

CD 10

30

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Mary Alyce Owens [mary_alycio@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 9:26 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Subject: Don't change the proposed FPA ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Congress Park neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances. Don't let Denver be a laggard in the acceptance of FPA's in neighborhoods. Sustainability is the message and the action people are taking, and a reasonable FPA ordinance is part of that movement.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers. I have never heard of the INC. I follow my neighborhood Congress Park organization, but did not know there this other organization existed. Who are these people?

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for

public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council. Please do some research on the success of FPA programs in other forward

looking cities like Denver. I was at the Planning Board hearing March 16th and they were unanimous in their approval. They listened to all our public input and were open to allowing the ordinance to pass as it stands.

Sincerely,

Mary Alyce Owens
781 Garfield Street

Mary Alyce
303.902.0819

"Too often we underestimate the power of a touch, a smile, a kind word, a listening ear, an honest compliment, or the smallest act of caring, all of which have the potential to turn a life around." Leo Buscaglia

"Your biggest break can come from never quitting. Being at the right place at the right time can only happen when you keep moving toward the next opportunity." Arthur Pine

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: davidkamau.t@gmail.com on behalf of David Kamau [DavidKamau@live.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 10:49 PM
To: Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Cc: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9
Subject: Please don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Cherry Creek III neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods.

Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care.

Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs

with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure.

Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
David Kamau

CD10

18

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Brian Curtiss [bcurtiss@bauenroofing.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 8:51 AM
To: Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4
Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Congress Park neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified

annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Brian Curtiss

4/4/2011

C010

4

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Kendra [kendra8148@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 1:39 PM

To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10

Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com

Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Capital Hill neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no

logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of

frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Kendra Ingles

4/4/2011

CD 10

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: wallybarrett@aol.com**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2011 2:08 PM**To:** Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10**Subject:** Food Producing Animals Ordinance**Please Don't change the proposed ordinance**

I am a resident of Congress Park and have recently been made aware that a group calling themselves INC (?) is speaking for residents of Congress Park. I know 6 people in this area (and many all over the city) who've had chickens for many years and several with goats., but have no idea if any pay the license fee. I support the proposed Food Producing Animals Ordinance as it is written, as it is fair to property owners and protects neighbors.

It is a new age,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,we're in the 21st century with many people having great difficulty getting enough to eat. A reasonable license fee is different for you folks, than for a family who is living in poverty. After 30 years of working with homeless and needy folks I'm very aware of the perceptions of "Haves" when it comes to costs for "Have Nots"

Can you imagine how many people in Denver have chickens and goats who aren't paying the fee because it is far too expensive and prohibitive. What's next,,,,,,,,,,neighbors reporting neighbors for Chicken Violations and "Chicken Police" with hig boots ?

Sincerely
Walter E. Barrett

CD 10 2

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Kate Johnson [fennydog@hotmail.com]**Sent:** Thursday, March 31, 2011 12:58 PM**To:** Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10**Subject:** Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Congress Park neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income

families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Katharine Johnson

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

CD 11

39

From: Hillary Estner [hillrepute@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no

logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of

frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Hillary Estner

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

coll 36

From: shannon magee [shmagee48@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 7:20 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council
Cc: Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10; sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Stapleton neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability

to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Shannon Magee

From: Ira Kalfus [irak4wou@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 8:36 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council
Cc: Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Montbello neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods.

Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care.

Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure.

Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,

Ira Kalfus

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Rebecca Loy [rebecca.loy@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 10:17 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Subject: backyard chickens

Hi,

I'm a resident of the Stapleton neighborhood in Denver and I understand that you're considering a food-producing animal ordinance (finally!). I also know that there are some proposed amendments to that ordinance that would make it all but impossible to keep chickens in our small, green-conscious backyards here (like requiring 25ft of space from your neighbor's yard, for example).

Please keep us in mind as you're navigating competing concerns from neighborhood associations and local food activists. I'd like to keep three chickens without having to pay \$150/year and without having to navigate complex government permitting processes to do so. I have cats and I never needed a permit for them. I don't have to prove anything about their living conditions or provide 80 square feet per cat or any other thing. When I foster greyhounds, I don't have to prove to any city organization that my yard is adequate, that I can provide any shelter for the dog, that I will keep the dog away from the neighbor's fence. Cats and dogs are far more likely to do harm than chickens and frankly, I think they're more likely to suffer if abused. But we don't impose burdensome requirements on people who keep them. We don't require that dog droppings are cleaned every week or that dogs are kept 25 feet from the neighbors or that a dog house be 25 square feet.

I'd like to see an ordinance allowing small flocks of hens passed (and soon!). But I suppose I'd support the ballot measure floating around as an alternative to more cumbersome, unnecessary regulation.

I wish you the best of luck in balancing everyone's competing demands on this issue!

Cheers,

Rebecca

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

49

From: Dania Walker [daniawalker@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, March 29, 2011 3:42 PM**To:** Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their

neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Dania Walker

😊 You can either Grin and Bear it, or Smile and Change it! 😊

From: Maggie Stanislawski [mstanislawsk@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 5:26 PM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the _____ neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods.

Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care.

Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential

impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure.

Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
Maggie Stanislawski

X

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Plakorus, David [dplakorus@louisberger.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 11:43 AM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the _____ neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. I believe that the proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to 3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is patently unfair and illogical to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animal that don't require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified

annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

10 foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,
David Plakorus

4/4/2011

David Plakorus, LEED Green Associate
Environmental Planner

Cell: 303.929.3637
Office: 303.985.6631
Fax: 303.984.4942

535 16th Street | Suite 600 | Denver, CO 80202

This message, including any attachments hereto, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and is intended solely for the attention and use of the intended addressee(s). If you are not the intended addressee, you may neither use, copy, nor deliver to anyone this message or any of its attachments. In such case, you should immediately destroy this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply mail. Unless made by a person with actual authority conferred by The Louis Berger Group, Inc., (LBG) the information and statements herein do not constitute a binding commitment or warranty by LBG. LBG assumes no responsibility for any misperceptions, errors or misunderstandings. You are urged to verify any information that is confusing and report any errors/concerns to us in writing.

4/4/2011

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: dencc - City Council
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 3:00 PM
To: Boigon, Carol S. - City Council At Large; Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6; Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2; Hancock, Michael B. - City Council Dist. #11; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Linkhart, Doug - City Council; Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council Dist. #9; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10; Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council
Cc: Williams, Gretchen - City Council
Subject: FW: Chickens and Goats

From: Mary ford [mailto:youlonsavage@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 2:58 PM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: Chickens and Goats

Dear City Council Members, Please do not amend the proposed city ordinance to allow householders to have chickens and goats without a posted notice of intent and approval of their neighbors.

Thanks

Youlon Savage

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

non-resident 8

From: lia peckman [lpeckman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 11:30 AM
To: Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Madison, Carla A. - City Council Dist #8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10
Cc: sustainablefooddenver@gmail.com
Subject: Don't change the proposed ordinance -- INC doesn't speak for me!

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I think it is so unfortunate that a few extremely vocal RNOs have chosen to aim their misdirected hostility toward a proposed ordinance that offers the vast majority of Denver residents the freedom to choose a sustainable, low-impact lifestyle.

I want to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written. The proposed ordinance strikes a fair balance between supporting the rights of individual property owners and protecting neighbors from adverse impacts. In addition, the current guidelines within the proposed ordinance fall well within the range of what is occurring in other cities with successful FPA ordinances.

Although I am a resident of Highlands Ranch, this issue is very important to me as I plan to move within the next six months. Having the option to raise backyard FPAs would be a major incentive for moving into Denver. Denver has placed itself on the map with several sustainability initiatives, and approving the proposed FPA ordinance would only further the City's position as a national leader in sustainability and innovation.

I understand that INC may be issuing a position statement asking for various parts of the ordinance to be changed. INC does not speak for me, nor do they speak for a number of my Denver friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers.

I would like the following provisions in the proposed FPA ordinance to remain intact:

No needless RNO/neighbor notification -- Some RNOs have expressed concern that public notification will not occur for a limited number of FPAs under the proposed ordinance. Standards for public notification should be based on impact.

There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats would cause significant impact to a neighborhood. Many people in Denver are currently raising these animals, and state that their neighbors have absolutely no idea that the animals exist. We do not require public notice/input for up to .

3 dogs (even if these dogs weigh 150 pounds each and have the potential to bark and bite). It is unfair and irrational to require public notice for 8 female fowl and 2 dwarf goats, when there is no evidence of negative impact on neighborhoods. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles allow the keeping of a specified number and/or type of FPAs without public notification. Seattle used to allow up to 3 chickens and 3 dwarf goats without a permit. They experienced so few problems that in 2010 they upped their allowed numbers to 8 chickens and 3 dwarf goats.

No annual permitting fee -- Other cities that have adopted FPA ordinances have not reported an increased burden to city agencies because of enforcement. There is no logical reason for requiring ongoing annual permitting fees for animals that do not require vaccinations for public health reasons (like dogs and cats do). Many people who wish to raise backyard FPAs are doing so because they want access to healthy, affordable food. While chickens and goats do pay for themselves, there are some costs associated with their care. Adding unjustified annual fees to that amount would unduly burden Denver residents, especially low-income families who stand to benefit the most from access to affordable food. Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Colorado Springs all allow a specified number and/or type of FPAs with no permit and no fees.

Ten foot separation between FPA structure and a neighbor's dwelling unit -- The proposed 10 foot separation (coupled with noise, odor, and nuisance regulations) is adequate to balance potential impacts on neighbors with the ability of Denver residents to enjoy reasonable use of their property. The suggested 25 foot separation would effectively "zone out" many Denver residents from the ability to keep FPAs. There are people in Denver who are currently keeping FPAs with a shelter 10 feet from their neighbor's dwelling, and they haven't experienced any problems. Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not have any shelter distance requirements for the keeping of FPAs. Seattle successfully requires just a 10 foot separation from a neighbor's dwelling.

Permeable space requirement -- Respected chicken keeping books cite a minimum space requirement of 4 square feet per bird. Denver's proposed ordinance asks for 10 square feet per bird, which is 2.5 times what is listed in some books and 20 times the amount of space that factory farm chickens have access to. Urban backyard chicken keepers acknowledge 10 square feet of space as a respectable standard -- this would equal a minimum of 80 total square feet of wandering room for anyone who kept 8 hens. While many chicken owners may opt to voluntarily provide their birds with more than the required minimum, I believe that the suggestion of mandating 16 square feet of space per bird is unnecessary and is not supported by successful FPA ordinances in other cities. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Fort Collins do not include any permeable space requirements in their ordinances.

Shelter space requirement -- The shelter space requirement in the proposed ordinance is addressing the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure for chickens. Because chickens go blind and don't move at night, a relatively small space (1 square foot per bird) is adequate for containing them. Chicken owners generally provide their birds with some form of shelter/shade/structure to daytime shelter when it's needed (which isn't very often with Colorado's low precipitation rates), but whatever daytime shelter is provided doesn't need to meet the construction standards of the predator-proof, nighttime enclosure. Asking that an excessively large (4 square feet per bird) nighttime enclosure be required would not only present an unnecessary cost burden to the chicken owner, but also leaves the chickens at greater risk of frostbite during winter nights. Seattle, Portland, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles do not include any space minimums for chicken shelters in their FPA ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my request. I look forward to seeing the LUTI committee vote on April 5th to move the proposed ordinance, in its current form, through to City Council.

Sincerely,

Lia Peckman