

From: [ERIK STARK](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Loretta Heights Campus
Date: Friday, August 23, 2019 10:34:40 PM

As a Denver resident and native, I am against using the Loretta Heights Campus for development. The City of Denver has now some of the lowest open space/parkland per capita of any sizeable city in the U.S. That's a disgrace. Loretta Heights is a lovely space and needs to be kept as open as possible, to help preserve some of Denver's legacy as a City that cares about beauty and the health and well-being of its citizens, not just the health and well-being of its developers.

Thank you,

Erik Stark

Denver, CO

303-941-6096

From: [Marg Utz](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Loretto Heights Campus
Date: Thursday, August 22, 2019 6:01:41 PM

Dear Denver City Council Members,

Please don't let the beautiful Loretto Heights Campus be destroyed by allowing 2500 people to live in the proposed buildings that will be constructed to accommodate them.

Sincerely,

Margaret Utz

LHC Alumnus

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Karen Kalavity](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#); [Morrison, Jason P. - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Foster, Alexandra O. - CPD Marketing Commun Spst](#); [CPD Communications](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Loretto Heights Metro District Service Plan and Small Area Plan
Date: Thursday, August 22, 2019 12:18:11 PM

Regarding Loretto Heights and the Proposed Metro District Service Plan

Over \$100 million is being proposed to go towards the Loretto Heights Metropolitan District Plan. That is a LOT of money to be financed - especially when it is going towards a very flawed plan.

This Metro District Plan is based upon the Denver Planning Office's Small Area Plan. Unfortunately, this Small Area Plan is being touted as a plan that was created by public input and represents 96% approval by people who were "participants" in the Small Area Plan Process.

This is not true.

Many of the **GOALS** of the plan were indeed endorsed by the residents and participants of the Small Area Plan, but the plan, itself, does not in any way represent the will of the majority of people or even the stated goals of the Department.

I attended almost all of the Community Meetings. Most of the people I talked with wanted to preserve much of the open green space on the Loretto Heights campus and espoused walking and biking trails as well as critical wildlife habitat for some of the existing "residents" of the site, if not for them specifically, then to make sure that they did not become stranded and wander into other neighborhoods. A family of coyotes has called the Loretto Heights campus home for many years...the same can be said for an owl on the east side of the campus as well as many other species of birds, mammals and other assorted animals who represent some of the last remaining vestiges of "biodiversity" in this part of Denver.

One of the stated goals of the Small Area Plan was to foster Environmental Resiliency. This campus would have been a great example of how to put that concept into practice. Instead, the Small Area Plan depends on heavy-duty automobile usage - among other things. Bike trails, if they are proposed, are simply lined up to the road network, where it is really not safe or particularly desirable to bike through the neighborhoods. The infrastructure costs seem to be based on traditional piping and other conventional infrastructure practices rather than looking towards and implementing "green infrastructure" practices that work and are being used in progressive communities to foster environmental resiliency.

The roads, themselves, are lined up in grid fashion. This is completely contrary to the grace and meandering nature of the roads that are on the site presently. Not only does the existing road system represent a certain rural-type historical aesthetic, but it also adheres to the "Form follows Function" principle. The Loretto Heights Campus occupies the highest site in Denver, this means that with a very drastic height and elevation differential on the campus, meandering roads really can tie in with the

elevation contours and get from one elevation to the next. A grid system just cannot accomplish this same effect. A grid system will require massive bulldozing of the site, retaining walls, cut and fill, etc. rather than “working with the site” where much of the existing landscaping, site features and buildings can be kept intact within their historic context and where the elevation differentials are in fact, a “selling point” to the site, rather than a bane that must be overcome. This contempt for the topography of the site has been evident from the beginning of the planning process and was really “brought home” when the Small Area Plan outlined locations for 8-story buildings that would have completely obliterated magnificent views to the west. Since that time, a few modifications have been made. Still, almost all the people I talked with were totally against having 8-story structures on the site altogether...even 5 stories was too much, as the Historic Administration Building is a 5-story structure, and no structure should compete with it.

Many of the residents in the area were concerned about keeping the historic architecture and context intact. But even residents who did not give “a hoot” about the historic character of Loetto Heights are very concerned about adding density and the consequential traffic problems that would be created. The developers are planning for a density factor that would bring approximately 2000 to 2500 residents to the “new” site. This has the potential for creating more than 2500 to 5000 travel trips per day. The Metro District Plan only addresses “improvements” within the site boundaries...it doesn’t even touch on the “improvements” that will have to be made to Federal Boulevard or Irving Street which will both be impacted with this new onslaught of traffic. Apparently, it will be up to the taxpayers of Denver to bear these “improvement costs”. What is even worse, the Small Area Plan was supposed to incorporate RTD, mass transit solutions as well as working with CDOT to overcome traditional transportation modes and actually reduce traffic, instead, the Small Area Plan makes possible even more distressing automobile and traffic messes.

I am supposing that to pay for all this expensive infrastructure (more than \$100 Million), the developers feel compelled to add density to the site to compensate for the costs. A better solution would be to remove much of the “improvements” to the site, leave a lot more green space, which is already sorely lacking in much of Denver’s neighborhoods and not have to raise more than \$100 million. A plan that required \$25 to \$50 million would really be more suitable and preferred by most of the people in this part of Colorado.

Thank You,

Karen Kalavity