

C07

5

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Alex Parrillo [amparrillo@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 12:30 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: In support of the proposed Food Producing Animals Ordinance

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the West Washington Park neighborhood. Chris Nevitt is my district councilman. I am writing to 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,

ALEX PARRILLO

4/4/2011

CD7

35

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Stephanie Prochaska [stephanie.prochaska@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 7:26 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 University 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

4/4/2011

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,

--

Stephanie D Prochaska
Masters Student, Library & Information Science Program
Morgridge College of Education
University of Denver

CD7

47

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Abigail Henderson [eryop5ft@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 4:40 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: Sundari Kraft: Sustainable Food Denver
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 Athmar 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

4/4/2011

FPA's 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 FPA's. 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,
Abigail Henderson

4/4/2011

CD7

42

Williams, Gretchen - City Council**From:** maggie_rice@comcast.net**Sent:** Tuesday, March 29, 2011 5:40 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; Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council**Subject:** Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance

Dear Members of the LUTI committee:

I am a resident of Denver, living in the College View neighborhood and own properties in University Park and West Colfax neighborhood where my tenants are interested in Sustainable City living which includes Food Producing Animals . 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

4/4/2011

c07

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

37

From: Michael Anderson [mband@earthlink.net]

Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 7:17 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: 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 Harvard Gulch 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

4/4/2011

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,
Michael Anderson

4/4/2011

c07

31

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Finn Ruehrdanz [finn.ruehrdanz@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 9:19 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 Ruby 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

4/4/2011

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,
Finn Ruehrdanz

4/4/2011

CD7

28

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Amy Kalinchuk [theoldecrone@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 10:00 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 College View 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,
Amy Kalinchuk

1721 W. Asbury Ave
720-323-2867

007

17

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

From: Benjamin Tackett [bentackett@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 9:09 AM
To: Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Sandoval, Paula E. - City Council; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Johnson, Marcia M. - City Council Dist #5; 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 Committee,

I am a resident of Denver, living in the Speer neighborhood. I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed Food Producing Animals (FPA) ordinance as it is currently written.

I could send you a longer email with a more complete and detailed explanation of why each component in the proposed ordinance is what should be passed. Instead, I would like to offer my experience as an urban chicken owner, when I lived in Portland, OR.

Urban chickens are not a new concept. Even a few decades ago, it was common for everyone to have chickens in their yard. When my wife first brought up the idea, I was completely against it. "No way" was my response. After taking two introductory courses, and speaking to several owners of Urban Chickens, I was convinced of the merits - and possible enjoyment - of owning the birds. It's hard to explain the enjoyment, entertainment, educational value and sustainability that come from having them.

- Chickens eat almost any scraps that come from the kitchen - reducing our waste stream.
- Well kept chickens don't have an odor.
- They provide eggs that are far more rich than those you can buy in the supermarket - produced right in your own back yard!
- They educate children about the sources of our food.
- Chickens are interesting enough that our neighbors across the fence started asking questions, and we became friends with them. Chickens actually helped to strengthen our community!

How many people on the committee own chickens?

Of the 7 people on the committee, the number who own chickens is likely in the minority. That isn't wrong - not everyone should or needs to own chickens - but to make a ruling on an issue, with no firsthand experience, it becomes increasingly important that the team spend a significant amount of time speaking with and sharing the experiences of those that have owned them. Most of the detractors on this issue have no first hand experience with them.

I was disappointed when I moved from Portland, OR to Denver, CO last year. Denver is not nearly as "green" or sustainable of a city as I would have expected - not for a place that draws so much from the outdoors and it's surrounding environment. Denver needs to take some significant steps forward. This committee is positioned to help Denver do that.

I live in an apartment building in Washington Park area. I don't stand to gain if the ordinance passes - but I stopped to take the 30 minutes out of my day because this issue is important. **Easy access to responsible ownership of Urban chickens is a building block for creating a more sustainable city.**

4/4/2011

Call the city of Portland. Talk to chicken owners. Get balanced information. Don't let fear of the unknown slow Denver down in it's transition to a more sustainable future.

Thanks for all that you do to lead this community forward. Your leadership is important.

All the best,
Ben Tackett

503.939.0248
bentackett@gmail.com

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

C07

16

From: Tiffany Martindale [maycinga@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 9:15 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 West Wash 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. In fact, I find it absurd that a single loud voice can overshadow the voice of an entire neighborhood and then be lauded as representing that neighborhood. Make no mistake, despite all of the RNO's purported support for their position, they have not reached out to neighbors one time to find out if they are speaking for themselves or for the neighborhood.

I can appreciate that others don't share my viewpoint, but that doesn't mean that theirs is shared by all. The only ethical thing for the West Wash Park RNO President to do is to represent her position as a personal opinion. The RNO did not reach out to residents to learn about our position.

There is no reason to assume that chickens and dwarf goats living in Denver will have behavioral problems that these animals don't have in other cities. The ordinance was drafted with strong input from a variety of stakeholders and the research is clearly in favor of this ordinance. We moved to Denver expecting a progressive and forward thinking home for our family. It is disheartening not to hear strong support for FPAs considering their acceptance and encouragement in other large cities. Don't paint Denver into a backwards thinking corner. I urge you to move this ordinance as it is written to the City Council.

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

4/4/2011

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,

Tiffany Martindale

Williams, Gretchen - City Council

CD7

11

From: ellen seymour [ellen.seymour@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 9:40 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; 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 on Logan and Alameda. 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,
Ellen Seymour