating in our planning process, we can't do it without you. For example, this winter we will begin an update to Blueprint Denver and I hope you will attend as many meetings or online events as you possibly can. We need you and your thoughts.

And lastly, you mentioned my ranch, please know that I'm a Denver guy. I moved to Denver in 1982 where I practiced architecture for 32 years, I was the chair of the Landmark preservation commission for 7 years, chair of the planning board for 9 years, and recipient of an INC good neighbor award for my work in the City Park West neighborhood. I may not sleep in the city limits but I live there for sure. And yes, I know who I work for, I work for you.

Thank you for caring about Denver and your neighborhood.

Brad Buchanan

Executive Director
Denver Community Planning and Development

On May 8, 2015, at 3:16 AM, "sturtz@reagan.com" <sturtz@reagan.com> wrote:

Mr Buchanan: Is there any space on your ranch? Seems like the perfect location for a 3 story, 120 Unit Apartment Complex. Who pays your salary? The citizens of Denver or the developers?

John Sturtz
710 S Krameria St

-----Original Message-----

From: sturtz@reagan.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2015 11:19am
To: rezoning@denvergov.org
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Zoning Application #20141-00096

What does it take for you folks to wake up and LISTEN to the citizens of East Denver? We are opposed to REZONING for DUMMIES. We are opposed to unfettered, irresponsible, misguided and near criminal rezonings in Denver.

When the citizens speak and the zoning and planning board listen, we have a functional, well planned, and mutually beneficial development.

When you add lobbyists and developers and those who pose as advocates for the developer and the developer's attorneys and 'donations' from developers to City Council members - you've created this ugly, obscene, dishonest and disgusting image of: DENVER, A World of Crap City

Reject Application #20141-00096

John Sturtz
710 S Krameria
Resident of City Council District 5

Bartleson, Debra - City Council

From: Mark Manassee [markmanassee@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2015 11:30 AM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096

As a Denver native and long-time Crestmoor Park resident, I urged you to turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for the Buckley Annex in Lowry. We want zoning that fits our area, not urban zoning that would allow runaway Cherry Creek-style development. More specifically,

- This C-MX-5 zoning allows for commercial development and multiple, high-density, 5-story buildings that could be nearly 100 feet with roof objects on top.
- This zoning category fits for downtown Denver, but not for our area.
- Residents in neighborhoods in east Denver do not want to turn Lowry into Cherry Creek or a mini-downtown.
- We don't want Monaco Parkway and Quebec Street to be as congested as Colorado Boulevard.
- Our streets are already clogged. We do not have light rail. Lowry and City officials have no plans to handle the dramatic increases in traffic that we would face on Monaco Parkway, Quebec Street, Alameda Avenue, First Avenue, Lowry Boulevard and other small streets in the area.
- The proposed zoning would allow shallow setbacks on Quebec and First Avenue with hulking buildings towering right over the streets.
- The developers are trying to squeeze far too much into too small a space. Along with apartment towers, the application calls for retail and office buildings up to 5 stories tall.
- High-density development in this part of Denver will generate at least 9,500 extra car trips a day. But Lowry officials contend that this zoning will not cause "significant traffic impacts." This claim is utterly false!

Regards,
Mark Manassee
105 Jasmine Street

Bartleson, Debra - City Council

From: Elizabeth Aguilar [liz4374@q.com]
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 4:28 PM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: below in letter

I am in agreement with this writer. I lived between Monaco near Alameda and east of Cherry Creek. I hate what's happening in Cherry Creek with big boxy buildings set right up to the street and increased traffic as I drive through there often. I will attend the June 8th meeting to learn more about who made these decisions and why.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ejlorimer@aol.com
Date: May 5, 2015 5:17:08 PM MDT
To: liz4374@q.com
Subject: Re: (no subject)

I hope you can at least forward my email to zoningreview@denvergov.org and dencc@denvergov.org and say you agree with my comments if you don't care to send your original thinking of opposing the zoning. It's vital that as many neighborhoods and citizens as possible speak up.

In a message dated 5/5/2015 3:19:51 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time, liz4374@q.com writes:

Brilliant, Jane just brilliant. You covered everything, wrote so coherently and forcefully. I loved the "get out of bed with the developers." YOU also brought up environmental issues I hadn't thought of.

Thanks, Your friend Liz

I plan to attend the meeting tomorrow at the BMH synagogue. Maybe I'll see you there.
On May 4, 2015, at 9:52 AM, Ejlorimer@aol.com wrote:

Fortunately, the City emails bounced and I had a chance to clean up the grammar and other typos. I added some other names recommended by INC leaders.

Original email sent 5/3/2015 to: MaryBeth Susman, Michael Sapp, Mayor Hancock, Denver City Council, Zoning and Planning all bounced.

Re: Rezoning Application #20141-00096

Dear Mr. Mayor, Denver Zoning Planning Board and Denver CC:

I am strongly opposed to Urban Center zoning that is spreading like wildfire throughout Denver. The canyon-like buildings will change the environment, increase traffic, increase heating of the planet, increase pollution, tax our resources (fire, police, water, etc).

When the Denver Zoning Code was changed a few years ago, we were impressed that Denver seemed to care about retaining the integrity of existing neighborhoods. These past three years have seen Denver overbuild ant-farm, look alike rental units throughout the City and not even provide adequate parking per unit. Our open space (something that we who live in the West like) is dwindling. And these new rentals are not "affordable housing". It will take two incomes to pay the rent with space allotted to only one vehicle which will, in turn, increase the on-street parking and increase potential for theft, hail damage, etc and that leads to higher auto insurance for all of us. Or, does Denver want to push the entire auto industry out of Denver and all the related jobs?

There is no reliable public transportation and not everyone will afford renting a car to go to the mountains or doctors, etc. Believe me, after using Uber to DIA and being whacked with a 'surge' charge that doubled the quoted fare, I know for sure; I'll never use them again.

Cherry Creek is a place I no longer shop. I drive to Park Meadows. Cherry Creek has become an ugly, overbuilt area now. Too much glass that will increase use of energy, planet heating, cause bounce glare for drivers, etc. No parking and torn up streets that we taxpayers no doubt will be paying to re-pave, even though developer equipment is what ruined the streets. If I were one of the people who had bought a townhome there when the bungalows were torn down, I'd be pretty upset. It's no longer a neighborhood - it's a small downtown within the City.

While I have heard that Councilwoman Susman feels everyone can walk, ride a bike and should live, work and play within a four-mile radius, it is not realistic. As a handicapped senior, I myself indeed cannot ride a bike or walk everywhere. I'm tired of the "get used to it, take it or leave it" attitude that prevails. It's insensitive and it is non-creative thinking. While I understand growth, I don't understand this "build it and they will come at any cost" ideal. Denver is not a green city any longer - oh, except for the marijuana which I assume is hopefully consumed so we'll not pay attention to the insanity surrounding the overbuilding here.

Lowry, Mt. Gilead area, Park Heights, Crestmoor are not transportation hubs, are miles from future light rail and the roads are not right for the increased traffic that will ensue, not to mention the resources and other impacts. Speaking of roads, who is the quality control for those? When our fairly new intersections and roads are already falling apart, it seems we are just doing 'enough to get by' and quality doesn't matter anymore, so we spend and spend to put bandaids on our roads rather than doing it right with quality materials. Follow the money...

I know Denver is landlocked and the only paradigm that this City feels will work is to raise property taxes and overbuild to the point of no open space left, but I beg you to get out of bed with the developers and remember who voted you into office. Oh, maybe the question is, do our voices even count anymore. It doesn't feel like it.

E. J. Lorimer

Denver Neighbor who lives between all of these areas impacted by these zoning decisions near Lowry

=