

2014I-00096, Approximately 99

Quebec Street

Public Comments

E-mailed to Denver Planning

Board

May 5, 2015

From: [Christine O'Connor](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: Staff Report for #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:37:34 AM

I would ask the Planning Board to look at two things in the CPD staff report.

1. There is no exhibit situating the subject site within RTD's Light Rail Maps, an important factor in considering appropriate zoning context. There are several maps attempting to situate this parcel, but no Light Rail map.
2. There is nothing incorrect in the chart on page 5 of CPD's Staff Report listing surrounding zoning. However, the chart paints a narrow picture of the character of existing neighborhoods around Boulevard One. It is also an example of how piecemeal rezoning affects each subsequent rezoning application.

For example, the west and south sides of the subject parcel are now shown to reflect new zoning granted in 2014 and therefore have not captured the Edge Zoning in Crestmoor to the west and Mayfair Park to the north. (Granted the grid omits the R-2-A area to the SW of the Buckley Annex as well.) it is ironic that, while purporting to rely on the planning for the entire boulevard One area when presenting "density" numbers, the City now relies on vacant land to the W and S of this parcel only.

By treating this 18 acres as another piecemeal rezoning, the Planning Board can safely ignore the fact that Edge and Suburban and R-1 and R-2-A zoning describe most of Council District 5 and much of the residential areas up and down Monaco and Quebec. Yes, the Lowry Town Center to the NE corner includes a variety of uses and zoning, but even the Town Center is comprised of a mix of low lying senior housing, retail, and four story office and residential. The Lowry Town Center does not look and feel like Cherry Creek and does not justify the choice of Urban Center zoning along Quebec.

I urge each Board member to independently go to Find My Zoning on denvergov.org and examine the east Denver neighborhoods and contexts in District 5 and up and down Quebec and Monaco. I urge you to consider the effects on existing Denver residents of applying this Context and designation to 18 acres of Lowry.

Thank you.
Christine O'Connor

From: [Kelli Yahoo](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: Reject Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:17:38 AM

Please reject Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex in Lowry. We want zoning that fits our area, not urban zoning that would allow runaway Cherry Creek-style development.

Kelli Ramsdale
[260 Jasmine Street](#)
[Denver, CO 80220](#)

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

From: [Maggie Price](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:37:34 AM

Hello,

Please turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 until more thoughtful zoning that fits the residential neighborhoods can be found.

Best Regards,

Maggie Price

1465 Fillmore

Denver 80206

From: littbrennan@comcast.net
To: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Rezoning application 20141-00096, former Buckley Annex
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 5:30:05 PM

I am writing to express my opposition to the above-referenced rezoning application filed by the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. The application seeks to allow 5-story housing units on the former Buckley Annex property in the development being called Boulevard One. I am aware that this rezoning issue will be considered at a public hearing before the Planning Board on May 6. I wanted to provide my comments in advance, for your consideration.

My family has lived at our current address in Lowry, 7305 E. Maple Ave., since 1998. We are the original owners of our home, and we were among the first group of homeowners in the Lowry neighborhood. I have always assumed that the Buckley Annex land would eventually be developed. I look forward to welcoming the new residents of Boulevard One to this wonderful community, and I am excited about adding new businesses to the neighborhood as well. When we chose to live in Lowry, we were seeking an environmental mix of residences and businesses within walking distance of our home. We eschewed a suburban bedroom community where one has to drive everywhere. I think that Lowry has done a very good job (so far) of mixing residential (both single-family and multi-unit) and commercial development to the benefit of the people who live and work here.

Unlike some of my neighbors, I am not going to assert that a 5-story residential building is not "in character" with the Lowry neighborhood. The land immediately south of the Buckley Annex already has several apartment buildings of that height or higher (Berkshires). And there are existing, higher density buildings within Lowry. My concern is focused on the added density these proposed 5-story buildings will add to the Boulevard One development and in particular its proximity and access to Quebec St. (Neither the Berkshires nor the higher-density residential buildings near the Lowry Town Center have direct access to Quebec.)

Here is my biggest concern: the egress point from my neighborhood to head south on Quebec (or west across Quebec) is Cedar Place. Turning left onto Quebec or going straight at that intersection is a difficult proposition already. With the traffic flowing north and/or south on Quebec St. at any given time, there are few opportunities to exit the neighborhood safely to proceed south or west. That intersection requires significant patience to navigate safely, which many drivers do not possess. I have two teenage daughters, one of whom is already driving and one who will be driving soon. My advice to them has been to consider this intersection as the most dangerous one they will encounter on a regular basis.

I am not naive. It is inevitable that more traffic will be headed in both directions on Quebec St. once Boulevard One is fully developed. But single family and row homes will not increase the amount of traffic to the same extent as 5-story buildings. It is irresponsible to consider adding that kind of density to this area without a plan for

addressing the existing traffic flow issue at Quebec and Cedar Place. And I am skeptical that any plan could accommodate the increased traffic resulting from 5-story buildings on this intersection. (The rezoning application addresses only impacts on "signalized intersections in the area.")

I also do not believe that the proposed rezoning meets the stated criteria in the rezoning application submitted by the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. All of the following are already supported by the development of Boulevard One *without* the rezoning and are therefore not justifications for allowing a *zoning change*: promoting infill development; mixed used community--live/work/play within neighborhood; promoting public transportation; and sustainable development. It also appears that LRA cherry picked surrounding areas for illustrating comparable density (including Berkshires, but ignoring Park Heights, which has very low density but also abuts the Boulevard One development to the south).

As noted above, the rezoning would result in a significant detriment to current residents of the area, specifically the residents of my neighborhood to the south of Lowry Blvd. and west of Quebec. As such, it does not "further[] the public health, safety, and general welfare of the City." In addition, the the proximity of bus stops is not a justification for increasing the housing density already called for in the City's Plan. The public transportation options for Lowry residents are pitiful compared to other neighborhoods, especially those with access to light rail. My only public transportation option from my house to my office downtown is a bus ride that takes a minimum of 45 minutes door-to-door. The current zoning, excluding 5-story buildings, is sufficient to support and promote a variety of mobility choices based on the existing transportation options.

The proposed rezoning is also not "necessary to provide land for a community need that was not anticipated at the time of adoption of the City's Plan." There is certainly a need for more *affordable* housing in Denver, which may have increased since 2010, and which is often best answered with large, multi-family buildings. But Boulevard One is not a significant affordable-housing development. The current zoning permits a sufficient diversity of housing types and costs.

It is also not correct that "[t]he land or its surroundings has changed or is changing to such a degree that rezoning . . . is in the public interest to encourage a redevelopment of the area to recognize the changed character of the area." (quoting the justifying circumstances cited on the rezoning application form) It is nonsense to say that the character of the area has changed since 2010 when the Denver Zoning Code was adopted. If anything, increased traffic flow on Quebec over the past 5 years *weighs against* a zoning change allowing greater density than what is permitted under the City's Plan. And importantly: the Lowry Redevelopment Authority will develop Boulevard One with or without 5-story buildings. The current zoning should remain in place.

Thank you in advance for considering my input on the proposed rezoning.

Jean Brennan

7305 E. Maple Ave.
Denver, CO 80230
303-343-4441
littbrennan@comcast.net

From: [Margaret Velarde](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Citizens Outrage
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:22:10 AM

Rezoning Application #20141-00096 and beyond. Like many of my fellow citizens (or perhaps some would call us saps) I oppose the unfettered "development" that elected officials of this city espouse. It is particularly evident with urban Center zoning which MB Susman seems to love. Phooey on the fact that there is no infrastructure to support such density, or indeed that her constituents find objectionable and out of character of the neighborhood. It seems she finds it important that lots of people want to live at Boulevard One. One has to wonder if all those folks realize that parking will be next to none and all those pretty little parks won't mean anything compared to the pollution that will ensue. But who cares the city officials seem to say. The neighborhood and people be damned, I've got mine and cuddle more closely to the developers they sleep with. The travesty that is now Cherry Creek is a perfect example of greed gone amok with those ugly structures, some of which seem to hover over the sidewalk, one more disgusting than the other. No sensible person is against development but it should be done judiciously and in keeping with established neighborhoods. I see a grass roots organization forming, perhaps called TAKE BACK OUR TOWN with recalls in mind. Please listen to us. We vote. Thank you.

From: [Sharon Berthrong](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:16:02 AM

Please do not approve the zoning for 20141-00096

this is not compliant with the Lowry neighborhood

thank you
sharon b

START NECESSARY TROUBLE
John Lewis - Freedom Rider

From: [Kelli Yahoo](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: Reject Rezoning#20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:15:57 AM

Please reject Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex in Lowry. We want zoning that fits our area, not urban zoning that would allow runaway Cherry Creek-style development.

Kelli Ramsdale
260 Jasmine Street
Denver, CO 80220

Sent from my iPad

From: [Anne DeWitt](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: deny rezoning application
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:30:08 AM

Please deny the rezoning application #20141-00096 for Bucklye Annex in Lowry.

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."
Tell your city officials that this claim is utterly false!

Please, please, please. This will RUIN our neighborhood.

Thank you,
Anne DeWitt
470 Kearney St.
Denver, CO 80220

From: [Heather Bays](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:27:42 AM

Dear Planning Board:

My name is Heather Bays and I am 14 year resident of the Lowry community. I am writing to ask the Board to turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 so that zoning that fits our neighborhood can instead be found. The Lowry and Crestmoor communities would be forever changed and damaged by zoning similar to what is being developed in Cherry Creek. Please do not approve the rezoning. Keep our neighborhood similar to what it is now....

Best regards,
Heather Bays

The Bays/VanSickle Family
7806 E. Severn Place
Denver, CO 80230
303-366-3485

From: jeandveirin@gmail.com
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Cc: [Lowry United Neighbors](#)
Subject: Rezoning for Buckley Annex and 195 S. Monaco Parcel
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:26:38 AM

To the City Council and Planning Committee of Denver,

As a resident of East Denver, I would like to go on record as a citizen against zoning the Buckley Annex as an "Urban Center." In addition, I would ask you not to change the zoning on the 195 S. Monaco property which is currently the site of Mt. Gilead Church.

This zoning is not in keeping with the nature of the many neighborhoods surrounding this parcel of land and will adversely impact our quality of life as well as the traffic of all adjacent neighborhoods and all those who drive on the overburdened roads on Monaco, Quebec, and Alameda Avenue on a daily basis. Many other neighborhood streets, i.e. Cedar, 1st Avenue through Crestmoor and Hilltop and Cherry Creek, even 6th Avenue and other side streets are experiencing an influx of drivers who try to avoid these major arteries during peak hours.

We all know that Denver is a city of beautiful neighborhoods of which we are proud. It is a given that the city is experiencing an influx of new residents because of this. However, poor planning with no possibility of a relief from the growing gridlock due to no infrastructure nor possibility of mass transit is seriously affecting the quality of life of all residents. It is also contributing to declining air quality in our city as more cars are waiting in traffic on roads clogged with cars.

We are asking that our local government officials strive for smart, reasonable development in making sure to get it right in regards to appropriate zoning for our neighborhoods impacted by the Buckley Annex and the 195 S. Monaco property.

Thank you,

Jean Dveirin
182 Oneida Court
Denver, Co. 80220

From: [Elizabeth Frank and Harry Newman](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Cc: [Elizabeth Frank](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:36:39 AM

Dear Planning Board,

We have lived in the Lowry area for sixteen years and are writing to oppose the referenced rezoning application. The development this rezoning would allow is completely out of place in this part of the city.

Our area has already become quite congested. We would be very upset for our neighborhood to become so dense as the Cherry Creek area. We have very limited public transportation available.

We request that you only consider and approve zoning that fits the character and infrastructure of our neighborhood. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Frank and Harry Newman
169 S. Quince St.
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Ed Vickland](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: Zoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:00:57 AM

Please turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 so that zoning that fits our residential neighborhoods can be found. You continually go against the concerns of the neighborhoods for max density.

From: [Joanne Schultz](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: BUCKLEY REZONING
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:28:54 AM

As residents of Lowry for the past 7 years who value the quality of life in Denver, we feel it is our responsibility to add our voice to those of the many other concerned residents in our neighboring communities.

Rezoning Application #20141-0096 should be adamantly opposed. High density, urban development is not appropriate in the Lowry and Crestmoor neighborhoods; and issues of traffic safety, congestion and general public health and welfare have not been adequately addressed. We live in a Gallantry home and have already seen a major increase in traffic the past several years as well as commuters taking short-cuts through our development during rush hours, ignoring the Private Alley signs that our HOA has posted. We fully expect that Boulevard One development plans will only exacerbate this problem.

The current residents of the impacted communities deserve a reasonable and smart redevelopment plan that respects preserving the character of their neighborhoods while still meeting the needs of the larger Denver community in a responsible and intelligent rezoning plan.

We trust that you will listen to the many concerned citizens who only want the best, not only for their own communities, but for Denver as a whole.

Thank you.

Dr. and Mrs. Terry K. Schultz
Lowry Residents (since 2008)

From: [Paul Morgan](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:15:26 AM

I am a resident of Lowry and am opposed to Rezoning Application #20141-00096, the latest in a series of proposals to change the character of east Denver, most of which, unfortunately, have been approved against the strong opposition of the residents of this area.

The 2008 plan promised townhouses (2.5 to 3 stories) along Quebec and 1st Ave. ("*To provide a gradual transition to the existing residential neighborhoods, there shall be single-family-attached residences on the edges of the property near existing single-family residential uses.*")

It also promised to provide a 35 foot setback for development from the Right-of-Way ("*To provide an attractive edge to the redevelopment and to buffer the impact of the Quebec Street traffic, a minimum 35' landscaped setback shall be provided from the Quebec Street R.O.W. to any future buildings.*") These promises to residents should not be ignored in rezoning applications for the following reasons:

- The rezoning is not compatible with the lack of public transit, especially light rail and existing traffic congestion problems (unfunded congestion relief plans), and the single family residential areas adjoining the site;
- The rezoning will increase traffic that and pollution that will endanger the health, public welfare, and safety of my family and my neighbors.
- I support reasonable, smart redevelopment that fits east Denver AS PLANNED, not rezoning to suit developers.

I respectfully urge you to reject this rezoning application.

Thank you,

Paul Morgan

--

Paul Morgan
1095 Rosemary St
Denver, CO 80230
303 704 9780
morgan.pablo@gmail.com

From: [Jo Snell](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD; Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development; denc - City Council](#)
Subject: Turn down Rezoning Application 20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:10:12 AM

Shame on you for stooping to such a low level, by scheduling a City Planning Board hearing the afternoon of the day the "Friends of Crestmoor Park" was holding a community-wide meeting. What a dishonest tactic to keep them away from your meeting.

Instead of applying underhanded methods to further a very harmful development, why not turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 and *work* with neighborhoods to establish proper zoning and development for the already-established area?

Jo Snell

From: [Stephanie L. Creen](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Lowry United Neighborhoods](#)
Subject: Turn Down Rezoning Application #20131-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:05:36 AM

To the Denver Planning Board:

I am writing to express my firm opposition to the rezoning of 195 S. Monaco Parkway. I currently reside in the East Park neighborhood of Lowry and for the past several years, and have personally felt the effects of Mr. Kudla's previous rezoning approval at the Legends of Lowry. The rezoning in that development has pushed an unthinkable amount of cars onto our streets, and poses as a major safety concern for residents, emergency vehicles, and those visiting our neighborhood.

I am also a parent to two small children (ages 2 and 4) that attend Crestmoor Learning Center, which sits just on the other side of Cedar. This is a school for children ages 6 weeks to 5 years old. As many of you have already been made aware at several meetings, this 120 PLUS unit apartment complex poses a HUGE safety concern for children, parents, teachers, and residents. Currently, our teachers park along Cedar to give priority parking to parents, in an already undersized parking lot that is used overnight and on weekends by neighboring apartments. With an increase in parking/traffic, those teachers will now be forced to park several blocks away in the dark. Knowing the amount of crime that our neighborhoods already experience, you are contributing to the increase in crime that will undoubtedly occur. In addition, it is absolutely absurd to think that a car will ever be able to make a left-hand turn on Monaco Parkway, out of the proposed apartment development. That traffic will now flow onto Cedar (where children, parents, and teachers walk) and throughout the Crestmoor neighborhood. The pictures attached shows traffic heading South on Monaco at 5:11pm while I am trying to take a right hand turn on Monaco, from Cedar (at the light), to pick up my children from school. As it is, I sit through three traffic lights (on average) to turn left onto Monaco. And, let's not forget about those 40+ year olds (and potential pedophiles/sex offenders) that will now have a direct view into my children's outdoor playground, from the 40ft+ building.

Mr. Kudla knew what the current zoning restrictions were when he purchased the church property for \$1.6 Million. Like any other developer, he's asking for forgiveness later in order to turn a profit, which he clearly admitted at the Chapel meeting. The residents of Crestmoor and the surrounding neighborhoods understand that growth occurs, and are open to viable options for that land, such as townhomes, condos, or single family homes (NOT large apartments AND townhomes). The original zoning was put in place for a reason, not to accommodate and additional 200+ residents and their cars. The current infrastructure of Lowry and Crestmoor CANNOT support the increased population being proposed. There are many other areas around Denver that CAN accommodate this and where land is for sale (i.e along Mississippi Avenue, west of Havana; near Havana Gardens; or in the DTC area). These areas are on a bus line, have multiple lane access, are within walking distance to shops and restaurants, and have existing stop lights for safety and regulated traffic flow; a demographic that Mr. Kudla and his team say that they are marketing towards.

Please stand up for the citizens of Denver and hear what they have to say. We live here and we will be the ones to deal with the aftermath; not you and certainly not Mr. Kudla. Over 200 people opposed this rezoning and now it's your turn to listen and fight for us. We cannot withstand the population growth that has been forced onto Cherry Creek. There is still time to right this wrong.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Creen
East Park (Lowry)

From: [Linda Mayer](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: re-zoning of east Denver
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:03:36 AM
Importance: High

I do not want our east Denver neighborhood to look like Cherry Creek or downtown. I stay away from both places. Traffic is horrible. I feel closed-in. All of this "high-rise" building is detrimental to the city. It makes me want to move away from Denver.

- o I oppose Rezoning Application ##2014I-00096.
- o I support reasonable smart redevelopment that fits east Denver
- o "Dense urban character" – a goal of this Urban Center zoning – is not appropriate here
- o The proposal does not further the health, public welfare and safety of me and my neighbors
- o The proposed zoning is not compatible with lack of transit in east Denver and single family residential areas adjoining the site
- o Townhomes (2.5 -3 stories) along Quebec and 1st Ave. were promised in the 2008 Plan : (Specific quote from the 2008 Plan: *"To provide a gradual transition to the existing residential neighborhoods, there shall be single-family-attached residences on the edges of the property near existing single-family residential uses."*)
- o The promised 35 foot setback from the Right-of-Way has been eliminated: *(Quote from the 2008 Plan: To provide an attractive edge to the redevelopment and to buffer the impact of the Quebec Street traffic, a minimum 35' landscaped setback shall be provided from the Quebec Street R.O.W. to any future buildings.*

Respectfully,
Linda Mayer
211 Oneida St.

From: [Diane Rubinstein](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 7:34:16 AM

To the Planning Board,

I URGE YOU TO TURN DOWN REZONING APPLICATION #20141-00096 so that zoning that fits our residential neighborhoods can be found.

I live in this area and object to this rezoning for the following reasons:

- * Our neighborhood is formally designated as an ***Area of Stability within Blueprint Denver, not an Area of Change***. There's no compelling reason to change this zoning.
- * The current zoning protects the character of the neighborhood, reflects the surrounding context of single-family homes and represents the vision of our community. This area has always been zoned single family and the New Zoning Code reaffirmed in 2010 that this area should remain E-SU-DX.
- * Residents in the surrounding neighborhoods have consistently expressed support for low-density, residential development in this area.
- * If passed, the rezoning could result in dangerous traffic, inadequate parking, and harm to pedestrians.

THANK YOU FOR LISTENING TO THE VOICES OF YOUR CONSTITUENTS.

Diane Rubinstein
89 Rampart Way
Lowry

From: [Smith, Andrea @ Denver DTC](#)
To: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: Please Vote no on Rezoning Application #20141-00096.
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 7:03:54 AM

As a resident of the small Lowry West neighborhood, the Buckley Annex will be more than dense enough for 1st Avenue and the already congested area at Quebec and Alameda.

We do not need or want 5-story mixed use in our residential neighborhood.

We do not want to be a "second Downtown".

Crossing Monaco or Quebec as a pedestrian becomes increasingly difficult & dangerous trying to get to the park.

We already have cars and trucks parking in our neighborhood that do not belong to our residents.

Vote NO on rezoning application #21041-00096.

Thank you
Andrea Smith
Lowry West

Sent from my iPad

From: [Barbara](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Lowry United Neighborhoods](#)
Subject: Rejection of proposed zoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 6:42:24 AM

To all on Board

I am asking the Planning Board to reject the proposed Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for the Crestmoor, Lowry area. This rezoning does not take into effect severe density impact on this community. There are few streets capable of handling the increased traffic and other than buses, there are no alternative plans for mass transportation to lighten this increased traffic. It is absurd to think this proposal, if approved, will less the already heavy traffic load in the area.

Sincerely
Barbara Drennan
553 Alton Way
Denver, Co 80230

From: [Doug Williams](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 6:28:41 AM

I oppose rezoning application #20141-00096.

Find a zoning that fits our neighborhoods.

This portion of east Denver IS NOT downtown, NOT a transit hub, and is MILES from future light rail.

Thank you,

D Williams
Homeowner in Mayfair Park

From: [Merritt Pullam](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Cc: [Kerwin, Gregory J.](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application ##2014I-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 10:50:29 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

My Name is Merritt Pullam and I am the President of Mayfair Neighbors Inc. an RNO in East Denver. Our boundaries are located from Monaco to Eudora and Sixth to Colfax. At our monthly board member meeting tonight dated 5/4/15 the board voted to send the following message in the hope you deny the below rezoning application.

Reference: Zoning application #2014I-00096 by the LRA for C-MX-5 with waivers

1. ***We oppose Rezoning Application ##2014I-00096.***
2. We support reasonable smart redevelopment that fits east Denver
3. “Dense urban character” – a goal of this Urban Center zoning – is not appropriate here
4. The proposal does not further the health, public welfare and safety of you and your neighbors
5. The proposed zoning is not compatible with lack of transit in east Denver and single family residential areas adjoining the site
6. Townhomes (2.5 -3 stories) along Quebec and 1st Ave. were promised in the 2008 Plan : (Specific quote from the 2008 Plan:

“To provide a gradual transition to the existing residential neighborhoods, there shall be single-family-attached residences on the

edges of the property near existing single-family residential uses.”)

7. The promised 35 foot setback from the Right-of-Way has been eliminated:
(Quote from the 2008 Plan:

“To provide an attractive edge to the redevelopment and to buffer the impact of the Quebec Street traffic, a minimum 35’ landscaped

setback shall be provided from the Quebec Street R.O.W. to any future buildings.)

We ask you to please consider the citizens of Denver, especially those of us living within the immediate area of this proposal.

We ask you to deny the LRA's C-MX-5 Urban Center Zoning application.

Thank you,

Merritt Pullam

President

Mayfair Neighbors Inc.

303-419-2622

merrittpkw@[gmail.com](mailto:merrittpkw@gmail.com)

From: borster@comcast.net
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 9:45:39 PM

Having lived in the Montclair neighborhood for 36 yrs. I'm more and more disturbed about what Denver is doing to our once open family neighborhoods. This is not downtown, we do not offer a fast way to transportation, light rail or otherwise. We are happy neighborhoods and don't want zoning that looks like downtown in our residential neighborhoods, now or in the future. You can find zoning that FITS our neighborhoods. Leave these parts of Denver looking like they do now, not like urban squash with no light, bad traffic, less open space, and dangers to our residents. No "dense urban character" for us!

Sincerely,
Lynn Borcuk
Montclair neighborhood resident

From: [George Swan](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: marybethsusman@denvergov.org; [dencc - City Council](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Oppose Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 9:09:34 PM

To everyone voting on this application, please vote against it. Do the needful!

The re-zoning of Buckley Annex already disregarded consideration of increased traffic when they concluded "2000 cars were already using the Annex, so the number will not change."

This Rezoning Application #20141-00096 should be opposed because the infrastructure will not change, the density will increase, and the current re-zoning underway at Buckley Annex has not even begun to reveal our worst fears. We can do better.

Please consider all of us who moved to Lowry now seeing the current traffic greatly exceeding what we expected when we moved here in 2007. We need zoning that suits our neighborhood. This portion of East Denver is not downtown Denver! We are not a transport hub! And the light rail connection is years away!

Vote against application #20141-00096, please.

Thank you,

George Swan, MPH
180 Poplar St, Unit i
Denver CO 80220
303-406-8009

"transforming healthcare for everyone"

From: [Jason Parnes](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: Oppose Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 8:44:45 PM

To whom it may concern,

I oppose the rezoning application #20141-00096 in Lowry. I would prefer for the rezoning application to better fit the surrounding neighborhood. Lowry is not part of the Denver downtown, nor should it be zoned as such. There is no major transit hub near Lowry and it is many miles from future light rail access. I hope that this will be reconsidered.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jason Parnes

From: [Paul-M David](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD; heresa.Lucero@denvergov.org; dence - City Council; Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office; Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office; Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager; dence - City Council; Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office; Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office; Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager](#)
Cc: [lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Isn't something being forgotten?
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:53:10 AM

A quick note re the proposed developments at Buckley Anex as well as Crestmoor Park. The responsibility of all public officials is to represent their community. These particular neighborhoods have a certain character and were developed based on very specific zoning laws. Most of the people who live here do so because of those characteristics and the type of environment they represent. Changing zoning laws and attempting to drastically increase density, height, & traffic will dramatically impact the core and essence of our neighborhood. Most of the residents here strongly believe that if that will happen it will be a great detriment and have voiced their concern and opposition. As public representatives and city officials who are here to represent the community, it seems that somehow this basic message is not getting through... What seems to be the problem? Did you forget the basics? first and foremost your responsibility is to the community!!! With all due respect-it's time to get back to basics and core values. As someone who has lived and enjoyed this neighborliness for 23 years I think that you will find most people who live here very open minded and responsive. We are not anti development or anti progress, but most of us believe that it can be done in a responsible manner and within the existing core values and characteristics of one of the cities greatest neighborhoods. If it ain't broke please don't fix it! And why are the wishes of the overwhelming majority being ignored by the very people who are suppose to represent us? This is basic stuff -what is wrong with this picture? Respectfully presented by a citizen. PMD

--
Paul-M. David 210 South Locust ST. Denver CO 80224

From: [Sandy Shur](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: Lowry .ciiiv
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 6:16:44 AM

Keep zoning from blocking my house from losing its mountain view (upgraded price property for mountain view) I
With proposed 5 story building on Quebec I will lose my view
And this will lose the neighborhoods feeling.
Also traffic will be bad

Roslyn Shur. 22 Quebec st

From: [nathan.hansen](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Boulevard One
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 8:28:11 PM

Hello,

I oppose to the Rezoning Application #20141-00096. I live in the Historic Montclair neighborhood and have been hearing about the Boulevard One area zoning dilemma and others. I completely object to the zoning and wish the City and County of Denver would keep these developments away from quiet neighborhoods. THIS IS NOT CHERRY CREEK! My neighbors and I have spent well earned money to stay away from downtown and Cherry Creek. Please keep all 5 story mixed use building far away from Historic Montclair neighborhood. These zoning debates should be voted upon by tax paying citizens.

Thank you,
Nathan Hansen
799 Niagara
Denver, CO 80220

From: [Steve Nutt](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: Oppose - Rezoning Application 20141 00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 7:54:07 PM

I am against any rezoning that calls for more density in Buckley Annex or the 18 acre Mt. Gilled Church. While there are arguments for business and allowing more people to enjoy our amazing neighborhood, I am baffled by the lack of parking and roads in Cherry Creek North while the skyline is going up, up, and away. That Urban Center zoning has just popped, there will be so many more people, less parking, and the roads are shrinking.

Denver is a great place, please do not change the zoning to accommodate more people. Our schools are too full, the roads are too full and needs more maintenance, there just is not enough room.

I live less than 2 blocks from Buckley Annex and have been very excited about the project. Now that the roads on the North side connect directly to my neighborhood, Lowry West, I have started to wonder how much traffic is going to flow in front of my house as a least path of resistance to get to the Albertsons shopping center?

Find zoning that fits my neighborhood. This is not Cherry Creek North, it is not Downtown, our roads are only so big, and we do not have a light rail. When was the last time you drove down Colorado Boulevard thinking it was fun?

Steve Nutt
7124 E 2nd Ave

From: [Megan Ackley](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 7:54:01 PM

It has come to our attention that the Urban Center zoning proposal, including an Urban Center five Story Mixed Use zoning for 18 acres at Quebec & Lowry Blvd. (Buckley Annex), followed by the identical Urban Center zoning at Buckley along Monaco Parkway goes to the Planning Board on May 6. In addition, there is a controversial proposal for rezoning of the Mt. Gilead Church property at 195 S. Monaco.

We are residents of SW Lowry, and will bear the impacts of these huge buildings along Quebec and Monaco, including the density, traffic and parking problems that come with the proposed development.

We strongly urge you to find zoning that fits our neighborhoods. This portion of east Denver is not downtown. It is not Cherry Creek. It is not a transit hub. And it is miles from future light rail.

Please respect our decision, lifestyle and investment. We have chosen to live in Lowry specifically because it is a less dense part of the city.

Please keep the proposed "downtown-like" development out of our residential area.

Megan & Craig Ackley
194 S. Roslyn Street
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Tom Olds](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 7:35:01 PM

To the Planning Board,

Below is a letter I sent to Councilwoman Susman on February 21 expressing my concerns for the potential rezoning of the Mt. Gilead Church property at 195 S. Monaco. I have the same reservations about Rezoning Application 20141-00096 as it does nothing but increase density in an area that has seen it's fair share. Within the application it stated that the Boulevard One project as a whole will "not cause significant traffic impacts" because the number of vehicle trips per day (estimated at 9,500) is the same as what was created when DFAS was functional. DFAS has not been viable for a long time and it's hard for me to believe that 9,500 vehicle trips per day was the norm. Traffic, or lack there of, can change the complexion of a neighborhood probably more than any other element. The trend now is for mixed use developments to make "sustainable" neighborhoods with the goal to live, work, and play within the confines of the development. But how many people who will live in Boulevard One will actually work there? I bet it's less than 5%. If that's true, more commercial development within the project will result in more vehicle trips per day into the neighborhood as jobs are created. Additionally, this entire project, along with those noted below come without any real infrastructure improvements to help relieve traffic. You know why, because it's impossible. You can't widen Monaco, Quebec, or Alameda so congestion will be greater and delays will be longer. To continue to increase density where traffic relief is impossible burdens those of us who live here already and makes our neighborhood that much less enjoyable. Cars dominate our lives already and the idea that higher density, mixed use developments is the way to best alleviate the inevitable gridlock is folly. Take a drive thru Cherry Creek, or the Highlands, or our neighborhood for that matter and you'll see that we have big problem already and mixed use developments and buses will not save us. That said, I urge you to reject the re-zoning application in question.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Olds
tom.olds@advancedhydronics.com
546 S. Olive Way
Denver, CO 80224
303-778-7772 Office
720-203-5339 Cell

www.advancedhydronics.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tom Olds <tom.olds@advancedhydronics.com>
Subject: 195 S. Monaco
Date: February 21, 2015 at 7:11:30 AM MST
To: marybeth.susman@denvergov.org

Dear Councilwoman Susman,

I urge you **not** to support a zoning change that would allow the construction of a 120 unit

apartment building at 195 S. Monaco St. If you live in the area, you know how congested traffic can be on Monaco and Alameda streets already. Add the full buildout of the Boulevard One project where over 800 living units plus office and retail spaces are planned and it will be highly challenging to navigate the neighborhood because of the increased density. Once again, city planners have failed us by allowing such a dense development in an area that has already seen massive density increases with the additions of Lowry, Stapleton, Cherry Creek, and the yet-to-be built, Lowry Vista. As a 22 year resident of Winston Downs, I have seen the character of our area change dramatically. While I am not opposed to development and certainly expected it when Stapleton Airport and Lowry Air Force Base closed, it seems what we always get are designs that maximizes every square foot for the sake of increasing Denver's tax base. Little regard is ever paid to local residents concerns while developers get their way and get rich in the process. On it's own, 120 units is not a large complex. But when taken in the context of all that has been built and planned to be built, it amounts to "piling on" an already over developed area.

Again, I urge you not to support the zoning changes and strongly encourage you to lobby your fellow council members to vote against it as well to land us one small victory for our neighborhood where we have had precious few in the recent past.

Sincerely,
Tom Olds
tom.olds@advancedhydronics.com
546 S. Olive Way
Denver, CO 80224
303-778-7772 Office
720-203-5339 Cell

www.advancedhydronics.com

From: [betty lamb](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); Lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141 - 00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 5:09:05 PM

I am opposed to Rezoning Application #20141 - 00096.

Stop trying to put 10#s of development in a 5# bag.

Lawrence T Lamb

From: jevans@lowrynews.com
To: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Our Future
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 5:06:33 PM

May 4, 2015

To the Denver Planning Board and Councilwoman Marybeth Susman,

It is with sadness that I am addressing this issue with you once again.

There have been so many promises in our community that seem to have now been disregarded.

We have attended countless meetings and sent numerous emails where our voices are apparently heard and apparently ignored.

First, there is no explanation of where the 11 units/acre figure is arrived at. When the figures were originally given to us they included many condos built where Hangar 2 is now. Are those numbers included still or has anyone looked at the current density?

Second, most of the density for Buckley Annex (Boulevard One) is focused on the east side of the parcel.

Third, we were promised in the 2008 plan that townhomes would be 2.3 to 3 stories along Quebec as well as a minimum 35' setback.

Fourth, the townhomes along Quebec were not going to have 5 story townhomes built behind them in what is now called a transition from 3 to 5 stories

Fifth, the 2008 plan included 2.5 to 3 story buildings all the way to 1st Ave. Now as far as I can determine the height of the buildings from Lowry Blvd. to 1st will all be allowed to be 5 stories tall.

The biggest disappointment is that whatever promises seem to be made, it is alright for them to be changed as long as there could be short term gain. What gain and for whom is not clear.

What has come to the forefront in the many community meetings is that the area is not designed for the kind of the traffic that the development will bring or the strain on already depleted aqueducts and other city services. Nor is it apparent how this density will fit in a mostly "suburban like" neighborhood. There has never been any thought to rapid transit in this area.

I have also heard the argument, from transportation that when DFAS was fully operational that the traffic was not an issue. Wake up. We have Lowry, Stapleton, Denver Tech and other developments that have occurred since then. (We can't forget that Aurora has really expanded and many people from the east now travel through this area to get to work!) Comparing our current traffic with traffic back then seems unreasonable.

Councilwoman Susman, do you really believe that the City of Denver should make traffic so miserable that people will get out of their cars and use busses in this area? (Don't forget the traffic coming from Aurora that will only continually add more traffic as it continues to expand)

Seriously I challenge you and everyone in the council and in the planning department to take transit from this area for a week. The challenge will be to get children to daycare, school, afterschool activities, sports and other lessons. (If you don't have children with these needs find a family who does and follow their schedule) Also take up the challenge and do all your shopping using our

busses in this area. No fair shopping ahead using your car and stocking up or just shopping for yourself, it will have to be as though you have a family to shop for. You'll have to carry everything with you on the bus. Then you'll also have to be to work on time.

After you have accepted and completed this challenge then I suggest you review your plans and see if you think it feasible to expect people to use the current bus system to accomplish the daily living that our current society demands.

And don't forget that even if you think you can add more busses or more routes, you will still have to accomplish this Herculean feat of getting everyone to where they need to be on time and bringing all your shopping with you on the bus.

I will look forward to your response

Joyce Evans

Lowry Resident

Cc: denc@denvergov.org, lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com

--

Joyce Evans
Executive Editor
The Lowry News
303-437-9636
www.LowryNews.com

From: jevans@lowrynews.com
To: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Planning for OUR Future
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 5:04:24 PM

May 4, 2015

To Denver Planning Board and Councilwoman Marybeth Susman,

It is very difficult to understand that the planning board and city council again believe that putting more density in a mostly "suburban" area will not impact transportation, pollution and water issues.

It is admirable that Councilwoman Susman made the effort to use public transportation for a week. However she did not carry groceries for a family (large bags of diapers, etc) on a bicycle or on a bus, nor did she have hip, knee or other joint issues as many of the people living in the neighborhoods in the affected areas may have.

She also did not have to get children to daycare, school, after school activities or sports, many of which as you are aware are not provided by our schools any more.

If we simply had a population of singles or young married couples without children maybe this idea of using public transit in these affected areas would not be such an issue, especially if rapid transit was available.

I would hope that when plans are being made for a diverse population that their needs have priority over the perceived needs of the people Denver is hoping to attract to the new developments.

Showing that we as a community and city planned for the future and not the short term gains would be a great gift to give to our future generations.

Please show that you are thinking of the future, not just 5 or 10 years from now, but what will we make of this area. Will we be proud that we exercised forethought or will the future generations have look back with disdain for our short sightedness and disregard for their future.

Let's actually be and have a community that works together and lives enjoyably together, not one where the people's voices are not heard.

Sincerely,

Joyce Evans

Lowry Neighbor

Cc: dencc@denvergov.org, lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com

--
Joyce Evans
Executive Editor
The Lowry News
303-437-9636
www.LowryNews.com

From: [betty lamb](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: Lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Opposing Rezoning Application 320141 - 0096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 5:02:37 PM

I oppose Rezoning Application #20141 - 00096.

When we moved into Lowry (2007) and then saw the proposed 2008 Plan, we were told that there would be a gradual transition to the existing residential neighborhoods. What has happened to those single family attached residences?

In the same 2008 Plan, it also referred to a 35 foot setback of landscaping. This amount of landscaping would definitely help the noise (that would come with the height of the plan on the table) echoing back into the existing residential area and beyond..

We are a neighborhood that would like to stay a neighborhood and not a "downtown" or "Cherry Creek downtown"

Let's keep options open to people wanting to live in a neighborhood as we have at the present time by voting down Rezoning Application #20141 - 00096 and looking at a zoning that would be more in line with what we are proud of in this eastern part of Denver.

Betty Ver Steeg-Lamb

From: [Marilyn Winokur](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: Opposed to Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 4:51:42 PM

Dear Planning Board:

I am writing to voice my opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096.

I am highly concerned about these high density development plans and do not believe they fit our neighborhoods. We already have too much traffic, noise, and congestion on Quebec and on Monaco, and these plans are inappropriate for our neighborhood. We are miles from any current or future light rail stations, and the traffic will be intense. I hate what is happening in Cherry Creek and do not want similar high density building and congestion near me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn Winokur
7002 East Walsh PL
Denver, CO 80224

From: [Frank Spreyer](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 4:26:53 PM

My name is Frank D. Spreyer and I live at 21 Quince Street, Denver, CO 80230. I am writing to oppose the Urban Center Five Story Mixed Use zoning at the Buckley Annex. Our residence is one block east of Quebec where the Buckley Annex is located. We don't have the mass transit infrastructure to support such a densification of the neighborhood. Quebec Boulevard to the north of the Lowry neighborhood is a bottleneck and Quebec south of Lowry is a bottleneck, too. Plus, Alameda is already at maximum load for morning and evening rush hour. What is being projected with this zoning does not match with the rest of Lowry and will change Lowry from being accessible and pedestrian/bicycle friendly to one that is inaccessible where you walk or bike at great risk. Please don't do this!

Yours truly,
Frank D. Spreyer

From: [Donna Kornfeld](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: rezoning application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 4:24:01 PM

I live in Winston Downs and I am against all this huge development next to me. Traffic is bad enough now without multi story apartment buildings with several cars per unit adding to it. This is not DOWNTOWN and it is not a transit hub, and I will not ride a bicycle to the many stops I make during the day. This area is supposed to be single family and a low height area. Please consider our thoughts.
Donna Kornfeld dckornfeld@comcast.net

From: [Pearlman, Nathan](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 4:36:44 PM

Urban development in the proposed neighborhoods in the face of already inadequate capacity for traffic along Quebec street is a recipe for disaster. I heartily oppose this proposal.

Nathan Pearlman
783 So. Oneida Way
Denver, 80224

From: [Kate Knickrehm](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Oppose Zoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Monday, May 04, 2015 3:34:15 PM

Please stop doing this to our neighborhoods! This proposed zoning does not fit our previously quiet, well-established neighborhoods. Because of all of the development at Lowry, Stapleton, and now along 8th Avenue and the old medical center, our traffic is already terrible. The density contemplated by this proposed zoning is completely out of character for our neighborhoods---this portion of east Denver is not downtown, is not a transit hub, and is miles from future light rail.

Our once pleasantly liveable city is being ruined step by step. Please don't let this happen!

Kate Knickrehm Hoffman
700 Oneida Street
Denver, CO 80220

--

--Kate Knickrehm
--kate.knickrehm@gmail.com

From: [Janet Warren](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: Listen to the people
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:26:13 AM

Hi-It doesn't appear that you are listening very well to the neighborhood people who surround the proposed rezoning at 195 South Monaco Parkway, namely Rezoning Application # 20141-00096. You know all the reasons we are against massive development. I'm sure you understand our point of view, but why are you ignoring all the protests? I think it is pretty plain that we don't want this rezoning to happen, so why are you pushing it through? For very unsavory reasons, I'm sure...Janet Warren

TIME RECEIVED
May 4, 2015 12:19:45 PM MDT

REMOTE CSID
7209416215

DURATION
55

PAGES
2

STATUS
Received

May.04.2015 01:42 PM Denise Goltz

7209416215

PAGE. 1/ 2

TO: PLANNING BOARD
720-865-2887

FROM: Denise J. Goltz
182 Newport St.
Denver CO. 80220

I TOTALLY OPPOSE THE BUILDERS PLAN AT 195 S. MONACO
PKWY

AGAIN YOU NEED TO KEEP IN STEP WITH THE CURRENT
NEIGHBORHOOD. ALSO IF YOU DRIVE DOWN MONACO
PKWY. FROM WHERE THE CURRENT CHURCH IS TO I70
ENTRANCE YOU DO NOT SEE ANY LARGE APARTMENTS. THIS
IS RESIDENTIAL AND PLEASE KEEP WITH YOUR
CONSTITUENTS YOU SERVE AND ONLY APPROVE WHAT IS
FEASABLE FOR THIS RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

WE LIVE HERE YOU DO NOT. THIS IS NOT LA, OR NYC, OR
URBAN, THIS IS RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AND PLEASE
RESPECT THIS. THE TRAFFIC IS HORRENDOUS AS WE SPEAK.

DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR THIS RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD
AND ONLY ALLOW 6 OR 8 UNIT TOWNHOMES AS THERE IS
NO PARKING AND A PARK IS ADJACENT TO IT.

THANK YOU,
DENISE J. GOLTZ



To: Planning Board

720-865-2887

From: Denise J. Goltz
182 Newport St.
Denver, CO 80220

I totally oppose Rezoning Application #20141-00096

Please find Zoning that is in the same fit as our RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD. Five story buildings do not fit with our Neighborhood.

Also they are putting in streets and 2 homes are under construction as I write this and I do not see sidewalks.

In the next block we have California Sidewalks and you need to see to it that sidewalks are a part of the planning for Boulevard One. I also notice that the streets are not as wide as the adjoining streets. PLEASE WE LIVE IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD, YOU DO NOT AND IT AFFECTS US EVERY DAY.

THIS IS A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD NOT AN URBAN DENSE CHARACTER. JUST BECAUSE YOU SAY IT IS DOES NOT MAKE IT TRUE.

MAYFAIR PARK IS OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND WE ARE RESIDENTIAL. PLEASE SERVE YOUR CONSTITUENTS.

Denise J. Goltz
182 Newport St.
Denver CO 80220



From: palmer-willis@comcast.net
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Zoning concerns
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:55:48 AM

Please, please, please---we implore you to oppose increasing the density in our already crowded south Lowry neighborhood; please oppose any further growth and traffic.

We live in Winston Downs and some days, even in rush hour, can hardly get out of our neighborhood because of racing, congested traffic; sometimes it can take up to 10 minutes to cross Alameda, or Exposition, and one can never enter Quebec to go north. We used to be able to walk across Quebec to jog, walk, or bike in Fairmount Cemetery but not anymore. Every morning we see a parade of cars entering the neighborhood, against signs prohibiting turns, to try to get through a different route from Quebec to Monaco.

We have had enough traffic for several years; so far, we have loved being Denver residents and do not want to move. Please don't vote for more "dense urban character" for those of us who have chosen to live in the city in peace and quiet.

Thank you for your considerate response to our pleas.

Very truly yours,
Harriet Palmer-Willis
Leon Willis

657 South Pontiac Way
Denver Colorado 80224
303-333-2063

From: StrongG@gtlaw.com
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:00:36 AM

Dear Planning Board:

I am contacting you to voice my opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for the Buckley Annex. As a new property owner and resident of Mayfair Park since May 2014, I value our established neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods, particularly the safety, quiet, and reasonable flow of traffic. Please consider the long existing nature of this residential area in your approach to rezoning in order to retain the current character of our neighborhoods and maintain its tranquility and family friendliness.

Thank you.

Gayle L. Strong

Mayfair Park Resident

If you are not an intended recipient of confidential and privileged information in this email, please delete it, notify us immediately at postmaster@gtlaw.com, and do not use or disseminate such information.

From: [Ben Pepper](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office](#); [Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager](#)
Cc: [lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com](#); "Friends of Crestmoor Park"; "Dave Cohen"; "Andy Domenico"; [p_hersch@msn.com](#); "Jane Broida"; "Fran Rew"; "Simon James"; "Vicky & Bill Ballas"; "Giacomini, Tony"; "Ellen Slatkin"; "Monica Hess"; "Bei-Lee Gold"; "Alyn Park"; "Jay Wissot"; "Patty Ellerby"; "Lyle Kirson"; [jmcgoverndo@mac.com](#); "Randall Nakagawa"; "Katie McCrimmon"; "Peggy NEUSTETER"; [halisi@halisivinson.com](#); "Sandy Stoner"; "Kerwin, Gregory J."; [waynenew2015@gmail.com](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [jenn.hughes@denvergov.org](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:11:55 AM

City Planners, Managers, Zoning Board, et al,

I highly object to the process being routinely followed by the city representatives that are purportedly chartered with representing the residents of Denver. The entire process has broken down, apparently at your hand. Developers and planners that do not even live in our neighborhoods are leading an opaque and 'behind the scenes' crusade to create an unsustainable city. Building up does several things that fly in the face of responsible city management.

We are already facing similar water problems to those now crippling California, we have increased crime, services are stressed, our energy use is increasingly controversial. Add that developers are paying their way to profits at the expense of our neighborhoods, and you have a problem of viability in regards to your charter.

We are not going to look back in 15 or 20 at all favorably on Denver's leadership of today if we become yet another unsustainable, big, dirty, noisy, high crime, overcrowded city, this at Council's and City Planners' hand.

As a back drop to all of this is the Crestmoor Park problem. Although isolated in that it is only one redevelopment project, the numbers speak for themselves:

82% oppose that rezoning effort, and only 18% approve.

Now, in the back halls of our governmental installations it turns out that a fairly simple and ethical process of transparency has been grossly violated. From a note I just received:

[Our city leaders hit us with a double whammy this week! They knew about a Friends of Crestmoor Park meeting to unveil site designs for 195 S. Monaco Parkway on Wednesday, May 6. We invited them to join us. Then, at the last minute, they scheduled a Planning Board hearing on the same day to try to rush through plans for high-density development at Lowry.](#)

Curious, and very disconcerting that our leaders are not able to participate in our meetings, but can find time to supersede our meetings with their own, at the last minute.

It is also very disconcerting that you are so committed to creating yet another Concrete Canyon (Formerly Cherry Creek North) at Alameda and Monaco. Protecting campaign contributions above protecting our neighborhoods is ill-advised at the very least. Whether it rises to actionable is worthy of some additional research

Under separate cover I will copy all of you, transparently, on a note I was already planning to send to our district representatives, copying a growing number of us that have had to band together in an informal neighborhood watch group due to increased crime in the very neighborhoods our representatives are chartered to serve.

Regards,

Ben

From: jevans@lowrynews.com
To: [denc - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:12:42 AM

To all concerned
this area is not designed for the density being requested.
Please turn down the rezoning application #20141-00096 until a better
solution not just for the short term but for our future and future
generations to come can be determined

--

Joyce Evans
Executive Editor
The Lowry News
303-437-9636
www.LowryNews.com

From: sturtz@reagan.com
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: FW: Zoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:57:49 AM

-----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

From: [Deborah Kupecz](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: Denver zoning in Crestmoor Park and Lowry
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:32:10 AM

Ms Lucero, I have resided at 500 Oneida Street in Mayfair Park for 25 years. I have seen the methodical and well planned changes that have occurred in most of the Lowry Redevelopment area.

However I am adamantly opposed to the zoning proposals under consideration at 195 S Monaco Parkway as well as the changes at the former DFAS site. The current proposals will increase traffic concerns, decrease safety for children in an area with several schools and threaten the current property values. This planning is poorly advised and considers only the developer. Please add this letter to the growing number that you have received that oppose the City Council's actions to date.

Deborah Kupecz

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [Anthony Romeo](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: rezon ing
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:03:43 AM

Dear Ms. Lucero,

I am writing to you to request that you vote to rescind Rezoning application 20141-00096 on the basis that it is too extreme a change for the Lowry and surrounding areas. Further study should be considered. Thank you,

Anthony C Romeo
85 Rampart Way #407
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Patricia Romeo](#)
To: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Subject: Neighborhood zoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:54:45 AM

Theresa,
Please turn down Rezoning Application #20141-0096 so that
Zoning that fits our neighborhoods can be considered'
Patricia J. Romeo

From: hmonatt@aol.com
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: Lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; Pbakanowski@aol.com
Subject: Rezoning application 20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:20:20 AM

I am writing to request that you turn down the rezoning application #20141-00096. I am very concerned about development that is not in keeping with our area in terms of volume of traffic and density. Please consider the fact that our neighborhood/area has up until this point been one of the best redevelopment stories in Denver. Lowry redevelopment has kept the character of Denver and this proposed rezoning will not support that. Our area lacks appropriate transit options and street/road infrastructure to support this density. There is nothing in the rezoning proposal that would further the health, public welfare or safety me and my family. In fact greater risk for neighborhood residents is definitely inherent.

The 35 foot setback is necessary to enhance the character and safety of the neighborhood. One only has to look at the redevelopment along 8th avenue around the old medical school area to see how dangerous and poor of a fit a smaller set back is for the neighborhood. We do not want this imposing type of look for building in our neighborhood nor this risk in our neighborhood.

Furthermore, in the 2008 plan town homes of 2.5-3 stories were promised along Quebec and 1st avenue. This provides a gradual transition into the existing residential neighborhoods and should not be compromised.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of my family's concerns.

Holly Monatt and Paul Bakanowski
Lowry Residents

From: [Barbara Volpe](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Christine O'Connor](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Important!
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:25:46 AM

Dear Planning Board:

Turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096!! I have owned property in Crestmoor for 37 years and am now a resident of Lowry. Crestmoor and Lowry are lovely, stable and peaceful neighborhoods which will be ruined if the city continues to pile too much growth and density on them. This portion of east Denver is not downtown, not a transit hub, and is miles from future light rail. Work needs to be done to find zoning that fits our neighborhoods.

It is high time that our city government pay attention to its residents who are fighting to protect the character of Denver neighborhoods which is one of the things that has made Denver so special over the years. Developers should not have a stronger voice in zoning matters than the voters!

Do the right thing for Denver, protect our beautiful neighborhoods and listen to the voters!
Turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096!!

Thank you,
Barbara L. Volpe

Barbara Lane Volpe
303-322-3186 (h)
303-478-2509 (c)

From: j.breese@comcast.net
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office](#); [Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Buckley Annex application 2014-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:32:52 AM
Attachments: [Defects in Buckley Annex GDP.docx](#)

Dear Councilmembers and Denver Planning Board

I am very knowledgeable about the pending zoning application for Buckley Annex, number 2014-00096.

I have attended countless meetings over the years. In every one of these meetings and in every survey

of neighbors there has been almost unanimous opposition to this application. My wife and I remain

staunchly opposed to this very dense proposed development. It does not fit into the neighborhood. It will

generate **9500 new daily traffic trips on top of the traffic congestion that already exists.**

This application violates every tenet of BluePrint Denver. It is surrounded by areas of stability that will

be eroded from it. It will overpower and overwhelm the crown jewel Crestmoor Park.

I am attaching a

copy of a letter previously sent that sets out the tremendous defects of this plan. If any project needs to

be stopped in Denver, it is this one. The site is appropriate for single family homes and perhaps for

multifamily homes, but not for 3 to 5 story apartment buildings.

Please, please, please exercise common sense and reason and do not approve this application.

Instead, substitute suitable development consistent with that that surrounds it.

Enhance our

neighborhoods or at least does not degrade them.

James B. Breese

Paula L. Breese

225 Kearney Street

Denver, Colorado 80220

**James B. Breese
225 Kearney Street
Denver, Colorado 80220**

December 28, 2012

Lowry Redevelopment Authority
7290 East First Avenue
Denver, CO 80230

Dear Lowry Redevelopment Authority:

I am a resident of Crestmoor Park. While I am a lawyer, I have no expertise in redevelopment projects. I have tried to learn about the GDP process, the purpose of a GDP, and what it should contain. I have found many glaring deficiencies in the GDP for Buckley Annex. I am respectfully asking that it either be withdrawn entirely or that a second GDP that complies with basic requirements be done. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am appreciative of steps Councilwoman Susman has recently taken to improve the GDP. I am commenting on its present format.

It is very important to recognize that the Buckley Annex GDP is unique in several respects. Therefore there should be different requirements of it than of a typical GDP. First, unlike most GDP's there have been years of planning before the GDP's submission. Second, the developer is now known. Third, the developer has actually been the originator of these plans.

I understand a GDP provides a conceptual plan for integrating the anticipated land uses for a project. It must consider the effect the site will have on "adjacent properties" GDP R 1.2. (I have used this citation for the Rules that apply to a GDP.) It must ensure that public facilities and services such as roads "will have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development" GDP R 1.2. Most importantly, I also understand that a final GDP "shall be binding upon the applicants . . . and approving City agencies, and shall limit and control the issuance of all zoning permits. . ." GDP rules, (zoning section, page 12, GDPR)

The Buckley Annex GDP is deficient in these ways:

1. The GDP lacks sufficient specificity and detail. Although there are many technical defects in the GDP for Buckley Annex, its biggest fault is an utter lack of specificity and detail. For example, eight large parcels such as those across from Crestmoor Park describe extremely broad proposed land uses ranges from "commercial/SF attached/condo/apartment". This would permit construction of anything from a townhome to a 65 foot high (or higher) commercial building anywhere within the parcel and we could do nothing about it.

GDPR 4.2.B. Chart 1 at page 17 states a GDP is required to include a "preliminary concept of uses and ranges of square footage and general locational distribution" and a "parking concept". It should contain a diagram with "density ranges by total square feet, units per acre, people per acre (human density) and floor area ratios, "locations of shared parking, if any" among other things. The Buckley Annex GDP lacks each of these requirements.

GDPR 4.2.B. Chart 2 states a GDP may require inclusion of "proposed development standards (e. g. density, height, bulk, setbacks, open space) etc. This requirement is "triggered" (I assume

required) “if the GDP or a subarea within the GDP is adjacent to an Area of Stability (all surrounding adjacent neighborhoods are areas of stability). The GDP lacks this important requirement.

GDPR 4.2.B. Chart 4 at p. 21, states additional submittal requirements may include zone lots and building pad sites, building locations including setbacks, building area (gross floor area in square feet and floor area ratio), building elevations and materials, building orientation including entries, site parking location, and layout and many other aspects. Again, despite much planning for Buckley Annex, the GDP is silent in these areas.

In reading over the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan I noticed that there was initially reluctance to set forth detail within the GDP:

“If a GDP is to be initiated prior to a developer selection, the LRA believes the parameters such as unit count or density are better determined during the zoning process and should not be included in the GDP. . .” BARD, I.5.

This made some sense, since at the time, the developer was unknown and a new developer would need some flexibility in crafting its own plan. But the developer is now known. It is the LRA. Since the LRA has already thought through and created a plan, there is no reason to omit detail within the GDP. LRA has more knowledge, familiarity, and experience with this plan than any outside developer could rapidly acquire. (Also, there is no danger in including such details within the GDP since minor amendments can easily be made by the developer and only major amendments require a new public review process. GDPR 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

Buckley Annex is a significant and substantial development of over 70 acres being inserted into midst of long established East Denver neighborhoods. Crestmoor Park, Marfair Park, George Washington, and Historic Montclair neighborhoods either adjoin, or are very close to, this proposed development. They will each be affected, as will the new residents of Lowry who were promised a certain product. There is no justification for having a GDP that lacks details and substance. GDP’s submitted for other projects have contained details such as those requested above, including estimates of the maximum number of square feet for commercial uses, density of residential units in each parcel, etc.

- 2. The GDP is not constrained by the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan (BARD).** At public meetings the LRA sets out its future plans by portraying and describing the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan. The GDP states it has

“been created within the guiding principles and framework of the 2008 Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan . . . Many of the notes . . . [in the GDP]. . .come directly from the Buckley Redevelopment Plan”.

While the Buckley plan provides a “guiding principle” for the GDP, it has not been incorporated into the GDP (and cannot be viewed on the GDP website). Most important, because the Buckley Redevelopment plan is merely a “guiding principle”, its terms are not legally binding and cannot be enforced. The GDP should expressly incorporate the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan if that is intended. Then, and only then, can there can be meaningful public comment. Right now the GDP document is a 12 sheet document that lacks any detail. Approving a GDP without details is akin to signing a blank check.

- 3. Urban design and/or architectural standards and guidelines are not included in the GDP.**

Prior to the application, the applicant should include information about “previously approved design guidelines” GDPR 3.2.1.C.4, page 7. Sheet 4 of the GDP states

“Individual parcels will be designed in accordance with the Lowry Design Guidelines and applicable zoning regulations”

It is not at all clear whether the project will be bound by Lowry Design Guidelines. It either is so bound or it is not. The public, the City, and the applicant need to know. Also, the language is ambiguous. Are some parcels bound and others not bound? Which parcels are not bound? This language should be clarified.

Now that Lowry is the developer, Lowry Design Guidelines should apply. Years ago LRA asserted LRA design guidelines could not apply since LRA would not be the developer. Now that LRA is the developer, it should apply the same guidelines to Buckley Annex as to all other parts of Lowry. It should be noted that former Councilwoman Marcia Johnson appointed a committee of citizens to fill any gap between the LRA design guidelines then existing and standards that should be set for Buckley Annex. It worked for over two years and presented its recommendations. However, so far its work has been ignored.

4. Sufficient technical studies were not done before submission of the GDP. GDPR 4.2.B. Chart 4 states there must be a completed traffic study *accompanying* the GDP. GDPR 4.2.A.5 states “Technical studies shall be approved by the appropriate city departments *prior* to inclusion in the application (emphasis added).” Until the December 18th meeting, we were unaware of the results of any recent study. The Buckley Annex Plan asserts that 9,500 new traffic trips will be generated by the proposed development in an area that is already congested. It further states there will be 10,000 trips through the site on Lowy Boulevard alone. Neighborhood groups had repeatedly asked to have traffic studies done, to no avail. There was some information that such studies were underway, but until December 18th we had not seen them. (Sheet 1 of the GDP states separate . . . traffic studies are being submitted as {a} companion document to the GDP”) Traffic impact studies are supposed to be done *prior* to the submittal of the GDP, not after it has been submitted while the “clock” for public input is running. The first glance at the study revealed on December 18th, left us with glaring concerns about increased traffic.

5. There is insufficient evidence of public meetings about the GDP prior to its submission. At first glance, there has been broad public participation in developing the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan. Under Rule 3.2.1.B, before the GDP application is filed applicant there must be “public outreach” to explain the conceptual development proposal and solicit feedback about the anticipated benefits and impacts of the proposal *within the GDP*.

Evidence that public meetings have occurred on the redevelopment proposal must be presented with the application. GDP Rule 3.2.2.A. Until December 11th, there had been no public meeting specifically designed to get broad public input for over 5 years. At the last public meeting exclusively held for such a purpose, hundreds of neighbors appeared and there was 90% opposition to the plan. Although major (and many favorable) amendments were thereafter made to heights, mix of uses and density in that plan and there have been significant changes in its character, there have been no broad public meetings held to solicit public comment *on the proposed GDP* until December 11th.

While it is true that there have been numerous Buckley Annex committee meetings on specific topics which the public could attend, these were not held for the purpose of discussing the overall plan *or the GDP*. Most meetings were held on weeknights from 5-6:30 and on weekday mornings from 8:30- 10:00, making it difficult for working people to attend.

Finally, regular citizens were also very distressed and suspicious at the timing of the release of the GDP. The 45 day comment period encompassed Thanksgiving, Chanukah, and Christmas, the most distracting time of the year. Again, we are pleased that this comment period has been extended and there will be further public hearings.

6. There should be additional public meetings after this first draft of the GDP is corrected. I understand LRA wants to move forward as quickly as possible with the redevelopment process. However this project is a significant one with expected significant impacts. We should not blindly rush forward with it. Page I. 5 of the BARP states “the length of time to process a GDP is approximately 12 months.” LRA has stated as recently as the Buckley Annex Update of June 26, 2012 that *three* rounds of the GDP process were anticipated. There should be further meetings and opportunities for public comment after the current comment period as Councilwoman Susman has recently insisted upon.

In summary, I urge you to insist upon a GDP that meets legal requirements. I urge LRA to either incorporate, or not incorporate, the Buckley Annex Redevelopment Plan into the GDP. I urge the LRA to either adopt or not adopt the LRA Design Guidelines into the GDP. I urge the LRA to release more results from its traffic study prior to its next draft of the GDP. Then, and only then, can there be meaningful public discussion on the future of Buckley Annex. Only then will there be a document that the LRA, the City and the public can confidently rely upon. Once this is done, there should be other “rounds” held in the GDP process.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

James B . Breese

From: [Pearl Nardini](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: zoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:33:24 AM

I strenuously OPPOSE Rezoning Application #20141-00096. This zoning ravages our community. And, why do I have a feeling that the politicians who vote FOR these measures are being held hostage by the developers? The politicians sell their souls and ruin a community for what? Money in their pockets? Recognition? Wine and dine parties? It is a shameful display of greed!

Pearl Nardini
250 Hudson Street
Denver CO 80220

From: [Karen House](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:39:04 AM

Dear Planning Board: I live just below Alameda on S. Pontiac Way. I am writing about the Urban Center Five Story Mixed Use zoning for 18 acres at Quebec & Lowry Blvd. (Buckley Annex) that you will be considering at your hearing tomorrow. I am concerned because this will be followed by the identical Urban Center zoning along neighboring Monaco parkway, and follows the proposal for rezoning of the Mt. Gilead Church property at 195 S. Monaco. I oppose Rezoning Application #20141-00096; please find zoning that fits our neighborhood(s). I am aware that the particular zoning that is being considered permits high lot coverage, virtually no setbacks from the right-of-way, and urban building forms that maximize square footage. I am obviously concerned about density, traffic and parking problems that will come with these developments. I would ask that you match the new developments to the residential areas that will be affected and not permit any rezoning in our neighborhoods that will promote a dense urban character. Our portion of East Denver is not downtown, not a transit hub, and is miles from future light rail. In my view, that kind of zoning is geared towards transit centers, major corridors and downtown.

Sincerely yours,

Karen House

457 S. Pontiac Way

Denver, CO 80224

From: [Matt Baline](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Sapp, Michael - Mayor's Office](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - Mayor's Office](#); [Buchanan, Brad S. - CPD Office of the Manager](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; friendsofcrestmoorpark@gmail.com
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex in Lowry
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:39:06 AM

Planning Board,

Please turn down rezoning application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex in Lowry.

This proposed rezoning would lead to development that is radically inappropriate for this area of Denver, diminishing the quality of life of its residents. Nearby neighborhood residents have no desire to see Lowry turn into another Cherry Creek or mini-downtown, replete with traffic problems, high-density tall buildings, and the like. We chose to live in this area for its distance from areas zoned to support those urban characteristics. We don't need to be any closer to such troubles.

As noted, the proposed rezoning will undoubtedly lead to traffic problems in the area.

Any claim that there will be no significant traffic impacts cannot be true. There is absolutely no light rail in or near the area and only standard bus service. Ours is not an area equipped to support high-density development. As such, a radical increase in density would surely result in a drastic increase in automobile traffic, choking Monaco, Quebec, Alameda, and our neighborhood streets with congestion like we see on Colorado Blvd. today. Such traffic would significantly diminish the quality of life for nearby residents by making it harder to get out and enjoy the city as a whole.

It would also make life more dangerous for us and our children as impatient drivers speed and look for shortcuts down our side streets. Again, we live in this area to enjoy the wonderful amenities of Denver as a whole, without suffering the trials and tribulations of more dense areas.

Moreover, the tall, 5-story buildings with shallow setbacks that would be allowed by the proposed rezoning have no place in our area of Denver. The only skyline that a residential area of the city should have is one filled with tall trees and the peaks of houses. As millennials, we value the notion of living, playing, and working close together, but large office towers looming over our homes and parks do not fit that vision. Urge developers to another way to bring those three aspects together, one that won't diminish the residential qualities that led us to the area in the first place.

We appreciate the importance of ongoing development in the city and understand that increased density can bring with it many benefits in addition to its downsides.

However, this proposed rezoning is not the right move for the Lowry/Crestmoor area of Denver. It would lead to development that is radically inappropriate, diminishing the quality of life of its residents.

Thank you,
Matthew and Lorraine Baline
Owners
254 S Jersey Street

Denver, CO 80224
339-224-0404

From: [John House](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Zpplication #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:44:04 AM

Dear Planning Board: I live just below Alameda on S. Pontiac Way. I am writing about the Urban Center Five Story Mixed Use zoning for 18 acres at Quebec & Lowry Blvd. (Buckley Annex) that you will be considering at your hearing tomorrow. I am concerned because this will be followed by the identical Urban Center zoning along neighboring Monaco parkway, and follows the proposal for rezoning of the Mt. Gilead Church property at 195 S. Monaco. I oppose Rezoning Application #20141-00096; please find zoning that fits our neighborhood(s). I am aware that the particular zoning that is being considered permits high lot coverage, virtually no setbacks from the right-of-way, and urban building forms that maximize square footage. I am obviously concerned about density, traffic and parking problems that will come with these developments. I would ask that you match the new developments to the residential areas that will be affected and not permit any rezoning in our neighborhoods that will promote a dense urban character. Our portion of East Denver is not downtown, not a transit hub, and is miles from future light rail. In my view, that kind of zoning is geared towards transit centers, major corridors and downtown.

Sincerely yours,

John House

457 S. Pontiac Way

Denver, CO 80224

From: [James Gilman](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Christine O'Connor](#)
Subject: Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:51:25 AM

Planning Board,

We are opposed to the Rezoning Application #20141-00096.
The application is not in the best interests of the citizens in our area, and needs to be reformatted to reflect what is more appropriate for Lowry and Denver.

James and Patricia Gilman
450 Syracuse St. No.1

From: [Alison Rodgers](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: East Denver Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:08:25 AM

Turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 so that zoning that fits our residential neighborhoods can be found!!!!!!!!!!!!

Concerned Lowry neighbor,

Alison Rodgers

From: [Edward Volpe](#) on behalf of [Edward L. Volpe](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#); [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:09:55 AM

Dear Planning Board:

Turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096!! I have owned property in Crestmoor for 37 years and am now a resident of Lowry. Crestmoor and Lowry are lovely, stable and peaceful neighborhoods which will be ruined if the city continues to pile too much growth and density on them. This portion of east Denver is not downtown, not a transit hub, and is miles from future light rail. Work needs to be done to find zoning that fits our neighborhoods.

It is high time that our city government pay attention to its residents who are fighting to protect the character of Denver neighborhoods which is one of the things that has made Denver so special over the years. Developers should not have a stronger voice in zoning matters than the voters! Neighborhoods such as these were designed decades ago to be low density and the long-term residents purchased here for the spacious nature of the area and the quiet streets lined with old growth trees, lawns and landscaping.

Do the right thing for Denver, protect our beautiful neighborhoods and listen to the voters!

Turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096!!

Thank you,
Edward L. Volpe

From: [Karen Dworak](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: Zoning application 20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:13:16 AM

To All Parties:

If you allow zoning application 20141-00096 to be approved it will be apparent that you have absolutely no regard for the neighborhoods which will be impacted by such a change nor for the general decline in the quality of life for people in residential neighborhoods who are quickly have their living environment destroyed. Just because Denver is growing at an unprecedented rate does not mean that every developer should be able to count on ramming zoning changes through the Planning Board and the Denver City Council. The area where they want 5 story mixed use development is already overrun with congestion. Approving more unsuitable growth for the area only indicates that not one of you live or have to commute through this area. Responsible and suitable development would go a long way toward calming our neighborhoods which do NOT want to become an extension of Cherry Creek or the development slated for Glendale. If we had wanted to live in an urban dense environment, we would be living in Lo Do or Cherry Creek.

I am 61, grew up in Denver and tell friends around the country that I no longer wish to be here because too much unbridled, ill-conceived and frankly irresponsible growth is ruining the city for all who live here.

Please listen to all the citizens who love their residential neighborhoods and don't accept carte-blanche the zoning change request numbered 20141-00096.

Thank you for your consideration in this very important matter.

Karen Dworak
163 Newport St.
Denver,CO

Sent from my iPhone

Old School Yearbook Pics

View Class Yearbooks Online Free. Search by School & Year. Look Now!

<http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3141/5548fa09171dd7a08698bst01vuc>

From: [Chris Strickland](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: [Chris Strickland](#)
Subject: Rezoning Request
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:13:59 AM

To: The Rezoning Committee,

I am requesting that you decline the Rezoning Application #20141-00096 for Buckley Annex Lowry. I have several reasons for making this request and the major one is the increase of traffic this would cause in this neighborhood environment. Denver is growing at a pace that the infrastructure is not able to keep up with the increase of people and cars. We do not have the roads to handle the increase and we don't have the police in place to adequately canvas the proposed increases.

Thank you very much,

Christina Strickland
200 Elm Street
Denver, Co. 80220

From: sturtz@reagan.com
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Zoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:19:58 AM

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

From: [Debby Kaufman](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: Please turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:20:51 AM

Please turn down Rezoning Application #20141-00096 so that zoning that **fits our residential neighborhoods** can be found.

Lowry is a fantastic place to live. It is clean, safe, convenient, and beautiful.

I am concerned about:

- the lack of transportation
- parking
- the character of the existing neighborhood
- traffic

I am also concerned that meetings were scheduled concurrently, making it impossible for residents of both Lowry and Crestmoor to voice their mutual concerns.

Thank you

--

Debby Kaufman
303.587.7909

From: [Rita Lipton](#)
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: application 20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:43:04 AM

PLEASE, PLEASE turn down application #20141-00096 so zoning that fits the neighborhood can be found.
Traffic will be unmanageable!!!!!!!!!!!!

Rita Z. Lipton
118 S. Locust St Denver Co.

From: sturtz@reagan.com
To: [Rezoning - CPD](#)
Subject: FW: Oppose Rezoning #20141-00096
Date: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:57:18 AM

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

From: sturtz@reagan.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2015 11:46am
To: dencc@denvergov.org
Cc: lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Oppose Rezoning #20141-00096

Help!

We our witnessing the attempted destruction of a beautiful city. Thanks to our myopic city officials, with a little help from developers/lobbyists/and their ilk, we're getting rezonings crammed down our throats. We're getting density, traffic, noise and increased crime rubbed in our face.

Promises need to be kept. Setbacks and building height restrictions need to be honored. LISTEN to the citizenry and the residents of the existing neighborhoods. It seems to me that some questions should be answered before any rezoning is considered: Is there existing infrastructure to handle additional housing/people/traffic? Is there existing transportation alternatives in place?

Please use common sense and do the right thing,

Reject #20141-00096