

Buckley Annex Letters Commenting on Parking Waivers

Applications:

2013I-00051

2013I-00052

2014I-00012

CB14-0522

From: Radleigh@aol.com
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Buckley Parking - Imminent Disaster
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 10:47:15 AM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

Below you will find specific wording regarding the parking situation currently being debated for the Buckley addition to Lowry. I've included it in order to be assured that I said all the "technically correct" things.

However, here's my laymen's comments regarding this situation: this is a disaster waiting to happen driven solely by greed to build as much living space as possible, without concern for the quality of life in the area. The purpose is to maximize profit without concern for the long term property values of the people who innocently buy a home there without knowing the mess that will eventually fill their streets.

As a past resident of Stapleton, and a current resident of East Park in Lowry I can tell you that I purchased in East Park without knowledge of the parking problems caused by this same sort of shenanigans played with the parking codes. The quality of residency here in East Park is a distinct drop from what I experienced in Stapleton and it's purely due to the parking mess we have here.

As public servants, I am asking you to PLEASE do not repeat this fiasco. It's simply wrong.

Radleigh Valentine
9596 E. 4th Avenue
Denver, CO 80230

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.

The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.

The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to

include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement. The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver. The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee. **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed - will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

From: [Kent Lund](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Cc: [Elizabeth Lund](#); lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com
Subject: Lowry Boulevard One: "Notices of Rezoning"; Map Amendment 20141-00012; Public Hearing before the Planning Board on June 4, 2014 @ 3PM
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 5:05:06 PM

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Planning Board:

My wife and I own a home, and since 1990 we have been full time residents, in the Lowry Park Heights neighborhood immediately south of the proposed Boulevard One development.

I will be brief:

- I urge you to require that each housing/residential unit of whatever kind or type in Boulevard One (i.e., single family home, town home, condominium, apartment, whatever) be required to have at least two parking spaces.
- I oppose and I urge you to reject/deny any zoning action(s) of any kind (i.e., waiver, change, variance, relief, amendment, whatever) that would allow or permit fewer than two parking spaces for each and every housing/residential unit in Boulevard One.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent J. Lund
203 S. Pontiac Street
Denver, CO 80230

From: [MacDonald, Elizabeth A.](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [MacDonald, Elizabeth A.](#)
Subject: Lowry Parking
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 10:25:26 AM

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Elizabeth A. MacDonald
Of Counsel
elizabeth.macdonald@FaegreBD.com

Direct: +1 303 607 3680

[FaegreBD.com](#) [Download vCard](#)

FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP
3200 Wells Fargo Center
1700 Lincoln Street
Denver, CO 80203-4532, USA

Home Address:
9597 E. 4th Avenue
Denver, CO 80230

This message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments. Thank you.

To ensure compliance with Treasury Department regulations, we advise you that, unless otherwise expressly indicated, any federal tax advice contained in this message (including any attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters addressed herein.

From: [Joan Schwarz](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Cc: [MaryBeth.susman@denver.org](#)
Subject: Lowry Prking
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 8:28:56 PM

☐
planning.board@denvergov.org
MaryBeth.Susman@denvergov.org

Include this text:

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

JOAN SCHWARZ

From: pgyvgs@aol.com
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Map Amendment 20141-00012
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 7:01:32 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard

One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Lee & Peggy McGill
146 S. Poplar
Denver, CO

From: [Larry Halpern](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 2:10:05 PM

Dear Planning Board:

I am new to the Lowry area and am concerned about the redevelopment happening near our home. It is my understanding that there are three separate applications in place right now. I am concerned on how this will affect the quality of our neighborhood. I would ask that you separate these applications and look at them individually. My concern is related to one of these applications.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezoning's. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

It is my request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->**Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now**

occurring at Lowry.

I do not believe that Lowry comes close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley. In reality I do not believe that people will give up their cars.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I feel it is reasonable to request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of wonderful Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Thank you,

Larry Halpern
210 S. Oneida St.

From: Sarah Arbess
To: Pyle, Michelle A.- Community Planning and Development; marybeth.sussman@denvergov.org; Planningboard - CPD
Subject: parking in lowry
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2014 2:09:34 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

sincerely,
Sarah Arbess

From: [Michelle Ku](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Boulevard 1 zoning
Date: Saturday, May 31, 2014 5:26:51 PM

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Michelle Ku

212 S Olive St
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Andy Motz](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Boulevard 1
Date: Saturday, May 31, 2014 2:00:47 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you [on June 4th](#).

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or

similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Sincerely
Cindy and Andy Motz

Sent from my iPhone

From: [JoanTroy](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Boulevard One @ Lowry
Date: Saturday, May 31, 2014 12:57:14 PM

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant

Joan Troy
183 So. Pontiac St

From: slarm@comcast.net
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Lowry Amendments
Date: Monday, June 02, 2014 6:43:15 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by

applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Sherry Graham
303-332-5126
Promenade at Lowry Resident

From: [Ceuleers Lynn](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Lowry Annex Parking
Date: Friday, May 30, 2014 7:25:37 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Sincerely,
Lynn Ceuleers
433 Alton Way
Denver, CO 80230

From: [The Pardos](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Map Amendment 20141-00012
Date: Sunday, June 01, 2014 7:55:11 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed - will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Mateo and Lisa Pardo
6130 E. Cedar Ave.,
Denver, CO 80224

From: [Kathy Stollar](#)
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Map Amendment 20141-00012
Date: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 11:16:44 AM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by

applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Kathleen Stollar
9660 E. 5th Avenue
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Kerstin Froyd](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Map amendment 20141-00012
Date: Monday, June 02, 2014 4:16:45 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

We strongly support the below request. Inadequate parking as Lowry redevelopment nears completion is not tenable. This area is already taxed by inadequate parking across First Ave at the Schlessman library which spills over into the neighborhood and also makes driving in this area hazardous both for cars and pedestrians. This is the time to be proactive and learn from the mistakes in parking space requirements that have caused ongoing problems in other areas of Lowry.

We ask that you address each rezoning affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. We are writing about the third rezoning.

We request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was insufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

We ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

We request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Sincerely,
Kerstin and John Froyd
102 S Ulster St
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Helene Martin](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Parking at Buckley Annex
Date: Sunday, June 01, 2014 10:13:20 AM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Helene Martin
182 S. Olive St
80230

From: [KRISTINA HASSELKUS](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Subject: Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012
Date: Sunday, June 01, 2014 10:56:46 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply ~~some~~ requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Kristina Hasselkus
9320 E. 4th Place
Denver 80230
Sent from my iPhone

From: j.breese@comcast.net
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development; Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Buckley Annex zoning issues
Date: Friday, May 30, 2014 3:11:23 PM
Attachments: [Defects in Buckley Annex GDP.docx](#)
[buckley letter blueprint den8.doc](#)

James B. Breese
225 Kearney Street
Denver, CO 80220
May 30, 2014

Dear Members of the Planning Board

I am a resident of Crestmoor Park and am knowledgeable about the entire Buckley Annex project

and its history and development. I have read and studied the letter sent to you by Lowry United

Neighborhoods about the issues now before you and I am in full agreement with it. You should

be aware that residents of surrounding neighborhoods have consistently expressed significant

opposition to this project since it is at odds with the surrounding neighborhoods, which are

valuable areas of stability. There are literally thousands of pages of letters of opposition to this

entire proposal. I urge you, or at least one staff members, to study the history of this project and

read every comment submitted by surrounding neighbors.

According to Denver Traffic studies, Buckley Annex will generate 10,000 **new** daily traffic trips

through our neighborhoods. Its density is a multiple of 3 to 4 times that of surrounding neighborhoods.

A majority of its units will be rental apartments totally at odds with the surrounding area. Its density

is in direct opposition to almost every aspect of Blueprint Denver since it is not located near any

transportation hub. Its proposed 65 foot tall buildings adjacent to Crestmoor Park will degrade

the Park in violation of sound planning principles. I have attached several previous letters I have

written in protest to the Annex. I am frankly appalled at the way our Denver citizens have been

repeatedly ignored throughout this process. We have been told time after time, "Don't worry,

your voice will be heard" at his stage or that, but we have been ignored. I hope you will take

steps to alleviate these impacts through appropriate zoning protections.

Thank you for considering these comments and the attachments.

James B. Breese

**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 Lowry 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

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

December 28, 2012

Lowry Redevelopment Authority
7290 East First Avenue; Denver, CO 80230

Denver Zoning Plan Administrator

Councilwoman Mary Beth Susman

Lowry Redevelopment Authority Board

Re: Buckley Annex GDP

Dear LRA, LRA Board, Denver Zoning Plan Administrator, Councilwoman Mary Beth Susman:

My wife and I have been residents of the neighborhoods surrounding Lowry for twenty five years. We searched for many years to find a suitable home in Crestmoor, seeing it as an area of great stability and quality. We spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to tastefully remodel the home we bought in a manner consistent with the neighborhood's existing architecture. We invested our resources in reliance upon this stability. Others in surrounding neighborhoods, including new Lowry residents, made the same reasoned decision to live in this stable area.

This letter and comment will primarily assert that the Buckley Annex plan is at odds with the overall intent and purpose of Blueprint Denver. As you know, compliance with Blueprint Denver is a prerequisite for any GDP that promotes new development. Blueprint Denver is a document to guide Denver's future redevelopment. Blueprint Denver repeatedly states that areas of stability like our neighborhoods, are to be respected and preserved, and that any development nearby should be consistent with current housing and use patterns. Likewise, the stated goals of the redevelopment Task Force of Buckley Annex state that it should "respect adjacent land uses by mirroring existing land uses." The plan mirrors no existing land use on three of its four sides.

Buckley Annex is surrounded by three neighborhoods that consist almost entirely with detached single family homes. Each of these neighborhoods has densities less than 1/3rd the density of that proposed for Buckley Annex. The fourth neighborhood, now Berkshires, has higher

density, but contains no businesses at all. Buckley Annex, with its proposed commercial activity is inconsistent even with the character of Berkshires.

I realize that the Buckley Annex is shown as an "area of change" under Blueprint Denver. Areas of change are generally described as areas of stagnant commercial centers and other "areas where all would agree that the redevelopment would become an asset to and supportive of the surrounding community". But Buckley Annex is atypical of most areas of change, like Stapleton. It is a small area, with little capability to gradually transition from single family homes into dense areas with tall buildings. It is nestled in the midst of areas of stability.

Blueprint Denver encourages "areas of change" to be located to shift development to areas near transportation corridors and to land around major transportation hubs like light rail stations. Unlike many other "areas of change" this area is *not* on a major transportation corridor and is *not* suitable for intensive densities. This redevelopment will increase transportation problems that are already of great concern. Blueprint Denver states that "adding density to areas that are single use, far from transit with a low density street pattern simply adds an equal number of auto trips."

Blueprint Denver states that "forecasted growth is to occur in areas of change where it will be most beneficial and *away* from areas of stability where it may have negative consequences". Buckley Annex is no such place. This redevelopment is surrounded by areas of stability and will have huge negative consequences to the neighborhoods around it. Areas of change are those "where most people would agree that development or redevelopment would be beneficial." The people in surrounding neighborhoods do not agree the type of development proposed for Buckley Annex would be beneficial.

This project is at odds with several other major tenets of Blueprint Denver. The planning goals for Buckley Annex properly state that the redevelopment plan should balance the needs of the community, Air Force and future developers. It acknowledges that "a plan backed by broad community and political support has more value to a developer." I submit there is no broad public support for this development. By contrast there is major opposition to this development. This makes it far less attractive and valuable to a developer. At the last truly public meeting five years ago on November 14, 2007 a straw poll showed 90% of participants opposed the Buckley Redevelopment Plan. Although the plan has been improved in many respects since that meeting, it does not mean the public now accepts it.

These are not subtle points. Any objective viewer would conclude the Buckley Annex plan is completely out of character and inconsistent with the surrounding stable communities in which we live. The Lowry Redevelopment Authority should drastically modify its plan to make it significantly more congruent with the surrounding neighborhoods' wishes and the City should insist upon such changes.

Blueprint Denver also specifically sets forth the necessity for meaningful public involvement in the planning process. The public is to "be heard and heeded". Fortunately, Councilwoman Susman has decided the GDP process should not rush forward. Now hopefully there will be a better opportunity to educate and inform the public and to consider public comment. I realize, of course, there have been various task force meetings that were "open" to the public. These were not meetings to educate and inform the public. Instead they dealt with compartmentalized development issues without the opportunity of seeing the entire picture.

Throughout the Buckley Annex planning process those who differed with the plan have repeatedly been reassured that their objections can be raised and will be heard during the GDP process. That is the purpose of public involvement. Many cynically believe this is a "done deal" and the public will have no say in the outcome. I urge you to heed the concerns of the citizens who live nearby and make appropriate changes to the current plans.

Thank you for carefully considering these comments.

Sincerely,

James B. Breese

From: Julie P
To: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Boulevard One Parking
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 9:19:27 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment 20141-00012

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Julie Pellet
8082 E. 6th Place
Denver 80230

From: danielt.powell@comcast.net
To: [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Buckley Annex zoning
Date: Friday, May 30, 2014 12:24:27 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.
- The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation in East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was NOT sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.
- The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement (two parking spaces per unit).
- The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.
- The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.
- **Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring in other developments at Lowry.**

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If

the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Sincerely,
Daniel T. Powell
132 So. Olive Street
Denver, CO 80230

From: [Brad Nieder M.D.](#)
To: [Pyle, Michelle A. - Community Planning and Development](#)
Cc: [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#)
Subject: Buckley Annex
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 9:56:20 PM

To the Planning Board:

Re: Map Amendment [20141-00012](#)

I understand there are three distinct rezoning applications affecting the first areas of development on the Buckley Annex property. I ask that you address each rezoning separately, and not lump them together in your deliberations and your vote. I am writing about the third rezoning.

The first two zoning applications address Single Family zoning in two areas. Single Family homes certainly fit the surrounding contexts of Park Heights, Lowry West, Mayfair Park, and Crestmoor, and I support the first two rezonings. While it is my understanding that the LRA proposes reduced setbacks, greater height and greater lot coverage than allowed by the Single Family designations chosen by the LRA, I am in favor of Single Family zoning for these first two parcels that will come before you on June 4th.

I request that the Planning Board not adopt Proposed Zone District of G-RH-3 in the third zoning application unless a waiver or condition is put back into the Application requiring two parking spaces per unit for anything built in this location. There are several reasons for this:

- The applicable section of the Zoning Code for G-RH-3 requires one (1) parking space per unit.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The larger community has spoken out on the need to avoid a repeat of the situation on East Lowry where requiring 1.5 spaces per unit was sufficient at Legends, and continues to cause havoc in the surrounding area due to insufficient planning and zoning.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Board of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority heard parking concerns and voted to include in its initial zoning application a request for this additional parking requirement.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The LRA Board later voted to remove this request from the above referenced zoning application because it believed City staff would not support this waiver.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The LRA Board included a "recommendation" that developers provide two parking spaces per unit in townhomes, rowhouses, live/work situations as an "Addendum" to its Design Guidelines, but this will be left to the discretion of the Lowry Design Review Committee.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Zoning, adopted by City Council, is enforceable. Recommendations in Design Guidelines are subject to interpretation if market conditions change. The two parking space per unit

requirement for this third zoning application must be included in the zoning to help avoid situations now occurring at Lowry.

Lowry does not come close to serving as a "transit oriented development." Light rail -- when completed -- will still be 5 or 6 miles away. This remains an auto dependent community. I request that the Planning Board not make its decision based on the hope that people will give up their cars to live on Buckley.

Since this third area in the heart of the new development could include up to 250 rowhouses or similar living units, the difference between requiring 500 parking spaces versus 250 (with the overflow going to the street) is significant.

I ask that the Planning Board listen to the existing community that surrounds Boulevard One. All three applications before you each contain at least three other waivers or conditions requested by the LRA. If the Board determines to apply some requested waivers/conditions, this additional parking condition can be included as well.

I request that the Planning Board include a new requirement of two parking spaces per unit for this third zoning application (G-RH-3) only. This parking condition/waiver is designed to "preserve and enhance the individuality, diversity and livability of [our existing] Denver neighborhoods" -- a goal cited by applicant Lowry Redevelopment Authority in its application. Thank you for balancing the needs of the existing communities with the request by the LRA.

Brad Nieder

The Healthy Humorist

Brad Nieder, MD, CSP*

Doctor-Keynote Speaker-Comedian

7195 E. Bayaud Ave., Denver, CO 80230

303-364-9061, 303-364-9062 (Fax)

drbrad@healthyhumorist.com

www.healthyhumorist.com

www.facebook.com/healthyhumorist

*CSP: Certified Speaking Professional