

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comment</i>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kristen	8/2/2022	On the new draft it does not state a focus for a grocery store. I truly hope this Major need will not be overlooked. The closest grocery store is 15+ minutes away, which is insane. This area needs a major grocery store. Large store, not just gardens.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Genesis Cobb	8/2/2022	Very exciting plans. Mostly the grocery store, and retail space. If all goes well, when would this project break ground?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kris Gisoni	8/2/2022	There should be no development in this open space. The entire open space should be a park. The only thing it needs is a small grocery store. Other than that this neighborhood is very dense and does not need more development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	8/3/2022	This planning process has completely missed the mark by putting blinders on and just assuming development of only PHGC land is within scope. We can address the city's (not the public's) "Prevailing Vision" without sacrificing the health and environmental benefits of the PHGC greenspace. There are 50 acres of non-greenspace next to the 40th and Colorado Blvd Commuter Rail Station already teed up (pun intended) for mixed use, high density development. That means no Metro Tax District, hundreds of income-restricted housing, mixed use residential, commercial and retail without chopping up PHGC land. The reason for the binary question simply is the nature of conservation easements. They either protect the entire property, or they protect none of it. So as we've been saying for YEARS -- develop around the property, not on it. If the city acquired the property with the Measure 2A money that was sold to voters in 2018 as intended for parks acquisition (\$40 million annually in tax revenue for the last nearly 4 years!), we could put that money to use creating a wonderful regional park to serve tens of thousands of existing and new residents. Developing on the PHGC is neither inevitable nor advisable.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Maria Barreto	8/3/2022	12 stories creates a mammoth that blocks all the views of the mountains and sunlight which will create an ice skating rink in the winter. It also brings in too much density into an already crowded area: more trash, more traffic, more crime. ENOUGH. Stop building big. You are taking a small neighborhood and creating a massive mess.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Dan Jacobson	8/3/2022	I want the entire Park Hill Golf courses To remain as open space or park use only. No residential or business. This was the original intention Stop trying to change the intention and the majority of the community's will to satisfy the developers who support city council members
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Catherine Hakala	8/3/2022	I continue to be stunned by the sham process in which the City spends our taxpayer dollars to appease a developer who blatantly lied (about Loretto Heights redevelopment) and in spite of a clear message from voters that we don't want the easement lifted. In the meantime, it has become clear that there is tremendous opportunity for repurposing of commercial real estate Downtown as a result of the shift to working from home.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Tom Fahres	8/3/2022	I would like to formally submit the contents of <a href="https://greaterparkhill.org/news-and-opinion/double-vision/">https://greaterparkhill.org/news-and-opinion/double-vision/</a> , especially the image of the 155 acre site, drafted by a landscape architect, indicating a wide range of non-golf recreation uses
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	8/3/2022	Just curious why Denver voted to keep the land open space and now the city is ignoring the easement and ignoring the vote to develop it anyway. It should remain open space. I don't understand the point in voting if votes are ignored. What a shame. Very corrupt.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ana Novelli	8/3/2022	I am concerned that the affordable housing will only last for a fixed number of years. What is the plan to address the housing situation in five - ten years? Will there be a contract with Westside? Additionally what are the expectations from the city that Westside commit to continue having things like a community center and parks that don't make income for them?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Anne Barrow	8/4/2022	I am a NE parkhill resident. I would like to participate and provide input where opportunity for engagement exists such as meetings open to the public.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Nick Bither	8/5/2022	I generally think the plan as currently laid out looks great! I applaud the mix of park space and increased housing supply. This city is in desperate need of additional housing supply, but retaining some green space that is available for the public to use is great too. Love the mix of housing and green space! I hope the final plan includes lots of non-car transit opportunities as well, for those of us who prefer to walk/bike/take public transit. Keep up the good work and lets fast track this project to improve our city!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Curtis Haverkamp	8/8/2022	I like the idea of greater public access to the park/green space, but it does feel that the development is going against public opinion. Why not upzone Denver or allow for greater infill instead? There's large sections of single family exclusive zoning close to dense areas (such as Country Club / Congress Park / Skyland / Hilltop). It makes more sense to upzone areas closer to CBD / Cherry Creek, and nearby/in-between denser areas first. Continuing to pursue Park Hill Golf Course development after losing the vote? Doesn't seem like the government is spending taxpayer dollars well.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	8/8/2022	Hi. I thought that the redevelopment of PHGC needed approval of the Denver voters. Is that correct? Please advise.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	8/11/2022	What part of "Perpetual" as in Perpetual Conservation Easement, valued at \$60 million to the taxpayers of Denver, does the city not understand?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Deryk Standingr	8/11/2022	The planning process has been one sided. At no point have I been able to advocate for keeping the space a green space. All surveys have had some form of development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Dina Clark	8/12/2022	I protest this zoning request. there is a conservation easement on this property. The voters said they did not want it lifted without their approval and you are going ahead against the wishes of the public in favor of the developers who purchased this land. Clear disregard for what the people want vs. what the mayor and the developer wants. Denverites want and need more green space. Not more "mixed use" from which only a few profit.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	LeAnn Anderson	8/12/2022	Strongly oppose rezoning request.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Messner	8/12/2022	Can you please advise as to the next steps for public involvement in the City process (not though the developer or the working group)? When will this be seen before the planning commission? What is the process for formal public comment to that process? Written or verbal? Will it be on the zoning change application only or will the strategic community planning process be before the commission? Thank you in advance for your response.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Shawn	8/12/2022	How many times do voters have to say no to this crap? Give up already and leave green space as green spaces!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gary Martyn	8/13/2022	Very frustrating that the flood detention area continues to be called park space when even the city's own parks director says that is not true. At best this is misleading, on the surface, though, it is lying. The storm this past week has shown how unusable the 25 or 30 acres are after a storm. And the drainage doesn't appear to work properly. I think the suddenness of the storm showed that this area could be lethal to any unfortunate soul using it as a park. I'm not understanding how the zoning can be changed on property that has a perpetual conservation easement on it. Asking for a zoning change while the easement is in place seems to be a waste of resources.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Linda Redstone	8/14/2022	Voters have already said No once to the development of of the Park Hill Course. Why do we need to do this again? Denver already has a lower per cent age of open space than most other comparable cities, about 6 per cent. Why do we not have 11 per cent?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Tom Morris	8/14/2022	The people of Denver, including neighbors, have expressed their landslide opposition. The mayor is using the fact that he no longer needs votes (term limited) and he has the right to ignore the people because his sponsors have demanded it. If the development is approved in opposition to the people, Hancock and his smiling band of "yessir's" will buy cheap seats in the halls of infamy. A reasonable legacy for a man who chose the rich over the people. I almost wish he would try it to remove him and his yes-men from any list of competent mayors.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Sarah Jo Hunter	8/14/2022	You have fundamentally ignored your own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by you all when you consider Westside to be your "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers? You all have failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Harr	8/14/2022	68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement The City should not allow a developer to build on PHGC land: 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021; the perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The City's plan assumes taxpayers should give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own. I oppose this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alan Dresser	8/14/2022	The entire Park Hill Golf Course should remain a park with park related structures and activities. NO COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT!!! There is a extremely small amount of undeveloped land in Denver and what little parkland type land that remains should remain parkland.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Karen Bergman	8/14/2022	I would like for this land, in its entirety, to become a regional park, as approved by vote of the people of Denver.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Nora Kelly	8/14/2022	We need to preserve a perpetual open space for the Park Hill Golf Course -- the acreage is as much as Washington Park and this area too, should remain open for the citizens of Denver to enjoy. NO DEVELOPMENT. The CPD process that has resulted in this draft area plan, is a sham. I do not support it.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Rachel McCracken	8/15/2022	Preserve the open space!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Richard McCanna	8/15/2022	The August 7 intense rainstorm and widespread flooding should show everyone the need for green space. The more Denver developers cover green spaces with concrete the worse our flooding problem gets. It makes no sense to pave over large sections of Park Hill Golf Course.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Joanna & Chris Johnson	8/15/2022	We are wholly AGAINST ANY DEVELOPMENT except for a public golf course or total open space on the former Park Hill GC land. This land has an easement to keep it development free + the Voters said they want Open Space again last year.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Regina K Dunn	8/16/2022	Every neighborhood in this city should be included in the low income apartment plans. Park hill is already doing it's part. Our families have apartments to SURVIVE in. Now they need outdoor areas to explore together and make life worth LIVING!!!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Douglas F Tweed	8/18/2022	Voters overwhelming approved Amendment 301 which stated that the property should be open space. I would love to know why the Mayor and City Council continued to spend unauthorized city money to plan unwanted development. I live three blocks from Parkhill Golf Course and we were never interviewed for our opinions. My understanding was that all residents within 1/2 mile were supposed to be personally interviewed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ford Frick	8/18/2022	Colorado state law requires a judicial finding that a conservation easement can no longer serve it's original purpose before it can be nullified. Why isn't this limitation addressed? Why is the City spending tax dollars to prepare a private developer's plan when there is a valid easement present? Solve the easement issue first and then plan the property.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Email	Vic Lazzaro and Nan Odell	8/22/2022	<p>You were listed as the contact person for the Office of City Planning. As a long time Denver resident and one who at one time golfed at Park Hill GC and now live across from City Park, the plan presented is a travesty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Denver has among the worst ratio of parks to population of most major cities.</li> <li>•The PHGC had an easement that the City is ignoring and likely will result in community lawsuits if violated.</li> <li>•Shopping and housing can be provided by buying land near the PHGC and building there. – Even giving special abatements to encourage that development.</li> <li>•This is a rare, if even once in a lifetime opportunity to maintain open space in the urban landscape – the City, County, and related departments are irresponsibly blowing it.</li> </ul>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	8/20/2022	<p>Westside does not own the development rights to this property. Those development rights, currently estimated to be worth \$60 million, are owned by the citizens of Denver who have made it abundantly clear they are not willing to give them up. Until the matter of the perpetual conservation easement is settled, this exercise by the city in playing Fantasy Football to perpetuate the illusion that development is inevitable is a monumental waste of time and taxpayer money.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Annie Pratt	8/20/2022	<p>I feel that this brochure and website is total propaganda that implies that the City has the right to develop this property and this is a done deal. I've seen the proposed plan and am calling bullshit on this entire land grab move. This is just one more case of the City and Mayor Hancock allowing developers to realize big profits at the expense of communities. If this is allowed, by the time the developers are done, there will be very little affordable housing, no community services and no open space... because those things aren't profitable and developers only care about making a profit.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	David Pratt	8/20/2022	<p>This is so one sided and barely even truthful! You all should be ashamed. This is not what I want my government doing for me. This is disgusting. Sorry, it's just wrong!</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	FT	8/21/2022	<p>Lets see some actual data on these results. Stop sending out these pro development puff pieces disguised as community engagement. Your survey questions and distribution were a joke. This planning process has been a joke.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	8/22/2022	<p>CPD's June 30th "Community Open House" is a continuation of the sham planning and development process conceived and implemented by CPD with the predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans.</p> <p>Starting soon after Westside purchased the PHGC land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the Hancock Administration began working with Westside on plans to break the conservation easement and construct a mini-city of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." Working for its "client" Westside, it's not surprising that CPD's hand-picked "Steering Committee" was primarily composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal "area plan" that CPD will draft and likely present to the Planning Board and City Council for approval later in 2022. The next hurdle for the Hancock Administration and Westside will then be for the Hancock Administration to submit a ballot measure to Denver voters in accordance with Ballot Initiative 301 that passed city-wide in November 2021 by 63% to 37%. The Hancock Administration/Westside ballot measure will seek voter approval for breaking the PHGC land conservation easement and allowing residential and commercial construction on the land. Presumably, the Hancock Administration and Westside will use CPD's "area plan" in their campaign to support their ballot measure. Why CPD's Planning Process is a Sham The CPD planning process is a sham and it's irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers?</li> <li>• CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development.</li> <li>• CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.</li> </ul>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	8/22/2022	<p>Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space.</li> <li>• CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DeWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens.</li> <li>• CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.</li> </ul>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey (cont)	8/22/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights).</li> <li>• CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase-- despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member--CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign.</li> <li>• CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> </ul>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Chris Maj	8/22/2022	This area is supposed to be a conservation easement. Your entire plan is the opposite of that. Total scam.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Andrew Lefkowitz	8/22/2022	I'm concerned that, given the many things the community has said they want in this space (affordable housing, retail, community building spaces) that the ever growing number of acres committed to open space may be too much. I think park space is important, and I would gladly see slightly less, if it meant more retail space for small, local business, or a grocery store.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	8/22/2022	We voted that the people of Denver would say if that land could be developed. The people need to vote on it, right? So what is this all about? You are talking like it's a done deal.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Yukhananov	8/23/2022	A grave issue that many Denverites face is housing affordability. Our city's lack of affordable housing is notorious and impacts the poor, working class, and middle class. I have close friends that left Colorado because of high rental costs. I am hearing frequently from out-of-state acquaintances that wanted to move to Colorado, but avoided it because they were afraid of being cost burdened. I'm concerned that this housing crisis will undo Denver and make our city irreversibly inequitable. This draft mentions a desire to build affordable, mixed-use developments. I am generally happy with the direction of this sentiment, but it's not going far enough. Yes, build more housing and make the units affordable, but, to ensure they stay affordable, make at least a part of those units public. Public, as in owned and operated by the city of Denver. I say this because we have tried market-based solutions and they hardly made a difference. It's likely that the upcoming affordable housing ordinance will fail to reduce the overall cost of rent in the short and long term. There is a housing model that may serve as a useful blueprint, the Vienna housing model. In case there's an unfamiliarity with it, I added some resources below: Vienna's Unique Social Housing Program (HUD): <a href="https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_featd_article_011314.html">https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_featd_article_011314.html</a> Vienna's Radical Idea? Affordable Housing For All (Bloomberg): <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41VudBdYXY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41VudBdYXY</a> Social Housing (City of Vienna): <a href="https://socialhousing.wien/TheViennaModel">https://socialhousing.wien/TheViennaModel</a> <a href="https://www.vienna-model.at/en/prinzipien/">https://www.vienna-model.at/en/prinzipien/</a> Thank you for taking the time to read this comment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Walsh	8/23/2022	This draft plan is full of misleading and omitted information. Having listened to many steering committee meetings I can say that this process has been directed behind the scenes by members of CPD, Westside, DMCI, and others to produce a pre-determined outcome of development over preserving the long standing conservation easement on the land. I cannot see any plan that seeks to create a concrete corridor climbing 12 stories tall along Colorado Blvd being able to pass. The city should uphold the conservation easement and require that the land be used as open space or some sort of community amenity as prescribed in the easement. Even this plan barely acknowledges the easement, but the fallacy of "it can only be a golf course" is not true if you ask any lawyer that is not at the direction of the Mayor's office. Please stop wasting time and resources from our city officials to undermine the will of the voters. Meanwhile the neighborhood of Northeast Park Hill has insufficient drainage during rain storms, lead water pipes, and inadequate sidewalks for current residents. Coming all around the Golf Course is affordable housing at 40th and Colorado Blvd. and 38th and Holly. Along with more restaurant/retail at 40th and Colorado. There is also plenty of opportunity for additional development on 33rd and Hudson as well as other areas in the neighborhood that do not require lifting a perpetual conservation easement. The fact that there is an easement on the land is why there is so much opposition. Please take into consideration that an easement is meant to last forever and not just when convenient.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carroll Watkins Ali	8/23/2022	This is an instance where development is what the situation calls for. It is an opportunity to right some wrongs and to create equity as a once thriving community can be redeveloped. #ROC, #redevelopourcommunity, #reviveourcommunity, #restoreourcommunity.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	8/23/2022	When will a plan be developed for 100% park/open space? This land has a VERY protected perpetual conservation easement on it. Why is this being ignored in this plan? The narrative that 100 acres of park space is being "donated" is not true. 25 of these acres is an unusable portion that is a storm drain. With the recent rain, it is evident that this area is not suitable to be used for anything. It is flooded land and not usable as parkland.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Suzanne Tate	8/23/2022	The planning process was incomplete; groups were not allowed to discuss priorities in a large session, so that the most important aspect could be agreed upon. North Park Hill does not need anymore concrete or densifying. In order to combat traffic and heat, North Park Hill needs open space and additional green space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Katherine Asher	8/23/2022	Elyria- swansea and Clayton neighborhoods proximity to I-70, I-25 and industrial areas has led to decades of negative environmental impacts to soil, air and water. By preserving the open space that is now the City Park Golf course we have the opportunity to mitigate climate and pollution risks. The health and wellbeing of residents should be placed first and foremost. Denver residents value clean air and open spaces. Urban gardens, safe recreational areas along with trees and drought tolerant landscape reflect the future we want to see.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Sleeman	8/23/2022	This plan has always been oriented towards development. There was never any serious consideration of leaving the parcel as open space. This is true even though a majority of voters in the entire city voted to require a city wide vote before the conservation easement could be lifted.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Maria	8/23/2022	The citizens of Denver voted to keep open space why is Denver spending money trying to push through this development and voiding our rights! Climate change is here and we need to keep green space in an area that is so polluted and over crowded as it is now. DO NOT WANT YOUR PLAN city needs more parks/open space New York City even has more open space per capita than Denver. Look what your trying to do to our beautiful city. You talk about need for affordable/low income housing I would like to see a map or outline of all this type of housing in Denver owned by Denver or Private?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Teresa Kao	8/23/2022	5, 8, 12 story buildings are inappropriate for this neighborhood How would current neighborhood benefit from this development? This project would bring in a large number of residents, virtually a new neighborhood! Enormous increase of traffic congestion on Colorado Blvd would help no one. What grocery store would be interested in entering this area? A supermarket or 7/11 type , which we already have. Why not plant acreage with trees and turn it into carbon credit for denver? In spite of assurances that current neighbors will be involved in decision, it is clear that mayor is facilitating removal of perpetual conservation easement to allow development, that elected officials do not care in the slightest about the current neighborhood and how this project will degrade quality of life, and that nothing we can say will have any effect on mayor/westside plan to pave over and "develop" the land.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	<p>In my opinion, the approach taken by the Department of Community Planning and Development to conclude that "the prevailing vision" of the community considers it appropriate to preserve only one half of the total acreage of the former PHGC for open space and recreation was biased, and unreliable. The methods supported by the City to inquire about the "vision" of the people of Denver never offered residents the option to endorse a plan that would require the entire 155 acres of the former GPHC to be utilized for recreation and open space. The recent vote by the community to reject the stated position of the Westside developers to favor some residential and commercial development was overwhelmingly rejected by the voters at the ballot box.</p> <p>The survey cited by the City and Westside as a basis to claim that the prevailing vision of residents living within one mile of the former PHGC was to favor mixed use was biased for several important reasons. First, the initial and main question asked respondents to choose between use of the land exclusively as a golf course, or as a mixed use site with residential development and park land. This dichotomous choice was by design biased in favor of an endorsement of mixed use. A fair and unbiased survey of opinion would have presented more options, including full residential and/or commercial development, or full preservation as parkland and open space. Second, there was no demonstration that the survey in fact reached a representative sample of the intended audience, nor that the number of responses received were adequate to rely on the survey results. Third, there was no reason to restrict the survey to addresses within one mile of the site. These biases, including the limited choice of options, was particularly objectionable in view of the City's knowledge that an active grass roots movement expressed vocal support for full preservation of the former GPHC as open space or parkland. The process undertaken by the City to promote a plan that would devote approximately half of the former PHGC for commercial and residential development was performed without a scientifically valid environmental and public health impact analysis intended to impartially present the costs and benefits of various options, including preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. This is in contravention to best practices for consideration of major development projects under consideration by a public entity such as the City and County of Denver. Based upon peer-reviewed research, and my experience as a physician and academic specializing in environmental health and public health, it is my opinion that consideration of these factors would strongly favor preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. Consider the following:</p> <p>Between 2010 and 2019, Denver was the country's fifth fastest growing large city. [<a href="https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010">https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010</a>]. Growth has come with an increased number of cars, roads, parking lots, shopping plazas and other buildings in our community: Nearly half the land in Denver's city limits is paved or built over. [<a href="https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/">https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/</a>]</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	<p>At the same time, the percentage of City land devoted to open space and parkland has fallen behind that of most other cities. With only 5% of its land used for parks and recreation, Denver has fallen from 13th place in 2012 to 18th place in the 2021 Trust for Public Land Park Score for America's 100 largest cities. In comparison, the percentages of land used for parks and recreation in some other cities are: Washington, D.C.—21%; New York City—16%; San Francisco—21%; San Diego—21%; Portland, Oregon—14%; Boston—19%; Minneapolis—10%; Los Angeles—13%; Seattle—11% and Chicago—9%. According to the Trust for Public Lands, the 2021 national median percentage of land used for parks and recreation in America's 100 largest cities is 15%. [<a href="https://www.tpl.org/parkscore">https://www.tpl.org/parkscore</a>]. Use of the former PHGC entirely as parkland would substantially strengthen the park system of our increasingly densified and developed city.</p> <p>The neighborhoods that include and generally abut the PHGC land south of I-70 are the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood that is east of Colorado Boulevard and the Elyria-Swansea, Clayton, and Cole neighborhoods that are west of Colorado Boulevard. These neighborhoods have substantial communities of color. The percentage of non-white residents in each neighborhood are as follows: Northeast Park Hill: 78.3%; Elyria-Swansea: 87.54%; Clayton: 67.1%, and Cole: 66.2%. [<a href="https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/">https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/</a>]. Many residents of these neighborhoods have limited income. For example, the median household income for Northeast Park Hill is \$37,501. [<a href="https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income">https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income</a>]. These neighborhoods are close to the I-70 corridor and industrial sites. They are among the most polluted neighborhoods in the City. For example, the 80216 zip code, the area in which the Elyria Swansea neighborhood lies, in 2017 had the highest environmental hazard rating of any zip code in the United States. [<a href="https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/">https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/</a>]. These neighborhoods now have a pressing need for open space and trees. For example, the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood ranks 473 out of 483 Denver census blocks in the Tree Equity Score created by the national conservation organization, American Forests. Only two percent of the land in this neighborhood has tree canopy cover which compares poorly with the 24% tree canopy cover that American Forests considers optimal. The Tree Equity Scores and tree canopy cover numbers for the other three neighborhoods are comparable to the deficient Northeast Park Hill neighborhood numbers. [<a href="https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222">https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222</a>]</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	<p>Protection of the PHGC land conservation easement would protect the existing tree canopy and increase equity of access to open space for low-income communities of color. Because of the relative lack of open space and tree cover in the four neighborhoods generally abutting the PHGC land and south of I-70, the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment has given two of them (Northeast Park Hill and Swansea-Elyria) a rating of "High", the most severe rating, and the other two (Clayton and Cole) a "Medium-High" rating on the 2021 Neighborhood Heat Vulnerability Index. [<a href="https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#-13201793">https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#-13201793</a>]. Commercial and residential development of the PHGC land, combined with increasing air temperatures associated with climate change, would contribute to the development of "heat islands" which, in turn, would threaten the health and well-being of those living and working in these neighborhoods. Urban heat islands are associated with heat exhaustion, heat stroke, heat-related respiratory problems, and death: trees and vegetation play key roles in countering urban heat islands and indirectly the negative health effects with which they are associated. [<a href="https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands">https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands</a>; <a href="https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts">https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts</a>]. The City's eventual acquisition of the PHGC land for a designated park would offer the opportunity for the City to augment the land's critical tree canopy thereby reducing heat island issues.</p> <p>The former PHGC tract, on which the City and County of Denver holds a conservation easement, represents an irreplaceable opportunity for Denver to utilize parkland to promote the health and well being of city residents. There are ample opportunities for commercial and residential development to be pursued at alternative locations.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Joe Mauro	8/23/2022	<p>Where in Denver will the loss of acres of open space that will occur in the development of Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) come from?? The loss of any of the open space at PHGC will result in a greater heat island affect, particularly in a section of town that has less trees overall and has a population much more susceptible to increasing urban heat. For the many mature trees that will be lost to the proposed development, how will Denver find those carbon sinks to take the place of these trees for their reduction in carbon as well as their cleansing of our air?? How can Denver afford to lose ANY open space to development that can occur in any number of other, better locations?</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Wendy Harring	8/23/2022	<p>I do not understand why this process has been undertaken and why the City is expending its (being the taxpayers') resources on it. The land is subject to a conservation easement bought and paid for by the taxpayers. There is a Colorado statute requiring that a Court find that the purpose of a conservation easement has become impossible to fulfill before an easement can be terminated. Denver voters overwhelmingly favor the land remaining as open space as evidenced by the vote in November 2021 on ballot measures 301 and 302. All the "surveys" taken to date with respect to the golf course are skewed in that there is never an option to keep the land as open space. Most importantly, Denver is growing rapidly, our open space is shrinking, and there are few, if any, opportunities to preserve what is left of our open space. The golf course is the largest open space tract left in the City. All 155 acres must be preserved as open space. If the golf course is developed, the opportunity to enhance and grow our open space will be lost forever. That would be a travesty.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Marian Curtis	8/23/2022	<p>I am deeply concerned that we may lose a most rare parcel of open space in Denver. Our ratio of public land to people is already LOWER than the median for ALL cities comparable to Denver in size! Denver residents voted to protect this land but Hancock found a way to invalidate the will of the people; eager as ever to say "Yes!" to developers!</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	8/23/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course property is protected by a perpetual easement purchased for the public's use and enjoyment of the land as recreational open space in 1997 with Denver taxpayer funds. Now, the City is working hand-in-glove with Westside Investment Partners to pave the way for development of the property by undoing that easement, contrary to Colorado law, the overwhelming public support for Ballot Measure 301 and the provisions of the easement. Westside surely knew about the 1997 easement in 2019, when it paid just \$3.55 per square foot for the land. That's about one percent of the price other developers are paying for developable property in Denver these days. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend that the City purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space. Instead of following the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the City has worked at cross-purposes with those recommendations. Indeed, City documents explicitly state that its Community Planning and Development bureaucracy considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its "client" in the Westside Investment Partners-driven planning process for the land.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	8/23/2022	From its very outset, the City's "community engagement" process has been designed only to ratify what the developer wants and only heed the pro-development voices it wants to hear. The 1997 perpetual conservation easement should be the default condition in any plan for the area. However, CPD's process presumes development and largely ignores the easement. To CPD and the vetted pro-development supporters on its Steering Committee, the only possible outcome of the planning and community participation process is development, irrespective of concerns about the impacts of developing the land, the loss of open space and future parkland and the land use changes already underway in the vicinity of the Park Hill Golf Course. CPD falsely claims that the community supports development of the land. This ignores surveys showing that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former golf course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Furthermore, it ignores the overwhelming support of open space by voters last November via their approval of Ballot Measure 301 and the resounding defeat of Ballot Measure 302, the City and Westside's attempt to make it easier to remove the conservation easement and destroy any chance of creating a full-scale park for all of Denver's citizens. The CPD process is unwaveringly biased against considering or even acknowledging nearby land development activities and opportunities that would meet many of the "needs" and provide many of the "benefits" that Westside promises would arise from developing Park Hill Golf Course. Likewise, the CPD process assiduously ignores any adverse fiscal or environmental impacts of developing Park Hill Golf Course. There are better ways to meet Denver's needs for more affordable housing and the other alleged benefits touted in the Draft Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. The City's expenditure of resources to benefit of Westside Investment Partners has been a colossal waste of tax dollars. Those tax dollars and funds from the 2019 bond measure to acquire more parkland would be better spent on implementing the Save Open Space Denver vision for a regional park at the Park Hill Golf Course property (See <a href="https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b">https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b</a> .) My family and I remain unalterably opposed to this corrupt boondoggle.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Abdur-Rahim Ali	8/23/2022	There needs to have equity. One hundred acres for open space as opposed to fifty acres for housing, retail and all other community needs is unacceptable. Northeast Park Hill was once a thriving community. I can be redeveloped to meet community needs—attainable/affordable housing, super market, credit union, incubator for small business for community commerce and potential for building generational wealth. It is a moral imperative to address the hierarchy of human needs over special interest to preserve open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Timothy Tipton	8/23/2022	I think the city should not be using resources for planning purposes until the issue with the conservation easement is resolved. Citizens of the city paid for this easement with their tax dollars, and it should be honored. The city and Westside Investment Partners act as if the easement does not exist. I think the site should remain open space to enhance the neighborhood and the whole city environment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William DeGroot	8/23/2022	The purpose of the conservation easement was to prevent development of the golf course. This plan is an affront to the entire idea of conservation easements. We aren't creating any new land, while the ratio of open spaces to people in Denver is declining.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Georgia Garnsey	8/23/2022	#1: It is illegal to develop on the PHGC land.#2: CPD has spent over \$200,000 of taxpayer money on an illegal plan.#3: NE Denver needs open space because of all the dense development planned for the area, including affordable housing.#4: NE Denver is already suffering from the heat island effect as documented by Trust for Public Land data.#5: The CPD Steering Committee does not represent the community. The words "perpetual conservation easement" cannot be stated in meetings. This is undemocratic by any standard.#6: The NE Denver community suffers from the "heat island effect" according to TPL data. This effect will deepen with Westside's development proposals. Traffic studies have not been completed.#7: The view plane to the west that the PHGC land now affords will be obliterated by Westside's plans for 12 story (and other levels?) buildings lining Colorado Blvd.#8: There is no legitimate process governing the PHGC Steering Committee. No one is allowed to mutter the words "perpetual conservation easement." This is not a democratic process.#9: I grieve for my city. All this talk about equity. I only see greed. And congestion and ugliness.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	8/24/2022	I do not support any development on the former Park Hill Golf Course. Denver presently has insufficient open space to protect its residents from heat and pollution and to provide them respite from the built environment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carolyn Pauls	8/24/2022	Keep it open space and youth athletic fields, as the conservation easement requires. The city of Denver should have never sold it to Westside Development in the first place. It was and should still be intended to keep as green space. Northeast Denver has an enormous lack of tree canopy and recreational green space for our youth. The will of the voters has been sold out by the City of Denver to Westside Development. The city needs to honor the intent of the Conservation Easement and the overwhelming need for keeping what little green space we have.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Stuart Hayden	8/25/2022	I received your "Thank You!" note in the mail, but found it both overtly insincere and wildly inappropriate. On one side, you thank me for sharing my voice "to guide the future of the FORMER Park Hill Golf Course." On the other side, you ignore my guidance, give me "A Look Ahead" at what you plan to do instead, and defend "The Vision," your vision, your Small Area Plan. Unless you actually prove it to be "responsible, sustainable, and community-led," such statements sound simply propagandistic. Shamelessly promoting an agenda that benefits the private owner despite a public promise and commitment to the contrary perpetuates concerns about political corruption within the City. Your plan undermines the very concept and value of conservation easements writ large. The private owners purchased Park Hill Golf Course well aware of the conservation easement, effectively betting millions of dollars against the City's willingness to uphold its legal and moral obligation. The benefits promised by the private owner are not worth losing the public trust.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kelil Barasso	8/30/2022	I believe in the change. Like stieplton area . Development For every thing we need.Especially park and Retariment community. Small business owner and health care facility. Open more apportine for Elder and Retaire people. Accibility Transport.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ed Bell	9/2/2022	Please include me in future communications as I am a stakeholder at 42nd & Madison.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Vicki Kelley	9/5/2022	This bamboozle had been attempted multiple times by this clown car mayor and city council. Voters spoke last November. NO developers please. Hancock will have to find another way to reimburse Westside for funding his mayoral runoff.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Darren McKinnis	9/7/2022	When I look at the plan presented I think oh wouldn't that be nice. Housing and storefronts and a park that will change the landscape. Who wouldn't love chic boutiques, a grocery store and maybe a restaurant or two. Affordable housing is another great catchphrase that is being used to entice people to catch the dream of the development. There are two issues with all of this. The first is that is going against the principle of keeping the space as an open buffer from the city. The second problem is that it is an investment group leading the rally. Please tell me when investment companies have ever had the best interest for the people. Their only interest it to make a return on investment. By allowing development to happen in this area the city is only allowing increased traffic and changes in the environment. The other night I drove from Park Hill to South Broadway. The difference in temperature was a 10 degrees difference. South Broadway is an example of what is not needed in the Park Hill area. Although I am a new transplant to Denver I feel that the investment company and the city are trying to sell the residents of Park Hill snake oil. Hopefully the will of the people will be heard. No to development and yes to a beautiful green space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	9/7/2022	It's just so aggravating what happened here and how this all went down. From the sale to the development. We begged the city for a grocery store at Holly and the again at Dahlia. We didn't get anything! Now all of a sudden the city is all concerned we don't have a grocery store. I can't stand it. I hope the whole city votes against lifting the conservation easement. At this point I'd rather it a vacant abandoned lot.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jennifer Glitsos	9/9/2022	I am very excited about this project and developing the land. I'd love to see something like the Northfield shops in Stapleton and Main Street they have, along with parks and bike paths! I know this is just the planning/zoning process but when do you think development will actually get started? Just a rough estimate if everything goes well?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	9/29/2022	Please provide me the links for someone to use (1) for submitting written online comments to the Planning Board for its October 19 Public Hearing and (2) for registering to attend online and make oral comments at the October 19 Planning Board Public Hearing
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Shiloy Sanders	10/3/2022	How do I submit my opposition to the Westside proposal for rezoning Park Hill Golf Course to build 12 story buildings?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ann Cisneros	10/3/2022	I was under the impression that this matter had been submitted to voters and decided. It seems underhanded for the process to continue in hopes that voters have moved on to other issues. I strongly object to the plan to build on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I do not believe that the proposed residential structures are in the best interest of the community. Certainly, giving a windfall to the developers on weak claims of "affordable housing" is not in the interests of the community. The community would benefit most by preserving this open space. Maintaining the areas as a golf course is preferable to the proposed re-zoning, though I hope the space will be used for more trees, walking/biking/running paths, and a mountain bike/jump course. For environmental reasons, I hope the area will remain green space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	Written Comments to the Planning Board from Woody Garnsey in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application [October 22, 2022] I am a Denver native, a 51-year resident of Park Hill, and a retired attorney. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application. CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Scoufis	10/3/2022	Fully support this project. As someone who lives less than a mile from the golf course, we need more park space and shopping options, including a grocery store.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Harr	10/3/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! <b>Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside</b>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacob Wooden	10/3/2022	I'm a park hill resident and I approve of this plan. We need more housing, and more density, particularly near existing transit options like the A line and Colorado Boulevard bus routes.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	10/3/2022	I strongly oppose the plan. I don't want more tall buildings along Colorado Blvd. and the associated traffic that goes with it. The voters have opposed development of this land where Westside will make a killing financially. The Conservation easement should be honored. Not enough open space in the plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Elaine Granata	10/3/2020	Because of the conservation easement area planning is premature. Once the easement issue is resolved then appropriate planning should commence. I strongly oppose the planning process and the proposed plans that are being floated by Community Planning and Development. The process has been skewed toward the developer and has not maintained appropriate neutrality.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mather Ferguson	10/4/2022	I do not want to see our limited green space in the city be overtaken with more concrete, more houses, and more businesses. Colorado Boulevard is littered with businesses and doesn't need more in the PHGC area. There is simply no need. One of the beautiful things about our city is the presence of green spaces. It adds value to our city, our mental health, our physical health, and our environment and climate. As I understand it, when the land was donated to the city, it was meant to remain green space, albeit a golf course. The city and the people must not go back on their word and agreement to honor that condition. The company that bought the golf course knew what they were getting into when they bought. Do not let money and corporate interest take even one inch of this beautiful green space away from our residents by building commercial and residential properties on it. Keep all of the green space for all of our residents.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Terri Hobart	10/4/2022	I am writing in support of the proposed Park Hill Golf Course development and the residents of NE Park Hill who have expressed a need for affordable housing, healthy food options, commerce, and economic opportunities. I believe the proposed plan addresses the concerns that have been raised and the 100 acre park is sufficient to protect open space and provide opportunities for the community and youth. I ask that you give greater weight to the Community Voice Report that reflects the needs and desires of the residents in the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the Golf Course recognizing that the avenues to provide comment so far have been biased against the local residents given the current demographics and historical disenfranchisement of these voices.
Online Comment Form	Amy Golden	10/4/2022	We voted to protect the easement. We continue to do a absurd dance with the developers. This is an oasis. A needed protection in an urban area that will suffer from the impacts of cutting down old growth trees. Denver is getting hotter- we need to protect this green space. The traffic on Colorado is horrendous already and there has been no commitment from a real grocer to establish within this "proposed" development. This is a hardcore "No" from me and my family.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan C Wofford	10/4/2022	As a 45 year resident of Park Hill, I feel strongly that the Park Hill Golf Course should remain open/park space, no development whatsoever except as enhances park setting. There is plenty of industrial, un developed land nearby to build affordable housing and a grocery store
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Timothy Kennedy	10/4/2022	Buildings are too tall. Little to no elements to reduce global warming or carbon dependent heating/cooling. All roofs should have solar with battery storage on site. Heating a cooling should include heat pumps of scale. Low income housing inadequate as a % of project thus not addressing the needs of teachers, healthcare worker, police and fire workers etc. Not enough open space (less than promised). No plan for electric cars
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kenton Burns	10/5/2022	Denver needs trees and open space, not more concrete, shops and buildings. Plenty of space for affordable housing can be found nearby (fact). Do not destroy open space of high public value for the profit (windfall) of a group of developers who, for the most part) do not even live nearby. The original conservation plan purchased by the city of Denver is what will, for years, provide the greatest value to residents who will appreciate the space, cooling environment and park amenities which can (eventually) be planned and offered therein.

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jerome Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I want to register my strong opposition to the rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course. Our voice has not been heard because the rezoning puts 12 story buildings on land that is protected by a conservation easement. To me this is giving land to the highest bidder at the expense of the values of the neighborhood that lives in this area.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jerome Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I strongly oppose the Small Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. Besides violating the conservation easement at the residents tax payers expense - the hidden cost of losing valuable open green space, increased congestion of traffic in the neighborhood by putting 'through streets' of 38th and Dahlia Street (which speeds regularly top 50 mph on Dahlia and include many accidents at the corner of 38th and Dahlia), broken promises and lack of safe spaces to recreate and exercise.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Martha Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I strongly oppose the Small Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. Besides violating the conservation easement at the residents tax payers expense - the hidden cost of losing valuable open green space, increased congestion of traffic in the neighborhood by putting 'through streets' of 38th and Dahlia Street (which speeds regularly top 50 mph on Dahlia and include many accidents at the corner of 38th and Dahlia), broken promises and lack of safe spaces to recreate and exercise. I often walk in the park since it is close to my house and enjoy the quiet location away from the traffic, the trees, the breeze and the green space. I fear the encroachment of more vehicles, more noise, and more dogs that destroys the concept of the open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William R Dresser	10/5/2022	I am strongly opposed to. This area should remain a open space for the people of Denver. I am very disappointed that the city has spent tax dollars to oppose what the people have already voted for!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William R Dresser	10/5/2022	I am strongly opposed to this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Louis Plachowski	10/5/2022	strong opposition. We should not be spending taxpayer monies and time on an issue that has not yet been decided. There is a conservation easement in place and until the people of Denver have made their choice the advancement of a zoning change is a waste of resources. Has the developer been given a go ahead?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	I strongly oppose both the small area plan and rezoning proposal for the former Park Hill Golf Course. George Washington Clayton died in 1899 having amassed a large real estate portfolio becoming Denver's biggest single property owner, investing in downtown real estate and also in the edges of Denver of the time including Capitol Hill, City Park, Clayton, Park Hill, University Hills and what would become Stapleton Airport and the Denver County Jail near Smith Road and Havana Street. He bequeathed his portfolio to fund a school for orphan boys and specified that the Park Hill Golf Course land remain agricultural for future generations. He entrusted the City of Denver, as original trustee of his estate, with the responsibility of securing and upholding his vision. Agricultural land use categories include: (1) irrigated cropland; (2) dry cropland; (3) improved pastureland; (4) native pastureland; (5) orchard; (6) wasteland; (7) timber production; (8) wildlife management; and (9) other categories of land that are typical in the area. The people of Denver embraced Clayton's desire and the city of Denver codified that desire by zoning the property as « open space » and placing a conservation easement paid for by its citizens on it. The citizens of Denver reaffirmed the desire for open space with the passage of Ballot Initiative 301 in 2021. This is the prevailing vision. It is the responsibility of the City of Denver as grantee of the easement to ensure that the property be maintained as open space. The assistance provided by the city to the owner of the property to change the use of the property to a non agricultural/open space and development use shirks and runs counter to its stewardship responsibility and contractual promise to the public to protect the property for conservation. "Open Space is land that is not intensively developed for residential, commercial, industrial or institutional use. It serves many purposes, whether it is publicly or privately owned. It includes agricultural and forest land, undeveloped shorelines, undeveloped scenic lands, public parks and preserves." "The conservation easement is a recognized "land protection mechanism" under both federal and state law. Every conservation easement is written to address the individual needs and desires of the landowner and the property, while meeting the requirement to acknowledge and protect its "conservation purposes," it is a recorded legal document between a landowner and a qualified conservation organization (a city or land trust) that identifies the important conservation values on the property and permanently protects those values by restricting development, subdivision and other non-compatible uses of the property. The land remains in private ownership, but the easement is a perpetual restriction on the property. The land can be sold or transferred, but always subject to the terms of the conservation easement. The grantee of the conservation easement, a land trust (or in this case the City and County of Denver,) perpetually holds the development rights in the conservation easement for the limited purpose of ensuring that they are forever terminated and extinguished and may not be used by the Grantee (the City), the Grantor (Westside) or any other party. The land trust is legally obligated to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. Stewardship of the easement requires annual monitoring of the property by the land trust to record natural or man-made changes to the property, document the land use and management, note possible violations of the terms of the easement, and interact with the easement donors — exchanging ideas, answering questions, discussing the landowner's vision of the future for the property.
Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	A property qualified for conservation purposes must include one or more of the following Conservation Values that will provide a benefit to the public: Agricultural or scenic open space Natural habitat of fish, wildlife or plants Land for outdoor recreation and/or education Historically important land and/or structures" North Denver, arguably more than any other part of the city, has the greatest need of any where else in the city for a large expanse of open space, at a minimum the full 155 acres of PHGC (same size as Washington Park) to combat and mitigate the extensive pollution caused by nearby industrial and transportation sources of pollution - Cherokee Power Plant, Metro Wastewater, Purina, Suncor, I-70, to name a few. Historically a sacrifice area adjacent zip code 80216 continues to be considered to be one of the most polluted zip codes in the country and under Superfund review and/or remediation by the EPA and Colorado Public Health and Environment. Locating buildings on this tract of land will only add to the pollution load in the area and destroy nature's way of combating it. "The concept of carbon pollution is normally associated with the transportation sector. When air pollution is mentioned, we tend to imagine a large number of vehicles stuck in traffic, releasing emissions into the atmosphere. However, buildings actually have a higher environmental footprint than transportation, although it is less evident. Buildings produce pollution both directly and indirectly, representing 39% of carbon dioxide emissions according to the US Green Building Council. Transportation is in second place with 33% of emissions, and industrial activity is in third place at 29%." Do we really want to impose more environmental injustice on the community living in north park hill and surrounding areas by installing buildings on an open space that can naturally clean the air and water, add oxygen, and cool the surrounding area? Denver's own plans as articulated in Game Plan for a Healthy City, Tree Canopy inventories, Climate, Sustainability, and Public Health studies provide visions that are other than the dense development proposed by Westside on this land. The Trust for Public Land studies show that Denver is deficient in open space as compared to other cities according to their criteria. There are alternative locations for housing but none of this size for open space. The larger the open space the greater the environmental benefit. The prevailing vision is for Denver and particularly northeast Park Hill and north Denver to have more, not less, open space and for housing, also needed, to be located in already developed areas and possibly underutilized areas, not green space. Industrial properties, paved parking lots, defunct motels, and office buildings are just some of the properties that can be redeveloped or repurposed for housing. Preserving the entire 155 acre parcel for conservation purposes is the prevailing vision. I strongly disagree with the vision presented by Westside and the City to develop portions of the Park Hill Golf Course for housing and retail. It is critical that the entire parcel remain open space for protection of biodiversity and the health and quality of life Denver residents.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	It is my understanding George Washington Clayton wanted his land to remain agricultural and entrusted the City of Denver to keep it so. Denver did not and instead used Clayton's estate for its own benefit. The probate court discovered and relieved the city of its executor duties. Nonetheless the city has found other ways to obtain Clayton's assets:1. Use of its condemnation authority to obtain 90 acres of Park Hill Golf Course for a detention basin2. Use of its power to rezone to change the classification of the golf course from open space subject to a perpetual conservation easement (current zoning) to privately owned open space unrestricted and potentially available for other uses subject to planning (proposed zoning)3. Use of its planning authority to conduct a sham visioning process for the future of Park Hill Golf Course ignoring/violating the following:a. George Clayton's wishes,b. current zoning,c. taxpayer purchase of a conservation easement,d. opposition by stakeholders to the conclusions drawn by consultants in the visioning process, and,e. environmental considerations (heat island, air and water quality , wildlife habitat, need for parkland, quality of life, psycho-sociological impacts of nature deficit, health, etc.)

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022			
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	Denver was once considered a city in a park. It now has less than 8% of its land designated as park land, much less than comparably sized cities which have designated over 20% of their lands for parks. The additional concrete called for in Blueprint Denver requires mitigation with offsetting green space. Park Hill Golf Course is one of the few large open spaces left in the city which could be designated a city park. If we want a livable city we must have green space, responsible stewardship of our land, and an enlightened fox guarding the hen house. Open space vs housing is a false choice. Denver needs both housing and open space. Housing can be built in a variety of locations - on parking and industrial lots and can be provided vertically. Open green space with trees is in limited supply and housing is being built all over Denver particularly in the north of the city. The "permitted uses" listed in the easement - golf course, tennis courts and ball fields - can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation. The most livable cities are defined by their large parks and open space. They are deemed the lungs and souls of cities, providing oxygen, cleaning the air and water, and providing scenic beauty. To many they are revered as God's creation not man's. They are grounds where plants and animals, including humans, thrive and play. The virtues of natural places in feeding the soul have been extolled by artists of all types - poets, writers, painters - since time immemorial - Henry David Thoreau, Frederick Law Olmsted, Robert Frost, Emily Dickinson, Jean Jacques Rousseau, to name a few. Wealth has been defined by the size of land preserved. Noblemen have had the privilege of hunting and playing on large estates. Is it fair that the less fortunate are relegated to tiny homes and/or apartment/condo storage units and small concrete pocket parks? Denver does not even come close to other major cities in the US with respect to open space set asides in close proximity to its residents. Furthermore it is intensifying development of every available green space in every neighborhood.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	David Engelken	10/7/2022	Our open space at Denver is already being swallowed. The manipulation with zoning attempts to subvert the legal status of Park Hill Golf Course threaten one more precious and wonderful piece of open land and sky in our besieged and under-park-landed city. Please, CDP and City Council, preserve this land from in-fill development as the existing contracts, zoning laws and covenants that govern it require.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jean Socolofsky	10/7/2022	Please honor the citizens of Denver as their representatives. They voted in a fair and open election, and overwhelmingly in favor of leaving this area as an Open Space. Please focus on the much needed redevelopment of the existing housing and buildings just a few blocks away to fulfill stated needs. Thank you.
Online Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for the Park Hill Golf Course) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. (please see the Nov 2021 voter results for Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively)2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law (violating the statutes which govern conservation easements) and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer (Westside Partners).A legitimate question from taxpaying voters such as myself: Why is the City and County of Denver not promoting legal visions for this property such as those presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/">https://yesopenspace.org/</a> ? Take a look at the outstanding proposed park image presented here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a> . Were the City to present these images (for an intact, 155-acre park), alongside the "visions" presented by the developer, then the process of voting on any change to the conservation easement would actually be legitimate. As it stands to-date, the CPD's "plans" are a joke to this voter, neighbor and taxpayer, as they ignore the presence of the \$2 million conservation easement for this property.
Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	10/7/2022	The CPD planning process is a sham and it's irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land: Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers? CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space. Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	10/7/2022	CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase—despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. 1 CPD's documents establish that its Executive Director and her staff consider Westside—not Denver's citizens and taxpayers—to be CPD's "client" in this planning process. 2 Despite Westside's expensive opposition campaign where it spent at least \$636,000, Ballot Initiative 301 carried nearly 300 precincts and only narrowly lost in 7 precincts. In fact, despite Westside claiming to speak for "local voices," the vote in precincts surrounding the PHGC land was even more emphatic—winning by 68% to 32%.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement!It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Online Comment Form	Ed and Nancy widmann	10/8/2022	We are very disappointed that the plan is not to reopen and refresh the golf course.This course has history that should not be ignored. It was an early course where many residents learned to golf.It also had many black members many of which were Denver leaders , such as judges etc.We believe that if this is developed there should only be single family homes, which is keeping with the Park Hill neighborhood.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Alexandra Lansing	10/8/2022	I strongly oppose to any development on the Park Hill Golf Course land that is protected by a conservation easement. The community has not received a fair process of community involvement and freedom of speech. I have attended multiple "visioning meetings" and was told that my views about preservation and conservation were not going to be addressed. It was apparent that not all community voices were welcome in the so called "community visioning process."
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	10/9/2022	I don't want 12 story buildings here in our single family/duplex neighborhood. 12 STORIES IS HUGE. Even if it is far northwest. What happened to the referendum we voted on that said we had to have a citywide vote to lift the easement? Without that you are going against the will of voters. You are IGNORING the will of the voters. What happened to the center for African American business center the developer promised in the beginning of the process? Most neighbors want all open space. You can see the flame from Suncor and the I70 from the golf course we need pollution mitigation. And we are low income and can't take the worsening of the heat by paving. I can feel the cool from the grass at sunset even on the hottest days. Open space open space open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carol Ann Chambers	10/9/2022	I am opposed to the rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course. Rezoning would be illegal and presumptive that the City and the Board chooses to ignore Denver voters regarding a conservation easement. I have followed the process to create the PHGC area plan and it was based on the conservation easement being lifted before a vote was taken. The PHGC area plan didn't include drawings on the surrounding neighborhoods and areas of development during the process and discussion. I consider this exclusion as not meeting full disclosure during discussions and process.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alan Dresser	10/9/2022	I am strongly opposed to rezoning this property. The entire 170 acres should remain open space. Denver has enough development and not enough parkland!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alice Applebaum	10/9/2022	Strongly opposed. These developers do not do what they say they will do. Once our green space is gone there is no way to get it back. Denver is known for good parks! Shouldn't EVERYONE have access to parks?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alice Applebaum	10/9/2022	Strongly opposed! We need green space for quality of life in our city. Once it's gone we can't get it back. These developers are known for bait and switch promises. Please do not let Them develop the golf course.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Taylor Richards	10/9/2022	I am strongly opposed
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mary Lou Clark	10/10/2022	It is totally ridiculous to approve rezoning while a conservation easement is in place. We all know our crooked mayor (who everyone hates) wants to get his grubby little hands on this property for his developer buddy. Last November the voters thwarted his plan to dismiss the easement but he keeps trying. So...is he coercing the planning board to get this property rezoned offering some sort of compensation? I wouldn't put it past him as he's such a snake! I think you all are inviting a lawsuit if you try to do this! These same comments apply to: PARK HILL GOLF COURSE SMALL AREA PLAN! So...STRONG OPPOSITION TO THESE PLANS!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Laurel Mohr	10/10/2022	There is a conservation easement on this land. The people of Denver have strongly supported this easement. The Northeast Park Hill neighborhood has strongly supported this. We do not want development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Judith Cohen	10/10/2022	I do not understand why the City and the Planning Department continue to spend time and money on this plan when the citizens of Denver have clearly said they want open space and not development and the property cannot be developed unless the conservation easement is lifted.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Todd Nicotra	10/10/2022	I think this plan makes great sense and will encourage smart growth for the neighborhood and the City of Denver. 100 acres of parks, mixed income housing, and commercial development seem like a much better use of urban land than a golf course. As a resident of Denver, I fully support this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Priscilla Stiefler	10/10/2022	We, Denver voters, strongly oppose Mayor Hancock's alliance with his "client" to develop the City Park Golf Course into something other than using it as open space. The conservation easement is legally binding and the City's attempts to overturn it are not welcomed by 63% of us who voted. DO NOT DEVELOP THIS PROPERTY ACCORDING TO THE CITY'S CURRENT PLAN!!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Nick Johnson	10/10/2022	I am very against this plan! There is no guarantee the developer will follow through on their proposals. It also likely increases traffic substantially in the area. Plus, it will concentrate affordable housing in this area. There is already a good deal of affordable housing in this area. This will create a pocket of wealth discrepancy in the city. We really need to maintain our green space. The smog and construction in this city in out of hand. We should strive to maintain some nature and trees and a place where people can just enjoy being outside.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan Klann	10/10/2022	I want this land preserved as open space, not developed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kathleen Wells	10/10/2022	There is not a good reason to build 12-story buildings on land that is protected by a conservation easement. There are no circumstances that justify abrogating the easement. If this were to occur, one would think all such easements would be at risk.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	T Goldhamer	10/10/2022	This land is encumbered by a conservation easement bought and paid for by taxpayers of the City and County of Denver. The City must protect the conservation purposes of the easement and not cooperate in any way with allowing uses other than open space, recreation and scenic uses. If the property owner wants to use the property for other than a golf course the City and the owner could come to agreement on other uses that still protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement and work to get any necessary court and voter approval. Such uses may not be as profitable for the property owner. This developer bought the property knowing about the easement but gambling that the city would go along with a profitable development proposal. The City has an obligation to uphold the conservation easement to protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement. The property owner's plans and promises are enticing to some in the community but they are no guarantees and come with the burden of a Metropolitan District with substantial costs, loss of irreplaceable open space and vistas, and increased congestion and traffic. The development ideas elicited from the community should be facilitated on the surrounding undeveloped or underdeveloped land and the Park Hill Gold Course Land should be preserved as open. Please rethink this draft plan. Work toward meeting objectives that the plan elicited on other land in the area.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	10/10/2022	I am writing in support of Denver Audubon's assessment of Denver, and its developers, planning process for the Park Hill Golf Course open space. In addition to adding value for businesses, tax income, and low-income housing that may advance the public's interest and enjoyment of the park at the perimeter, there are many options for use on nearby industrial space as an alternative. Why not preserve the already preciously protected space we have left? As internationally agreed at the recent Denver-based Greater and Greener urban parks conference, there is a clear path forward for developing open park space that limits gentrification and provides for healthy and smart urban land use. * OPEN SPACE PER RESIDENT. Northeast Park Hill is an underserved community in need of walkable access to a park. Increasing the 91 acres now available to the surrounding communities by the entire 130 acres available at the PHGC would still only bring these communities up to just over one-third of the acreage available to the communities of Berkeley, Gateway-Green Valley Ranch and Washington Park. Denver formerly had one of the highest ratios of open space per resident – we were a national leader in that field. Now, with only 170 sq. ft. per person, Denver ranks 12 out of 15 of the nation's largest cities. * LOSS OF WILDERNESS HABITAT. The Denver area is a part of a principal route of the Central Migration Flyway used by millions of migrating birds in spring and fall. The widespread loss of habitat is the biggest driver of bird population declines. Audubon considers 113 species using this Flyway to be highly vulnerable to changes from human activity. Preserving large intact areas of habitat is crucial to the survival of North American bird species. Habitat size matters to migrating bird species. Loss of Denver as a stop-over habitat constitutes a serious threat to species survival. * VALUE TO RESIDENTS. Preserving a single, uninterrupted area of open space for the regional community has important benefits, albeit different from any single commercial advantage from urban development. Parks, research shows, can advance the community's objectives to help children develop physically, intellectually, psychologically and socially. * ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE. Improving the overall quality of Denver's urban tree canopy to add shade that reduces the heat island effect of streets, parking lots and buildings, traps and removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and cleanses airborne pollutants from the air we breathe. I wholeheartedly agree with Denver Audubon's recommendation: "At least 90% of the Park Hill Golf Course should be retained as open space, as wild and natural as possible, using native plants for any necessary revegetation. Well-planned development around the area's periphery can create opportunities for "buy-in" by adjacent neighborhoods that would support a sense of stewardship and conserve area resources."A personal view. I've volunteered for the city of Denver and the state of Colorado as a community representative for about 40 years with a renewed focus on open space and wildlife support in our dense urban areas. Most of it has been in support of Denver City Park as one such important space. I believe thriving urban wildlife habitats (particularly for birds) are a measure of our own survivability as a community. Denver Audubon has done a thoroughly researched assessment of the developer's plan for this large portion of the city's urban space. Their assessment is worthy of further, pre-decisional discussion.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	MARIA FLORA	10/10/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement for recreation and open space. Under the Colorado Conservation Easement Statutes, that conservation easement cannot be terminated without a court finding that due to changed circumstances, the purposes of the conservation easement cannot be fulfilled. That is an impossible standard, for a number of reasons. The conservation easement protects the land from development, so why are we considering a zoning change and small area plan while the conservation easement is in place. And Denver voters are unlikely to vote to terminate the conservation easement to promote a private development. The landslide vote in favor of Initiative 301 in the fall of 2021 shows that the citizens of Denver value this greenspace and see the importance of it for the next seven generations, even if the administration does not. The immediate neighbors to this land do not want it developed, but want it to remain 100% open space. Take a look at the Greater Park Hill 2019 survey (77% want 100% open space) and the precinct-by-precinct vote on Initiative 301 before you believe Westside that the neighborhood wants this property developed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Muhammad Khan	10/10/2022	My concern is with Dahila St being a through street will let heavy traffic through the residential neighborhood. Signs and barricades don't really stop a motivated driver. This is also not in line with what the Denver residents expressed with the park street closures during 2020. I guess if you put a roundabout that'll deter plenty of drivers. The other shortcoming that I see is there's no right-of-way being requested on Colorado Blvd for the future BRT. I get the lofty goal of converting existing lanes of Colorado Blvd to BRT but personally, I would rather earmark the land now than try to figure out in the future where the land will be coming from.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Steve Good	10/10/2022	Outrageous that the City is proceeding with a plan to overturn a conservation easement that the City itself put in place, and that Denver voters overwhelmingly endorsed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Vanessa Glass	10/11/2022	As a neighbor in the Clayton neighborhood, I am writing in support of the proposed Park Hill Golf Course development and the residents of North East Park Hill who have expressed a need for affordable housing, healthy food options, commerce, and economic opportunities. I believe the proposed plan addresses the concerns that have been raised and the 100 acre park is sufficient to protect open space and provide opportunities for the community and youth. I ask that you give greater weight to the Community Voice Report that reflects the needs and desires of the residents in the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the Golf Course recognizing that the avenues to provide comment so far have been biased against the local residents given the current demographics and historical disenfranchisement of these voices.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Maria T	10/11/2022	Strong opposition Keep Open Space
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Penfield Tate	10/11/2022	Penfield Tate's Comments to the Planning Board offered in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application I am a long time Colorado and Denver resident and have lived in Park Hill since 1984. I am a practicing attorney with an emphasis in public finance and municipal law, among other things. In my practice I have represented the City and its agencies on a number of public project financings over the years. I am a member of Save Open Space Denver ("SOS") and was a member of the successful effort to pass Initiative 301 promoted by Yes for Parks and Open Space this past November. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan ("Small Area Plan") and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application ("Zone Map Amendment"). Regrettably, CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development aspirations of its real estate developer "client." CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of the developer's plans. After Westside purchased the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land in July 2019 subject to the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the City administration began working with Westside on plans to eliminate the City-owned conservation easement and open the land to construction of residential and commercial buildings. It also granted the developer a three year window during which it would not enforce the requirements of the conservation easement. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." CPD's "Steering Committee" was substantially composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. This was done over the objection of members of the "Steering Committee" who were not shown a draft of the "prevailing vision" report before the City released and promoted it to the public. In early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal Small Area Plan. At this time, the City also dismissed SOS from the "Steering Committee" because it did not support the City's prevailing vision of development of the site. Principal Rationale for Opposing Approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application: My principal rationale for opposing approval of CPD's Small Area Plan and the developer's Zone Map Amendment Application is: (1) they violate the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement; (2) they violate state law because there has been no court order issued pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute allowing termination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the conservation easement; and, (3) their approval would result in the City and Denver taxpayers making a multi-million dollar gift to Westside. Mistakes in CPD's Planning Process: CPD's planning process has been laden with mistakes in many ways including the following: • Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers the developer to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers?

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Penfield Tate (cont.)</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>• During its planning process, CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. Instead, CPD has only posted on its website and shared with the Steering Committee and the Planning Board in its October 5, 2022 "Informational Item—Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan" FAQs prepared by the City Attorney regarding the conservation easement. Proponents of preserving the conservation easement for its open space and recreational conservation purposes disagree with the City Attorney's opinion that if the conservation easement is preserved the land must always be operated as a golf course. In summary, we maintain the is the true meaning of the conservation easement, which should be preserved: A conservation easement is an interest in real property that is defined and governed by Colorado statutory law. A conservation easement, by legal definition, imposes limits on the use of land to maintain it, among other things, "predominantly in a natural, scenic or open condition, or for wildlife habitat...or recreational...or other use or condition consistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity." While a variety of land uses are allowed, these uses must be consistent with this statutory definition and the specific "conservation purposes" described in the conservation easement document. The "conservation purposes" of the PHGC land conservation easement are to maintain the land's "scenic and open condition" and to preserve the land "for recreational use." The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation. Therefore, if the developer and the City choose not to continue golf course operations on the PHGC land, they could modify the conservation easement's "permitted uses" as long as any new uses are consistent with the easement's open space and recreational "conservation purposes." Such a modification would not trigger the Colorado statutory requirement for securing a court order related to conservation easement termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements. • CPD has been overreaching by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. This process should have been done in context. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where Save Open Space Denver has identified over thirty-six acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space. • Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. The developer's proposed "gift" of an 80-100 acre park is not gift – it is the confiscation of a 155 acre conservation easement owned by the City for its people. • CPD has wholly ignored meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space.</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Penfield Tate (cont.)</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>• While relying on its invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes, CPD has ignored the fact the overwhelming majority of people who have engaged on the issue have supported preservation of the conservation easement. CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. CPD has ignored the significance of the November 2021 election where voters in precincts surrounding the PHGC land and citywide voted by a 68% margin to provide extra protections for the PHGC conservation easement by mandating a citywide vote before the conservation easement could be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned and before any residential or commercial buildings could be constructed on the PHGC land. CPD has ignored the strong written and oral public comments provided in the "Public Comment" portion of the "Steering Committee" meetings and on CPD's "Comments submitted through general comment" website form supporting preserving the conservation easement in accordance with its open space and recreational conservation purposes. The overwhelming majority of commentators have opposed development and supported preserving the conservation easement. • CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside must utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that impose upon property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. • CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. • CPD has even ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. • CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Penfield Tate (cont.)</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. • CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is likely now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). • CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a substantial majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in the Small Area Plan phase-- despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member--CPD prevented Save Open Space Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" and removed SOS. • Most significantly, CPD has wastefully put the cart before the horse conducting a Small Area Plan process now. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. Why approve a Small Area Plan and Zone Map Amendment before a court has determined under state law that either is allowed?</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Mary Ellen Garrett</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>What are the options for the Park Hill Golf Course at this point? As a Park Hill resident, who also lived here as a child and young adult, I think city leaders are blowing a fantastic opportunity to improve and maintain this site as a park. Can that still be considered? As we along with much of the world swelter in record heat, the importance of trees, open space, and parkland to urban community health is vital. Affordable housing is also a huge need in Denver; the project envisioned by Westside Development for PHGC would be a drop in the bucket of this need, while forever foreclosing the entire site remaining a park. It's not clear why the city didn't purchase this site from the previous owner, but is this an option now? Clearly Westside didn't purchase it to keep it as open space, in spite of the conservation easement – paid for with our tax dollars – that's in effect for this land. They and city planners have steamrolled a planning process promoting Westside's development vision, which will require the conservation easement to be revoked in order to build. Public input into this plan has been carefully staged; public meetings I attended were a frustrating farce. It's been very sad, and I think questionable, to see city staff used at these meetings to further the developers' agenda. Neighbors have drafted a comprehensive park proposal. What's needed for city leaders to give this serious consideration? Denver residents have made their preferences clear: a 2019 Greater Park Hill Community-commissioned survey found a large majority of the neighborhood — 77 percent — prefers the property "remain entirely some kind of green space/park or golf course." And last year's city-wide election results on proposals 301 and 302 show a very strong preference for what Denverites want to see happen at this site: preserving it as open space! What can be done at this point to honor the wishes of the majority of Denver residents regarding the future of the Park Hill Golf Course?</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mary Ellen Garrett	10/11/2022	I'm upset that this planning process did not invite public input on a full range of conservation options. It has only presented development proposals from the developer. I think this invalidates the results of the public comments you've gathered. The whole process has been framed by Westside. City staff have been co-opted, and the public -- which strongly supports keeping this whole site as open space/parkland -- has been invited to give opinions on a very limited range of alternatives. Revoking the conservation easement is barely mentioned in the current plans or at meetings I've attended. Didn't we as taxpayers pay several million dollars to keep this land from being developed? My main concerns: the planning process is a sham, to promote the developer's vision, and should go back to the drawing board and solicit input on a full range of conservation v. development ideas. Denver residents have strongly voted in favor of conservation for this site. How have those votes been factored into the current planning process? What about the conservation easement? How has your planning team dealt with the comprehensive park plan that Park Hill neighbors have proposed, as featured on the cover of the August 2022 Greater Park Hill newspaper? I heard some belittling comments about this proposal by the developer. I'm requesting that city staff take it seriously and include it in the information that is being presented for public comment. Thank you.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Steve Ryder	10/11/2022	Denver Field Ornithologists is an all-volunteer, non-profit organization founded in 1935 with a current membership of 600 individuals and families. Our mission is to promote interest in the study and preservation of birds and their habitats. In recent years our members have expressed a keen interest in conserving bird and bird-associated habitat statewide, with a particular focus being the Denver Metropolitan Area.COMMENTS REGARDING THE ZONE MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATIONThe entire property is currently zoned by the City as OS-B, which accommodates privately owned active recreation. (Re-Zoning App, pp. 28-32) The proposed zoning keeps less than one-half of the property in the OS-A District. This is problematic for the following reasons:a) The intent of the current zoning is to allow a private golf course, which most agree is less desirable than a more broadly-considered open space and park system. But this is not merely a zoning designation, its restrictions are in the form of a conservation easement that anticipates the property NOT being developed.b) Any amendment to the conservation easement should either be neutral, meaning it remains entirely a zone for recreation and open space, or strengthened to promote connecting people to nature via a passive Open Space designation.c) Regrettably, the proposed zoning essentially extinguishes much of the intent of the current zoning by requiring an urban, development-centered landscape over about one-half of the property. This is obviously contrary to the intent of the conservation easement. Of particular concern is "The Project" statements (p. 31) which provide clear evidence that there is little to no interest in providing the public a viable open space area that allows the experience of nature in the City:a) Out of the 155 currently protected acres, only 100 acres would be designated as parks and open space; and a majority of these 100 acres would be a formal city park (as opposed to open space more conducive to experiencing nature in its more ecologically productive state); b) The actual "Open Space" in the re-zoning proposal could in reality be the OS-A District (~80 acres) minus the proposed city park acreage, leaving actual Open Space to as small as 25-30 acres -- a planned afterthought and an incredible wasted opportunity.The low importance of the environment in the Comprehensive Plan Goals reinforces our view of the City's afterthought approach to environmental resilience (pp 38-39). It is argued that the re-zoning proposal will "greatly advance" water conservation goals. Not so. The proposed city park will use similar water amounts than used by the golf course, and the open space will require similar amounts of water for a few years for the vegetation to become established. The remainder of the property will likely use huge amounts of water due to its planned highly developed structure. Per capita water use is a poor measure of water conservation, unless one starts from a baseline, in this case a former golf course.In summary, the re-zoning proposal violates the intent of the current property's zoning designation (including its open space intent), and will result in a considerable loss of urban wildlife habitat, contrary to the City's stated goals (see Area Plan below). Finally, the amending of the existing conservation easement (to allow public use of Open Space and parks) must take place prior to the adoption of this proposal, which presumes the easement's wholesale amendment or extinction.This proposed arbitrary extinguishment of a conservation easement raises troubling concerns by setting a precedent in the practice of land conservation that easement-protected lands can be viewed as land waiting to be developed. Amendment of this easement must maintain its context and intent -- the current proposal is unapologetically development oriented, with passive recreation and open space being a mere afterthought.COMMENTS REGARDING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE SMALL AREA PLAN The Comprehensive Plan 2040 contains six "vision elements" that form its base. The fifth element states: In 2040, Denver is a thriving, sustainable city connected to nature and resilient to climate change." While high-minded and aspirational, the current re-zoning and comprehensive plan thinking would result in an embarrassing lost opportunity to actually connect people to nature, if the Park Hill GC site were planned accordingly. You cannot create "open space" and "nature" out of 5-10 story buildings, a city park and a remaining snippet of open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Edward J. Shalkey Jr.	10/11/2022	I am strongly opposed to making any changes whatsoever to the existing OS-B zoning except for changing zoning to OS-B in the event the property ever becomes publicly owned. The proposed additional uses will forever preclude the entire property from remaining open space in its entirety.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Edward J. Shalkey Jr.	10/11/2022	The Area plan ignores the requirements of the Conservation Easement which would preserve the entire property as open space. Developing significant portions of this property with uses allowable in the zoning change application will permanently remove a large tract of open space from the city's substandard inventory. More open space is required for the current and future long-term health of a growing city. The Area plan proposes residential and commercial development in reaction to perceived short term needs such as streets, parking, housing and commercial development, with only a token, modest sized, loosely defined recreation area. This is a very short-sighted plan to enable the rescue of an aggressive developer's investment plans in the face of the recent city-wide vote to preserve ALL OF the Park Hill Golf Course open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT	10/11/2022	Statement in Opposition to the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan1. The Department of Community Planning and Development used a flawed approach to find a "prevailing vision" that favors residential and commercial development on the former PHGC. In my opinion, the approach taken by the Department of Community Planning and Development to conclude that "the prevailing vision" of the community considers it appropriate to preserve only approximately one half of the total acreage of the former PHGC for open space and recreation was biased and unreliable. The methods supported by the City to inquire about the "vision" of the people of Denver never offered residents the option to endorse a plan that would require the entire 155 acres of the former GPHC to be utilized for recreation and open space. In actuality, as evidenced by their votes in favor of Measure 301 and against Measure 302 in November 2021, Denver voters overall and the Park Hill neighbor in particular decisively rejected the stated position of the Westside developers to favor some residential and commercial development.The survey cited by the City and Westside as a basis to claim that the prevailing vision of residents living within one mile of the former PHGC was to favor "mixed-use" was biased for several important reasons. First, the initial and main question on the survey asked respondents to choose between use of the land exclusively as a golf course, or as a mixed-use site with residential development and park land. This dichotomous choice was by design biased to favor endorsement of mixed use. A fair and unbiased survey of opinion would have presented more options, including not only mixed use, but also full residential and/or commercial development, and full preservation as parkland and open space. Second, there was no demonstration that the survey in fact reached a representative sample of the intended audience, nor that the number of responses received were statistically adequate to reflect the targeted community. Third, there was no valid reason to restrict the survey to residential addresses within one mile of the site. These biases, particularly the limited choice of options, was particularly objectionable in view of the City's knowledge that an active grass roots movement expressed vocal support for full preservation of the former PHGC as open space or parkland. The process undertaken by the City to promote a plan that would devote approximately half of the former PHGC for commercial and residential development was performed without a scientifically valid environmental and public health impact analysis intended to impartially present the costs and benefits of various options, including preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. This is in contravention to best practices for consideration of major development projects under consideration by a public entity such as the City and County of Denver. For example, the relative impact of "mixed use" versus full conservation as parkland and open space on factors such as urban heat island effects, air pollution from traffic, access to open space and parkland for recreation and physical exercise was never impartially and scientifically assessed.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	2. Preservation of the former PHGC entirely as parkland and open space would address substantial environmental and public health needs of Denver. Based upon peer-reviewed research, and my experience as a physician and academic specializing in environmental health and public health, it is my opinion that environmental and public health factors strongly favor preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. Consider the following: 1. Between 2010 and 2019, Denver was the country's fifth fastest growing large city. [https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010]. Growth has come with an increased number of cars, roads, parking lots, shopping plazas and other buildings in our community. In fact, nearly half the land in Denver's city limits is paved or built over. [https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/] At the same time, the percentage of City land devoted to open space and parkland has fallen behind that of most other cities. With only 5% of its land used for parks and recreation, Denver has fallen from 13th place in 2012 to 18th place in the 2021 Trust for Public Land Park Score for America's 100 largest cities. In comparison, the percentages of land used for parks and recreation in some other cities are: Washington, D.C.—21%; New York City—16%; San Francisco—21%; San Diego—21%; Portland, Oregon—14%; Boston—19%; Minneapolis—10%; Los Angeles—13%; Seattle—11% and Chicago—9%. According to the Trust for Public Lands, the 2021 national median percentage of land used for parks and recreation in America's 100 largest cities was 15%. [https://www.tpl.org/parkscore]. Use of the former PHGC entirely as parkland would substantially strengthen the park system of our increasingly densified and developed city. The neighborhoods that include and generally abut the PHGC land south of I-70 are the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood that is east of Colorado Boulevard, and the Elyria-Swansea, Clayton, and Cole neighborhoods that are west of Colorado Boulevard. These neighborhoods have substantial communities of color. The percentage of non-white residents in each neighborhood are as follows: Northeast Park Hill: 78.3%; Elyria-Swansea: 87.54%; Clayton: 67.1%, and Cole: 66.2%. [see https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/]. Many residents of these neighborhoods have limited income. For example, a recent assessment found the median household income for Northeast Park Hill was \$37,501. [https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income]. These neighborhoods, which are close to the I-70 corridor and industrial sites, are among the most polluted neighborhoods in Denver. For example, the 80216 zip code, the area in which the Elyria Swansea neighborhood lies, in 2017 had the highest environmental hazard rating of any zip code in the United States. [https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/].
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	These neighborhoods now have a pressing need for open space and trees. For example, the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood ranks 473 out of 483 Denver census blocks in the Tree Equity Score created by the national conservation organization, American Forests. Only two percent of the land in this neighborhood has a tree canopy cover, which compares poorly with the 24% tree canopy cover that the organization American Forests considers optimal. The Tree Equity Scores and tree canopy cover numbers for the other three neighborhoods in the vicinity are comparable to the deficient Northeast Park Hill neighborhood numbers. [https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222] Protection of the PHGC land conservation easement would protect the existing tree canopy and increase equity of access to open space for low-income communities of color. Because of the relative lack of open space and tree cover in the four neighborhoods generally abutting the PHGC land and south of I-70, the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment has given two of them (Northeast Park Hill and Swansea-Elyria) a rating of "High", the most severe rating, and the other two (Clayton and Cole) a "Medium-High" rating on the 2021 Neighborhood Heat Vulnerability Index. [https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#c-13201793]. Commercial and residential development of the PHGC land, combined with increasing air temperatures associated with climate change, would contribute to the development of "heat islands" which, in turn, would threaten the health and well-being of those living and working in these neighborhoods. Urban heat islands are associated with heat exhaustion, heat stroke, heat-related respiratory problems, and death. Conversely, trees and vegetation play key roles in directly countering urban heat islands and the negative health effects with which they are associated. [https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands; https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts]. The City's eventual acquisition of the PHGC land for a designated park would offer the opportunity for the City to augment the land's critical tree canopy thereby reducing heat island issues. 3. Preservation of the entirety of the former PHGC as parkland and open space is the only option that fulfills the City of Denver's stated goals for climate action. In November 2020, the Denver voters overwhelmingly approved Measure 2A, the Climate Protection Fund, which was referred to the ballot by the City Council on the recommendation of the Climate Action Task Force. According to the November 2021 report issued by the Office of Climate Action, Sustainability and Resiliency entitled, "Climate Protection Fund Five Year Plan": "In addition to strategies that directly eliminate emissions, Denver will pursue nature-based solutions to sequester carbon, including preservation of shortgrass prairie, preservation and expansion of the urban tree canopy, and preservation and maintenance of forests in the Denver Mountain Parks" [emphasis added] (see report page 15). Maintaining the former PHGC as verdant open space and parkland, supplemented by additional planting of trees, would be the course of action most supportive of this goal. In addition, the report specifically cites the importance of environmental justice concerns as part of Denver's climate action. As a metric to address climate equity, the report identified "Reduction in disparities in pollution and climate-related vulnerability between communities in Denver" (see report page 37). As noted earlier, the fact that the Denver neighborhoods adjacent to the former PHGC now experience the highest heat vulnerability index and have the lowest tree canopy cover, argues strongly in favor of preserving the site entirely for parkland and open space. City of Denver Forester Mike Swanson acknowledged this when he told the Denver Post "Yes, Denver needs more trees. And we need to stop pouring concrete." [Denver Post, January 3, 2021, https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/03/denver-tree-planting-greenspace-heat-islands/].
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	The former PHGC tract, on which the City and County of Denver holds a conservation easement, represents an irreplaceable opportunity for Denver to utilize parkland to promote the health and well-being of city residents. There are ample opportunities for commercial and residential development to be pursued at alternative locations. Respectfully submitted, Michael J. Kosnett, MD, MPH, FACMT Associate Adjunct Professor Colorado School of Public Health* 2099 Ivy Street Denver, CO 80207 (Affiliation noted for identification purposes only. This is not an institutional statement.)
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Yukhananov	10/11/2022	I think going for a market driven approach is the wrong way forward and we will regret going forward with this plan. The community needs high-quality public housing, not market driven and poorly subsidized units. With this plot of land, we can significantly alleviate the housing crisis in Denver, however, this proposal will not do that. If we are building half-a-million dollar units, we aren't solving the crisis, we are making it worse. I propose that the city intervene and prevent development until there is a more concise plan that is housing and people focused as opposed to market driven. Thank you for your consideration.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Hadley Peterson	10/13/2022	The 303 ArtWay acknowledges that aligning through the Golf Course property will increase safety and mobility options since DOTI is not pursuing intersection rebuilds in a timely manner along Colorado. This project continues to be UNFUNDED by the City and County of Denver after 7 years of advocacy and design work with the Northeast Park Hill community. By leveraging the Golf Course development, this community can be proactive about their future.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jason Schaefer	10/13/2022	I have been following the Park Hills Golf Course saga closely and dove into the the information and arguments put forth by those proposing to redevelop the golf course and those who want to have it function as open space. While both sides make valid points, the proposal to develop the golf course into a mixed-use development is a more holistic and comprehensive approach that meets the moment while addressing many challenges and needs in our city. Ultimately, the open space concept is too narrowly focused, feels very NIMBY/exclusionary, and doesn't address top priorities like housing. The proposal to redevelop strikes the right balance. It provides much-needed housing while still providing a significant green space that will benefit the surrounding neighborhoods and community at large. Better still, it is located near transit. This is critical from both a climate and equity standpoint. We need to provide more housing options near transit. The Colorado A-line station is underserved from a housing standpoint. Not taking this opportunity to add more housing units while we're in the midst of housing affordability and climate crises' would be downright negligent.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jenna Katsaros	10/13/2022	Please do not take away green space from an already deficient area. Development of parks, trails, outdoor spaces/fields, natural areas will compliment this area full of multi-family units (read = no backyards!) and honor the intent of the easement. I am frustrated to see this project continue to be pushed as "helping" people in that underserved area. They are underserved in parks and green space! Future development can be focused - and will be focused - near the light rail station at 40th & Colorado. Where are the plans showing that development project? The city continues to lack transparency. This is only favorable to special interest groups, most of whom helped get Hancock elected. The favoritism and pushing this down NE park hill throats under the guise of "equity" is disappointing and short-sighted. Shame on Hancock for making these promises and shame on the Committee for allowing it to move forward.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	10/13/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course Area plan is fatally flawed because it is inconsistent with the conservation easement purchased for the public's use and enjoyment in 1997 with Denver taxpayer funds. Attempting to undo that easement, is contrary to Colorado law, the overwhelming public support for Ballot Measure 301 and the provisions of the easement itself. Westside Investment Partners surely knew about the 1997 easement in 2019, when it paid just \$3.55 per square foot for the land. That's about one percent of the price other developers are paying for developable property in Denver these days. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend that the City purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space. Instead of following the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the City has worked at cross-purposes with those recommendations. Indeed, City documents explicitly state that its Community Planning and Development bureaucracy considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its "client" in the Westside Investment Partners-driven planning process for the land. From its very outset, the City's "community engagement" process has been designed only to ratify what the developer wants and only to heed the pro-development voices it wants to hear. The 1997 perpetual conservation easement should be the default condition in any plan for the area. However, CPD's process presumes development and largely ignores the easement. To CPD and the vetted pro-development supporters on its Steering Committee, the only possible outcome of the planning and community participation process is development, irrespective of concerns about the impacts of developing the land, the loss of open space and future parkland and the land use changes already underway in the vicinity of the Park Hill Golf Course. CPD falsely claims that the community supports development of the land. This ignores surveys showing that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former golf course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Furthermore, it ignores the overwhelming support of open space by voters last November via their approval of Ballot Measure 301 and the resounding defeat of Ballot Measure 302, the City and Westside's attempt to make it easier to remove the conservation easement and destroy any chance of creating a full-scale park for all of Denver's citizens. The CPD process is unwaveringly biased against considering or even acknowledging nearby land development activities and opportunities that would meet many of the "needs" and provide many of the "benefits" that Westside promises would arise from developing Park Hill Golf Course. Likewise, the CPD process assiduously ignores any adverse fiscal or environmental impacts of developing Park Hill Golf Course. There are better ways to meet Denver's needs for more affordable housing and the other alleged benefits touted in the Draft Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. The City's expenditure of resources to benefit of Westside Investment Partners has been a colossal waste of tax dollars. Those tax dollars and funds from the 2019 bond measure to acquire more parkland would be better spent on implementing the Save Open Space Denver vision for a regional park at the Park Hill Golf Course property (See <a href="https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b">https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b</a> .) My family and I remain unalterably opposed to this corrupt boondoggle.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kelvin kreymborg	10/14/2022	Why can't we ever get real numbers in any of these plans? Real numbers like anticipated population to live here? How many units will be affordable or semi affordable that they plan to build? Even if it works out as a unit break down like of every X# number of units# y and #z will be built. Same with open space and # of trees to be planted also amount of impervious areas? We always get these concerns addressed in generalities. Somehow I think the city & developer has to have an algorithm or formula they can plug these concerns into and pretty much have the answer already. We deserve that info.. we also need to know how the developer will be held accountable to these commitments.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mary Ellen Garrett	10/14/2022	I'm very discouraged by the planning process and draft plan for this important site. Meetings I attended consisted of displays spread around rooms, with staffers at each display, who we could chat with. Nothing was recorded or tabulated. The effect was to completely diffuse and dilute public concerns and comments. This whole process has been an exercise to justify the developer's plans for this incredible neighborhood asset. I oppose the rezoning request. The city should start over with a planning process that asks neighbors about the full range of conservation v. development options. Yes, only a small % want the area to continue to be a golf course, but a very high % want it to be a park and open space! The neighborhood plan for a comprehensive park needs to be shown as an alternative in this process and rezoning request.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Deryk Standerling	10/14/2022	I do not support moving forward with development of the park hill golf course. I live in northeast park hill and every survey where input has been requested, there has never been an option to make this a park or keep the property as it is. The process has been biased towards the developer. Let a 3rd party non biased firm actually ask the community what we want without guiding us to various housing and business options before moving forward with plans that meet the developers needs. If the community actually has a chance to voice all of our desires for this space without being led to a specific outcome, I would be happy to support whatever is decided.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jeff Bailey	10/17/2022	I am in favor of the developer's plan, as Denver sorely needs many thousands of housing units of all types and prices. This parcel being near public transit is another big plus. The park is also nice. I hope the city officials here do not cave to NIMBY pressures. Housing unit growth needs to match pop/job growth and there is much catching up to do.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jason	10/17/2022	Why are you moving forward with this plan considering that the voters were clear in their support of keeping the conservation easement in order to maintain the old golf course as a park/open space?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jeanne Robb	10/18/2022	In the 1989 bond issue Denver voters voted to put \$ 2 million towards the purchase of Park Hill Golf Course. I think the hope had been to buy the property, but instead a conservation easement was placed on the property. A conservation easement is a tool requiring public trust. Keeping the faith with voters should be one of the highest values of any government official. We have missed the opportunity to do so in two bond issues that have been presented to voters since Clayton raised the idea of selling the property in 2016. During this time, I have leant heavily to preserving the entire open space on this site. Sadly, that is not the issue before Planning Board at this time. Small Area Plan I understand that this plan was prepared as a reference if City Council refers the easement question to the voters. So I will comment on the plan as follows: 1. Neither the plan nor the accompanying staff report acknowledges the 1989 bond issue vote. Citizens paid additional property tax for this easement. The plan should state that the public voted to tax themselves for this conservation easement. 2. The plan recommends a 70 - 80 acre regional park (about the size of Cheesman). I agree that the regional detention area should not count as park acreage. That is clear in the stormwater/infrastructure section, but it should also be clarified in Q1, D., p.33. 3. The "Parks First" drawings of the connection(s) to green space along Colorado Blvd in the "Planning Overview" (2.3.1) section are substantially different and significantly more desirable, than the drawing used in the "Quality of Life" Open Space Framework on p.33 and the "Mobility" (3.4) section. Could there be alternate drawings in the Open Space Framework section that more closely match the "Parks First" concept? 4. While the plan mentions affordable housing for families, I'd like to see it emphasized. Large Development Review While not listed on your agenda, I understand the LDR process is underway, even before the Small Area Plan has been approved. That seems precipitous. The principles of this plan must be strongly and faithfully applied in the LDR. Drawings I have seen from Westside are disappointing in light of the plan's "Western Gateway" principle. Also, please be sure that they are providing 80 acres for a regional park, not including the 20 or 25 acres of drainage detention. Even if the city attorney's opinion is that the property can only be a golf course, and thus, the easement must be removed even for a park, others see an easement as something you hold in public trust, not to be easily abandoned in spirit. Voters will not want to release the easement without a plan with substantial guaranteed open space. The amount of open space will be the most important factor in any vote. The Small Area Plan and the conforming LDR must convince voter that this will happen. Rezoning I do NOT support rezoning at this juncture. I get that the City may be trying to be as clear as possible before the vote, but rezoning open space seems like a done deal. I feel that rezoning before the vote on removing the easement betrays the public trust. While having plans in place could inform voters, a zoning prior to the removal of the easement will confuse them. If you need to guarantee a certain amount of open space, that could be stated in the ballot issue. Metropolitan District Again, this is not on your agenda, but I have read a district is in the works. As above, the timing seems wrong. But if this moves forward in the future, the district taxes should not be a burden to the affordable owners. In conclusion, I am distressed by how quickly all pieces of this project are moving forward before the public can vote on whether to remove the conservation easement.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kristen Anderson	10/18/2022	I'm writing to share my strong objections to the proposed rezoning of this property. Denver voters voted to protect this land through a conservation easement and paid for that easement because we wanted to see this large property preserved as open space. As Denver has continued to get more and more developed, large tracts of land like this become even more important to give residents places to recreate, access nature and the mountain views that make our city famous, as well as to preserve places that help reduce air pollution and reduce the heat island effect that has become more and more dramatic in recent years. Northeast Park Hill was identified in a recent study as being one of the worst areas of the city for the heat island effect, because we have so much pavement and so little tree cover. If we don't keep this property open space, that will become significantly worse. In this neighborhood, we live every day with significant air pollution from all the traffic along I-70 and Colorado Boulevard, as well as from the truck traffic to the industrial area north of us. We also get the pet food-processing smell from the Purina plant on a regular basis. The natural open space on the golf course property, with its mature trees, helps ameliorate those effects. If the city truly believes in health equity for all its residents, we need to do what we can to protect the things that help make up for the extra environmental health risks that residents in neighborhoods with higher pollution live with every day. Protecting this land as open space and continuing its existing zoning is a crucial step to do that in this neighborhood. Furthermore, a number of the claims in this application are disingenuous. First, the applicant mischaracterizes the existing easement as only allowing the property to be operated as a golf course that only few people can benefit from, but the easement specifically mentions recreation. Former Mayor Webb has said it was clear when it was written and approved by voters that the intention was to keep the land open space for recreation, which could be interpreted more broadly. Second, the public outreach section completely ignores significant objections to developing this property, registered at every stage of this proposal's public comment opportunities by both those of us who live within blocks of this property (as I do) and other city residents who voted for and helped fund the purchase of the conservation easement. Finally, the applicant also significantly exaggerates the amount of open space that would actually be publicly accessible for recreation under this proposal. A large portion of the proposed "park" is actually a stormwater detention area that is not publicly accessible for recreation. And about 20 other acres of their open space total would just be green spaces in front of buildings, not a large park that anyone can use for recreation. Denver's long-term plans include becoming a more sustainable and climate-resilient city. Honoring the will of voters and taxpayers through preserving the open space designation for this space will help us achieve that. It will reduce the heat island effect, help ameliorate pollution, by retaining mature trees, can help prevent flooding like we recently experienced by keeping more unpaved land, supports residents' health by providing a large place for outdoor recreation in a very built-up area, and protects wildlife habitat in the city (foxes were regularly seen on the land this summer). Please support our health and help boost Denver's image and reality as an environmental and livable city by keeping the current zoning designation for this property. All of the other needs identified for this neighborhood through this planning process can happen on other parcels that are already zoned for development. Thank you.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Brian Loma	10/19/2022	Think the voters spoke in 2021 when we voted to protect open space. Also, I think that Norm is a Scammer. He committed to financially supporting our group that provided services for the 2022 5 Points Jazz Festival. He never provided the financial support he committed to. My friends wanted to work with Norm to provide a local food bank utilizing the Park Hill Golf Course clubhouse. They are now suing Norm and his group. This proposal was not what the citizens asked for and I as a resident of Skyland Neighborhood call for a no vote on his proposal.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kristen	10/19/2022	Grocery store should be of most importance. Would be great for this neighborhood to have not only solid food options, but local shops and restaurants to build the economy. Right now there are homeless encampments and people trashing vehicles all around, so my one question would be if the housing units are all affordable/ community housing or if there are also traditional style homes being built? What percentage of the build are to be for affordable versus for the community shelters? I happy for us to give back to peoples in need, however with the multiples shelters (4 I am aware of) and community housing surrounding this area... I am concerned as to why it seems the only location for these low income/ shelters are only in Clayton and Park Hill? Is this something happening in other zones too? Just concerned we are structuring Clayton and park hill into a low income zone. Rather than building a more inclusive area for all incomes. There are hardly any food options, no retail, and no grocery stores... hoping we can make the community better, safer, and bring outside neighborhood visitors to this area.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Barry Rosenberg	10/19/2022	I live in Park Hill and am interested in what happens at the former golf course. I like the idea of affordable housing and would like to know what percentage of the homes will actually be affordable and what is considered to be affordable. I think, if developed, it would be great if all the homes had geothermal heat, solar energy (preferably a solar farm, electric appliances and 220 wiring (for electric cars). I would hope no or very, very few trees will be cut down, if developed
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Barry Rosenberg	10/19/2022	responded earlier. I think thousands of seedling should be planted on non residential areas. School children in Denver can plant seedlings and see them grow, like they will. Seattle has an amazing arboretum and, while City Park is an arboretum many of the trees are not native to our area. I would suggest contact the Park People, a non-profit in Denver for advice and where and what to plant.. see <a href="http://theparkpeople.org">theparkpeople.org</a>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jesse Parris	10/19/2022	I want to know exactly how many affordable units 0-30% AMI are proposed to be on this property?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jorge G.	10/23/2022	Could you explain how it is legally possible to propose zoning changes when the Conservation Easement remains in place? Doesn't that have to be lifted first before anything of this sort could be seriously considered?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Chelsea	11/28/2022	Has the committee modeled viewshed impacts of the height of 8 and 10 story buildings? The people who abut the park will have their Mountain View's obscured by this height of development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Scott Strohmeier	11/28/2022	I am adamantly opposed to any development of the park hill area. we've voted TWICE to negate any development, and now we're going to have to vote again? Criminal.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mark Obmascik	11/28/2022	No means no. Time for the mayor to listen to voters, not campaign contributors. Taxpayers own the conservation easement to the Park Hill Golf Course -- it's not up to a lame duck administration to give away to developers what taxpayers have bought. A no vote by voters means no City Hall override of the conservation easement.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	11/28/2022	The citizens of Denver very emphatically VOTED to keep the Park Hill Golf Course UNDEVELOPED. It is incomprehensible why the city, working hand-in-glove with Westside Development, has interpreted that vote as having never happened, and instead coming up with some half-cocked "prevailing vision" for developing the property -- and enriching Westside many, many times over. As a lifelong Denver resident, I am strongly opposed to re-zoning, re-developing, "prevailing" or whatever else the developers want to call this.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

<p>Planning Board Comment Form</p>	<p>Woody Garnsey</p>	<p>10/2/2022</p>	<p>Written Comments to the Planning Board from Woody Garnsey in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application [October 22, 2022] I am a Denver native, a 51-year resident of Park Hill, and a retired attorney. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application. CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans. Starting soon after Westside purchased the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the City administration began working with Westside on plans to break the City-owned conservation easement and open the land to construction of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." CPD's "Steering Committee" was substantially composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal Small Area Plan. Overarching Basis for Opposing Approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application: My overarching basis for opposing approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application is: (1) they violate the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement; (2) they are illegal because there has been no court order issued pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute allowing termination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the conservation easement; and (3) their approval would result in the City and Denver taxpayers making a multi-million dollar gift to Westside. The Fatal Flaws of CPD's Planning Process: CPD's planning process has been fatally flawed in many ways including the following:• Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers?</p>
<p>Planning Board Comment Form</p>	<p>Woody Garnsey</p>	<p>10/2/2022</p>	<p>o A conservation easement is an interest in real property that is defined and governed by Colorado statutory law. A conservation easement, by legal definition, imposes limits on the use of land to maintain it, among other things, "predominantly in a natural, scenic or open condition, or for wildlife habitat...or recreational...or other use or condition consistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity." While a variety of land uses may be allowed, these uses must be consistent with this statutory definition and the specific "conservation purposes" described in the conservation easement document.  o The "conservation purposes" of the PHGC land conservation easement are to maintain the land's "scenic and open condition" and to preserve the land "for recreational use." The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation.  o Therefore, if Westside chooses not to continue golf course operations on the PHGC land, it and the City could modify the conservation easement's "permitted uses" as long as any new uses would be consistent with the easement's open space and recreational "conservation purposes." Such a modification would not trigger the Colorado statutory requirement for securing a court order related to conservation easement termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements.  • CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where Save Open Space Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.</p>
<p>Planning Board Comment Form</p>	<p>Woody Garnsey</p>	<p>10/2/2022</p>	<p>o CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course.  o CPD has ignored the significance of the November 2021 election where voters in precincts surrounding the PHGC land and citywide voted by a 2-to-1 margin to provide extra protections for the PHGC conservation easement by mandating a citywide vote before the conservation easement could be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned and before any residential or commercial buildings could be constructed on the PHGC land. CPD has failed to give appropriate consideration to the strong written and oral public comments provided in the "Public Comment" portion of the "Steering Committee" meetings and on CPD's "Comments submitted through general comment" website form supporting preserving the conservation easement in accordance with its open space and recreational conservation purposes. The overwhelming majority of commentators have opposed development and supported preserving the conservation easement. • CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. • CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. • CPD has failed to complete a meaningful study regarding the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. Instead, CPD has only prepared a superficial 1-page document titled "Concept-level Traffic Analysis" that it has posted on its website. • CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. • While relying on its invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes, CPD has ignored the fact the overwhelming majority of people who have engaged on the issue have supported preservation of the conservation easement.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned “Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment” dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods “are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita” and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.</li> <li>• Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the “prevailing vision” for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement.</li> <li>• During its planning process, CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. Instead, CPD has only posted on its website and shared with the “Steering Committee” and the Planning Board in its October 5, 2022 “Informational Item—Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan” FAQs prepared by the City Attorney regarding the conservation easement. Proponents of preserving the conservation easement for its open space and recreational conservation purposes disagree with the City Attorney’s opinion that if the conservation easement is preserved the land must always be operated as a golf course. In summary, here is the opinion of the conservation easement preservation proponents:</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights).</li> <li>• CPD hand-picked the “Steering Committee” to have a substantial majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in the Small Area Plan phase-- despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement “Steering Committee” member--CPD prevented Save Open Space Denver from replacing its appointed “Steering Committee” member who needed to resign.</li> <li>• CPD has wastefully put the cart before the horse conducting a Small Area Plan process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become “impossible” to continue fulfilling the easement’s open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> </ul>
Planning Board Comment Form	Amy Harris	10/3/2022	It is absolutely unbelievable to me that there would even be consideration of rezoning the Park Hill Golf Course Land while it is firmly protected from development by a publicly held conservation easement. Obviously, this rezoning cannot be approved. Further, there is simply no chance that the conservation easement will be lifted to allow for development of 12-story apartment buildings. Perhaps the greatest of several barriers is the will of the People of Denver, who must approve such development plans in a citywide vote. If we look to the performance of Initiative 301, we see that over 60% of voters supported 301 and opposed 302. The number was closer to 70% in the neighborhoods nearest to the golf course land. We have spoken up time and time again to ask that these development plans are halted and instead this land is purchased by the City with 2A funds and built into a regional park with public amenities. We will never stop fighting. Please listen to us. And at the very least, please take the reasonable route in considering this rezoning - if it is currently impossible to build on the land, why on earth would you support rezoning to support development? It makes NO sense.
Planning Board Comment Form	Amy Harris	10/3/2022	From the very beginning, the Small Area Plan process has been fraught with deceit and manipulation. It is obvious that when Westside bought this land in 2019, they had a plan in place for how the land would be developed to ensure that they could profit mightily from it. Westside calculated that it could buy off the Mayor and City Council and create fake nonprofits claiming to support development because it will benefit our community. What they did not count on was the power of the people! We, who LIVE HERE, do not support development on protected land. We DO NOT support bringing thousands of additional residents to our neighborhood which has already been severely underserved for decades in terms of access to parks and open space, clean air, and clean water. We all have lead in our water and yet there is only a slow crawl of effort to amend that, and instead we are mailed water filtering pitchers. We live in one of the most polluted areas IN THE NATION due to the nearby oil refinery, dog food factory, and toxins spewed into our air by traffic on Colorado Blvd and I-70. Our tree canopy is practically nonexistent and it makes our neighborhood unbearably hot in the summer due to the heat island effect. And it's not to say that we won't do our part in regards to housing - we have welcomed the Delwest affordable housing project that will bring another 750 folks into our neighborhood, and we welcome the new housing that the Urban Land Conservancy has planned for 40th & Colorado Blvd. But we draw the line at taking away the only potential for our park-starved community to finally have proper access to open space and desperately needed playing fields and other amenities for children. The LAST place that housing should be built on is on protected land! We DO NOT want to see the grass and trees turned into concrete and metal. There is another way! There are other places to build housing in this city, and it is already happening! What will you be prouder of in 50 years - that you protected precious and rapidly dwindling open space in a dense city, or that you gave that land to a wealthy developer so they could construct 12-story buildings and block our mountain views while pocketing millions in profit? Please listen to us, the people who live here. We do not want this. We want and deserve to have the ENTIRE land continue to be protected and converted into 100% public use as a park with associated amenities.
Planning Board Comment Form	Roberta Marks	10/3/2022	Our community has stated repeatedly that we do not want high rise buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Roberta Marks	10/3/2022	Our community has stated repeatedly that we do not want high rise buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Aaron Gottlieb	10/3/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Aaron Gottlieb	10/3/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Robert and Jungoak Haddock	10/3/2022	Here in East Denver we lack sufficient open space that Denver promised in the East Area Plan. Denver needs to keep this valuable space (all of it) green undeveloped. The conservation easement that was granted years ago needs to be honored and kept intact. No development on the golf course.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Kevin P Doyle	10/3/2022	Any development of PHGC will destroy my 123 home community. You have been made aware of this and my community (HOA and RNO) has submitted three separate resolutions bringing this o your attention in 2016,2018 and 2019. You cannot build a community by destroying another and that is your plan!!! Despite the obvious objection from the voters in this city. Neither the city nor the developer has talked to my community about Overlook at Parkhill's investment in the conservation easement despite constant efforts from our community with the Mayor, Clayton EL, Arcis and Denver City Council. As you know or should know, the Clayton Trust had granted certain easements to Overlook when it was developed and built, related to drainage and protection of the homes in the Overlook. These easements were obtained at great expense to the HOA, with the understanding and reliance upon the fact that the Clayton Trust's property was being and would continue to be operated as a golf course pursuant to a conservation easement granted to the City in 1997 and the Agency Agreement in 2000, as reaffirmed by the conservation easement placed upon the property by the Clayton Trust in 2019. Now that the property has been sold to Developer and there is a redevelopment plan being proposed that changes the use of the property, Overlook has substantial concerns that the proposed redevelopment plan infringes on and will substantially burden Overlook's easements, and will cause further damages to Overlook and its residents. First, on May 9, 2001, Clayton Trust granted the HOA that certain drainage easement recorded in the Denver County Clerk and Recorder's Office at reception number 2001180554 (the "Drainage Easement"). Pursuant to that easement, the HOA was given the right to construct a stormwater drainage at the north end of the Overlook property (just west of the intersection of 38th Avenue and Dahlia Street), and was granted a "non-exclusive perpetual easement and right-of-way" to provide for the drainage, retention, and release of storm and surface water. While the currently proposed draft of the redevelopment plan proposes that the property immediately adjoining the north and west sides of the Overlook be a regional park and open space, the Overlook is highly concerned that the redevelopment plan will make changes to the property that will adversely affect the current drainage system. There are no assurances in the Plan that the drainage of the existing area, or the elevation of the existing property, will not be modified or altered in a way that will cause impeded flows or adverse consequences to Overlook. As such, by this letter Overlook requests that Developer provide written assurances and guarantees that (a) any development plan will make sure to allow full stormwater and surface water drainage from the Overlook northward to the detention center at Smith Road and Dahlia, and (b) any development plan does not impact, alter, amend, or restrict the rights granted to Overlook in the Drainage Easement. Second, Overlook and its owners have suffered certain damages by virtue of Developer's violations of the covenants of certain easement rights granted to Overlook. Specifically, on May 9, 2001, Clayton Trust also granted Overlook a non-exclusive, perpetual easement and right-of-way along the west side of the Overlook development, in order to erect and maintain a golf ball barrier fence, which easement was recorded in the Denver County Clerk and Recorder's Office at reception number 2001076256 (the "Barrier Net Easement").
Planning Board Comment Form	Kevin P Doyle	10/3/2022	Clayton Trust and Overlook also entered into those certain Covenants as recorded at reception number 2001076257 (the "Covenants"). The Barrier Net Easement and Covenants established a 40-foot-wide barrier on the west side of the Overlook development. Although Clayton Trust (as Owner) retained the right to access this 40-foot-wide swath, its access was limited only to use the area for "Golf Course operations, including landscaping and landscaping purposes and any purpose which will not interfere with [Overlook's] enjoyment of the easement rights hereby granted[.]" Barrier Net Easement, at § 3; see also Covenants at § 1 (Clayton Trust agreed to have access to Overlook property "incident to use, operation, and maintenance of the Golf Course and the Golf Course Property"). Prior to Developer's acquisition of the property, there was only occasional use of a maintenance road behind the barrier net by golf carts and other light-duty vehicles operated by the golf course. When Developer purchased the property, Overlook agreed not to object to occasional security patrols on the road. Recently, however, Overlook has repeatedly observed full-size vehicles and trucks driving down the maintenance road behind the barrier fence every day. This has caused rutting and damage to the road behind the barrier fence (which is also a visual blight, and has changed the drainage patterns of the area), is causing damage to the split-rail fencing that separates the individual owners' yards from the property behind the barrier net, is causing damage to the backyards of individual owners due to the substantially increased vibrations, and is generally causing harm to the Overlook owners' quiet use and enjoyment of their properties. Overlook would ask that Developer limit its use of the road to the security patrols originally discussed, and that Overlook and Developer engage in further dialogue to identify and confirm any additional uses of the road. Third, more generally, Overlook is keenly aware of the redevelopment plans proposed by Developer in conjunction with the City and County of Denver. The HOA previously has spent substantial sums to erect and maintain its golf ball barrier net, which still stands today. Specifically and without limitation, the HOA built the original towers and netting at an approximate cost of \$500,000, and replaced the net in 2015 at an approximate cost of \$90,000 with a new net that was expected to last for thirty years. If the redevelopment plan is approved and the property no longer is to be used as a golf course, then the funds expended by the Overlook to maintain its easement and the netting will be lost. While you are busy trying to figure out the value of a conservation easement you should be busy talking to me and my community because we started this in 2015 and you have ignored us since that time. Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement it would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside. We already have a better plan for the community and you should ask!
Planning Board Comment Form	Robert and Jungoak Haddock	10/3/2022	We are opposed to any and all redevelopment plans. Period.
Planning Board Comment Form	Michael McCumber	10/3/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want ANY development on land that is protected by a conservation easement. This land is critical open space that is needed to minimize the heat island effect that plagues this area. Once developed we will never get open space back! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space and have shown multiple times in multiple ways. When will these attempts finally stop?
Planning Board Comment Form	Rachel McCracken	10/3/2022	We do not want the easement lifted. We want the golf course to stay exactly as is - as was promised to us.
Planning Board Comment Form	Thiago Fornazier	10/3/2022	The people of Park Hill do not want the golf course to be rezoned or developed
Planning Board Comment Form	Douglas Laird	10/3/2022	keep open space, there are plenty of options for affordable housing and commercial development, but once open space is paved over it's never coming back
Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/3/2022	Attempting to Rezone this property in the face our vanishing urban open space, the perpetual conservation easement meant to preserve this for open space and recreation in perpetuity, and the landslide vote by Denver voters in November 2021 is outrageous! In particular, the immediate neighborhood voted 68% to 32% to strengthen the protections of the conservation easement -- not to facilitate development! Please reject this rezoning effort.
Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/3/2022	The sham Steering Committee filled with carefully selected "usual suspects" that could be relied upon to rubber stamp whatever the CPD planners created do not reflect the community's input. 68% of the community (and 63% of all Denver) do not want the city to give away the perpetual conservation easement which prevents the destruction of hundreds of mature trees and make our Heat Island problem even worse. The Blueprint Denver 2040 plan shows this property as "Open Space/Park" because it is the last remaining large urban open space/recreational property left in Denver. The sham Steering Committee was PROHIBITED from considering the high-density developments that are (or soon) happening on ideal redevelopment properties located around the 40th and Colorado Train Station. High density development is already starting right across the street, eventually leading to tens of thousands of new residents within walking, biking and mass transit distance from what needs to be a full size park for Denver. Should this reach an April ballot, Denver's elected officials will be once again reminded that No mean NO to giving away \$60 million to the land speculator that apparently is spending vast sums to buy influence to ram this development through a weak and soon headed out the door city administration.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine Swan	10/3/2022	There is a conservation easement, paid for by city taxpayers, protecting the land from development. It makes no sense at all to move forward with consideration of a plan to develop the land under the circumstances. Further, the plan is disingenuous, as it is based on solicitation only of plans that presuppose development of the land. The city and developer have yet to present a plan that provides for the land to be used solely recreation, park, or open space, consistent with the conservation easement. It seems this is by design, as the city and its "client" do not want to address the reality that the majority of the citizens of this city are not interested in gifting valuable development rights to the developer nor in seeing the open space that we paid to protect developed. We do not want to see ANY development on the site. It should be used for desperately-needed park space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Peggy Hammond	10/3/2022	This is the last large swath of green/open space in Denver. Westside Development knew there was an easement - in perpetuity - when they purchased this land. The City continues to work with Westside on development plans, despite the voters saying clearly they want this land to remain open space. Virtually ALL of the land around the gold course is or will be developed - densely. We need open green space. Once it's gone it is gone forever. <b>STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PROJECT.</b>
Planning Board Comment Form	Peggy Hammond	10/3/2022	Do not want development on land that is protected by a conservation easement - how many times do the voters need to tell you guys this? We want open space - once open space is gone, it is gone forever. There are plenty of other parcels of land to build on - to attempt to build on the last large swath of open space - with a conservation easement on it - is pure greed by Westside Development - a company that KNEW there was a conservation easement and assumed they could buy their way into developing no matter what the people of Denver want. The so-called "survey" was biased - I know because the only options for answers were what the developers wanted - there was no option for keeping this as open space. Westside should not be allowed to bully their way into overturning the wishes of voters - and the City and City's Planning Dept should not be wasting time and money on helping Westside to do this.
Planning Board Comment Form	Bryan Saunders	10/3/2022	There should be ZERO development at this site based on the conservancy status as well as the desperate need to keep Denver a greener place to live. This property is a once in a generation opportunity to provide open space, recreation, and supporting community needs to an area that needs and demands better government response for a greener, cleaner and more vibrant community. There are plenty, more than plenty, of business and residential development spaces near this special space. As a long time resident of Denver and the Park Hill area, we are fortunate to have access to some parks but how do you even consider not taking advantage to make this park a new GEM of the city. Denver supposedly, prides itself on green space but development seems to have taken over any chance that our city can maintain its standing as a place of recreation, kid friendly, family friendly and neighborhood friendly without consistency in looking forward. One of my sons plays soccer, and for the last two weekends we had to drive to Aurora and Castle Rock because there are not enough fields in Denver. That is not ok. That is not the Denver I know and love. We can do better and this space and this opportunity is just one example of how we can be progressive, green, and say to developers you have your options but THIS is not one of them.
Planning Board Comment Form	Pete Meinig	10/3/2022	I sat through the entire presentation on September 7th. I was skeptical that the rezoning was little more than a land grab for greedy developers and crooked politicians. Now I am quite certain. Four rich white guys sent their one Asian partner to speak to an audience that was by and large vehemently opposed to the project, and talked about things like improving the North Park Hill community and 'being green'. This project would add THOUSANDS of cars to an already overburdened Colorado Blvd, and sandwich a poorer neighborhood between the Stapleton neighborhood (or whatever they are calling it now) and this new monstrosity, which would almost certainly accelerate the gentrification of that largely black neighborhood. This isn't about helping that community, social justice, being green, or any of those feel-good liberal talking points. It's only about one thing - making a few people a lot of money. They are scumbags for trying it in the first place, and the deceptive bills that try to sneak in the rezoning only prove that the politicians are complicit in their scumbaggery.
Planning Board Comment Form	Douglas Tweed	10/3/2022	A vote in last November's election was overwhelmingly to keep this property as Open Space
Planning Board Comment Form	Constance Mortell	10/3/2022	How can the city of Denver want to decrease the amount of open space per resident in this city, when we have less open space than NYC and Washington, DC - this administration is not remotely interested in saving and paying honor to the natural environment most move here for - but can only think of the bottom line and more money for themselves, via the real estate developers they keep supporting in the face of massive air pollution here, traffic grid-lock and huge numbers of homeless, and they just want to keep concreting over more and more and more open space. Total violation of what they are supposed to do for the residents!
Planning Board Comment Form	Winston Downs Community Association	10/3/2022	Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. -CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. -CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. -CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. -CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. -CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.
Planning Board Comment Form	Winston Downs Community Association	10/3/2022	CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. -CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). -CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase—despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. -CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. -Denver's drive for density opposes its claim to support climate control. For every person claimed to move here, there is a person moving away because Denver does away with parks, open space and areas for recreation. -Park Hill location needs open space in this community - not more buildings, heat islands and added traffic due to Denver's total lack of transit planning

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Elaine Granata	10/3/2022	There is a conservation easement to keep this land open space. Until the easement issue is resolved any rezoning is premature. I also believe we should not be paving over land. Housing and development are best applied to land that is already covered in concrete/buildings. Denver, and especially northeast Denver, is behind in having parks-- parks soak up CO2, cool the neighborhood, buffer noise from I-70 and Colorado Blvd. The Parks and Recreation Advisory board recommended that the city buy this property for a park-- that recommendation should be given serious consideration.
CPD Email	Susan Young	10/4/2022	Good Afternoon,I want to express my opposition to the rezoning of Park Hill Golf Course, which has been purchased with the goal of development by Westside instead of maintaining the area as a greenbelt.The city has been moving ahead with planning to develop the golf course in partnership with Westside, rather than partnership with Denver residents. We want a vote on whether the area can be developed or not. Thanks for listening and I hope you do not vote to rezone the area.Sincerely,Susan Young
Planning Board Comment Form	Paige L Burkeholder	10/4/2022	This is to express my opposition to this rezoning. My opposition is based in the conversation easement that is in place. That easement needs to be address by all Denver voters BEFORE any development plans are introduced or decided upon. That this continues to move forward without consideration to the easement in place, causes Denver neighbors to believe that city leadership (elected and staff) do not care or listen to residents. It doesn't matter whether I live near this parcel, but it matters that I am one of thousands of Denver neighbors that oppose any consideration of development until the conservation easement is first addressed. Thank you!
Planning Board Comment Form	Martha Douglas	10/4/2022	1. The Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040 includes, as priorities, "equity goals, climate change goals, and other goals". I do not see how building over an existing green space will address climate change issues. Throughout the re-zoning application, the developer states how important green space is; yet, they are ready to use up 50% of the existing open green space for housing and commercial purposes.2. There are several references to a "future extension of 38th Ave." I would like the rezoning to wait until that extension is a reality.3. There is NO guarantee that a grocery store will be built anywhere near this project. It is entirely up the grocery store companies to decide to build. The re-zoning cannot say that there will be one.4. The Conservation Easement refers to a golf course - or other outdoor recreation. It does NOT limit the use of the property to just a golf course.5. Any developer wants to make money from their projects. It is really hard for me to believe that everything promised in the re-zoning application will take place and have a permanent impact on North Park Hill, especially affordable housing that will benefit the current residents of North Park Hill. I foresee outside buyers of the affordable housing units, not current residents of North Park Hill.6. All the development and increase in housing will drastically increase traffic and congestion in North Park Hill. Colorado Blvd. is already a nightmare with freeway traffic. This will NOT benefit North Park Hill.7. I am still confused and angry that the entire planning process has ignored the current Conservation Easement. Why?8. If the city of Denver is going to maintain the 80 acre park, why not have the city purchase the entire plot and create a 155 acre public park?
Planning Board Comment Form	Martha Douglas	10/4/2022	1. The Draft Area Plan recommends a minimum of 100 acres of open space. The Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan will only have 80 acres, with some other acreage "found elsewhere". This does NOT meet the Draft Area Plan.2. I do not like the waivers for building height limits. Why have the the limits if anyone can override them? (This may be re-zoning issue.)3. There is NO guarantee that a grocery store will build a store in this area. Any plan that tries to sell that to the voters and planning board is not being truthful. Of course, it would be nice to have a grocery store within walking distance! I would like that in South Park Hill!!!4. A lot seems to be riding on the extension of 38th Ave. I would rather we wait for the extension of 38th before thinking this plan will work.5. The addition of commercial space may help local residents. Again, there is NO guarantee that the rents will be low enough to entice small business owners to set up shop.6. The Small Area Plan is talking around in circles about the impact of increased traffic in that area as a result of more dense housing. The traffic is already a nightmare at any rush hour. Will this make it better for the current residents of North Park Hill?7. What WILL make a positive impact on the current residents of North Park Hill would be a city park that covers all of the 155 acres.
Planning Board Comment Form	John Sleeman	10/4/2022	It does not make sense to even consider this rezoning when there is an existing conservation easement that would bar the development proposed in the rezoning request. The planning process regarding this parcel has been geared towards development from the start, with no serious consideration ever having been given to maintaining the entire parcel as open space. It is readily apparent that this planning process is a sham designed to allow the developer to present a plan, supposedly supported by the "community", in order to get the easement lifted. If the conservation easement were lifted, then and only then, it would make sense to consider rezoning. Given the strong city-wide support of the initiative requiring a vote to lift the easement, it is unlikely that the easement will be lifted. The community (and this is the entire community, not just a few selected surrounding neighbors) has repeatedly opposed putting in 12 story buildings on this parcel. This proposal should be rejected or, at a minimum, tabled until after a vote on the easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	John Sleeman	10/4/2022	The process that led to this plan ignored the existence of the conservation easement and was not legitimate. The survey results supposedly supporting development were based on surveys that were geared toward achieving that result. City planning staff time and resources were wasted because if the easement remains in place, there will be no development. The pro-development orientation of this process is apparent from the references by city staff to the developer as "the client" and additionally that there was no alternative plan developed for addressing the parcel if the existing easement remained in place. The entire process was geared towards developing a plan that could be presented to the voters as a selling point in favor of allowing the easement to be lifted. That is not a proper use of taxpayer resources. Engaging in such a lengthy planning process that required so much time and resources to come up with a plan that is barred by an existing easement is nothing short of outrageous. This parcel should be developed into a park, not turned into a profit center for the developer.
Planning Board Comment Form	Timothy Kennedy	10/4/2022	Denver taxpayers would be gifting land to developer.Conservation easement is in place with strong support of Denver voters. It would worsen global warming and air pollution (already bad).The city needs more open space and parks/recreation for this area.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christopher Rossi	10/5/2022	The City of Denver is lacking greenspace. Developing this property, the last large section of greenspace in Denver, is a mistake. Keep this greenspace as open space/parks with no development. The voters have spoken and have voiced support for keeping the conservation easement in place. The City paid \$2 million dollars of taxpayer money to obtain this easement for a reason, keep it in place. There is no reason to rezone this property to allow development by a private developer since the Conservation easement is in place.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christopher Rossi	10/5/2022	Denver is seriously lacking open space/green space as the city continues to grow! This piece of land is the last large piece of open space/greenspace in the city. DO NOT DEVELOP THIS PROPERTY! The City paid \$2 million for the conservation easement years ago for a reason, We need open/Green space! Also the Voters of Denver have made their voices heard - they do not want this property paved over and developed!
Planning Board Comment Form	Martha Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I strongly oppose the Small Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. Besides violating the conservation easement at the residents tax payers expense - the hidden cost of losing valuable open green space, increased congestion of traffic in the neighborhood by putting 'through streets' of 38th and Dahlia Street (which speeds regularly top 50 mph on Dahlia and include many accidents at the corner of 38th and Dahlia), broken promises and lack of safe spaces to recreate and exercise.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Patrick Bertch	10/5/2022	I support keeping the park a park. This part of Denver desperately needs the park, not high-rise buildings. This land is protected by a conservation easement, so rezoning makes no sense. This would basically mean us taxpayers are sending a huge donation to Westside.
Planning Board Comment Form	Patrick Bertch	10/5/2022	The community here locally has made it clear that we don't want high rise buildings, some over 10 stories! here on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would make no sense at all to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place, and likely to stay, given the dearth of open space and parks in this part of Denver. If we took this action, our tax dollars would end up becoming a lovely and massive donation to Westside.
Planning Board Comment Form	Bradley Cameron	10/5/2022	The Planning Board's consideration at this time of a rezoning for Park Hill golf course reflects an ignorance regarding the legal nature of current ownership of the property. While it is true that Westside currently owns "fee title" to the property, it does NOT own any interest in the property's development rights. Instead, it is crystal clear that the development rights for all 155 acres is currently owned by the City and County of Denver due to its ownership of the conservation easement. The complexity of this real property issue is rooted in English common law, which is the foundation of Colorado's real property legal frame work. Most of you have probably heard of the "bundle of sticks" analogy regarding real property. In essence, property can be viewed as a bundle of sticks, ownership for which can be divided up numerous ways. In this situation, and given the existence of Denver's conservation easement, Westside does NOT own the required ownership interest in the development rights to the property to request its rezoning. If the citizens of Denver eventually vote to allow the extinguishment of the conservation easement, and such extinguishment subsequently occurs, then Westside has sufficient ownership interest to seek the rezoning of the property. Until that happens, Westside does not. Consequently, the Planning Board should either table or deny outright the rezoning request.
Planning Board Comment Form	Bradley Cameron	10/5/2022	The proposed Park Hill golf course small area plan should be rejected for 3 reasons. First, the process by which the proposed plan was developed was NOT inclusive of the entire community. The Steering Committee was hand picked with a bias toward those in favor of development, and when one of the few members who were pro-park had to step down, a similarly minded replacement was not allowed. Simply put, the process was a complete shame. Everybody knew at the very beginning what the outcome would be. Second, the proposed plan does not take a long term view of the needs of Denver for adequate park land for a growing population. Denver has added tens of thousands of new residents in the past decade, and appears headed toward adding similar numbers in the future. Park Hill golf course is the last large parcel of open space that exists within the municipal boundaries of Denver. And, Denver owns and controls a conservation easement on it that prohibits its development. Adjacent areas, in particular those immediately adjacent to the 40th Avenue & Colorado Blvd. commuter rail station, exist for the construction of high density residential and commercial development. Finally, failure to include adjacent areas outside the 155 acres of the golf course render the proposed plan myopic. Lots of development opportunity exists around the commuter rail station, and also in the industrial zone to the east. If those areas had been included, it would be clear that the best long term vision for the golf course would be open space preservation.
Planning Board Comment Form	Ford Frick	10/5/2022	This property is subject to a conservation easement. It can not be developed, rezoned or otherwise, without violating the easement or getting a state judge to opine that the conditions in Denver have so radically changed that the objectives of the easement (recreation, open space and clean air) are no longer possible to achieve. The Planning Commission should ask the proponent why a rezoning is being requested given the easement on the property and how the developer plans to move forward with development given the easement. Why is PC even considering this application? Tell the applicant to go get the easement withdrawn before you waste PC time.
Planning Board Comment Form	Ford Frick	10/5/2022	This property is subject to a conservation easement. It can not be developed, "plan" or otherwise, without violating the easement or getting a state judge to opine that the conditions in Denver have so radically changed that the objectives of the easement (recreation, open space and clean air) are no longer applicable. They are more applicable than ever! The Planning Commission should ask the proponent why a rezoning is being requested given the existing easement and how the developer plans to move forward with development given the easement. Why is PC even considering this application? Tell the applicant to go get the easement withdrawn before you waste PC time.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alan Hsu	10/6/2022	I find it difficult to understand why this area would be rezoned while the project / area is still under a conservation easement. Until that matter is addressed, this feels very premature and seems to be against the will of the public.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alan Hsu	10/6/2022	With the conservation easement in place, I'm still unsure of how this plan of developing on the land is taking place. I understand it's unrealistic to keep the entire area as green space but most of the plans seems to ignore the surrounding area. This plan should not be done in a vacuum.
Planning Board Comment Form	Nanci Young	10/6/2022	Why on earth are you considering rezoning on this property when there is a conservation easement in place?? This is surely putting the cart before the horse. Moreover, why is the city of Denver trying to give a city asset (i.e. the value of that conservation easement) as a gift to a developer?? This is all UNBELIEVABLE!!
Planning Board Comment Form	Nanci Young	10/6/2022	Particularly with the overwhelming defeat of 302 and the overwhelming approval of 301 in last November's election, Denver's citizens have clearly said they want this land to remain as open space. Unbelievable that we--the citizens--have to fight so hard against our own elected officials who are obviously determined to give a private developer, Westside, a multi-million dollar gift (that gift being an asset Denver citizen's paid for during the Webb administration). This is all beyond the pale!!!!
Planning Board Comment Form	Dick Young	10/6/2022	Makes no sense to try to get the land rezoned before there's a ruling or an election concerning this open space/conservation easement. If the current owners of this large open space, means what they say (and I have heard them make this presentation twice) that they will use 100 acres for a public park and spend 5 million in making it a good park--if they mean what they say then all they need to do to show their honesty is to donate that 100 acres now to the city and county of Denver and provide the 5 million to make it an outstanding park as they said they would.
Planning Board Comment Form	Dick Young	10/6/2022	Making any decision on the proposed small area plan is putting the cart before the horse--and the cart is miles away from the horse. Seems to me there must be some insiders trying anyway they can to get rid of the conservation easement and, thus, not permit the land to be used by all the people of Denver as an outstanding park.
Planning Board Comment Form	Connie Asher	10/6/2022	Westside Investment Partners, along with the Hancock administration, has gone ahead with major planning of a huge development on the former Park Hill Golf Course. The city of Denver voted 2-1 in 2021 to bring a vote to the people determining whether a 1997 conservation easement for the park could be lifted. And yet, the administration and Westside basically have decided to push forward with the planning process before it has even been determined that they can develop the park. Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12 story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning, allowing development while the conservation easement is in place. And it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space. Approval would result in the city and its taxpayers making a multimillion dollar gift to Westside. Kenneth Ho, a principal with Westside, arrogantly said, "Whatever SOS Denver (Save our Open Space) proposes, they don't own the property or have plans to fund it...one of the things we are actually burdened by is reality. What they are putting out there is fiction." The fact is that trying to save, maybe the only green land parcel of its size in this large growing urban environment may be the smartest reality that there is. For the greater good. For green space over more concrete. For the health of Denver and its residents.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Connie Asher	10/6/2022	Westside Investment Partners, along with the Hancock administration, has gone ahead with major planning of a huge development on the former Park Hill Golf Course. The city of Denver voted 2-1 in 2021 to bring a vote to the people determining whether a 1997 conservation easement for the park could be lifted. And yet, the administration and Westside basically have decided to push forward with the planning process before it has even been determined that they can develop the park. Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12 story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning, allowing development while the conservation easement is in place. And it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space. Approval would result in the city and its taxpayers making a multimillion dollar gift to Westside. Kenneth Ho, a principal with Westside, arrogantly said, "Whatever SOS Denver (Save our Open Space) proposes, they don't own the property or have plans to fund it...one of the things we are actually burdened by is reality. What they are putting out there is fiction." The fact is that trying to save, maybe the only green land parcel of its size in this large growing urban environment may be the smartest reality that there is. For the greater good. For green space over more concrete. For the health of Denver and its residents.
Planning Board Comment Form	Benjamin Carter	10/6/2022	Denver has significantly lower green area than comparable cities, and a noticeable heat island effect. Climate change seems to be worsening this effect, and the pollution struggles of the region complicate outdoor spaces even further. As these challenges and other strike our community, we need to take steps to preserve our resources for today and for tomorrow. In looking around and participating in several reviews, it has become apparent that this area has several new housing projects already in development, some practically adjacent. During the Park Hill Golf Course development reviews I participated with, the organizers acknowledged that neighboring developments and other resources were not necessarily taken into account. Additionally, during these reviews, there was a noticeable favoring of development coming from the organizers and facilitators, most easily witnessed when reviewing development options presented to the community, few or none of which offered 100% open space options. This is inherently problematic as it violates the use restrictions, and begins to highlight that this effort to develop the property seems to be a commercially driven effort, rather than a civic-minded one. In looking for alternatives near the neighborhood, one can readily witness that there are underutilized industrial and commercial areas that might be suitable for rezoning and revitalization as either residential or commercial use - or both, to enhance neighborhoods and add services. If the neighborhood between the Smith Rd and M.L.K. Jr Blvd, and between Quebec and Commercial, were able to take advantage of such revitalization along that north side, it might boost home values and incomes of the residents, ensure ready access to open space for all size needs on three out of four sides, and drive external investment into desirable new local businesses, all with the security of Denver Police District 2 right next door, and valuable RTD light rail access at either end.
Planning Board Comment Form	Benjamin Carter	10/6/2022	Imagine if Park Hill someday had a boardwalk along the tracks instead of a sidewalk, you could walk to work, and your kids could play safely in a nearby park after school! What a special place to live that would be! The City of Denver acquired this easement's set of use restrictions in 1997, paying \$2M as an investment on behalf of it's citizens to ensure that a real property interest was established to preserve the area as open space, whether that benefit be direct (i.e. a city-owned park) or indirect (i.e. golf course). We have seen the continuation of this civic interest over the years as our elected officials have continued their duties as public trustees to see that despite property ownership changes, the use restrictions were properly preserved. Anyone seeking to despoil that investment and land for the sake of new construction property development seems to be clearly driving an effort to violate the fiduciary and civic trust of Denver citizens, landowners, and other stakeholders, which our elected officials are charged with defending. Building new housing on this property would further exacerbate the problem that this easement was acquired to defend against, and potential new residents (especially if they are families with children) will only intensify the need for more open space. It is a short term solution for a long term opportunity. I vehemently feel that efforts to develop this area are misguided. We should preserve this space as close to 100% greenery + support services as possible. To do otherwise violates the spirit, intention, and literal text promised by the Park Hill Golf Course Conservation Easement and use restrictions, as well as the needs of our community. We should not allow the enrichment of Westside developers or any other organization, incidental or intentional, at the cost of the open space intentionally preserved in an easement, particularly when Denver already has so little. George Clayton would not approve.
Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/7/2022	A question came up at the Oct. 5 PHGC informational briefing concerning the conservation easement and its mandatory use as a golf course. While City Attorney McGrath was correct that as currently written, golf is the prescribed primary use for the property, that is not the whole story. What he failed to note is that the conservation easement can be modified to remove the golf use restriction without weakening or terminating the underlying conservation easement. CPD admitted that is the case in answer to two questions in their published Q&A following the March 25, 2021 Public Meeting (see questions 15 and 19 in the attached document). The only criteria that the modification needs to meet is that it does not violate the conservation purposes of open space and recreation. The reason the golf use is mentioned so prominently is that in 1997 when the easement was written, the land had been a golf course for more than 65 years, and it is likely that no one contemplated at that time that it would be used for anything else. So naturally, the language would reflect that reality. Unfortunately, CPD has chosen on their description of the steering committee proceedings to deceptively assert that their goal, if voters approve, is to "Update" the conservation easement, implying that it can be modified to allow commercial and residential development. Besides, does anyone think the city respects the mandatory golf use requirement? Has anyone seen a duffer plying the course in the last 3 years? Of course not. With a wave of the hand, the city granted Westside the ability to ignore that requirement since 2019. That 3 year timeout is set to expire in one month. Has Westside or the city made any move to reinstate golf use starting next month? Of course not. The golf use exemption will continue indefinitely (or at least July 2023). Is there any expectation that if voters reject the city gifting to the developer our development rights that are worth approximately \$60 million that Westside will decide to get into the golf operations business? Hardly. Nevertheless, the city and Westside have repeatedly used the "threat" that if citizens don't allow development, then they will be stuck with a golf course. On the contrary, the city would be the natural buyer of the property, with the ability to determine whether a full-scale park or golf is the best use as high density development next to, surrounding and across 40th Avenue and Colorado Blvd Train station proceeds. Will those future residents have to compete with 10,000 new residents Westside envisions settling on the reduced scale park?
Planning Board Comment Form	Wayne C Olsen	10/7/2022	The golf course needs to be kept as an open space/park. There is enough development in the front range. Take this opportunity to keep something green! Besides the fact that we the taxpayers have already paid 2 million for the rights.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Morris	10/7/2022	The people of Denver have expressed their support of the Easement when it was passed by the Webb Administration and when two submitted alteration proposals were submitted to city-wide vote regarding the project. If the planning board is a representative of the people, you have no alternative to rejecting the proposed zoning change. If you are supporters of the developer, you will have as much influence as I do which is non-existent as long as any of you sit on the Planning Board. This is a democracy. Fail to respect the people's expressed opinions at your own risk. If you fail to follow the people's opinions the next mayor would be correct to return you to the world you inhabited before your appointments. Trump might ignore the voters. Side with his people and you will end your influence on the future of Denver.
Planning Board Comment Form	Heidi Huisjen	10/7/2022	Our Southeast Denver community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I drive past this intersection everyday. We the citizens of Denver are seeing too much development of open spaces. Yes, we need housing, but it needs to be thoughtfully planned and not haphazardly plopped on land designated as open space. In 10 years, we're going to look back on the rapid development and wonder why we allowed so many poor decisions. Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside. Let's not keep giving developers the benefits and open space that makes Denver a beautiful town! Our fair city deserves to keep open space for the enjoyment of our citizens.

Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/7/2022	Unfortunately the "inclusive community process" is riddled with fatal flaws. The Steering Committee was dominated by friends of the mayor who were not required to disclose any financial ties or conflicts of interest, thus ensuring a favorable outcome. Even though the committee was unable to come to a consensus, nevertheless a "Prevailing Vision" was somehow divined, ignoring the main product of this process will be expensive for-sale units with high property taxes burdening the buyers due to the necessity of a metro tax district, the conservation easement's prohibition of development, the fact that high density development is already approved next door, with an addition 34 developer-owned properties surrounding the 40th and Colorado Train station just waiting to be redeveloped. This sham process was mandated to ignore all external factors other than that of this single, irreplaceable urban green space with no development rights. The community survey that purports to represent the local community's input was an ethically-challenged push poll that feared to ask if the community wanted the conservation easement and green space preserved. Instead it only gave the option of a golf course or "something else", which of course the city then used to falsely claim to be development. Failing to even mention the conservation easement or giving the option of 100% preservation placed a heavy thumb on the scales, and flies in the face of the statistically valid survey commissioned by the Greater Park Hill Community RNO that dared ask the question of 100% preservation, resulting in a 77% positive response from the community. The fact that in addition, 68% of NE Park Hill residents (over and above the entire city's landslide 63% vote) voted FOR strengthening the protections of the conservation easement in November of 2021 election further destroys the myth of local support for development. Finally, the Community Navigator process was flawed in that the organization's leader in a 2020 letter to City Council essentially accused the proponents of preserving this land for a park or open space as being wealthy, privileged racists. Then he was awarded the contract to find support for development in a carefully limited interview scheme. At each stage, the outcome was heavily weighted to achieve a predetermined outcome that the mayor has wanted for many years.
Planning Board Comment Form	Heidi Huisjen	10/7/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I drive by this golf course everyday and have always appreciated the open space that it brings to the neighborhood surrounding it. We need to stop letting developers make plans that are focused on high density housing. And less on creating open and thoughtful spaces for our citizens. Enough! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside. I would ask these planners involved in reviewing the materials for this project to start rethinking how the city approaches development and open space. Otherwise, 10 years down the line, we will have regrets.
Planning Board Comment Form	Scott Holder	10/7/2022	What part of "perpetual easement" don't y'all get? This is a criminal giveaway to Westside. Denver voters have repeatedly said they want this preserved as open space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Scott Holder	10/7/2022	Again, what part of "perpetual easement" don't you get? Preserve this as open space the way Denver voters have overwhelmingly and consistently stated over the years instead of a criminal giveaway to Westside.
Planning Board Comment Form	Annie Pratt	10/7/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!This land was purchased under a conservation easement, which the city paid for, and voters overwhelmingly voted to retain. Developer profits should need to stop being the primary objectives in this town.
Planning Board Comment Form	Shiloy Sanders	10/7/2022	Denver needs more open space and green areas to decrease smog and prevent overcrowding. The Park Hill golf course area is protected by a conservation easement and has beautiful well established trees and acres of grassy hills. It would be an abomination to rezone this area and allow high rise buildings. Colorado Boulevard is already a high traffic area and does not need more congestion added to it. Open spaces and more parks are what is needed and vital to keep North Denver from becoming a concrete jungle. Thank you for protecting Denver's open spaces and upholding this conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jean Socolofsky	10/7/2022	and then to have that power of the people's vote in a fair open election, denied, is against democracy and the rights of the citizens. The area is needed for more open spaces for the health and well being for the surrounding community, which is in the greatest need of such space, due to, i.e. Suncor, I-70, density. All Denver suffers. Please focus on existing neglected areas nearby to fulfill your goals. Our City government needs to support all the facts stated above.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for this property) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement (see voter response to Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively).2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer, against the wishes of the majority of Denver tax payers and voters.My question to the City of Denver: Why are taxpayer dollars not being used to consider and promote a vision for this property such as the "Imagining a Great Park" images presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/?">https://yesopenspace.org/?</a> (Please see attached images). You can also see this potential vision here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a>
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for the Park Hill Golf Course) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. (please see the Nov 2021 voter results for Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively).2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law (violating the statues which govern conservation easements) and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer (Westside Partners).A legitimate question from taxpaying voters such as myself: Why is the City and County of Denver not promoting legal visions for this property such as those presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/">https://yesopenspace.org/</a> Take a look at the outstanding proposed park image presented here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a> . Were the City to present these images (for an intact, 155-acre park), alongside the "visions" presented by the developer, then the process of voting on any change to the conservation easement would actually be legitimate. As it stands to-date, the CPD's "plans" are a joke to this voter, neighbor and taxpayer, as they ignore the presence of the \$2 million conservation easement for this property.
Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine S Matheny Dresser	10/7/2022	This property is under a conservation easement paid for by the taxpayers of Denver ... I did not hear in any of the presentation an appraisal of how much the conservation easement is worth today and how either Clayton or Westside will be compensating Denver citizens. It is premature to talk about rezoning prior to going before a state court to have the easement removed. There are so few parcels of open land in Denver; to pave this one over, in an area that between lack of trees, concrete, and stalled traffic, is already a heat island would shortsighted and tragic.
Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine S Matheny Dresser	10/7/2022	I have been to two informational meetings at the Park Hill Golf Course Club House and one online visioning meeting ... I think I am well versed in the issues concerning rezoning and the Small Area Plan. I, like a majority of Denver voters, supported ballot measure 301 and opposed 302. Denver needs more green space, not less. Not only do the voters of Denver need to approve the removal of the easement, but also the state must approve removal. What the city is doing here is premature.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Koppel	10/7/2022	The city paid for an easement on this property for a reason. Green space is important. There is plenty of area in the vicinity that can support a similar multiuse project. I would support it anywhere that is already developed (paved). Developers bought this land knowing there was an easement. The city should stand firm and show them that we value our green space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Caroline Schomp	10/7/2022	As the last large tract of open space we should not develop PHGC. there are still other options for development including affordable housing and a grocery store
Planning Board Comment Form	Michele Swenson	10/7/2022	The people in the area of the Park Hill Golf Course have expressed strong support for maintaining (not breaking) the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement, and for maintaining the Park Hill Golf Course as Open Space, NOT building residential and commercial construction. The planning and development process conceived and implemented by Community Planning and Development Department (CPD) advances the predetermined outcome of support for the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. It does not comport with the will of the people. Honor the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement, paid for by the people of Denver. Dedicate the area to park open space, as the majority of people have called for.
Planning Board Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	DEN needs more open space, not more crummy infill.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside.
Planning Board Comment Form	Morris Askenazi	10/8/2022	We need open space in Denver!
Planning Board Comment Form	Brian Kelly	10/8/2022	Westside is jumping the gun on this application. How arrogant and cocky of them. This rezoning should not be up for any debate until and only IF, in a general election, Denver citizens decide to negate the conservation easement which, by all measures, they will not do.
Planning Board Comment Form	Brian Kelly	10/8/2022	There is absolutely no reason for the citizens of Denver to give away this asset. Why are my local government officials trying to give a multi-million dollar gift to a private developer? This reeks of corruption.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Pratt	10/8/2022	I do not support giving away property we, the tax payers of Denver, paid for to keep as an open space in perpetuity. That's just ridiculous, but further, this sham of a deal has not been above board, has not moved forward in any kind of good faith, and should not be supported. If we are to transform this property it should be done without the involvement of the current property owners. They do not represent Denver, they do not represent the neighborhood, they are clearly in it for their own profit and nothing else.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Pratt	10/8/2022	See my comments regarding the rezoning and to further add, just no. I cannot support this plan or the developers behind it. The city should be ashamed of itself for not supporting our residents over these profiteers. We have too many issues on the ballot that are not in the people's best interests. It's sad to see this here in Denver.
Planning Board Comment Form	Wendy Harring	10/8/2022	I cannot fathom why the City is wasting its resources (which we taxpayers fund) on even considering Westside's rezoning application and Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course property. This is totally premature and inappropriate. The property is subject to a perpetual conservation easement paid for by the taxpayers. The conservation easement requires that the property be used as open space and for recreational purposes. The City and Westside consistently and on an ongoing basis continue to ignore the conservation easement and push for development of the property. Their actions led to Initiated Ordinance 301 (requiring voter approval for development on city park lands or lands subject to a conservation easement) which passed by an overwhelming majority and Westside's Initiated Ordinance 302 (an attempt to redefine "conservation easement" to exclude the Park Hill Golf Course) which lost by an overwhelming majority. Yet the City completely disregards the will of its residents/taxpayers. The City's actions make no sense and makes one wonder if the Mayor and others are indeed in the pockets of the developer. C.R.S. Section 38-30.5-107, a Colorado state statute, provides that, in order for a conservation easement to be terminated, a court with jurisdiction must find that conditions have changed making it impossible to fulfill ANY of the purposes for which a conservation easement was created. I submit to you that no court could ever make this finding. If anything, Denver's significant growth, climate change, drought, and the like have substantially increased the need to preserve what little open space remains in the City. Those are the changed circumstances, all increasing the need to save the Park Hill Golf Course from any development. The other City parks are overcrowded as is. If the Park Hill Golf Course is developed the opportunity to preserve the land as open space is gone forever. Lastly, my understanding is that Westside paid \$20 million or so for the 155-acre Golf Course. Recently, the 8-acre VA Hospital in Denver (and not far from the Golf Course) sold for \$41 million or over \$5 million per acre. If the City approves development of the Golf Course, the City will be making a HUGE financial gift worth millions of dollars to Westside and receiving nothing in return. This is ludicrous and completely unacceptable.
Planning Board Comment Form	Eileen Nuanes	10/8/2022	Since the beginning of this attempt to turn the Park Hill golf course into a development by Westside the opinion of those of us who helped pay for the open space easement with our taxes has been ignored. Despite a loss in a city wide election to vacate the open space requirement Westside and the Denver Planning Department have pushed ahead with their plans for this unwanted and unhealthy development. The lack of open green space in this and surrounding neighborhoods is a glaring failure and reminder that this neighborhood historically has never received the financial support for amenities that other neighborhoods, like Washington Park, Congress Park, or Cheesman Park have been gifted. Westside Development is just the latest attempt to take away a benefit from lower income neighborhoods by placing 400 apartments next to an industrial area and calling it "affordable housing". The open space designation was to meant to provide a place where people, can have recreation, a place to enjoy the out of doors, enjoy greenery, see wildlife and bring a sense of community to this neighborhood. This is why Denver spent two million dollars to ensure that this would remain open space. This neighborhood and the people of Park Hill and Denver will benefit more from less concrete, less asphalt, less congestion, less noise, less air pollution for years to come if this rezoning is denied. Please do not rezone this area for development and instead provide this neighborhood with a park for soccer games, for picnics, for concerts, for sunset walks, for children's laughter at a playground, things which make a neighborhood a place people want to be in a community you can help build. The saying is "if you build it, they will come". A park is a great way to begin.
Planning Board Comment Form	Keara Watson	10/8/2022	It's short sighted for the city to allow the Westside development company to take away an open space. I attended the community meeting on September 7th and quickly read between the lines of what the developers were saying. They showed us lovely plans and told us that they could put in open space and affordable housing but they were not genuine. The housing groups and Parks and Rec department representatives were only speaking about what could be, not what is guaranteed in a legally binding contract. Once the land is rezoned, Westside can do whatever they want with it, to their benefit and not the citizen's benefit. Also, they were rather rude and dismissive of peoples questions. I don't know why the city of Denver wants to work with Westside so much and why the PHGC is the only land they are considering. Is there someone working for the city that has a vested interest in Westside? There are other rundown areas that could use redevelopment instead. If Westside Development donates 2/3 of the property to the Parks department and actually is legally bound to do what they showed us in the presentation on September 7th, then I'd reconsider supporting them. No one reads these comments anyway. It's not as if our vote mattered. Thanks, Keara
Planning Board Comment Form	Alexandra Lansing	10/8/2022	The property is already zoned as open space. There is a conservation easement on the deed that further protects that open space in perpetuity. FOREVER. Rezoning would be a violation of that conservation easement, for anything other than open space. Therefore, it is a breach of contract. It is not consistent with the Game Plan for A Healthy City, approved by City Council on May 21, 2019. Rezoning is not consistent with city, state, and national climate change goals. Trees reduce the heat island effect, and yet we are cutting trees down right and left throughout the city as we build bigger homes and density. Science shows that trees and green space are necessary for public health. They mitigate pollution and provide oxygen for us to live. People are suffering from Nature Deficit Disorder, Asthma, Cancer, and other health issues frequently associated with lack of green space. There are not any circumstances that justify rezoning Park Hill Golf Course. Denver hosted the international City Parks Alliance Greater and Greener conference in 2019 as an exemplary city for parks and green space, yet we are depleting every little bit of open space, challenging even a participatory stand in an alliance as such. According to the Trust for Public Land Study, most large cities have over 20 percent of park space, and Denver has only 8 to 9 percent of parks. Denver is significantly below. This is a problem!
Planning Board Comment Form	Lacey Jennings	10/9/2022	We do not want/need 12 story buildings on a designated conservation easement. This is counter to the purpose of the conservation easement and Denver taxpayer preferences who want the conservation easement maintained.
Planning Board Comment Form	Maggie Price	10/9/2022	CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. One member of the current planning board was part of the Steering Committee CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	10/9/2022	68% of the neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement in the Nov 2021 election. Hundreds of residential units either adjacent or close to the proposed PHGC development are already in the pipeline to be built. Among US cities Denver isn't even among the top 50 in "green space per capita" now even without the PHGC development. The Denver Planning Board shouldn't appear to be pro-development and should uphold the PERPETUAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT!
Planning Board Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	10/9/2022	68% of the neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC voted FOR protecting the conservation easement. Hundreds of residential units either adjacent or close to the PHGC are already in the development pipeline. Denver isn't ranked even in the top 50 US cities for per capita green space, and has declined from 9.5 acres per capita in 2002 to 8.9 now. The Denver Planning Board shouldn't appear pro-development and should vote to respect the "PERPETUAL conservation easement
Planning Board Comment Form	Mary T Bernuth aka Terry Bernuth	10/9/2022	I continue to be shocked that so many city resources are being used for this proposed rezoning project when the land is under a conservation easement that the city paid the Clayton Foundation 24million dollars for. I understand that only the district court can modify or remove the easement currently on the subject property. The current easement is not ideal in that it limits the uses of the property. However, if proposed uses still maintained the property as green space my guess is that the district court would find that a reasonable use and make a change to the current easement so it can be used for other purposes than a golf course. I worked for the Clayton Trust, later called the Clayton Foundation in the 1980's. The assets of the trust and the income from the golf course were dedicated to the education and care of young ("white" language later changed by court order) boys who were orphaned in the early 20th century when the trust was created by Mr. George W. Clayton, the benefactor. At the time the trust was created, the golf course was a farm that provided food and dairy for the boys. Only much later did it become a public golf course. The Clayton College, as it was known, evolved with the times and became a residential treatment facility for boys licensed by the State of Colorado. When the Clayton Foundation was created in the 1980's, the board wanted to expand the educational mission of the foundation rather than the treatment mission it had evolved into. A district court order modified the trust agreement to allow that change and the golf course income continued to support the educational mission until it was closed. In my view, the last decade of unrestricted growth in Denver has eaten up almost all the green space that was available in the city outside of the parks. We now know how important those green spaces and trees are important to the health of the residents of the city. Housing is important but Denver needs to slow its growth so it can begin to make the changes necessary to have clean air for our current citizens. Keeping the Park Hill golf course green would be a huge step forward to doing that. I believe the property could be developed into an organic farming operation and tree farm that would provide apprenticeships for members of the Denver community to learn how to sustainably grow food for their neighbors and their family. The tree farm could help clean Denver's air and there might still be enough land for a park for families to enjoy.
Planning Board Comment Form	Gary Martyn	10/9/2022	Denver voters approved money to buy the Park Hill Golf Course. When that could not be accomplished, the city bought a permanent conservation easement to prevent development of the property. Denver voters did not ask the city to change course and develop this property. A private developer is trying to do this and negate what Denver voters actually voted to do. This is just wrong. The city using it's planning department to help this is also wrong. Rezoning of this property should not even be considered unless the conservation easement is somehow lifted. This whole process has been driven by a developer, not the people who hold the development rights. Please respect the citizens of Denver and do not go forward with a rezoning process. Is it even legal to do this?
Planning Board Comment Form	Gary Martyn	10/9/2022	The fine people of Denver who voted to provide the funds for preserving Park Hill Golf Course have not changed their minds and decided to develop this property. Rather, a private developer with assistance from the city is doing this. When Denver voters provided monies for the golf course property, they were buying a permanent asset for the city. That has not changed. The developer found a possible course to, in essence, invalidate that election. This is wrong, and the city should not be assisting in this effort. The small area plan should not even be considered, as Denver voters bought a perpetual conservation easement for this property. Please do the right thing for the people of Denver and reject any plan for development of the Park Hill Golf Course.
Planning Board Comment Form	Edwin L. Bell	10/9/2022	After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood . Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christine Dea Dea	10/9/2022	This attempt to revise the status of the land is ILLEGAL and not what previous widespread voting supports. No PR effort waged on the public or the political/financial push of City officials can change this. \$40,000,000 yearly is set aside for park acquisition so there is City money for a new open space. It is NOT an impossibility for the land to be maintained as open space and the thinking public knows that.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christine G Dea	10/9/2022	This is open space area. It is not zoned for 12 story apartments and the voters have SPECIFICALLY AND IN WIDESPREAD VOTING STATED THEIR DESIRE FOR OPEN SPACE. And, there is a conservation easement in place WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW THIS DEVELOPMENT. Read the law. Trying to overcome the law by pressuring City Council and others in power negates the power of the people.
Planning Board Comment Form	Timothy Dea	10/9/2022	This is an atrocity. The LAW is clear. Yet the Westside development interest is trying to shove their might down our throats. Hancock and Happy are choosing to listen to Westside and not the people nor the law. Excuse me, this is a permanent easement, meaning in perpetuity. What do you not understand. I think you totally understand, yet ally yourselves with money and power over "WE, THE PEOPLE." Oh, and then there is the LAW.
Planning Board Comment Form	Timothy P Dea	10/9/2022	Your small are plan is ILLEGAL. Before you slick your way into your plan, why don't you listen to what we have told you in our vote. While you continue to attempt your seduction of open space, we will resist. Open space is precious to those of us who are born and raised in Colorado, Denver, and specifically Park Hill. We continue to see the politicians, such as Hancock and Happy, be seduced, knowing it is a mutual benefit to Westside and Hancock and Happy, This is called a power over move which attempts to use power for ill, or for development over precious open space, WE WILL NOT SIT STILL. I WILL BE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING AND WILL VOICE MY OPINION in the open, public forum
Planning Board Comment Form	Taylor Richards	10/9/2022	Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Laurel Mohr	10/10/2022	Your statement - "to best reflect the results of our community outreach, we have shaped this rezoning proposal to balance the neighborhoods support for a mix of development as well as parks and open space". Truth- The community voted 2/3 to 1/3 AGAINST development. The community overwhelmingly wants this land to remain open space. The community does not want 12 story buildings. It wants parks and open space. This proposal has completely ignored the fact that there is a conservation easement protecting the entire space .
Planning Board Comment Form	Dean DiGiulio	10/10/2022	As a long time central Denver resident who currently lives and has raised kids in central Denver, parks and open space are very important to my family. I would like to please ask that you keep this land in the public domain as a park and/or open space. There's plenty of existing private land for development, this I know, as a developer. Thanks, Dean
Planning Board Comment Form	Judith Cohen	10/10/2022	I do not understand why the City and the Planning Department continue to develop plans for this project when the citizens of Denver have clearly indicated with their votes that they do not want development of the Park Hill Golf Course and that the property cannot be developed under the current conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Gayle Larrance	10/10/2022	Too bad Mayor Hancock and the city choose to ignore the vote of the people!. Defeating commercial developers of the Park Hill golf course.

Planning Board Comment Form	Benjamin Carter	10/10/2022	<p>Denver has significantly lower green area than comparable cities, and a noticeable heat island effect. Climate change seems to be worsening this effect, and the pollution struggles of the region complicate outdoor spaces even further. As these challenges and other strike our community, we need to take steps to preserve our resources for today and for tomorrow. In looking around and participating in several reviews, it has become apparent that this area has several new housing projects already in development, some practically adjacent. During the Park Hill Golf Course development reviews I participated with, the organizers acknowledged that neighboring developments and other resources were not necessarily taken into account. Additionally, during these reviews, there was a noticeable favoring of development coming from the organizers and facilitators, most easily witnessed when reviewing development options presented to the community, few or none of which offered 100% open space options. This is inherently problematic as it violates the use restrictions, and begins to highlight that this effort to develop the property seems to be a commercially driven effort, rather than a civic-minded one.</p> <p>In looking for alternatives near the neighborhood, one can readily witness that there are underutilized industrial and commercial areas that might be suitable for rezoning and revitalization as either residential or commercial use - or both, to enhance neighborhoods and add services. If the neighborhood between the Smith Rd and M.L.K. Jr Blvd, and between Quebec and Commercial, were able to take advantage of such revitalization along that north side, it might boost home values and incomes of the residents, ensure ready access to open space for all size needs on three out of four sides, and drive external investment into desirable new local businesses, all with the security of Denver Police District 2 right next door, and valuable RTD light rail access at either end. Imagine if Park Hill someday had a boardwalk along the tracks instead of a sidewalk, you could walk to work, and your kids could play safely in a nearby park after school! What a special place to live that would be! The City of Denver acquired this easement's set of use restrictions in 1997, paying \$2M as an investment on behalf of it's citizens to ensure that a real property interest was established to preserve the area as open space, whether that benefit be direct (i.e. a city-owned park) or indirect (i.e. golf course). We have seen the continuation of this civic interest over the years as our elected officials have continued their duties as public trustees to see that despite property ownership changes, the use restrictions were properly preserved. Anyone seeking to despoil that investment and land for the sake of new construction property development seems to be clearly driving an effort to violate the fiduciary and civic trust of Denver citizens, landowners, and other stakeholders, which our elected officials are charged with defending. Building new housing on this property would further exacerbate the problem that this easement was acquired to defend against, and potential new residents (especially if they are families with children) will only intensify the need for more open space. It is a short term solution for a long term opportunity.</p> <p>I vehemently feel that efforts to develop this area are misguided. We should preserve this space as close to 100% greenery + support services as possible. To do otherwise violates the spirit, intention, and literal text promised by the Park Hill Golf Course Conservation Easement and use restrictions, as well as the needs of our community. We should not allow the enrichment of Westside developers or any other organization, incidental or intentional, at the cost of the open space intentionally preserved in an easement, particularly when Denver already has so little. George Clayton would not approve.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Bonnie Niziolek	10/10/2022	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford.</p> <p>This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units.</p> <p>I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Susan Glenn	10/10/2022	<p>There is such arrogance in proposing rezoning for an area that is still under a conservation easement! The developers proposing this rezoning seem to have amnesia regarding both the standing easement and the vote by the public that made it clear the public does not support commercial development of any sort. Stop wasting the taxpayers time and money on an issue that should have been resolved months ago. The City should be supporting their constituents, not private interest.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Susan Glenn	10/10/2022	<p>Although this matter was put to a vote months ago, and the voters resoundingly voted against development, this developer and the City Council continue to push for commercial development on what is protected space covered by an easement. In this era of climate change, the last thing we need is more commercial development of open space. The meetings to date to discuss the plan have been insulting-not once have the developers acknowledged the prior vote, have only presented plans including commercial development and have shut down any vocal opposition in a condescending manner. One wonders why the City Council is so vested in having this plan pass-and why they would have sold this land so cheaply if it was to be developed-if it was to be developed it should have been sold for about three times the price. This plan is a travesty and allowing the former golf course property to be anything more than a public park is a gift of taxpayer money that the taxpayers did not approve. Stop ignoring the public vote and stop wasting our time by forcing another one!</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Susan klann	10/10/2022	<p>I want this land preserved as open space</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Kathleen Wells	10/10/2022	<p>This rezoning is inconsistent with Denver's Climate Plan, a plan that includes, among other things, the need for open space, plants, and trees to reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. A significant reduction of existing green space violates the spirit of the plan and, importantly, contributes to accelerating air pollution. Air pollution, a serious health problem in Denver, is linked to greenhouse gases and is a threat to the public's health and welfare.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	John McMullen	10/10/2022	<p>We strongly oppose rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course to permit residential development for a number of reasons: 1. Development is contrary to the wishes of the people, as shown by the 60 percent opposition vote in the only election on the subject. 2. For reasons which raise questions about the integrity of both, Westside has apparently induced city government to abdicate its obligation to the people of Denver and support Westside's development plans which, for reasons below, are contrary to the best interests of the people. 3. Denver is already suffering the negative effects of over-development: severe traffic congestion; pollution; overcrowding; crime; and loss of open space. Thanks to development, Denver has gone from being near the top in open space parks to a mere 5 percent of city land, far below the national median of 15 percent. 4. The economic outlook for the next couple of years is bleak, raising the substantial likelihood that Westside, with the city's acquiescence, will protect its bottom line by cutting back on costs, resulting in a shoddy product.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Liz Coates	10/10/2022	<p>I have so many concerns about this development proposal. Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. Traffic in this area is already horrible, adding in hundreds of families with no regard to the area is careless and irresponsible. I also have a lot of concerns about the claim of affordable housing. Developers don't make money on affordable housing. In addition, there is a conservation easement in place on the land. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Finally, the transparency in this process is concerning. This seems to be a case of who has the most money, and not what residents and the community is asking for. Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Liz Coates	10/10/2022	<p>Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. Listen to the voters and drop this plan. The city should save its money to invest in building out park space. Don't spend thousands of dollars on paying for Westside's development plans.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Greg Sorensen	10/10/2022	Westside is requesting a rezoning for property that has a conservation easement on it to protect it in perpetuity as open space. This request to rezone the property is illegitimate because the property cannot be redeveloped without a vote of the citizens of Denver and court judgement, and that has not happened. So it is premature to request a rezoning. Maintaining this 155 acres as open space is critical to help Denver address its shortage of parks. There can be no better use of this land than as open space, which will provide mental and physical health benefits for hundreds of years. There are nearby parcels that can be used for housing and commercial development. If this land is lost to development, it will never--ever--provide the open space that Denver so critically needs.
Planning Board Comment Form	T Goldhamer	10/10/2022	This land is encumbered by a conservation easement bought and paid for by taxpayers of the City and County of Denver. The City must protect the conservation purposes of the easement and not cooperate in any way with allowing uses other than open space, recreation and scenic uses. If the property owner wants to use the property for other than a golf course the City and the owner could come to agreement on other uses that still protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement and work to get any necessary court and voter approval. Such uses may not be as profitable for the property owner. This developer bought the property knowing about the easement but gambling that the city would go along with a profitable development proposal. The City has an obligation to uphold the conservation easement to protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement. The property owner's plans and promises are enticing to some in the community but they are no guarantees and come with the burden of a Metropolitan District with substantial costs, loss of irreplaceable open space and vistas, and increased congestion and traffic. The development ideas elicited from the community should be facilitated on the surrounding undeveloped or underdeveloped land and the Park Hill Gold Course Land should be preserved as open. Please do not approve this rezoning request.
Planning Board Comment Form	Greg Sorensen	10/10/2022	This small area plan should not be approved. I do not understand why Denver is even developing this plan and acquiescing to the development of open space, something that Denver so desperately needs. How much money has the city of Denver spent on this sham process that does not take into consideration how critical open space is to the mental and health and well-being of Denver residents, regardless of where they live? The Park Hill Golf Course sits in the middle of a highly developed area, with I_70 to the north and Colorado Blvd to the west; there are many nearby parcels to the west that can be developed for housing and commercial facilities, but no large parcels of open space. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to preserve open space and make it available to all Denver residents. Denver used to be known for its parks, but CPD and its development-oriented plans are squandering this opportunity, and who knows for what. This is an illegitimate planning process that is being done before a vote by Denver citizens whether to allow this area to be developed. Shame on CPD and the Hancock administration for being at the beck and call of Westside to develop a small area plan that only includes this 155-acre area, but not the surrounding neighborhoods. If "affordable housing" were developed on this property, it would not be affordable after the creation of metropolitan districts to finance infrastructure development. This entire plan is a travesty and must not be approved.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tracey MacDermott	10/10/2022	I am opposing both Westside's rezoning application and the proposed Park Hill Golf course Small Area Plan. The city should not waste anymore of our city taxes to help support a developer. The Park Hill Neighborhood Survey conducted by NRC clearly shows that the neighbors in North and Northeast Park Hill do not want this land developed. Ballot initiative 301 also clearly shows the will of the people. We are in a climate crisis with Denver rating number 3 in the heat island effect as well as lacking in Park space. There is a conversation easement in place. Don't buy the developers non-sense argument that the land can only be a golf course. This is a blatant attempt to get cheap land for even cheaper development.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alex walsh	10/10/2022	This land has a conservation easement on it that restricts use. There is no way this should be rezoned as it would be a violation of the conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alex walsh	10/10/2022	This plan cannot move forward as there is a conservation easement on the land that restricts use as well as a city ordinance that requires a vote of the people before amending the easement. Stop wasting time and tax dollars undermining this process.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Korson	10/10/2022	As to the Park Hill Golf Course, it is very important to preserve open space in a city (Denver) experiencing rapid growth. I would prefer that that golf course be kept as is or converted into a park. Only very limited building should be permitted. Thank you
Planning Board Comment Form	Jay Morse	10/11/2022	The City of Denver has made a long standing commitment of maintaining, keeping and adding open space for parks. With so much hardscape and development in the city we need to keep that last of this large open space. Yes, it's important to have housing for people and to have green space for people to recreate, rest, and enjoy. There's plenty of opportunity to have dense housing surrounding this area. By keeping this area as open space for a park, the value of living in the area is immense. We have beautiful parks in Denver and we need this greenspace to thrive and live up to our high standards of being a healthy population. Also, this space is protected by a conservation easement. Let's respect that decision.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jay Morse	10/11/2022	The City of Denver has made a long standing commitment of maintaining, keeping and adding open space for parks. With so much hardscape and development in the city we need to keep that last of this large open space. Yes, it's important to have housing for people and to have green space for people to recreate, rest, and enjoy. There's plenty of opportunity to have dense housing surrounding this area. By keeping this area as open space for a park, the value of living in the area is immense. We have beautiful parks in Denver and we need this greenspace to thrive and live up to our high standards of being a healthy population. Also, this space is protected by a conservation easement. Let's respect that decision.
Planning Board Comment Form	Georgia McCracken Garnsey	10/11/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement that prohibits development. It is also protected by a state statute that requires anyone who wants to develop the property to show a Judge how it is "impossible" to maintain the area as open and recreational space. Nothing has changed. The conservation easement is in place. The State Statute is still in place. It is currently ILLEGAL to develop on the Park Hill Golf Course land. All the taxpayer money that has gone into the city and Westside's process to try and ram development through on land that the community at large does not want to see developed is a terrible and disgraceful waste. The city of Denver is not working on behalf of its tax paying citizens they have vowed to serve. This administration and the Planning Department are working on behalf of Westside Investment. If the conservation easement were lifted they would have succeeded in gifting Westside Investment Partners at least \$60 million. The environmental impact to this already concretized and highly polluted and trafficked area of Denver is incalculable.
Planning Board Comment Form	Georgia McCracken Garnsey	10/11/2022	The community does not want dense development, twelve story buildings, and massive amounts of concrete on the Park Hill Golf Course land. The community voted overwhelmingly to maintain the land as open space for recreational purposes in an area that is already undergoing dense development - including affordable housing - all around it. The city and Westside have conducted a sham Steering Committee Process where the committee is stacked with pro-development people and the words "conservation easement" were not allowed to be uttered. The city and Westside have conducted sham Push Surveys and other sham mechanisms to show community support for development and that is a sham, too. At a recent board meeting of the Northeast Denver Coalition most of the neighbors who showed up to speak about the PHGC land were adamant that they wanted the land to remain as open space and a possible regional park. It is also ILLEGAL to develop on the PHGC land. The land is protected by a Perpetual Conservation Easement and a State Statute, yet the city has spent upwards of \$250 million to push through rezoning and a small area plan that it would be ILLEGAL to implement. Sham upon sham upon sham. This administration and everyone who participated in and promoted all these sham processes are tainted forever. You have not served but manipulated and betrayed the tax paying citizens you vowed to serve. Disgraceful and it won't be forgotten.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Rachel Coates	10/11/2022	I am baffled as to how, in the midst of a climate crisis, we can even consider rezoning park/open space land to include buildings up to 12 stories. I am fully aware of the need to increase housing, and I understand that increasing density is the recommended way to do this. However, when I look west along the A-Line, I see what is coming to NE Park Hill...it's a lot of density. I am strongly opposed to the rezoning proposal because I believe that NE Park Hill deserves access to fresh air and open space. This should be a place to get away from the impending density - not the place to add to it. We need permeable land, tree canopies, and a place for our community to gather and recreate. I don't see any way that this land can be developed in a way that doesn't add greatly to the traffic congestion and decrease the quality of life for existing residents. Again, the housing (and density) is coming. Let's be thoughtful about developing the land *SURROUNDING* this "perpetually" protected open space, so that we have something to offer generations to come other than mixed use development.
Planning Board Comment Form	Andrew J Guarino	10/11/2022	Denver needs open space not more development in the few open spaces that remain. The proposed re-development of the golf course is wholly unacceptable. Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement - we must better protect our open space. Also, approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift/windfall to Westside - this is unacceptable. Westside knew that the conservation easement was in place and its expectation to reduce that easement in any way should be eliminated.
Planning Board Comment Form	Rachel Coates	10/11/2022	I have been a member of the CPD "Steering Committee" from the beginning, and have been highly disappointed by the process. Throughout the last year and a half, we have heard month after month about why and how this land will be developed. There has been no meaningful conversation about what it might look like if the conservation easement can't be extinguished. When questions were raised about the validity of the 'community voice report' (ie: no outreach to spanish-speaking neighbors, concerns over who was participating in the one-on-one chats, how the conversations were framed, etc.) we heard very little in response. When the validity of the survey that was sent out was questioned, there was no meaningful response. When the city held community workshops to invite comment from residents, the steering committee only heard about the folks who were in support of development. No word about the feedback from those who are in opposition - which based on last November's vote, there were plenty. This whole process has felt like the city is colluding with Westside to get development pushed through. Why isn't the city fighting for the last remaining open space in Denver, which is protected by a perpetual conservation easement? Why is the city referring to Westside as "their client"? I sincerely wish that CPD and Westside had been willing to have an honest conversation about the future of this land without the assumption that it will be developed. It's really unfortunate that this small area plan wasn't 'zoomed out' a bit to include the impending development projects that are slated to take place within a mile of the PHGC land. What's more unfortunate though is the impact this is having on dividing our community. Westside and Holleran have framed this as a racial issue - literally depicting people of color vs. white people on the mailer for the 302 campaign. The people of color in Northeast Park Hill are being sold a bill of goods - being told they can have their small business in the new development, that they'll be eligible for "legacy housing" in the new development, that there will be a grocery store in the new development, that this development won't lead to gentrification. How?! If the city wants to honor the people who have laid their roots in the neighborhood, focus on redeveloping the existing community center and keep PHGC open space. Neighborhoods of color deserve safe places to gather and recreate, free from traffic and pollution. Our neighborhood undoubtedly has plenty of needs, all of which could be addressed without bulldozing the last remaining green space in the city.
Planning Board Comment Form	chad kenney	10/11/2022	I believe this whole process is a farce. This extended process (all of it) is designed to create the impression that the decision to release the easement has already been made and the only thing under discussion is which plan is best. This is a fabrication and an elaborately constructed campaign on the part of the mayor, city council and West Side Development. This a plan to steal millions of dollars from the Denver voters. West Side Development purchased the Park Hill Golf Course with the existing easement with the cynical attitude that the easement could simply be removed or invalidated. West Side Developments stands to make millions because they did not pay market price for the Park Hill Golf Course. and that they could convince the mayor, city council to release the easement. There will be elections for a new mayor and most of the city council in 2023. This will be an issue that all of these candidates will have to address. We will make it an issue. It should also be clear that the Denver voters are not in favor of this grand give away to West Side Properties. The Denver voters will not vote to endorse this plan, not matter whatever contrivance the mayor, city council, planning department come up with, this process is flawed because it is dishonest and disingenuous..
Planning Board Comment Form	Maria T	10/11/2022	Denver Native Keep Green Space
Planning Board Comment Form	Steve Ryder, Denver Field Ornithologists	10/11/2022	Comments regarding Re-Zoning of the Park Hill Golf Course submitted by Westside Investment Partners, Inc., and the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan made by DENVER FIELD ORNITHOLOGISTS, Steve Ryder, Chair, Conservation Committee to the Denver Planning Board: Denver Field Ornithologists is an all-volunteer, non-profit organization founded in 1935 with a current membership of 600 individuals and families. Our mission is to promote interest in the study and preservation of birds and their habitats. In recent years our members have expressed a keen interest in conserving bird and bird-associated habitat statewide, with a particular focus being the Denver Metropolitan Area. COMMENTS REGARDING THE ZONE MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION The entire property is currently zoned by the City as OS-B, which accommodates privately owned active recreation. (Re-Zoning App, pp. 28-32) The proposed zoning keeps less than one-half of the property in the OS-A District. This is problematic for the following reasons: a) The intent of the current zoning is to allow a private golf course, which most agree is less desirable than a more broadly-considered open space and park system. But this is not merely a zoning designation, its restrictions are in the form of a conservation easement that anticipates the property NOT being developed. b) Any amendment to the conservation easement should either be neutral, meaning it remains entirely a zone for recreation and open space, or strengthened to promote connecting people to nature via a passive Open Space designation. c) Regrettably, the proposed zoning essentially extinguishes much of the intent of the current zoning by requiring an urban, development-centered landscape over about one-half of the property. This is obviously contrary to the intent of the conservation easement. Of particular concern is "The Project" statements (p. 31) which provide clear evidence that there is little to no interest in providing the public a viable open space area that allows the experience of nature in the City: a) Out of the 155 currently protected acres, only 100 acres would be designated as parks and open space; and a majority of these 100 acres would be a formal city park (as opposed to open space more conducive to experiencing nature in its more ecologically productive state); b) The actual "Open Space" in the re-zoning proposal could in reality be the OS-A District (~80 acres) minus the proposed city park acreage, leaving actual Open Space to as small as 25-30 acres - a planned afterthought and an incredible wasted opportunity. The low importance of the environment in the Comprehensive Plan Goals reinforces our view of the City's afterthought approach to environmental resilience (pp 38-39). It is argued that the re-zoning proposal will "greatly advance" water conservation goals. Not so. The proposed city park will use similar water amounts than used by the golf course, and the open space will require similar amounts of water for a few years for the vegetation to become established. The remainder of the property will likely use huge amounts of water due to its planned highly developed structure. Per capita water use is a poor measure of water conservation, unless one starts from a baseline, in this case a former golf course. In summary, the re-zoning proposal violates the intent of the current property's zoning designation (including its open space intent), and will result in a considerable loss of urban wildlife habitat, contrary to the City's stated goals (see Area Plan below). Finally, the amending of the existing conservation easement (to allow public use of Open Space and parks) must take place prior to the adoption of this proposal, which presumes the easement's wholesale amendment or extinction. This proposed arbitrary extinguishment of a conservation easement raises troubling concerns by setting a precedent in the practice of land conservation that easement-protected lands can be viewed as land waiting to be developed. Amendment of this easement must maintain its context and intent - the current proposal is unapologetically development oriented, with passive recreation and open space being a mere afterthought.
Planning Board Comment Form	Steve Ryder, Denver Field Ornithologists (cont)	10/11/2022	COMMENTS REGARDING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE SMALL AREA PLAN The Comprehensive Plan 2040 contains six "vision elements" that form its base. The fifth element states: "In 2040, Denver is a thriving, sustainable city connected to nature and resilient to climate change." While high-minded and aspirational, the current re-zoning and comprehensive plan thinking would result in an embarrassing lost opportunity to actually connect people to nature, if the Park Hill GC site were planned accordingly. You cannot create "open space" and "nature" out of 5-10 story buildings, a city park and a remaining snippet of open space.

<b>Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022</b>			
Planning Board Comment Form	Judy Baxter	10/11/2022	There are many constituencies with skin in this game. Developers who have been doing exclusionary planning while getting special consideration from the mayor's office and CPD for the purchase and development of a property with a known conservation easement. There are the residents of Denver who purchased that easement in good faith that it would be upheld with no clear delineation of how they are directly and clearly compensated by this plan and it's loss of the conservation easement. And there are the immediate neighborhoods that are either adjacent to or nearby that will be affected by the proposed project and rezoning. It is these latter groups I am most concerned for and feel their input has not been adequately addressed. I am opposed to the current presentation though it attempts to offer a compromise from what has been floated before, I do not feel that this application adequately or clearly devotes enough of the space to open space and the density of the rezoned spaces for residential and commercial space seems high. It says 100 acres, but really it is only 80 and some of that is a retention area not available for true use as a park or for recreational purposes. Or it isn't clearly explicit about how they are doing the allocation of open space. Respectfully Submitted- Judith Baxter, Denver-Montclair Resident
Planning Board Comment Form	Overlook at Park Hill HOA	10/11/2022	Please see the Overlook at Park Hill's RESOLUTION OPPOSING WESTSIDE INVESTMENT PARTNERS' AREA PLAN AND REZONING REQUEST FOR THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND. Also please make note of the following resolutions we have submitted: April 2018: RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND July 2019: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRESERVING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE PERPETUAL OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION EASEMENT August 2020: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REFERRED CHARTER AMENDMENT; LET DENVER VOTE; OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION September 2021: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INITIATED ORDINANCE 301 AND IN OPPOSITION TO INITIATED ORDINANCE 302
Planning Board Comment Form	Martha L Rooney Saitta	10/11/2022	My reason for strong opposition to this request for zoning change approval of the PHGC land rests on a number of particular issues. The conflict of interest between the current Hancock Administration, CPD, Parks & Recreation, and Westside Development/The Halleran Group, results in voters loss of faith in the objectivity and independence of their elected government. This has given Westside & Holleran an unfair advantage in the planning process. The commitment of CDP and Parks & Recreation to Westside's development plans has resulted in the use of thousands of taxpayer dollars on behalf of a one-sided proposal, with little support for the vision of those who would like the conservation easement and the current zoning to remain in place. CPD and Parks & Rec have been working to dismantle the existing conservation easement despite the wish of the majority of voters and nearby residents. This focus on the part of CPD has likely compromised the objective evaluation of other potential and more appropriate development sites in the areas surrounding the Park Hill Golf Course. There has been inadequate conversation about the real costs of the project and how it will be financed. CPD has failed to include discussion regarding increased taxes and fees that the community will have to pay as a result of the issuance of infrastructure bonds. These costs should be clearly compared to the costs of maintaining the existing conservation easement and creating a large public park for recreational use. CPD has failed to discuss the economics of Westside's affordable housing proposal and compare it to the housing plans of other real estate developers, such as DelWest's 38th and Holly project, as well as those being implemented by the Urban Land Conservancy where hundreds of permanent affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens on the community.
Planning Board Comment Form	Chad Kenney	10/11/2022	A spell corrected and edited version of my earlier comment: I believe this whole process is a farce. This extended process (all of it) is designed to create the impression that the decision to release the easement has already been made and the only thing under discussion is which plan is best. This is a fabrication and an elaborately constructed campaign on the part of the mayor, city council and West Side Development. This is a plan to steal millions of dollars from the Denver voters. West Side Development purchased the Park Hill Golf Course with the existing easement with the cynical attitude that the easement could simply be removed or invalidated. West Side Developments stands to make millions because they did not pay market price for the Park Hill Golf Course and they believed they could convince the mayor, city council to release the easement. There will be elections for a new mayor and most of the city council in 2023. This will be an issue that all these candidates will have to address. We will make it an issue. It should also be clear that the Denver voters are not in favor of this grand give away to West Side Properties. The Denver voters will not vote to endorse this plan, not matter whatever contrivance the mayor, city council, planning department come up with, as this process is flawed because it is dishonest and disingenuous.
Planning Board Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	10/11/2022	Statement in Opposition to the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan 1. The Department of Community Planning and Development used a flawed approach to find a "prevailing vision" that favors residential and commercial development on the former PHGC. In my opinion, the approach taken by the Department of Community Planning and Development to conclude that "the prevailing vision" of the community considers it appropriate to preserve only approximately one half of the total acreage of the former PHGC for open space and recreation was biased and unreliable. The methods supported by the City to inquire about the "vision" of the people of Denver never offered residents the option to endorse a plan that would require the entire 155 acres of the former PHGC to be utilized for recreation and open space. In actuality, as evidenced by their votes in favor of Measure 301 and against Measure 302 in November 2021, Denver voters overall and the Park Hill neighbor in particular decisively rejected the stated position of the Westside developers to favor some residential and commercial development. The survey cited by the City and Westside as a basis to claim that the prevailing vision of residents living within one mile of the former PHGC was to favor "mixed-use" was biased for several important reasons. First, the initial and main question on the survey asked respondents to choose between use of the land exclusively as a golf course, or as a mixed-use site with residential development and parkland. This dichotomous choice was by design biased to favor endorsement of mixed use. A fair and unbiased survey of opinion would have presented more options, including not only mixed use, but also full residential and/or commercial development, and full preservation as parkland and open space. Second, there was no demonstration that the survey in fact reached a representative sample of the intended audience, nor that the number of responses received were statistically adequate to reflect the targeted community. Third, there was no valid reason to restrict the survey to residential addresses within one mile of the site. These biases, particularly the limited choice of options, was particularly objectionable in view of the City's knowledge that an active grass roots movement expressed vocal support for full preservation of the former PHGC as open space or parkland. The process undertaken by the City to promote a plan that would devote approximately half of the former PHGC for commercial and residential development was performed without a scientifically valid environmental and public health impact analysis intended to impartially present the costs and benefits of various options, including preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. This is in contravention to best practices for consideration of major development projects under consideration by a public entity such as the City and County of Denver. For example, the relative impact of "mixed use" versus full conservation as parkland and open space on factors such as urban heat island effects, air pollution from traffic, access to open space and parkland for recreation and physical exercise was never impartially and scientifically assessed.
Planning Board Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett (Cont)	10/11/2022	2. Preservation of the former PHGC entirely as parkland and open space would address substantial environmental and public health needs of Denver. Based upon peer-reviewed research, and my experience as a physician and academic specializing in environmental health and public health, it is my opinion that environmental and public health factors strongly favor preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. Consider the following: 1. Between 2010 and 2019, Denver was the country's fifth fastest growing large city. [https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010]. Growth has come with an increased number of cars, roads, parking lots, shopping plazas and other buildings in our community. In fact, nearly half the land in Denver's city limits is paved or built over. [https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/] At the same time, the percentage of City land devoted to open space and parkland has fallen behind that of most other cities. With only 5% of its land used for parks and recreation, Denver has fallen from 13th place in 2012 to 18th place in the 2021 Trust for Public Land Park Score for America's 100 largest cities. In comparison, the percentages of land used for parks and recreation in some other cities are: Washington, D.C.—21%; New York City—16%; San Francisco—21%; San Diego—21%; Portland, Oregon—14%; Boston—19%; Minneapolis—10%; Los Angeles—13%; Seattle—11% and Chicago—9%. According to the Trust for Public Lands, the 2021 national median percentage of land used for parks and recreation in America's 100 largest cities was 15%. [https://www.tpl.org/parkscore]. Use of the former PHGC entirely as parkland would substantially strengthen the park system of our increasingly densified and developed city. The neighborhoods that include and generally abut the PHGC land south of I-70 are the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood that is east of Colorado Boulevard, and the Elyria-Swansea, Clayton, and Cole neighborhoods that are west of Colorado Boulevard. These neighborhoods have substantial communities of color. The percentage of non-white residents in each neighborhood are as follows: Northeast Park Hill: 78.3%; Elyria-Swansea: 87.54%; Clayton: 67.1%, and Cole: 66.2%. [see https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/]. Many residents of these neighborhoods have limited income. For example, a recent assessment found the median household income for Northeast Park Hill was \$37,501. [https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income]. These neighborhoods, which are close to the I-70 corridor and industrial sites, are among the most polluted neighborhoods in Denver. For example, the 80216 zip code, the area in which the Elyria Swansea neighborhood lies, in 2017 had the highest environmental hazard rating of any zip code in the United States. [https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/].

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett (Cont)	10/11/2022	These neighborhoods now have a pressing need for open space and trees. For example, the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood ranks 473 out of 483 Denver census blocks in the Tree Equity Score created by the national conservation organization, American Forests. Only two percent of the land in this neighborhood has a tree canopy cover, which compares poorly with the 24% tree canopy cover that the organization American Forests considers optimal. The Tree Equity Scores and tree canopy cover numbers for the other three neighborhoods in the vicinity are comparable to the deficient Northeast Park Hill neighborhood numbers. [https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222] Protection of the PHGC land conservation easement would protect the existing tree canopy and increase equity of access to open space for low-income communities of color. Because of the relative lack of open space and tree cover in the four neighborhoods generally abutting the PHGC land and south of I-70, the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment has given two of them (Northeast Park Hill and Swansea-Elyria) a rating of "High", the most severe rating, and the other two (Clayton and Cole) a "Medium-High" rating on the 2021 Neighborhood Heat Vulnerability Index. [https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#c-13201793]. Commercial and residential development of the PHGC land, combined with increasing air temperatures associated with climate change, would contribute to the development of "heat islands" which, in turn, would threaten the health and well-being of those living and working in these neighborhoods. Urban heat islands are associated with heat exhaustion, heat stroke, heat-related respiratory problems, and death. Conversely, trees and vegetation play key roles in directly countering urban heat islands and the negative health effects with which they are associated. [https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands; https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts ].The City's eventual acquisition of the PHGC land for a designated park would offer the opportunity for the City to augment the land's critical tree canopy thereby reducing heat island issues. 3. Preservation of the entirety of the former PHGC as parkland and open space is the only option that fulfills the City of Denver's stated goals for climate action. In November 2020, the Denver voters overwhelmingly approved Measure 2A, the Climate Protection Fund, which was referred to the ballot by the City Council on the recommendation of the Climate Action Task Force. According to the November 2021 report issued by the Office of Climate Action, Sustainability and Resiliency entitled, "Climate Protection Fund Five Year Plan": "In addition to strategies that directly eliminate emissions, Denver will pursue nature-based solutions to sequester carbon, including preservation of shortgrass prairie, preservation and expansion of the urban tree canopy, and preservation and maintenance of forests in the Denver Mountain Parks" [emphasis added] (see report page 15). Maintaining the former PHGC as verdant open space and parkland, supplemented by additional planting of trees, would be the course of action most supportive of this goal. In addition, the report specifically cites the importance of environmental justice concerns as part of Denver's climate action. As a metric to address climate equity, the report identified "Reduction in disparities in pollution and climate-related vulnerability between communities in Denver" (see report page 37). As noted earlier, the fact that the Denver neighborhoods adjacent to the former PHGC now experience the highest heat vulnerability index and have the lowest tree canopy cover, argues strongly in favor of preserving the site entirely for parkland and open space. City of Denver Forester Mike Swanson acknowledged this when he told the Denver Post "Yes, Denver needs more trees. And we need to stop pouring concrete." [Denver Post, January 3, 2021, https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/03/denver-tree-planting-greenspace-heat-islands/].
Planning Board Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett (Cont)	10/11/2022	The former PHGC tract, on which the City and County of Denver holds a conservation easement, represents an irreplaceable opportunity for Denver to utilize parkland to promote the health and well-being of city residents. There are ample opportunities for commercial and residential development to be pursued at alternative locations. Respectfully submitted, Michael J. Kosnett, MD, MPH, FACMT Associate Adjunct Professor Colorado School of Public Health* 2099 Ivy Street Denver, CO 80207 (Affiliation noted for identification purposes only. This is not an institutional statement.)
Planning Board Comment Form	Dan Perillo	10/11/2022	I have lived in the Park Hill Neighborhood for over 10 years and live walking distance to the PHGC. This space needs to remain green and open to all not for profit housing. Here is some of my other reasons. Please consider the neighborhood too. 1. They are trying to remove an easement that was put there by the person giving the land. To go against the word given is completely wrong. 2. When speaking to the Westside developers at open houses, they misrepresented themselves and their project multiple times. 3. This area does not need more market rate housing
Planning Board Comment Form	Dan Perillo	10/11/2022	Its a gift to Westside in the form of millions when there is absolutely no reason to do so. The conservative easement was given for a reason, please consider the people in the neighborhood.
Planning Board Comment Form	Karin Schumacher	10/11/2022	Our community including both the Park Hill one and the entire city of voters has said NO to this over and over-- in public meetings, in private discussions and on two ballot measures! The conservation easement deserves to stand and not be removed. There is no reason to violate the trust Denver citizen's have put in their decision by allowing the developer to commercially profit. Please- what part of No do you not understand? Thank you!
Planning Board Comment Form	Karin Schumacher	10/11/2022 (5:02 p.m.)	Our community, including both Park Hill neighborhood and the entire Denver city of voters has expressed their disapproval of this plan over and over, in public and private discussions, at open meetings, and on two prominent ballot measures in 2021! The conservation easement should not be removed, and commercial development is not appropriate in that space, which should be preserved for a community green space, public park and possibly recreation, but NO commercial retail or housing development. There are many other places to develop the latter without removing the conservation easement - which was legally enacted into perpetuity decades ago.
Planning Board Comment Form	Dick Peterson	10/11/2022	This beautiful piece of land must remain some kind of open space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jason	10/11/2022	This land is protected by a conservation easement which the voters clearly voted to uphold. There is no reason to rezone it. The only choice that the voters supported was a park/open space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Andrea Morrow-Kraljic	10/11/2022	Hello - I am a resident of Park Hill Village and I am NOT in favor of any development taking place on Park Hill Golf Course. I am only in favor of keeping this as a green space for the community to enjoy. I built my home next to PHGC in 2016 and extra paid to have a view of the golf course. Well that view only lasted a couple years before the city annexed a portion of the land for the water drainage project. It was incredibly traumatic to watch as big mature trees get chopped down and grassy lands to be dug up (see attached pictures). I do not want my community to have to relive the trauma of watching even more mature trees be chopped down and grassy lands be dug up all for Westside's profit and benefit. While Westside and the City of Denver have pushed the narrative that NE Park Hill needs affordable housing, minority owned businesses and a grocery store, these things come at a substantial price. If Westside gets its way then the community will continue to pay to have for the use of this land by having to pay for rent, leases, and or for other services. We taxpayers have already paid for this land to remain green in the form of a conservation easement. Isn't that enough? The community would also lose out on valuable green space as the proposed "regional park" by Westside hardly meets the green space needs of the growing NE community. Plus future generations in Park Hill need lots of green space for a healthy community. Westside is only concerned about its bottom line, investment and profits. It does not care about the community. It only has jumped through the required hops to show it's listening to the "community's needs", but only if the community's needs are in Westside's favor. I urge the Planning Board to not allow this space for rezoning and to secure continued green space of the entire Park Hill Golf Course and Park Hill community. Thank you

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Comment Form	Andrea Morrow-Kraljic	10/11/2022	I am a resident of Park Hill Village and I am NOT in favor of any development taking place on Park Hill Golf Course. I am only in favor of keeping this as a green space. I built my home in 2016 next to PHGC and paid extra to have a view of the golf course. Well that only lasted a couple years before the city annexed a portion of the land for the water drainage project. It was incredibly traumatic to watch as big mature trees get chopped down and grassy lands to be dug up (see attached pictures). I do not want my community to have to relive the trauma of watching even more mature trees be chopped down and grassy lands be dug up all for Westside's profit and benefit. While Westside and the City of Denver have pushed the narrative that NE Park Hill needs affordable housing, minority owned businesses and a grocery store, these things come at a substantial price. If Westside gets its way then the community will continue to pay to have for the use of this land by having to pay for rent, leases, and other services. We taxpayers have already paid for this land to remain green in the form of a conservation easement. Isn't that enough? The community would also lose out on valuable green space as the proposed "regional park" by Westside hardly meets the green space needs of the growing NE community. Plus our future generations in Park Hill need lots of green space for a healthy community, not 12-story buildings. Westside is only concerned about its bottom line, investment and profit. It does not care about the community. It only has jumped through the required hops to show it's listening to the "community's needs", but only if the community's needs are in Westside's favor. I urge the Planning Board to not approve the small area plan and to secure continued green space of the entire Park Hill Golf Course and Park Hill community. Thank you.
Planning Board Comment Form	Donna Good	10/11/2022	I just don't get why these changes are still being considered. We voted to make sure this didn't become a developer's dream project. Mayor Webb fought to keep this open space. This is a shame in process. I lived in Park Hill for 20 years and still have family there. Why is the city continuing to fight against the will of the people?
Planning Board Comment Form	Carolyn O'Shea	10/11/2022	This property is under a taxpayer funded conservation easement! Westside was fully aware of that when purchasing it. Why is CPD assisting Westside's efforts to unravel the easement?! This is a slap in the face to all Denver residents who fully supported the purchase of the easement and support keeping it in place, as the passing of ballot initiative 301 last year. I sat in on all of the "steering committee" meetings and what a joke those were. It was obvious from the start that CPD has no interest in preserving the easement, as it was totally ignored in those meetings, in fact, I never once heard it addressed! Why? Development discussions carried on as if there is no easement in existence. Again, all of these meetings and hours spent by CPD working for Westside are at taxpayer expense. In fact the "survey" conducted didn't have "keeping the land as preserved green space" as a choice for possible uses of the land, there were only choices involving various types of development. I'm really frustrated, disappointed, and angry that CPD is bending over backwards to help Westside develop this rare green space, which could be such a jewel and an asset to NE Park Hill, all the while totally ignoring the will of the voters and the fact that Denver, particularly NE Denver, is sorely lacking in green space. The "prevailing vision" is that of Westside and CPD. Those who advocate for open space and the easement literally had no voice in the process. The reasoning "we need affordable housing" doesn't apply here, sorry. Build it anywhere other than on protected land! Shame on CPD for putting Westside's interests above those of the citizens of Denver. It should be the other way around.
Planning Board Comment Form	Carolyn O'Shea	10/11/2022	This property is protected by a conservation easement, purchased by the taxpayers of Denver and it should remain protected and undeveloped. That's what conservation easements are for. The area west of Colo Blvd is ripe for development and already there are projects underway. Why is that not taken in to consideration? Why must 155 acres of rare urban, protected open space be sacrificed for the profits of a developer who knew very well that this was protected property when they purchased it? When speaking of an "area plan" the area surrounding the golf course needs to be involved, areas that are actually appropriate for residential and commercial development, where the protected golf course is not. This is the reason that people distrust government. Land that is protected by a conservation easement is not protected at all once a developer and CPD get involved. Truly appalling.
Planning Board Comment Form	Andrea Lewellyn	10/12/2022	PLEASE keep Denver somewhat green. The open space of Park Hill golf course is not a "luxury" but rather a "necessity". Our city has LOST acres and acres of green space over the recent years. I have watched the green areas eaten up. WE need it for our well-being and for the love of our City. I urge to oppose both the reasoning plans for case #20221-00158. Thank you for your attention to keep our city green before it's too late
Planning Board Comment Form	Jessica R Platt	10/12/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside which is not what tax payers want
Planning Board Comment Form	Patrick Lavin	10/12/2022	It is abhorrent that the city would rezone a property for development that is under a conservation easement. Shame on you.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jennifer Anderson	10/13/2022	I am disappointed that the City has supported Westside's purchase of the City Park Golf Course and proposed development, despite the fact that there is a conservation easement on the land. The conservation easement doesn't just belong to the City, but it belongs to the public. The public also spoke in the last election and reaffirmed that they didn't want any rezoning or development of the land, without voter approval. This application for rezoning is premature and flies in the face of what your constituents have expressly requested, i.e. that they be allowed to decide what happens to that land that has been put in a conservation easement. For those reasons, this application should be denied and resubmitted after such time that the voters of Denver have determined what is an acceptable development plan for the land if at all.
Planning Board Comment Form	Hadley Peterson	10/13/2022	The 303 ArtWay continues to be unfunded by the City and County of Denver. As a project focused on proactively designing for community pride and ownership, the 303 ArtWay agrees that an alignment through the development makes sense to best increase safety and serve the neighborhood. For nearly 10 years, the ArtWay has engaged with the community around safety, mobility, health, and storytelling. Whatever development happens on this property, the 303 ArtWay should go through it.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jennifer Anderson	10/13/2022	We are losing green space at an alarming rate in the Denver metro area, and this plan would further exacerbate that problem. Since this space is already green, we should leave it green and honor the conservation easement already in place. There is plenty of room for development in areas along 40th Blvd. that is already concrete/industrial. I do not approve of taking some of the last green space in the city and developing a huge portion of it. Please put the concrete somewhere else and preserve what little green space we have left in Denver.
Planning Board Comment Form	Brittney Tatom	10/13/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following: Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood. Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians. Improved intersections to promote connectivity. I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development.
Planning Board Comment Form	Keith Pryor	10/14/2022	This plan has had extensive community input and review of community stakeholders. It is in line with Comp plan 2020 as well as city wide local plans. I ask the board to support the adaption of the plan. Thank you for your consideration
Planning Board Comment Form	Veronica Valenzuela	10/17/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Veronica Valenzuela	10/17/2022	It would be hypocritical to approve rezoning while the conservation easement is in place. Denver voters value open space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Susan Fedenia	10/18/2022	I have lived, voted and paid taxes in Denver since 1986. Which means I have paid to have the Park Hill Golf Course to be put in a protected easement. We don't need more development. We do need to hold on to the open space we have and have paid for. 1433 N Williams St Apt 1101
Planning Board Comment Form	Robert Gore	10/19/2022	Allowing ADUs in Zoning Lots when a duplex exists.

Planning Board Comment Form	Shanta Harrison-Sullivan	10/19/2022	Good afternoon,I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course land. I am a life-long resident of Northeast Park Hill, and live about two minutes away from Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC). I have admired the grounds for many years, and attended many events at the clubhouse. Having lived in Park Hill my entire life, the scenery as I drive down 35th Avenue from my home to Colorado Boulevard, is familiar. It's relaxing. It's home. The vast landscape of trees and greenery creates a sense of tranquility and nostalgia that no longer exists in other areas of the neighborhood. It is the perfect location for a regional park, and will be a welcome reprieve for all when the surrounding areas are developed, traffic increases, and the heat island effect begins to rise. The last thing we need on this land is 5-12 story buildings – the majority of which will contain more market rate housing.Park Hill is most definitely in need of TRULY affordable housing, a grocery store, and other essential amenities. We have yet to see a comprehensive study of other areas in and around the PHGC site that could accommodate these needs. The PHGC, surrounded by five different neighborhoods, has become a magnet for those craving fresh air and open space. A growing number of residents are taking advantage of the natural landscapes and walking paths that the land offers. The land is already being used as parkland. I'll say that again for the folks in the back...THE PEOPLE are already using this beautiful open space as PARKLAND – walking, biking, exercising, etc. All that's missing are the swing sets and benches. The people have unofficially spoken. It's time to make it official and, designate the PHGC as a public park, open and accessible to all!
Planning Board Comment Form	Shane Sutherland	10/18/2022	I am writing to inform you that on October 6, 2022, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., (GPHC) voted 16-0 approving the attached resolution. This resolution entitled "RESOLUTION OPPOSING WESTSIDE INVESTMENT PARTNERS' AREA PLAN AND REZONING REQUEST FOR THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND" is in opposition to the proposed rezoning of Park Hill Golf Course.The GPHC is a Registered Neighborhood Organization with the City and County of Denver. Park Hill Golf Course is entirely inside the boundaries of GPHC.Shane Sutherland, Chair Greater Park Hill Community Inc. RESOLUTION OPPOSING WESTSIDE INVESTMENT PARTNERS' AREA PLAN AND REZONING REQUEST FOR THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND At a meeting of the Board of Governors of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. on October 6, 2022, the following resolution passed:WHEREAS, with Denver's significantly increased density and population and the adverse impacts of climate change,Denver has a critical need to protect and enhance its parks and open space for the health and well-being of itsresidents;WHEREAS, Denver's parks and open space have failed to keep up with its increased density and population;WHEREAS, Colorado conservation easements are created for the purpose, among other things, of maintaining land predominately in a natural, scenic, or open condition or for wildlife habitat or for recreational or other useconsistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity;WHEREAS, the City owns a perpetual open space Conservation Easement purchased in 1997 for \$2 million whichprotects the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course land from development (the "Conservation Easement");WHEREAS, Westside Investment Partners ("Westside") purchased the Park Hill Golf Course land in July 2019 subjectto the Conservation Easement and has declared its desire to cancel the Conservation Easement and develop thePark Hill Golf Course land;WHEREAS, the Community Planning and Development Department has prepared a "Park Hill Golf Course SmallArea Plan" ("Area Plan") and Westside has filed a "Zone Map Amendment Application" [Case No. 20221-00158]("Westside's Rezoning Application") requesting to rezone the Park Hill Golf Course land from the existing OS-B OpenSpace Recreation District to multiple different mixed use zone districts in order to facilitate development on the western half of the site.;WHEREAS, the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application involve building high-density commercial andresidential buildings up to 12 stories high on at least 55 acres along Colorado Boulevard, adding as many as 4,300residential units and 10,000 new residents, doubling the population of Northeast Park Hill, and making Dahlia ahigh traffic through street connecting Smith Road to 35th Avenue;WHEREAS, the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application will be on the October 19, 2022 Denver PlanningBoard agenda;WHEREAS, the Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. (GPHC) Board of Governors has consistently supported the Conservation Easement by passing the following Resolutions:April 2018: RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LANDAugust 2020: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REFERRED CHARTER AMENDMENT; LET DENVER VOTE;OPEN SPACE PRESERVATIONJuly 2019: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRESERVING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE PERPETUALOPEN SPACE CONSERVATION EASEMENTSeptember 2021: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INITIATED ORDINANCE 301 AND IN OPPOSITION TOINITIATED ORDINANCE 302WHEREAS, in October 2019, GPHC commissioned a formal statistically valid neighborhood-wide survey conductedby the National Research Center, the results of which showed that, regarding terminating or modifying theConservation Easement and changing the zoning for the Park Hill Golf Course land, three-quarters of respondentspreferred the land remain entirely some kind of green space/park or golf course;WHEREAS, the approval of the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application would violate the Conservation Easementand the Colorado Conservation Easement statute (C.R.S. § 38-30.5-107) unless a court order is first obtained allowingtermination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the Conservation Easement, and would result in the City andits taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside;NOW THEREFORE, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. respectfully urges the members of the Denver Planning Boardand the Denver City Council to vote against the "Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan" and Westside's "Zone MapAmendment Application" [Case No. 20221-00158].Approved: October 6, 2022
Planning Board Online Comment Form	Mimi Madrid	10/19/2022	My name is Mimi Madrid, I reside in Swansea at 4334 Elizabeth Street.I urge committee to VOTE NO on the rezoning request and the small area plan.Over the years, I've witnessed how landowners, investors and developers gentrify neighborhoods and displace poor and working families who are predominately families of color. It's done in a strategic manner - where community organizations are called in to create resident trust, nurture city buy-in, and ends in eventual displacement of most of the original residents.When Sisters of Color United for Education, a trusted long-standing community organization, called on residents and community members to help nurture the Park Hill Golf Course clubhouse back to life we answered with a renewed sense of faith in Westside Investment Partners and the Holleran Group. They must be different!Sisters of Color remodeled the clubhouse and made it suitable and safe for community members to access the building. Along with many others, I witnessed the years of decay, underdevelopment of the building - even saw rat carcasses behind kitchen stoves. As soon as the building was ready for community programs the issues began.Right before the vote in November, Westside and Holleran fell back on their lease agreement with Sisters of Color. Westside and Holleran Group has recently offered a settlement of \$173,000 for the remodel BUT to be paid out in a span of several years AND to be claimed as a charitable contribution. Their offer is disrespectful - it puts undue burden on Sisters and is asking for undeserving tax benefits for their bad actions. Sisters have decided to sue.I do believe our community needs affordable housing, accessibility to healthy food, and economic opportunities.However, I believe Westside and Holleran Group have acted in bad-faith with community partners and this behavior will continue decades into a project of this magnitude. Community Agreements they make at large will not be held and their actions show they will be broken.They will benefit themselves long-term and not the most underserved residents in our community.You can read the full lawsuit online in the Westword publication titled: Sisters of Color Suing Park Hill Golf Course Developers Over Clubhouse Dispute.I urge you to VOTE NO.
Planning Board Email	Monica Smith-Acuña, PSyD	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP.Sincerely,Monica Smith Acuna1258 S Williams St Denver CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Emily Tracy	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Emily Tracy1407 E. 10th Ave. #1Denver CO 80218

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Email	Matthew Suprunowicz	10/11/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors.
Planning Board Email	Ryan D. Cobbins	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board: I strongly support the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue) and the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158).Our community has a strong desire to continue positive activations around Denver. The Park Hill Golf Course is an important area that has the potential to meet and exceed the growing demands of a community that seeks places to live, work, and play. Our community needs more new parks and open spaces. With the public being part of the design process for the Park Hill Golf Course, the priorities for both parks and homes on this site are critical. This plan includes new publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities for all to enjoy, removing water-intensive grass that will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping, and increased biodiversity & pollinator habitats and activity.The Park Hill Golf Course application/plan will be great for our city and our state
Planning Board Email	John Desmond	10/12/2022	Dear Planning Board Members,I am writing this email to strongly support the submitted Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the related Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing a severe and persistent housing shortage. Rents have skyrocketed in the last few years and affordable for-sale housing units have virtually disappeared. I am a Park Hill resident and have lived in this neighborhood for over 19 years. As a long-time Denver resident and retired senior citizen, I worry about where I will move when I can no longer maintain my current house. There are currently few options in the Park Hill neighborhood for people in my age range that need smaller, more manageable and more affordable housing options. I also worry about how my 30 year-old daughter, who would love to move back here, will ever be able to afford to move back to Denver from the Midwest. I am certain many of my peers have similar concerns. We, as a city need to build much more housing at all price points, but especially more affordable housing.The proposed plan for Park Hill Golf Course does exactly that. It would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the current conservation easement – into a broad variety of housing options including significant affordable and workforce housing, greatly exceeding the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and the community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. I certainly believe that my fellow neighbors and I have had ample opportunity to express our opinions about this project - and the proposed plan responds to those concerns very effectively.Lastly, I am also a big supporter of more usable green space for Denver. The beauty of this proposal is that it provides both a substantial number of new residential units AND well-designed and well-located park spaces easily accessible to the adjacent neighborhoods. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, John Desmond 1601 Filbert Court Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Robin Nicholson	10/9/2022	Dear Planning Board, I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. I urge you to please approve this project. Sincerely, Robin Nicholson, Park Hill resident 1615 Holly St. Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Sara Bencomo	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 E 35th Ave), as well as the Rezoning application (4141 E 35th Ave, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of the community. The lack of attainable house, especially home-ownership opportunities, has had a real impact on the community.Instead of a defunct and unused golf course (except for the use a giant dog park at the moment), I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to the community to live, work and play. Upholding the commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. By creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that the community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals.The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women and BIPOC, owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I love how the commercial space is incorporated to the community and new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable well-lit paths throughout the community with healthy food options and local retail. And the fact that they want to bring in a grocery store/market is especially appealing since it is a food desert. I have worked with We Don't Waste, the non-profit that sets multiple markets to distribute free food to residents around this area, the demand is more than any one non-profit can
Planning Board Email	Gretchen Armijo	10/9/2022	Dear Planning Board, I am in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). As a longtime urban planner focused on equitable community development, I believe this Plan addresses the needs of a community that has experienced historic barriers to opportunity and prosperity. The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community as well as the entire City.Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community, and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Gretchen Armijo 801 Oneida St. Denver, CO 80220

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Email	Matt Wagner	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Matt Wagner 2936 Emporia Street Denver 80238
Planning Board Email	Anita West-Berry	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rentals and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. We need to create fair, environmentally, sustainable, and healthy communities for families, youth, and seniors. We need to ensure that Black and Indigenous People of Color(BIPOC) have easy access to transportation, parks and recreation, good jobs, healthy foods, and medical care. We can start by giving voice to the issue and then put action to words. I think it’s important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Anita West-Berry 4027 E 30th Ave Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Nick Massie	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.
Planning Board Email	Leslie J. Berry, Jr.	10/10/2022	I am a third generation native and resident of the City and County of Denver. My grandfather, Dr. Clarence F. Holmes, Jr, was born in 1892, was the 2nd African American dentist in Denver, and founded the NAACP chapter in Denver. To say I have a “dog in this hunt” is an understatement. I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help get us arrive at this point. The process has been Open, Transparent to the public, and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP.Sincerely, Leslie J. Berry, Jr.4027 E. 30th AveDenver, CO 80207(303) 862-1726
Planning Board Email	Sara O’Keefe	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)!’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,Sara O’Keefe2432 N Washington St Denver, 80205
Planning Board Email	Bryan-David Blakely	10/13/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Bryan-David Blakely 510 Grape St, Denver, CO 80220

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	John DeLuca	10/13/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, John DeLuca 2645 W. 25th Ave Denver, CO 80211
Planning Board Email	Keely C. Downs	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). We need more housing units and an old golf course is a great opportunity to use the land for a better purpose. This is a great area for housing units and the Small Area Plan looks really great as well. As a Denver resident who loves the City of Denver, I am strongly in support of this plan to create more than 2500 new homes. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Keely Downs 1940 S. Milwaukee Street, Denver, CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Eric Hecox	10/7/2022	I write in support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158) as Denver has a desperate need for additional housing as well as publicly accessible parks. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. Our community also needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Eric Hecox 1651 North Monaco Parkway Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Karolette Greene	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Karolette Greene2395 Clermont StreetDenver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Kyle Bassett	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Kyle Bassett 15449 West Baltic Ave, Lakewood CO 80228
Planning Board Email	John Victor	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. John Victor, GS Mobile Home Communities/Highline, Inc. 2100 E. Colfax Blvd. Denver, CO 80206

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Email	Brian Chen	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Brian Chen 255 Ash Street Denver 80220
Planning Board Email	William Ray	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. William Ray, 1782 Locust Street Denver CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Lisa J. Wingrove	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Lisa J Wingrove 2310 Elm Street Denver CO 80207
Planning Board Email	James J. Peros Pamela A. Peros	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. James J. Peros Pamela A. Peros 3855 S. Niagara Way Denver, Colorado 80237
Planning Board Email	Mina Ishida Goldstein	10/8/2022	I support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). My neighborhood, Park Hill, and in reality all neighborhoods, need more opportunities to build generational wealth. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Over the last few years, my family and I have known many people who have moved out of Park Hill in search of more affordable housing options in places outside the city like Aurora and Houston. Park Hill just doesn't have enough of the smaller, varietal homes that suit various financial and life needs of families and individuals. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. This area will become a thriving economic center for my neighborhood, and I wholeheartedly support that. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Mina Ishida Goldstein 1569 Eudora St. Denver, CO 80220

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Lisa Williams	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Lisa Williams, 1201 Galapago St, Denver, CO 80204
Planning Board Email	Anonymous	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.
Planning Board Email	Barbara Hill	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Barbara Hill 5789 S Danube Circle Aurora, CO 80015
Planning Board Email	Uta Greene	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Uta Greene 2825 S Cherry Way Denver, CO 80222
Planning Board Email	Andrew Feinstein	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Andrew
Planning Board Email	Erik Anderson	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely,Erik Anderson 650 Locust Street Denver CO 80220

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Email	Elizabeth J. Peros	10/9/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct and unused golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. The Park Hill Golf Course should be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. Specifically, more than 2,500 new homes can be built on the site, and at least 25% of those homes will be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of affordable housing options, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. In addition to housing, the community has articulated its desire for parks on this site. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. This is a perfect location to add in the community's preferences for parks and housing. The development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates parks and open space and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I cannot think of a worse use for the site. I am especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. I can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Please approve the plan and the rezoning. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Elizabeth J. Peros 3554 S. Hudson Street Denver, CO 80237
Planning Board Email	Tyler Downs	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Tyler Downs Wazee Partners, LLC 44 Cook Street, Suite 400 Denver, CO 80206
Planning Board Email	Christopher Banks	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Christopher Banks 2459 S Kittredge Way Aurora, CO. 80013
Planning Board Email	Stacey Cha	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Stacey Cha 999 S Logan St. #230 Denver, CO 80209
Planning Board Email	Churchill Bunn	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Thank you,Churchill Bunn 474 S. Williams Street Denver, CO 80209

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Planning Board Email	Jody Beck, PhD	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). I have spent the last two decades studying the issues of equity and justice in cities, much of that centered around how land use and access to resources impacts our citizens. The current use of this site as a golf course does not address the current needs of our cities, and neither does maintaining the entire site as open space. The citizens of our city desperately need affordable housing which the proposal in the Small Area Plan offers. The plan's proposal to make 25% of the housing on site permanently affordable is not only evidence of the good faith of the development team to address the needs of our citizens, but much needed in Denver. Open space is good, but high-quality open space that is rich with activity and accessible to homes is better. The current golf course use, and reserving the entire site as mere grass open space, is not only failing to provide a high quality open space for the city but it is grossly wasteful in terms of water and the need to use heavy loads of fertilizer and pesticides. The proposal would give the citizens of Denver a truly usable, high-quality, and accessible space of over 100 acres. This is a great improvement to our city. Lastly, the planning board can only approve this plan if it cares about equity. The plan provides for incubator and retail space that nearby residents can use to start building generational wealth – something that has been denied many of our citizens because of their race and background. I have also followed the politics of this site for many years. There are several very loud voices who do not live in the neighborhood and have funding and roots elsewhere that are arguing for keeping the site as a golf course – without any logical argument and certainly without any concern for equity and justice. It is clear to me that most of the people who should be making this decision – those who would be benefited from a redevelopment of the site – want more affordable housing, accessible retail and especially grocery stores, places to grow businesses and other enterprises, and safe high-quality open space. I reiterate that I am in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course along with the rezoning application. I am happy to answer any questions you may have in this regard. Cheers, Jody Beck, PhD Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture University of Colorado Denver
Planning Board Email	Sylvia Lambe	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and open up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Sylvia Lambe 3751 S Hillcrest Drive, Denver, CO 80237
Planning Board Email	John DeLuca	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, John DeLuca 2645 W. 25th Ave Denver, CO 80211
Planning Board Email	Kelsy and Edwin Bell, Jr.	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Kelsy and Edwin Bell, Jr. 4206 Madison Denver, Colorado 80216
Planning Board Email	Sevinay Yese Kovats	10/10/2022	My name is Sevinay Yese Kovats, I am CO Licensed architect practicing and living in Denver. I am writing in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)</li> </ul> I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Sevinay Yese Kovats 7700 E 29th Avenue Unit 401, Denver CO 80010
Planning Board Email	Barb Frommell	10/10/2022	I am a Park Hill resident, and I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Barb Frommell 4035 E 18th Avenue Denver, CO 80220

Planning Board Email	Casey A. Grosscope	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,Casey A. Grosscope
Planning Board Email	Olivia Fortunato	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Best, Olivia Fortunato
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203 Aurora 80247
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP. Sincerely, Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203 Aurora 80247
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203 Aurora 80247
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following:•Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site•A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood•Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians•Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Kerri R. Field 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203 Aurora 80247
Planning Board Email	Rodney D Bell	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Rodney D Bell 2496 Champa Street Denver, CO 80205

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely ,Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203Aurora80247
Planning Board Email	Jason Kaplan	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely Jason Kaplan 4130 Montview Blvd Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Morgan Ryan	10/10/2022	As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP. Sincerely,Morgan Ryan 1028 Tamarac St.Denver, CO 80230
Planning Board Email	David Pietsch, III	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,David Pietsch, III2343 S Clayton St.Denver, CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Ryan O'Brien	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing.It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood .Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely,Ryan O'Brien 650 Dexter Street, Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Tim Kovats, aia, LEED AP	10/10/2022	My name is Tim Kovats, I am a local architect and twenty-plus year resident of Denver. I am writing in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to.</li> </ul> Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,timothy kovats, aia / leed ap / project architect

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Eric Lazzari	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Eric Lazzari 1144 S Monroe St Denver CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Greg Ryan	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Greg Ryan 1028 Tamarac St. Denver, CO 80230
Planning Board Email	Jason Kleinhelter	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely,Jason Kleinhelter 2615 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Brooke Hickerson	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely, Brooke Hickerson 2645 E 2nd Avenue, Suite 200 Denver, CO, 80206
Planning Board Email	Alyssa Bryant	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing.It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood.Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Alyssa Bryant Aurora, CO 80014
Planning Board Email	Allen Aaron Lampert	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. While I'm not currently a Denver resident, I lived in Denver for 10 years between 1998 and 2008 and do a lot of business in the city and county in the commercial real estate arena. Sincerely, Allen Aaron Lampert 16155 W. Bayaud Drive Golden, CO 80401

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Mark S. Marshall	10/10/2022	As a Park Hill resident, I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood needs more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Mark S. Marshall 2572 Elms Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Joe DelZotto	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). As the owner of over 300 units to the northwest corner of the golf course, the community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. 100 acres of park and open space, the opportunity to add a significant amount of permanently affordable housing, better access to public transportation, and the potential to address the neighborhood's lack of a grocery store are all reasons to approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Joe DelZotto 155 S Madison St #326, Denver, CO, 80209
Planning Board Email	Peter Eklund	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Peter Eklund 5410 E 6th Avenue Parkway Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Evan Smith-Acuna	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Evan Smith-Acuna 1870 Vine St #103 Denver, CO 80206
Planning Board Email	Kevin Cosgrove	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Kevin Cosgrove
Planning Board Email	Brian Hommertzhaim	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following: •Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site •A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood •Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians •Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Brian Hommertzhaim 2053 Krameria St. Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Rob Thomas	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Rob Thomas 20377 e 49th ave denver, CO 80249

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Glenn P Greene	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. Sincerely, Glenn P Greene 8080 E Dartmouth Ave #38Denver, CO80231
Planning Board Email	Mark Howard	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)! I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Mark Howard 4624 Raleigh Street Denver, CO 80212
Planning Board Email	Will Wagenlander	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased more than 45% in twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. I want a City where all can afford to live, including my children when it's time for them to find their own home. We need housing for everyone. Not a passive park space that only serves a select few. Why can't we have both needed housing and needed parks at Park Hill Golf Course? This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. It's critical that the Planning Board recognizes how helpful the public process has been. Two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely Will Wagenlander 10857 East 26th Ave. Denver, CO 80238
Planning Board Email	Christopher Levy	10/11/2022	I am asking that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After a months-long public process, the community has made clear that there is no longer a need for a golf course at this location and wants something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community made clear that this is not a choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. Denver has changed and so have the needs of its residents. The development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. As a resident of Park Hill, this is the type of activation that makes me excited to be a young person living on this side of the city. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course, and as someone who frequently enjoys the newly renovated City Park course just down the street, I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park, new housing, and the opportunity for activation. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Christopher Levy 2315 Elm Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Cameron Greene	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has brought us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and the community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is an excellent demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Cameron Greene 2100 Welton st #1016 Denver, CO 80205
Planning Board Email	Matt Wagner	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Matt Wagner 2936 Emporia Street Denver 80238

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Rhoda Pilmer	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Rhoda Pilmer 2283 Locust Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Matt Brady	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of the community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on the community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to the community to live, work, and play. Upholding the commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that the community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Matt Brady 1560 W Nevada Pl Denver, CO 80223
Planning Board Email	Sanai Fennell	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Sanai Fennell 3464 E. 31st Ave. Denver, CO 80205 Owner of 3581 Olive St. Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Rachel Feinberg	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Rachel Feinber 2690 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Dilpreet Jammu	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Dilpreet Jammu 12762 Ironstone Way #303 Parker CO 80134
Planning Board Email	Jamira T. Jones	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years trying to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Jamira T Jones 1119 Detroit St Denver CO 80206

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022**

Planning Board Email	Stephen Fagan	10/11/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Stephen Fagan 3728 Jason st Denver, CO 80211
Planning Board Email	Jice Johnson	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Jice Johnson 1031 33rd St., Denver, CO 80205
Planning Board Email	Jackie Curry	10/12/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Jackie Curry 755 South Dexter St Apt 125 Denver, CO 80246
Planning Board Email	Darren Boyd	10/12/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Darren Boyd 3319 Columbine St Denver, CO 80205
Email to Planning Board	Rachel Feinberg	10/15/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely, Rachel Feinberg 2690 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207
Email to Planning Board	Catherine Compitello	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Thank you for considering this important perspective. Catherine

<b>Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022</b>			
Email to Planning Board	Greg Holm	10/17/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. The most successful and popular parks in the City of Denver – City Park, Crestmoor Park, Cheesman Park, Washington Park and others, thrive because they are surrounded on all sides by residential development that has direct access to the parks. Parks need people with easy access and residential development directly adjacent to parks is what makes parks thrive. This project's residential units will provide that missing element to the Park Hill Golf Club site. In contrast, Park Hill Golf Club is bounded on the: •West by Colorado Blvd., a six lane arterial street that is a major barrier to potential users on the west side of Colorado Blvd., •East by older industrial buildings on 75% of the frontage and by existing single family homes on 25%•North by Smith Road, another arterial street, as well as by the Union Pacific Railroad. North of Smith Road and the UP tracks are again older industrial buildings and there is multi-family development on about 30% of the frontage on the S. side of Smith Road. •South by existing single family development. The applicant's proposal will provide the additional residential density needed so that the 100 acres of parks the applicant proposes can thrive like the other great parks in Denver. In addition, the applicant will be funding the construction of the parks and the residential development they propose will generate substantial property tax revenue to make the City of Denver more fiscally sustainable and will provide additional funding for schools in the immediate vicinity of the project. The opponents claim to be in support of park uses, however the site plans on the Yes for Parks and Open Space website omit the surrounding context outlined above, which demonstrates that, without additional residential development, would likely result in a park without the users needed for the park to thrive. The opponents also offer no solutions for funding the design and construction of the park they suggest, and they are disingenuous when they suggest a park when the conservation easement they insist be preserved only permits an 18 hole golf course. While one can only guess at their motivations, their mention of the group's support of single family only zoning suggests that they support only the most expensive housing type, which historically has been used as a tool to exclude people with lower incomes, which includes many people in the BIPOC community. The opposition offers only that, opposition, and no positive vision of how this site can be utilized to address Denver's housing crisis. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Greg Holm 1325 S. Downing St. Denver, CO 80210
Email to Planning Board	Sarah McGregor	10/15/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Sarah McGregor 2886 Emporia Denver 80238
Email to Planning Board	Shawn Lindabury	10/16/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following: •Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site •A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood •Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians •Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Shawn Lindabury 3635 Akron St Denver, CO 80238
Email to Planning Board	Michael Niyompong	10/16/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community, and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors and open up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Michael Niyompong 2545 S. Sherman St. Denver, CO 80210
Email to Planners	Rodger Hara	10/18/2022	I am a Denver resident and have been involved in affordable housing finance and development for 50 years. I have worked for HUD at the local and national levels, for CHFA, DHA and a variety of private sector clients during that time. Since 2008, I have been an independent consultant for developers, housing authorities, HUD, CHFA, DOH, etc. This is to express my support for the proposed work at Park Hill by Westside, as I think it is an appropriate and necessary use. I have no relationship with Westside or anyone connected with the project and am expressing my support as a resident of Denver and advocate for good land use. Best, Rodger Hara 4255 S. Olive St., Unit 13 Denver 80237
Email to Planning Board	Bill James	10/18/2022	Some of you know me as a former Director at RTD and a long-time commercial and residential real estate appraiser with specialties in transportation-oriented development and affordable housing. I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). I welcome the gift from the YIMBY group of some of the language in this memo. Many years ago I advanced my feeble ability as a golfer by frequently playing at Park Hill Golf Course. More recently I appraised the property and watched it grow to serve the storm-water detention needs of the surrounding area. So I am very familiar with this asset of the city and want to ensure it will serve the city well in the future. With that background, I have watched closely the evolving controversy about redevelopment of the golf course land. After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – the community needs both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis. The City and RTD have invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure which with a station nearby can serve the community at Park Hill. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park, much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. As a student of land use, I think the former golf course can well serve all of those needs. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have new housing and a new park and retain to serve the new and existing housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Bill William M. James MAI CCIM MBA

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 12/1/2022

Email	Ruth and Stephen Rohs	10/19/2022	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me. •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy          •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping          •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity          •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)</p> <p>I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ruth and Stephen Rohs 4059 S Niagara Way Denver, CO 80237</p>
Email	Carol Friesen	10/19/2022	<p>I am writing in support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). I have enjoyed using the Park Hill golf course in the past, but I believe that this is a far better use of the land. Given the opportunity to create much-needed affordable housing, and given its proximity to major transit corridors, the RTD A Line and the proposed Bus Rapid Transit line on Colorado Blvd, it would be a sorry waste to use the land for any other purpose. I have seen a presentation of the plan and am quite impressed by how thoroughly the planners have taken into account important considerations like helping to fill schools in the surrounding area, creating a community retail hub including a neighborhood grocery store, and making businesses truly accessible for bikes and pedestrians. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. My family and I moved to the Central Park infill development in its early days, back in 2004. It was supposed to be a pedestrian and transit oriented development, but because I became a non-driver due to disability, we had to move to where transit was truly accessible. This development is infinitely better planned to accommodate and even encourage non-driving, as the park is not surrounded by busy streets. With climate change bearing down on us, this is truly the direction that Denver needs to go as a city. Sincerely, Carol Friesen 25 Downing Street Apartment 2-405 Denver, CO 80218</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Email	Georgia Garnsey	1/19/2022	My question is: Why was the voice of Save Open Space Denver (SOS) excluded from the Community Steering Committee? SOS representative, Sandy Robnett committed dozens of hours of her time to the Community Steering Committee and was told she could not name a replacement when all other members who made that request were allowed to do so.
Email	KC McFerson	1/19/2022	You run a good meeting. I wanted to send a quick note that I'm very excited about your process and am hoping this project will be a case study for a number of strong approaches for our state's communities. I'm sure you get a number of comments on a wide spectrum so I wanted to make sure you heard some strong support for how well you presented the information and the care that you're putting into this process. I'm deeply grateful for your dedication and your very apparent care for the sentiments and priorities of your residents (combined with just solid land use planning, of course).
Email	Elaine Granata	1/20/2022	I've been an occasional observer of the steering committee meetings for the Park Hill Golf Course and am distressed by the rancor and polarization, as I am sure you are, too. As a trained facilitator I don't see a way forward that has integrity and transparency. I wish you luck. I'm writing to ask a question that puzzles me, more so now after the vote in November for 301. Since that vote will result in another vote this coming election in which the fate of the conservation easement will be determined, why is your department taking staff time, resources and community good/ill will with a visioning process that may likely be moot after the election this coming November? I wonder, if I were a member of the steering committee, how I could take the task seriously knowing that it might be for naught. Is it good practice to raise expectations of the community then have them dashed by the vote in November? It seems to me that is a recipe for creating cynicism for public involvement processes. Also, per the agreement between Westside and the City, I understand that Westside is obliged to return the land to the operation of a golf course, presumably this summer, when the 3 year exemption is up. How does this factor in your decision to continue with the plan process? I'd appreciate a response to these questions. Thank you for your consideration.
Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	Thanks for accepting my questions. I am a Park Hill Resident and a business owner in north Park Hill and have a few questions: 1. The issue of the easement is never mentioned in this discussion. Based on the massive increase in land value in Denver, I estimate the easement to be worth well over \$100,000,000. Is there any plan to make the citizens of Denver whole by requiring the developer to pay this amount? The city paid around \$2 million in 1997 and should be rewarded for this investment. For example Apple stock was worth .16 around this time, it's \$170 today. 2. The fact that the committee may be suggesting development on this land implies that the easement must be removed. Has the committee been instructed not to examine the financial aspects of removing the easement? Do they have the ability to make a recommendation under the condition the developer reimburses the citizens? Or are they prohibited from doing so? Can the committee examine how much affordable housing could be built with \$100,000,000? 3. Has the committee examined the concept of putting the easement out to bid to other parties to maximize the return on investment to the citizens of Denver? 3. Have all members signed a declaration of interest or a "non-conflict" of interest statement where the member declares that there's no financial/personal interest or belief that could affect their objectivity regarding their recommendation? If not, are you aware of any potential conflicts where a member would directly benefit from funds tied to the developer, or to future payments from the developer if development moves forward? 4. Why do the recommendation not include numbers? It feel like members will make a mixed use recommendation no matter what they discover. Have they been instructed not give specifics such as percentage of land for open space, percentage of land for housing, percentage of supermarket, percentage of land for spots activity, etc.? It seems like the members should add these types of numbers to their recommendations, otherwise it seems like they are being used to simply make a development recommendation. Have members been instructed not to make specific percentages? If not, can they do so? 5. Is the committee aware that the developer has spent in excess of \$500,000 on the 301 and 302 campaign to invalidate the conservation easement? How has the city wide vote changed the committee's opinion? 6. Is the committee aware of the Park Hill citizens of Denver vote, where Park Hill citizens both North and South heavily support Open Space? Thanks for taking the time to respond to my questions
Online Comment Form	Dorothy Spears	1/17/2022	I am ready for a grocery store and gas station and more shopping centers there I have to travel several miles to a store or gas station
Online Comment Form	Lynn Milton	1/12/2022	Thank you for posting in Nextdoor. Excellent and very well written and laid out.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	<p>Dear Committee members,            Thanks for accepting my questions. I am a Park Hill Resident and a business owner in north Park Hill and have a few questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issue of the easement is never mentioned in this discussion. Based on the massive increase in land value in Denver, I estimate the easement to be worth well over \$100,000,000. Is there any plan to make the citizens of Denver whole by requiring the developer to pay this amount? The city paid around \$2 million in 1997 and should be rewarded for this investment. For example Apple stock was worth .16 around this time, it's \$170 today.</li> <li>2. The fact that the committee may be suggesting development on this land implies that the easement must be removed. Has the committee been instructed not to examine the financial aspects of removing the easement? Do they have the ability to make a recommendation under the condition the developer reimburses the citizens? Or are they prohibited from doing so? Can the committee examine how much affordable housing could be built with \$100,000,000?</li> <li>3. Has the committee examined the concept of putting the easement out to bid to other parties to maximize the return on investment to the citizens of Denver?</li> <li>3. Have all members signed a declaration of interest or a "non-conflict" of interest statement where the member declares that there's no financial/personal interest or belief that could affect their objectivity regarding their recommendation? If not, are you aware of any potential conflicts where a member would directly benefit from funds tied to the developer, or to future payments from the developer if development moves forward?</li> <li>4. Why do the recommendation not include numbers? It feel like members will make a mixed use recommendation no matter what they discover. Have they been instructed not give specifics such as percentage of land for open space, percentage of land for housing, percentage of supermarket, percentage of land for spots activity, etc.? It seems like the members should add these types of numbers to their recommendations, otherwise it seems like they are being used to simply make a development recommendation. Have members been instructed not to make specific percentages? If not, can they do so?</li> <li>5. Is the committee aware that the developer has spent in excess of \$500,000 on the 301 and 302 campaign to invalidate the conservation easement? How has the city wide vote changed the committee's opinion?</li> <li>6. Is the committee aware of the Park Hill citizens of Denver vote, where Park Hill citizens both North and South heavily support Open Space?</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for taking the time to respond to my questions.            Regards,            Basil</p>
Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	<p>I have submitted a series of question and never received a confirmation email. Does this system work? How do I know that you are receiving the questions?</p>
Online Comment Form	Noni horwitz	2/4/2022	<p>The election was abundantly clear that the community and overall city recognize that Denver needs open space. This city per capita has less green space than most others. SOS requires to be at the table and represent what was clearly the will of the people to acknowledge that legally an easement exists and cannot just be ignored.</p>
Online Comment Form	Amy Harris	2/8/2022	<p>Why is the small area planning process only contemplating the Park Hill Golf Course land and not taking into consideration the neighborhoods surrounding the land? When contemplating development, it is crucial to consider the development that is already planned and underway, especially with the impact this planned development will have on the already strained park and open space resources in the area, very poor air quality, and traffic.</p>
Online Comment Form	Frederick Klann	3/1/2022	<p>The City should buy the space for a park. Denver has fallen woefully behind in green spaces per capita. Pocket parks are overcrowded. I am shocked that the 301 group was excluded from the planning process after the city voted overwhelmingly in favor of the initiative. Denver is being ruined by overdevelopment. Planning that discriminates against the popular majority is non transparent and useless.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Idelle Fisher	3/4/2022	<p>The Park Hill Golf Course should remain open space as the city voted for. I am not sure why development is still being discussed when we clearly voted that we want it to remain open space.</p> <p>Denver is quickly turning into a concrete jungle, and we need to preserve any of the last remaining open spaces for residents to use and enjoy. Open spaces also help cool the city and trees and plants help remove the toxic air pollution that we are burdened with. I'd love to see if some community garden space was added, and native plant/natural areas so that we can all thrive here, humans and wildlife included. Please don't build on one of the last large swaths of open space Denver has, once it's built on it's gone forever.</p>
Online Comment Form	Kevin Marchman	3/23/2022	<p>We no longer have housing crisis of affordability quickly moving towards a emergency. Many Denverites can't afford winter coats if they are paying 50% of take home pay for housing. We don't need another large park if people can't house themselves.</p>
Online Comment Form	Ben Waldman	3/23/2022	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I have a couple of comments regarding the planning process of the Park Hill Golf Course:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Site planning is premature as we haven't developed any mechanisms to enforce the prevailing vision of all housing being affordable and commercial development being local and primarily owned by people of color. I support these array of goals but am hesitant to support any planning that doesn't start with setting up the proper mechanism to achieve and enforce the prevailing vision.</li> <li>2) The conversation easement and the ballot initiative still hang over this parcel. Again, it is premature to be going through a site planning process when these large barriers hang over the park. We are all spending time and the city money in a process that might end up being voted down by the city as a whole or City Council.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for taking the time to review my comments.</p> <p>All the best, Ben</p>
Online Comment Form	MARIA FLORA	3/24/2022	<p>Denver needs the open space on the Park Hill Golf Course now, more than ever. The City should be protecting the perpetual open space conservation easement which the citizens of Denver purchased with bond money. The planning process led by Community Planning and Development is being conducted without regard to development plans in the works surrounding the land, as if it exists in a vacuum or bubble - there has been no discussion of the dense development that will occur surrounding the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station, increased traffic, heat island effect and other environmental impacts of development, and Denver's growing park deficit.</p> <p>At the March 23 community meeting, many residents were of the opinion that none of the maps were acceptable (traffic, noise, pollution, loss of greenspace, worsening the heat island effect, obstructed views, nearby high density development coming across the street and near the train station, oh, yeah, the small matter of the taxpayer-funded conservation easement!</p> <p>I have attended ALL the CPD meetings on the Park Hill Golf Course land, and it is clear that it is a developer-driven planning process with a predetermined outcome of development rather than preservation of open space. This started with the City Attorney and the planners parroting the big lie that the conservation easement restricts the use of the land to a golf course. It has carried forward with a "push" survey and a visioning document that does not reflect the position of the steering committee. Now the City-drafted visioning statement is used by CPD to promote three development plans for the land, none of which include the open space vision that was prevalent on the steering committee. Open space advocates have been systematically excluded from the steering committee, while Westside and City cronies on the committee push for a small park and lots of development to line Westside's pocket.</p> <p>We must insist that the City preserve the conservation easement and purchase the land for parks, community gardening, and natural open space. Otherwise, Westside is in the driver's seat and we lost our precious open space.</p>
Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	3/24/2022	<p>Is the going to be a privately-owned park? Or will it become a city-owned park?</p> <p>The city could buy the entire 155 acres today for \$20 million or less, thanks to the conservation easement. But if taxpayers have to pay market rate for only part of the property to become a city-owned park, the cost without the conservation easement would skyrocket (\$50 million?).</p> <p>The strongest advocates for tearing up the conservation easement and gifting the developer with a tax-free increase in property values are term limited, and will be out of office next year. Why should they be allowed to determine the future of this property by ignoring 63% of Denver voters that want to keep the conservation easement's protections, or 97% of neighborhood residents that told the city they do not want to sacrifice this green space and replace it with luxury apartments and expensive townhomes?</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Ryan Hyatt	3/25/2022	Just want to say we support Plan 3, followed by Plan 2. We do not support plan 1.
Online Comment Form	Roger Harvey	3/25/2022	Zero of the concepts in framework plan meet the prevailing vision and what the voters voted for in 301. A significantly sized park #1 desire. Your definition of what is a significantly sized park is not arbitrarily based on other parks and neighborhoods, the voters based it on the existing acreage. A significant sized park utilizes a significant amount of the acreage. 60% min. or more. 2 Concepts are below 50% for Parkland. 85 acres - highest amount is 54% Will vote against it as will many others. Create three new concepts of 95 acres and more of Parkland. Delete all 3 shown.
Online Comment Form	John Brink	3/25/2022	I am unalterably opposed all three of the development concepts presented at the recent community meeting. The Golf Course property should be kept as recreational open space for all people in the metro area to enjoy. The way the city of Denver government has worked hand in glove with the developer to undo the easement on the property and undermine the vote of the people is a travesty and a waste of taxpayer money. Any elected official who supports this corrupt process deserves to be punished at the ballot box. Please include the following letter to the editor of the Denver Post in the administrative record for your planning process: The letter writer (Whose open space?, October 10, 2021.) and Westside Investment Partners, the developer behind ballot measure 302, want to remove protection of the former Park Hill Golf Course to make way for "mixed use" development, with some as-yet-undefined open space within it. They say their plans were conceived in response to input from the local community and that voices of the rest of Denver's citizens should not be heeded. On the contrary, the fate of the former golf course is a matter of great interest to all citizens of Denver. First, Denver taxpayers paid for the easement protecting it back in 1997. Neither the Mayor nor City Council should be able to give it away or trade it for non-open space development without our consent. Second, if protected, the site can be a city-wide asset on par with Denver's other major parks and serve as an oasis of open space in a quadrant of the city where parkland is sparse and recreation facilities have suffered years of neglect.
Online Comment Form	John Brink	3/25/2022	Westside and its allies campaign on behalf of measure 302 under the guise of protecting "local choice and local voices." This followed a carefully crafted, narrowly focused community involvement process that gave Westside the answers it wanted regarding the site's future. Another voice that was no doubt heard was that of the "independent expenditure" committee Andrew Klein, Westside's founder, bankrolled to the tune of \$400,000 to help re-elect Mayor Hancock in 2019, the same year Westside purchased the property. The "local voices" Westside and Denver's pliant elected officials don't want to hear include the board of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., which overwhelmingly voted last month to endorse measure 301 and reject measure 302. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend the city purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space. Westside knew about the 1997 easement when it paid \$3.55 per square foot for the land in 2019. That's about one percent of the price other developers are spending on developable property in Denver these days. No one should think for a moment that Denver "owes" Westside a penny either for the gamble it took when it bought the property intending to redevelop it or for the money it is spending to ensure that only the voices of those who support its development aspirations are heeded. The answer to the question "Whose open space?" is unequivocal; it's ours and measure 302 should be defeated. Also, please note that measure 302 was resoundingly defeated in November.
Online Comment Form	KC McFerson	3/25/2022	(1) I am concerned about the Mixed-Use Commercial in the NE corner of the development (SE corner of the intersection of 40th and Colorado). Will this include surface parking and effectively encourage more auto-dependent lifestyle & development in the area? I hope the answer is "no." The NE & NW corners of that intersection are a sad sight. Pls don't replicate. (2) I love that everything that'll be developed for commercial/res is mixed-use. Way to be flexible! (3) Thank you for including residential in general. We need housing and we need A LOT more density, especially so well located to transit. Well done. (4) I love seeing the development & changed use along Colorado b/c driving past open space that's hardly used is so depressing. And this will finally activate that area. (5) This is probably outside of your scope, but could Colorado be updated to have bus rapid transit? We really need to take advantage of the congestion on that ROW and dedicate 2 lanes to BRT. Car travel needs to be intentionally deprioritized for us to make progress on the transit that we need to, and the coming electrification of autos is only going to encourage us to feel like we've made progress and so rest on the issue while the land use impacts from excessive auto use will remain. BRT! BRT! (6) Given the location & transit access, could you eliminate parking requirements for this? I know you've got your code, just throwing out some support for the idea. Just can't help myself because our travel lanes in the neighborhood are already massive, hate to add to the expanse. (7) Well done on your engagement process. The times I've been out of the loop on this project have 100% been my lack of paying attention.
Online Comment Form	Jacquelyn Dekker	3/25/2022	First of all, I think it is an absolute shame that you are doing away with the golf course. It was the only affordable club in Denver city proper, and now that's gone. Now, the only clubs available in Denver city are exorbitant country clubs that only the very wealthy (and connected) have access to. I am disappointed that we would take away an accessible recreation opportunity, leaving access only to the elite. Denver residents will either have to move to be closer to more affordable golf clubs, or plan on lengthy commutes. Again, shame on you. Shame on you further for taking our green spaces and developing them. We do not need more commercial use. We need more residential spaces, but why not pave a parking lot instead of a green space? Shame on you. The only reasonable option is #2, City Grid. Both option #1 and #3 take up too much of the green space for development. Option 3 would turn the corner of 35th into an ugly, jammed, busy mess, much like the corner of 38th is now. Option 1 would just make the intersection at 38th and Colorado untenable. Do you even look at traffic flow when making these "plans"? Option 2 would at least allow for a nice entrance into the green space that doesn't jam up our intersections. If you must choose between these, for the sake of local residents, PLEASE select Option 2.
Online Comment Form	Deirdre	3/25/2022	The preservation of established green space in the form of a park or golf should stay intact. The developers should look for land that is not green. This is not what is preferred for our neighborhood. This neighborhood is already boxed in by roadways, traffic, concrete, and pollution. The green space at the Park Hill Golf Course offers a much-needed refuge for the community. Is it correct that Denver voters voted to preserve that open space?

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Kris Gisoni	3/25/2022	I want to see the entire former golf course made into a public park. I do not want to see any housing or business development in this open space. Northeast Park Hill needs a public park not more housing or business development.
Online Comment Form	Getabecha Mekonnen	3/25/2022	A Plan with VISION and Agreed Upon GOALS should guide the development. We as a community should learn from the Central Park ( former Stapleton) Green Book plan that helped carry the VISION and GOALS. The VOTE by the citizens of Denver should be informed by the a clear plan and this process that has started should work for such outcome. The Land Use Plan Town Meeting workshops were good start, and should continue to be the foundation that builds on the community input and stakeholders participation going forward. I suppose the "executive committee" will take on this mantle.
Online Comment Form	Angelina	3/25/2022	The option that commits the most space to affordable residential is the best option. Also, commercial space that includes a grocery store is second priority for me as a community member.
Email	KC McFerson	3/25/2022	Hi Courtney,  Thank you for managing such a large and involved engagement process. I think you & the city are doing a very nice job trying to get people involved and taking comments to heart, while keeping within the bounds of best planning practices. Well done!  Thanks,  KC
Online Comment Form	SujataC	3/26/2022	Love the layout of parkway concept most . Its evenly distributed maintaining a work life balance .
Online Comment Form	Ashley Murphy	3/26/2022	I am putting all my questions in one response, please respond to all questions.  1) I am not sure how come we are planning for building on an area that has a conservation easement on it and the people of the city voted to be able to weigh in on. Can you help me understand this?  2) How come the city is paying for this rather than the developers?  3) Are all the costs going to be paid for by the developers since the people of Denver have clearly spoken that they do not want development? (Except for the push poll done by the city with no option to have all open space)  4) Please help me understand the density impacts this will have on traffic, pollution, heat island effect, and other environmental concerns. It seems the environmental impact is being swept under the rug.  5) The mending roots forest is planted in an area that is planned for development in one of the renderings. How come the developers can move this with their "non-profit" when really it is just a tree farm that they got to have tax ride offs for? If it is a forest, how come they are not keeping it?
Online Comment Form	Taylor Boone	3/26/2022	I definitely prefer the city grid option, and do not like the Parkway option. North Denver deserves a premier park along the lines of City Park or Washington Park. While my overall preference would be to turn the entire area into such a park, I believe of the three frameworks presented the city grid option comes the closest to creating a truly premier park option for North Park Hill and the Clayton neighborhoods.
Online Comment Form	Thomas E. Roberts	3/27/2022	The land should be kept as open space & public park. Let others build businesses in the area on their own dime. Acquire the fee in the land with eminent domain and pay the owners \$1. That is all the compensation they are due. Their purchase was speculative. They had no reasonable expectation of being able to develop it. They may have had promises (winks and nods) by city officials but those are not enforceable. The title is, and remains, subject to an easement. I know whereof I speak. I have written books on the topic of eminent domain. One dollar is all that is due. Contact me and I will provide you with citations of authority.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Reven Marie Swanson	3/28/2022	Proposal 2 is the most desirable because it doesn't put roadways through open space. It centralizes structures and commercial use to the perimeters.
Online Comment Form	Andy	3/28/2022	The commercial section doesn't look big enough for a main grocery store. There are no close grocery stores to this location.
Online Comment Form	Laurel Clark	3/28/2022	Option 02 is the best of the options provided - but ONLY because it preserves more open space and park space than the other options. That said, the ENTIRE Park Hill golf course should remain as open/park space - AS DENVER VOTERS CLEARLY WANT. Where was THAT option? City leadership should do what the voters want and not what large developers and their lobbyists tell them to do. Large already-developed commercial areas exist along the Colorado Blvd corridor that are better targets for redevelopment than the open space in the old Park Hill golf course. Open space is a scarcity in Denver compared to other cities - especially in neighborhoods of color. Denver should look first to repurpose existing structures. If new development is needed - then it should be located where there are pre-existing structures. Open space needs to left open. Period.
Online Comment Form	Florine Nath	3/28/2022	I was in the camp of leaving the golf course as a golf course - in order to preserve as many trees and green space as possible, and also preserve the heritage of the course. That said, if development is now inevitable, it only makes sense to make the retail portion accessible to the most number of people as possible. That means the major retail needs to be at the 40th street intersection so it is most accessible by light rail.
Online Comment Form	Elaine Granata	3/28/2022	As Denver's population increases the ratio of people to parks is decreasing. Once land is paved over, it is not likely to be "un paved" when we discover we need more open space/permeable land to accommodate the needs of a growing population for recreation and heat island mitigation. There is lots of heat being generated from the expansion of I-70-- green space is needed to counteract this. All 155 acres should remain in open space/park land.
Online Comment Form	Christina	3/29/2022	This should be undeveloped, open park space for everyone to enjoy. No one should not be profiting from this open space. Denver has a great parks system and we could use another on this side of town. If you insist on developing the land (really it should just be open space), please create opportunities for small and/or minority businesses, and not corporations. And if you insist on developing the land, please create realistic affordable housing solutions for Park Hill residents. Please invest in this community, please give community members a chance for survival and stop gentrifying Denver.
Online Comment Form	J>Breese	3/30/2022	I cannot understand why this planning process does not have an option for preserving the entire area as open space, in violation of City residents' wishes. Every option requires large portions of the land to be filled with housing and commercial uses. This is not giving City voters the choice they wanted. How did this happen. I thought we voted against these types of plans.

Online Comment Form	Tom Fahres	3/31/2022	None of these concepts are viable as they do not address the perpetual conservation easement's impact.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	3/31/2022	I am confused and do not support this whole process. The former Park Hill Golf Course land is under a perpetual conservation easement. The use for this land was decided when the leaders and taxpayers of Denver put this conservation easement in place. It was to prevent the very thing that you are trying to do, develop this land. The citizens of Park Hill were promised this open space and it is an outrage that this process has even been allowed to take place. Furthermore, initiative 301 passed by a 3:1 margin to preserve this open space and protect it with a vote. I am a resident of Northeast Park Hill and will fight to keep this last piece of open space for future generations. I welcome you to reach out to me for further discussion.
Online Comment Form	Margie and Larry Feinberg	3/31/2022	Denver voters sent a strong message about preserving open space and denying developers free reign in Denver. The Mayor and others are ignoring this. Preserving open space for generations to come is imperative. We are very discouraged about the process going forward as it is now.
Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	3/31/2022	It seems to me that the "prevailing vision" is the one expressed by voters to keep the space green. You seem determined to plow ahead despite that vote. He developer's contributions to the Mayor's campaign seem to be paying off.
Online Comment Form	Maria Tweed	3/31/2022	<p>Feel your next page questions are discriminating by each category you are asking</p> <p>City of Denver brought this up at the last meeting why are we doing all this planning (taxpayer monies?) when ballot 301 had an overwhelming vote to a yes, you heard from your voting Denver citizens on this. City of Denver has allowed CPD to direct their own Steering Committee without any members of SOS participation for the Citizens of Denver interest and has allowed this Steering Committee to be backed with pro-development supporters (which I have noted names of these people from various media outlets)</p> <p>City of Denver has to face the issue that there is a conservation easement on the Parkhill Golf course (Denver taxpayers paid for). City of Denver are you aware that a scientific survey done by the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association which clearly reflects that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park, when CPD continues to say that the community supports development (I live 3 blocks from the site and have never seen any CPD/contract interviewers or communication left on my door regarding a survey) of the land completely ignoring the vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement and destroy our chance of creating a full-scale park for the expanding neighborhood.</p>
Online Comment Form	Maria Tweed	3/31/2022	<p>City of Denver what about our current neighbors on both sides of Colorado Boulevard from the Parkhill Golf Course that will experience major residential and commercial development that they do not want it and CPD's own survey found that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods confirmed this and what about the metro district needed to develop this land and the cost of that on future homeowners seems to be ignored. City of Denver I personally have brought this up at several meetings with no prevail that there have not been any traffic studies done as Colorado Boulevard is already at its maximum traffic capacity (just imagine, all the housing and retail contributing to the current traffic). City of Denver have not heard if there have been any studies done to show the environmental impact it will have on our neighborhood by losing greenspace, as you are aware Colorado is way behind on open space verses the population and the fact that Companies large and small located northwest of Park Hill spew all their pollution which mainly blows directly on to our community</p> <p>Last meeting had heard a lot of questions asked of the presenters and they were unable to answer</p> <p>Signed Denver Native, Maria Tweed</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Frank Sullivan	3/31/2022	Why is the City using tax payers' money for this process? It seems to me that is the owners' (of the land ) responsibility.
Online Comment Form	Alan Hsu	3/31/2022	I'm confused on why this process / committee is moving forward with any plans without addressing the Conservation Easement or the survey(s) that were done or even the vote that was had in November. These seem to be elephants in the room that CPD and the committee want to ignore. Any steps taken without discussing these issues seems to be ignoring the public and very sketchy/shady at best yet the steps seem to be taken regardless.
Online Comment Form	S Johnson	3/31/2022	As a native Denverite and longtime voter in Denver, I am vehemently opposed to any mixed use commercial or residential development of the former Park Hill Golf Course. Residents in Park Hill and surrounding neighborhoods have previously expressed their desire to maintain the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space and prevent further building and development. As the population in Denver soars and the city becomes more and more congested, preserving and protecting precious green space, such as the Park Hill Golf Course, should be one of the priorities of our city planners. Acting now is critical to ensuring a healthy and wholesome quality of life for future generations.
Online Comment Form	Joseph Demko	3/31/2022	Please do not develop the land formally known as Park Hill Golf course for any reason other than open space. Open space is one of the few things that you cannot redo in our society and it is important to preserve what little open space we have.
Online Comment Form	Douglas F Tweed	3/31/2022	I don't understand how this development is moving forward and PHGC is not being planned as open space. The voters of Denver, overwhelmingly, voted to have PHGC become open space by decidedly passing proposition 301. Who is paying for the committees that are consulting on the commercial development when that is not what Denver voters approved? Their plans seem to be missing many of the issues in this project. What about parking, water and sewage, and traffic access to the property. There should be no plan! Voters stated they want PHGC to be open space!!! Please be sure to address my questions.
Online Comment Form	nick nossaman	4/1/2022	I don't understand how you can be ignoring the voice of the people regarding the proper use of the Park Hill golf course--open space and green space--a park. If you hold the power and cave in to the developers I can only beg you to think twice about making such a mistake. Please
Online Comment Form	Judith Cohen	4/1/2022	I attended a planning meeting last week for the Park Hill Golf Course. I thought that the passage of 301 meant that any development had to be approved by the voters lifting the conservation easement. Meanwhile, the City Planning Department has hired a consultant who has created three development scenarios including commercial and residential development of the site. This seems to me to be ignoring the decision of the voters as well as wasting City money. Everyone in my breakout group favored no development over the three concepts submitted. I suggest that CPD rethinks its approach to this development.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	4/1/2022	<p>CPD continues to say that the community supports development of the land completely ignoring the vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement and destroy our chance of creating a full-scale park for the expanding neighborhood.</p> <p>CPD is ignoring the neighboring land on both sides of Colorado Boulevard that will experience major residential and commercial development.</p> <p>There has been no traffic study and attempts by committee members who have asked for one are ignored.</p> <p>There has been no environmental impact study to understand the cost of losing irreplaceable greenspace.</p> <p>Discussion about a metro district needed to develop this land, and the cost of that on future homeowners if the space is developed, is "parked" and not allowed to be discussed.</p> <p>CPD's own survey found that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods DO NOT want to trade open space for luxury apartments and townhomes.</p> <p>Denver voters sent a strong message about preserving open space and denying developers free reign in Denver. Let's make sure their voices continue to be heard.</p> <p>The City continues pretending that development is a "done deal." Please take this opportunity to ask why they are ignoring the conservation easement we paid for. Denver needs to protect our open space as other developments surround the PHGC land.</p> <p>Sacrificing our existing trees and green space is a huge mistake!</p>
Online Comment Form	Michele Swenson	4/1/2022	<p>It is unacceptable for Denver Community Planning and Development to disregard the will of the neighborhood people, reflected in the overwhelming November vote that defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement on the area that was Park Hill Golf Course, and favored maintaining the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space or park area. While ignoring the perpetual conservation easement on the former Park Hill Golf Course, CPD has also chosen to disregard the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association scientific survey demonstrating that fully 77% of the people in neighborhoods surrounding the former Park Hill Golf Course desire that it remain open space or be transitioned into a regional park. The former golf course represents a rare bit of irreplaceable greenspace that has been radically reduced in relation to development within the city of Denver. It is urgent that we preserve and protect precious remaining green spaces, instead of granting developers free reign to pave and develop them. There are other places for residential and commercial development. Denver leadership should heed the will of the people instead of putting aside the people's wishes to serve the bottom line and presumptions of developers.</p>
Online Comment Form	Janet Feder	4/1/2022	<p>It seems that CPD has already decided on the development of the Park Hill Golf Course by denying the acceptance of comments regarding the perpetual conservation easement and also disregarding the fact that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods have already stated they don't want to trade away this open space for luxury apartments and townhomes. So what, really, is this "planning process" when the community has already expressed what they want through voting, and the development is going ahead anyway?</p>
Online Comment Form	Ruth Abram	4/2/2022	<p>Please leave the golf course alone. A city needs all the open space it can save.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022

Online Comment Form	Erik Stark	4/2/2022	<p>What is CPD, this Mayor, and the City of Denver doing? This is a disgrace. I am extremely upset that the actual "will of the people", including people in Park Hill, is being ignored in this pro-development-at-all costs approach. Evidently, this Mayor and City think they can disregard actual voters, ordinance outcomes, scientifically done surveys (as opposed to contrived, developer concocted "visioning" processes and "outreach") to force what the developers want onto Denver's neighborhoods and citizens. Wrong! What is going on has finally made clear what a sock-puppet for developers this Mayor truly is. Be clear that the more this process is crammed down the citizen's throat, the more of a backlash there will be. We are tired of our city only being open for business for the money-boys and their profits, under the distorted narrative that "affordability" is what is driving the process. Nothing could be further from the truth. You don't need to destroy our last open space for affordability, shopping, grocery stores, or any of it. The entire north end of Park Hill between 38th Ave and I-70 is mostly commercial land, with numerous warehouses and small-scale commercial buildings, with vast potential for housing, apartments, condos, grocery stores, and more. The land is relatively cheap, and because of low industry, relatively unpolluted compared to the land west of Colorado Blvd. and above 38th Ave. Affordability could be built-in (20%-30% of all housing, apartments, condos, at cost) which would take an affordability mandate, which would take changing current state law, which would take leadership and vision, all of which is missing from this Mayor's character. Not to mention desire since he's opposed to anything which would trample on the profits in any major way of any developer. He's got his next cushy job to think about, after all. But the affordability propaganda being put out by the City and Westside regarding Park Hill Golf Course is spin and misdirection at its finest. There will be almost no affordability, and in relation to the very expensive homes that will dominate the landscape, affordability will be a farce. And a lie, as usual. I am calling on CPD, the Mayor, and the City of Denver, to stop lying to the public about Park Hill Golf Course. I don't think you will stop, but your methods are transparent, your motives clear in blocking all dissenting voices, and your lies obvious. You aren't fooling anyone. Time to actually support the people for a change, including providing affordable housing, grocery stores, and all the things the people in North Park Hill actually do deserve, without the big lie that you can only do it by destroying Denver's last big, and important (and protected) open space.</p>
Online Comment Form	Mike Fernandez	4/2/2022	<p>I attended a community forum was shocked that there was no consideration of preserving the entire space as parkland. What happened to that idea, which was favored by the vast majority of voters and local polls? Please let me know.</p>
Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	4/3/2022	<p>None of the three proposals has enough green/park space. I would like to see more green on the maps; housing better on middle plan. I have many concerns about the increase in traffic. Has an transportation or environmental impact study been done for the area? Has future development of commercial and retail space in the surrounding area been considered? Perhaps that would be a way to increase park space. Has the perpetual conservation easement issue been completely resolved? Is there any representation in the discussions of plans by those who are not enamored with CPD's current plans? Please don't railroad this through the planning process.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Jessica Toll	4/3/2022	<p>As a Park Hill resident I have several significant concerns with the draft. Above all else, I believe that the Denver taxpayers deserve to keep the bargain of the perpetual easement and preserve the land as open space. The citizens of Park Hill need to be heard by allowing full participation of SOS and by paying attention to the survey of the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association which states 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a park. An even higher number of the adjoining neighborhoods want it to remain open space and not to become high end condos. How exactly do you claim to be for Environmental Justice and support this plan? We had an election on this point and the Mayor and the developers lost. The people have spoken and yet the politicians refuse to listen which is disappointing and disingenuous. Even if you were to ignore the very clear views of the citizen and consider development it is ill advised and will harm Park Hill. Park Hill already has terrible highway access to the South. Have you ever tried to drive from Park Hill South on Colorado to I25? It is a nightmare. By developing the golf course, you will make it equally impossible for us to access I70 to the North. Have you done a traffic study on this? And last, I just have to say, that I am continually disgusted by the actions of Mayor Hancock and his developer cronies to pack the steering committee with developers, ignore the opinions of the neighborhood and the Denver votes and generally treat "Westside" as the client instead of the Denver citizens. We all deserve better. We deserve open space.</p>
Online Comment Form	Michael Jacobsen	4/3/2022	<p>Having lived in Denver since 1984 I have seen many changes to our beautiful open spaces. Our many parks are the jewels of this great City. With so much development going on now it is difficult to see the Park Hill Golf Course converted into developers plans for the destruction of beautiful open space and turned into a large scale housing development of parking lots and large scale housing projects; contrary to the easements in effect disallowing the development beyond open space and a golf course. I feel the benefits to the environment, City and neighborhoods surrounding the present Park Hill Golf Course are better served as the open space that it is at this time.</p> <p>Neighbors have voted in favor of this position. Will the City deny the will of good intentioned voters?</p> <p>Years ago, citizen efforts saved the City Park Pavilion from becoming City office spaces. The pavilion truly is a crown jewel in our park system for everyone to enjoy. These same like minded voters have good intentions for the preservation of the Park Hill Golf Course; not willing to allow developers to profit from the destruction of this precious open space. Save our Open Spaces!</p>
Online Comment Form	Kristen Andersen	4/3/2022	<p>I would have really loved to see a plan included that would preserve the entire golf course as a park! It would be really wonderful to have such a big green space in this part of the city, and would really help with the heat island effect and the pollution we already experience up here in NE Park Hill. The views across the golf course to the mountains from the streets south and east of the golf course are part of what makes me feel connected to the mountains and nature beyond the city living here.</p> <p>It would be great to see the needs in our community for more affordable housing, a local grocery, and small businesses be met on already developed land and the vacant lots scattered around the commercial and industrial areas nearby.</p> <p>Of the 3 limited plans offered, none of them seem to offer a view across the park to the mountains from the south and east, which is part of what is so nice in this area now. I like the green park buffer around existing neighborhoods of the 3rd plan, but not the way it breaks up the park space with development in the center.</p> <p>In the first plan, I like that it says it tries to preserve high value trees, but it looks from the plan like all the large trees along Colorado Boulevard and many of them along 35th are now in areas marked for development. I'd prefer to have those large trees also protected.</p> <p>It is nice in the first 2 plans to have any commercial development concentrated in the northwest or southwest corner of this area, so that it would be nearest the existing concentrations of housing. If the central part of the this space along Colorado Boulevard was left open, that could preserve our neighborhood views of and connection to the mountains.</p> <p>In short, protecting as much of the land as natural open space, with mature tree cover and mountains views, is really important in mitigating the heat island effect and pollution we already live with in this part of Denver, as well as our being otherwise surrounded by industrial and commercial development. Please consider making the entire area a great park and focusing development on other lots in the area that are not currently natural open space. We deserve as amazing a park as the people who live near City Park and Wash Park have, and it would be a really beautiful entrance to Denver off of I-70. Thank you.</p>
Email	Michele Swenson	4/6/2022	<p>It is unacceptable for Denver Community Planning and Development to disregard the will of the neighborhood people, reflected in the overwhelming November vote that defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement on the area that was Park Hill Golf Course, and favored maintaining the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space or park area. While ignoring the perpetual conservation easement on the former Park Hill Golf Course, CPD has also chosen to disregard the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association scientific survey demonstrating that fully 77% of the people in neighborhoods surrounding the former Park Hill Golf Course desire that it remain open space or be transitioned into a regional park. The former golf course represents a rare bit of irreplaceable greenspace that has been radically reduced in relation to development within the city of Denver. It is urgent that we preserve and protect precious remaining green spaces, instead of granting developers free reign to pave and develop them. There are other places for residential and commercial development. Denver leadership should heed the will of the people instead of putting aside the people's wishes to serve the bottom line and presumptions of developers.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022

Email	Carly Erickson	4/6/2022	My husband and I live next to the Park Hill Golf Course and we've been attending the meetings of the visioning process for the last few years. We were able to attend the latest meeting with our newest addition and we took a photo to commemorate the baby's first civic meeting! (We're the second photo from the left.) I know the city gets a lot of flack for the visioning process from certain groups but we are thrilled to be able to participate and hope to pass on the value of civic participation to our little one. Thanks to you and your team for giving us the opportunity to show him the importance of loving where you live and participating in the process. (Also, I'm sorry we couldn't get a better picture of you there but it already took us several tries to get one where his eyes were open/our eyes were open/he wasn't crying.)
Email	Alan Hsu	4/6/2022	Hi Courtney,  I appreciate your response and explanation! I do remember those surveys coming out so I guess that's where my confusion was. To check my understanding regarding the November election results, the ultimate decision comes down to a vote with the City Council and Denver voters? So the planning process is essentially to set something up for that vote? In other words, the vote isn't "do we develop or not" but more like "do we approve of this plan or not?"  Thank you, Alan
Email	Dan Danbom	4/6/2022	I guess I'm confused. The survey showed people wanted development, the vote on 301 essentially said they didn't -- including votes from people around the PHGC. Does the survey result trump the vote? Do meetings trump the vote? And if the visioning process is continuing, isn't it doing so in the hope the conservation easement will be lifted? Why does this feel like the developer is running the process? Thank you. Dan Danbom
Online Comment Form	Kara Walsh	4/4/2022	Does the Greenway Concept allow for more housing? It appears to but I can't quite tell.
Online Comment Form	james w. rogers,DDS	4/4/2022	the city owns an easement which states the city park golf course will not be used for development....i hope that easement will be honored.....
Online Comment Form	Sandra Robnett	4/4/2022	This land, which is protected by an easement,should not be developed at all. It is despicable how eagerly this organization is to help a developer and completely ignore the desires of Denver voters.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	4/4/2022	<p>I am submitting these comments regarding CPD’s ongoing planning process for the Park Hill Golf Course [PHGC] land that is protected from development by its conservation easement. Purchased by Denver taxpayers in 1997 for \$2 million, the PHGC conservation easement preserves this invaluable land in perpetuity for open space and recreational conservation purposes.</p> <p>Despite the conservation easement, the Hancock Administration and Westside Investment Partners are moving forward with their plans to develop the PHGC land open space using a seriously flawed planning process directed by CPD and paid for by Denver taxpayers.</p> <p>The current CPD strategy includes using its hand-picked, heavily pro-development Steering Committee to continue the flawed 2021 “Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process” under the new name “Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan Process” while denying any Steering Committee discussion of either the conservation easement or maintaining the full 155 acres of open space. CPD is planning at least six more Steering Committee meetings through September designed to develop a mixed use commercial and residential development plan for submission to the Planning Board and eventually City Council.</p> <p>The following are my more specific and detailed comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City documents establish that CPD considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its “client” in the planning process. CPD and Westside have been collaborating on developing the land since soon after Westside purchased the land in 2019.</li> <li>• In early 2022, CPD refused to allow Save Open Space Denver to appoint a replacement for its designated Steering Committee member who needed to withdraw. CPD had previously allowed a registered neighborhood organization to appoint a replacement. CPD advised Save Open Space Denver that its continued participation “would result in further discord within the community and would not be a valuable use of the committee’s or your organization’s time.”</li> <li>• CPD refuses to allow any discussion of the conservation easement that protects the land from development in perpetuity.</li> <li>• Under the Colorado conservation easement statute, the conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become “impossible” to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the easement. CPD refuses to explain how the City intends to comply with the statute.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	4/4/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD’s planning process continues to ignore the factual issue about whether any conditions on or surrounding the land have changed so that a court could make a finding of “impossibility” under the state statute.</li> <li>• CPD ignores the scientifically valid survey commissioned by the Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. neighborhood association which clearly reflects that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Instead, CPD relies on its commissioned survey that is an invalid “push” survey designed to support development of the land.</li> <li>• CPD has packed its Steering Committee with vetted pro-development supporters in order to assure a pre-determined pro-development “prevailing vision” outcome.</li> <li>• CPD continues to say that the community supports development of the land completely ignoring the 301/302 vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the City and Westside’s plan to remove the conservation easement protections in order to facilitate the development of a mixed use commercial and residential project on the land.</li> <li>• CPD’s planning process can best be described as “planning malpractice” for many reasons including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o CPD’s planning area myopically only includes the 155 acres of the former Park Hill Golf Course while ignoring neighboring land on both sides of Colorado Boulevard that will experience significant commercial and residential development</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>with no plans to perform any kind of environmental impact study, CPD has failed to address the public health and environmental benefits of preserving the 155 acres of open space</p> <p>CPD has failed to perform a meaningful traffic study regarding the impacts of commercial and residential development on the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to address the metropolitan district or districts that will be needed to develop the land’s infrastructure and the cost of metropolitan district taxes on future homeowners and renters.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Kathleen Stewart	4/4/2022	<p>I definitely support plan 2 above the others because it has the largest area of contiguous park and and most compact areas of business and residential. I also allows more area for drainage which fosters great bird and plant populations when managed appropriately.</p>
Online Comment Form	kathleen stewart	4/4/2022	<p>I also see plan 2 as preserving the most trees.</p>
Online Comment Form	chad kenney	4/6/2022	<p>The Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) should stay open space! I recently took part in a “PHGC Visioning Process” which was facilitated by the Denver’s Community Planning and Development (CPD). What a disingenuous sham! It was presented as an opportunity for community input into future of the PHGC. It was not! It was intended to create the illusion that the was community support for the development of PHGC. There is not! Michael Hancock and Westside Investment Partners are using CPD to promote their version of the Visioning process, which only includes development. As part of the “Visioning” process, this was presented, as if a forgone conclusion, that PHGC would be developed. Community members were offered three maps for development as if the decision to develop the PHGC had already been made. This is wrong and pharisaical. The mayor, Westside, and CPD are unable to remove the conservation easement without the approval of Denver voters, so they are developing a plan that favors development that they could use to entices the voters to approve. But this is just show. There is not a Visioning Process that allows meaningful input from people who are not in favor of development. The people who might not agree with the development have been systematically excluded from meaningful inclusion in the visioning process, so to create the impression that there is agreement from the community for the development. There is not! This is wrong!</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Georgia Garnsey	4/6/2022	I think the Prevailing Vision you speak of is the vision of the Planning Department and Westside Development and the consultants and hangers-on who are benefiting from Westside's insistence on developing the last large parcel of green space left in Denver, a city with a park deficit, pollution, heat island effects, high ozone levels and more. It shocks and saddens me to know that you, CPD, will manipulate the public's true wishes to serve developers' interests instead. The greed and deception involved in your planning process has alarmed me. I do not feel that the health of our city concerns you, nor the health of its citizens. The fact that you are pushing forward on a plan to develop the Park Hill Golf Course land when it is illegal to do so is alarming. The land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement and nothing has changed that. You have not shown how it is "impossible" to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the conservation easement as is required by the State Statute in order to terminate, extinguish, release, or abandon the conservation easement. Instead, you believe that it is your right to silence citizens' voices who want to preserve the land and to disallow mention of the perpetual conservation easement in your "visioning process." Did you know we live in a democracy, my friends - freedom of speech and all that? This is a grave disservice to the public you have sworn to serve. The fair market value of the protected Park Hill Golf Course land is about \$6 million. The City of Denver is being handed a wonderful opportunity to purchase the land at a bargain rate to be used for a regional park that would truly benefit Denver citizens, but instead you squander our taxpayer dollars on fake visioning processes, push polls, glossy mailers and more - all to benefit your client, Westside Development instead. It's all about the money, not about planning a beautiful, livable, healthy city for all its residents and you to be proud of. Very sad indeed.
Online Comment Form	KC McFerson	4/7/2022	Could you hold a wider variety of meeting times? The times are always right during dinner & kid bedtime and I'm really interested in participating but haven't been able to.
Online Comment Form	Steven Noble	4/9/2022	Is extremely important to include sports fields in the development, including fields that can accommodate multiple sports like Australian Football which is a popular community sport in Denver, however there are no specific facilities for them. And Denver also lacks fields with lights so it would be great to add light so the fields can be used in the evenings during spring and fall.
Online Comment Form	Dylan Braun	4/11/2022	Create an Australian football field! This can also double as a cricket field.
Email	Fritz Klann	4/8/2022	Hi Courtney: Thanks for your response. From that it appears that the current plan contemplates 55 acres of development. My feeling remains that Denver needs more park space. Once a leader in park space per capita, in my opinion with the aid of the current administration, developers have run rampant and now Denver trails the national average of park space acres per capita. Stapleton has engulfed huge areas. Bluff Lake used to have light use and is now crowded with people seeking space. How many people will the proposed project add? Will we fall even farther behind? Not that it matters much but that's my two cents. Thanks for your time and consideration. Fritz
Online Comment Form	Steve McVicker	4/12/2022	My preference for development would be the Greenway or City Grid options. Both retain the most green space, which is sorely needed in the immediate area. Larger green spaces for large athletic events such as australian football, ultimate frisbee, soccer, rugby and other big turf sports would be ideal. Any plans that break the green space into smaller units end up limiting the overall utility of the park. I also want to mention that the City Grid option appeals for the mixed use commercial development - I could see restaurants/bars with patios that offer a great view of the sports and other activities happening in the green space, and that being a big attraction for the neighborhood as a whole (something not many other parks in Denver can offer).
Online Comment Form	Ben Marcum	4/12/2022	Denver needs a large dedicated open space to support it's local Australian Rules Football team, the Denver Bulldogs.
Online Comment Form	Susan Bruce	4/12/2022	This is the perfect area for an Australian Rules Football field! The Denver Bulldogs has been searching in vain for years for a field that is the appropriate size, and the course would serve that endeavor well!
Online Comment Form	Alexis Cralley	4/12/2022	The city needs more large green spaces for sports practices. Part of the space should be dedicated to  Fields large enough for Australian football and Gaelic football. These are growing international sports in Denver, and Denver hosts tournaments yearly with national visitors supplying tourist funds. Currently, Arvada hosts the national tournament and reaps the financial benefits, but a location central to Denver would benefit Denver tourism and the players.
Online Comment Form	Matt Howell	4/12/2022	Australian Rules Football needs a designated field in Denver! There are over 35 Australian Football teams across cities in the USA and the Denver Bulldogs are THE most successful team since the leagues beginning...yet they don't have a designated field to play on yet! The field could of course be multi purpose and used for other sports like Soccer & Rugby.  Here is a link the the national league; <a href="https://usaf1.com">https://usaf1.com</a>

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Richard Mann	4/12/2022	m a member of the Denver Bulldogs Australian Football Club. We are the biggest, most successful men's and women's club in the US. We have hosted not only local and regional games, but also regional tournaments and the USAFL National tournament ( the largest in the world, which brings in over a million dollars of economic impact to the host city). I strongly feel if you can make this space as flat, open and multi purpose as possible, you will have optimum usage levels and exposure. Our typical field ( oval) can run 180 yards long and 130 wide, so obviously, the bigger the better. With the advent and expansion of sports such as lacrosse, rugby and ultimate frisbee, the more flexible this space can be , the better. This will also allow you to even out the wear and tear vs locking the city into set soccer/rugby fields where areas in front of goals/ through middle of field etc will wear excessively ( Australian Rules Football is extremely spread out and doesn't unduly wear one area of the fields vs other sports) .
Online Comment Form	David Villani	4/12/2022	Would love an area that has multi use soccer fields and Australian rules football fields
Online Comment Form	Jeremy O'Connell	4/13/2022	I would love to see an allocation for multi purpose athletic fields. In particular with large field allowance for growing sports like Cricket and Australian rules which require a much larger area than soccer rugby or NFL. Cricket is a fast growing sport with a thriving competition in and around Denver, and Denver is home to the largest Australian football mens and Women's club in the USA.
Online Comment Form	John Clayton	4/13/2022	I think it would be great to have a small facility to practice golf short game(100 yards and in). Also be great to have a sports field for Australian Rules Football/cricket/soccer and any other large field sports.
Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	4/19/2022	Will there be any water features (ponds, waterways, etc) in the new park space?
Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	4/19/2022	Will you commit to a specific percentage of conserved permeable space in the Park Hill GC?
Online Comment Form	Joseph Karas	4/19/2022	I would like to advocate for a large, mixed-use athletic field capable of hosting Australian football and cricket! Fields large enough for these activities (roughly a 170yd wide circle) are very difficult to find in the U.S., as most soccer or baseball complexes are divided by drainage infrastructure, fences, lighting, etc. This would be a boon for a number of local amateur sports groups (including the 14x national champion Denver Bulldogs and Lady Bulldogs Australian Football teams!) and also, obviously, be a great space for any activity, festival, etc.
Online Comment Form	Bernadette Kelly	4/19/2022	Denver needs a conservation burial ground, an environmentally friendly and natural alternative to embalming and placed in an expensive coffin containing chemicals and man-made materials or cremation which burns energy and pollutes the air.
Online Comment Form	Erin Sullivan	4/20/2022	A level ground park for space am Australian Rules football field, which can double as a rugby or cricket field - with a shared space community clubhouse and storage area for equipment would be fantastic.

Email	Maria Flora	4/25/2022	<p>Section 38-30.5-107 of the Colorado conservation easement statute provides that a conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the protected land—if has become impossible to fulfill the conservation purposes of the easement. The conservation purposes of the 2019 Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land conservation easement are “to maintain[the land’s] scenic and open condition and to preserve [the land] for recreational use.”</p> <p>Having carefully followed this CPD planning process since early 2021, we note that there has been no substantive discussion regarding either the PHGC land conservation easement or any facts that would support a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land—it has become “impossible” to fulfill the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the easement. Please advise us as to when CPD intends to address these threshold issues in this planning process and, if CPD does not plan to address these issues in this planning process, please explain the reasons.</p> <p>Furthermore, on CPD’s “Park Hill Golf Course—Next Steps” website, the only mention of the Colorado conservation easement statute is buried in subparagraph 8D of the Park Hill Golf Course FAQ updated December 9, 2021 found by first clicking on “Resources” on the opening webpage and then on the new webpage by clicking on the words “FAQs on the property background, etc.” under the heading “Legal History.” This subparagraph states that there is a “clear legal path” for dealing with the Colorado conservation easement statutory requirements, but it fails to provide any explanation about what the “clear legal path” is.</p> <p>We must request once again that CPD explain this “clear legal path.” Additionally, we must request that CPD advise us and post on its website information about when in this process the City plans to seek a court order under the Colorado conservation easement statute authorizing termination, release, extinguishment, and/or abandonment of the conservation easement. Nowhere on the CPD website, including the timeline “Park Hill Golf Course Planning Process,” is there any mention of the required court action pursuant to the statute.</p>
Email	Maria Flora	4/29/2022	<p>We are writing in response to Ms. Levingston’s email to Maria Flora dated April 25, 2022 which responded to our letter of the same date.</p> <p>Our letter addressed issues regarding CPD’s “Visioning/Area Plan” process and compliance with the Colorado conservation easement statute’s requirements regarding termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements. Fundamentally, we asked the following two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When does CPD plan to address the factual question as to whether—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land—it has become “impossible” to fulfill the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the PHGC land conservation easement and, if it does not plan to address these issues, why not?</li> <li>2. What is the “clear legal path” that the City and CPD have for dealing with the mandates of the Colorado conservation easement statute regarding termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement?</li> </ol> <p>Despite the fact that these questions are not answered anywhere on CPD’s website and have not been answered in CPD’s “Visioning/Area Plan” process, Ms. Levingston merely responded to these questions stating that CPD has “no further information to share”. Without giving answers to these threshold questions, it is unreasonable for CPD to complete an expensive and time-consuming “Area Plan” for the PHGC land and for the City to drag Denver voters through another election regarding the issue of breaking the conservation easement and allowing residential and/or commercial construction on the PHGC land.</p> <p>Finally, we must note that—contrary to implications in Ms. Levingston’s email—CPD has refused to allow a thorough discussion of the PHGC conservation easement in its “Visioning/Area Plan” process. CPD did allow an Assistant City Attorney to explain the City’s and Westside’s interpretation of the conservation easement. That said, CPD has refused our repeated requests to present our interpretation of the conservation easement and CPD even refused to allow its own retained conservation easement law expert, Larry Kueter, to explain his interpretation. As a consequence, CPD’s Steering Committee and the public are left with the incorrect belief that preservation of the conservation easement would require permanent golf course operations on the PHGC land.</p>
Email	Bernadette Kelly	4/27/2022	<p>If the golf course gets developed, which is inevitable, (I’ve been involved in zoning, development as a rep for Greater Park Hill Community for 14 years.) This development needs to address the true needs of the community: affordable housing, affordable rents for POC businesses, sustainable development - an example to the world of zero carbon development from ground breaking through facility maintenance. Another Central Park of cheap construction for the middle and upper class would be a failure. Our professional survey of residents in Park Hill overwhelmingly indicated that Park Hill Golf Course should remain as open space. We all know that isn’t going to happen. We have a developer that paid millions for the land. The planning stage is our last chance to get it right - address societal and environmental issues with the last large tract of land in Denver. I am a third generation Denver native. When my grandmother was born in 1912, her family lived at 2550 River Drive (same as Dennis Gallagher’s mother’s family). My mother was born in Denver and she attended Loretto Heights College. I was born in Denver at St. Joseph’s Hospital. I attended Machebuef High School on Montview and Elm in the early 1980s and now live 6 blocks north. Sincerely, Bernadette</p>
Online Comment Form	Amy Harris	5/7/2022	<p>Regarding affordable housing in Northeast Park Hill: 250 units of affordable housing are slated to be built at 38th &amp; Holly in 2022. Another affordable housing project at 40th &amp; Colorado is in its beginning stages (supported by ULC). 3-4 market-rate units are going to be built on the lot of the historic Robinson House on Albion Street right across from the Club House. Please make this and other information available to steering committee members so they aren’t considering development of the last open space parcel in Denver through a myopic lens. More residents are coming to NEPH - thousands more. We need a regional park, open space, and public amenities to support them and the current residents. Thank you.</p>
Online Comment Form	Anna Hergt	5/15/2022	<p>I rode my bike through this park today and there is a variety of wildlife that make this park their home. I didn’t see anything about conservation efforts in the most recent meet’s pdf slides. Will there or has there already been a survey of the land done to assess impact on wildlife? If you walk around here as well, I think you will find that untouched land like this in the city is extraordinary rare and beautiful. Preserving as much of the natural land is so important, especially with the views of the front range and benefits of old growth trees to filter the air from the nasty purina factory nearby! Thank you so much for considering.</p>
Online Comment Form	Stuart Hayden	5/24/2022	<p>I’m concerned CPD is spending too much time and effort planning an easement-restricted property. Not only will it be a total waste if the easement is not lifted, but it is ethically questionable. It makes CPD look partial to, and invested in lifting the easement. The burden of proposing alternative plans should fall on the owner. In no other circumstance does CPD do the owner’s work for them. City architects don’t design a new building for an owner interested in demolishing an existing structure to construct something else, especially when an easement or landmark designation prohibits exterior alterations to said building.</p> <p>To the public, CPD continuing to plan this development as if the easement has been lifted does not feel informative. It feels disenfranchising, disinterested in whether or not the community wants to lift it, and disingenuous.</p> <p>Please stop planning until the easement is lifted. Please stop doing the owner’s work for them. CPD should be demanding maximum community-beneficial concessions from the owner, not subsidizing large private developers. CPD’s time would be better spent processing the backlog of building applications sullyng its reputation, or pursuing policies that increase density without destroying existing resources like open space and buildings.</p>

Via email	Susan Jorgenson	6/6/2022	I vote no!!!! The poor home owners in the 13-1700 blocks! After years of paying mortgages and living a small footprint...now we are punished! Try this in some other neighborhood! Not mine!
Online Comment Form	Christine Dea	6/9/2022	Pursuing the overturning of the current, legal easement against the PHGC should NOT be done. What does the law mean, anyway? Really, what does it mean? That you can justify changes based on the push of developers who have contributed to the current administrations pockets? And, just because the City wants more tax revenue and owes favors to this developer is not in the public's interest. We need open space! The City administration and all of the employees pursuing this illegal scheme should be embarrassed and lose in court. Drop this effort.
Online Comment Form	Theresa Johnson	6/9/2022	As a Park Hill resident from 1989 to 2007, and a Skyland resident since 2007, I am disappointed and upset that the Park Hill Golf Course may be developed beyond open space only. The percentage of open space areas in Denver is very low when compared to all other major cities in the US. Denver citizens paid for an easement forbidding development and I am appalled the Hancock administration is trying so hard to overturn/ignore that. I strenuously vote no on the development!
Online Comment Form	Mary Domenico	6/9/2022	While I am beginning to think this administration does not care about citizen voices who do not represent big business, I want to again voice my opposition to the proposed development of the Park Hill Golf Course. We need open space in this city. The residents of Park Hill and Denver want it and deserve it.
Online Comment Form	Alison Walczak	6/10/2022	There is no logical reason, other than greed, that the land of the former Park Hill golf course should be developed when there is a current, legal easement forbidding development. i oppose this development.
Online Comment Form	Charlene Parris	6/14/2022	Honor the conservation easement and the will of voters - DO NOT DEVELOP OR PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARK HILL GOLF COURSE.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Trevor Wafer	6/15/2022	In the coming redevelopment, please consider keeping the golf course driving range on the new property as a recreation opportunity for people in the downtown area. The driving range at City Park GC is the only range in the downtown area and almost always filled to capacity with people waiting and sharing the hitting stalls. The next closest options for a public driving range in the area is either Overland Park GC or Common Grounds in Aurora, both far outside of the general downtown/city park area. The current driving range location in the southeast corner of the Park Hill GC property already has the infrastructure of safety nets on one side. The range should provide a good revenue stream to maintain the rest of the property/park space as the operation costs of a driving range is generally low. Leaving the driving range on the property would maintain the open space goals of the city and provide an option for members of the community to enjoy outdoor activity.
Online Comment Form	Christine Mohr	6/15/2022	I am opposed to breaking the conservation easement and constructing a dense mixed residential and commercial development on the Park Hill Golf Course land.
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	6/21/2022	When will CPD post the video replay of the June 14 Steering Committee meeting?
Online Comment Form	Liane Morrison	6/21/2022	As a Denver resident, I have voted on many issues that are not in my neighborhood so I find it inconsistent that one of the City positions is that the topic of the Park Hill Golf Course should be decided by only the people within a certain proximity to it. For example, applying that position to whether to expand the National Western Center would have meant that only residents in Globeville, Elyria-Swansea would have voted on it.  I am perplexed that the City is hosting the June 30 forum in a space that is so small that it limits the number of people who can attend. That seems to go in the opposite direction of inclusivity and a desire to hear from as many residents as possible.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	6/27/2022	There is currently a perpetual conservation easement on this property. Furthermore, this easement is protected by several items including a state statute as well as the need for a city-wide vote to agree to end the easement. Why have you not invested taxpayers' dollars developing a plan for this very likely outcome that 100% of this land needs to stay 100% open space with zero development? A plan that includes only open space usage? Where is this open space plan currently? If it does not exist at this point it certainly will be available to voters alongside the current plan for development? It would be extremely biased on your part to leave this open space plan out of the public eye.
Online Comment Form	C Dea	6/27/2022	The former Park Hill Golf Course land should be FULLY kept as open space. Why is Hancock et al. (as in your department) against the will of the entire city as voted on last November? The answer is self-serving and the people have voiced what they want. this continuing effort is simply ridiculous, as is your carefully crafted spin of a response.
Online Comment Form	Chloe Pulliam	6/27/2022	Why is the city of Denver continuing to push the narrative that development of the PHGC land is necessary and inevitable? We need more large regional parks for the constantly growing population of Denver. Developing this land that is under a conservation easement that Denver tax payers already voted on and paid for would be a great mistake. This land should become a park. The city has millions of dollars collected from the tax payers that is designated for exactly the purpose of expanding parks in our city.
Online Comment Form	Theresa Johnson	6/27/2022	I don't understand why this mixed use development is still being pushed when 2/3 of Denver's voters voted for open space, and when there is a conservation easement on the property. At least, that is my understanding.
Online Comment Form	Mary Domenico	6/27/2022	Again, I want to stress my opposition to the proposed development of the Park Hill Golf Course. I am a long-term resident of Park Hill and, like most of my neighbors, I know that the developers and the mayor's office are turning a deaf ear to the community. We need and want open space!
Online Comment Form	Anna McCaffery	6/27/2022	WHY ARE YOU CONTINUING TO PUSH DEVELOPMENT ON THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE WHEN THAT WAS VOTED DOWN BY RESIDENTS OF THE CITY????????
Online Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	6/27/2022	I'm a Denver native and have seen the dedicated park space significantly diminished over the last 50 years to the point that Denver now has only 20-30 % of open space of other major cities in the US. Despite of the vote of the people in Ballot initiative 301, the city is moving forward with high density development of the Park Hill Golf Course, and we won't let this happen!
Online Comment Form	Jeff Aldrich	6/27/2022	I have reviewed the new "proposal " from the City of Denver for the PHGC development and am dismayed that the City is ignoring the overwhelming vote of Denver citizens to not place high density developments on this property. No means No! Listen to the citizens, not the developers.
Online Comment Form	Tim Dea	6/27/2022	Here's what I think. Ballot 31 last November supported parks and open space. Voters overwhelmingly supported open space. Now it appears there will be another "process" in an attempt to overturn the voters. This is simply wrong. The easement "in perpetuity" has been law. DO NOT break the law nor the voters mandate.
Online Comment Form	Susan Young	6/27/2022	We live .9 miles from Park Hill Golf Course according to my computer map and we did NOT receive a form to provide input on the development of the golf course. We are opposed to development when there is so much planned development in the near area.  This is precious green space to be enjoyed by all. Park Hill Supermarket is conveniently located to the golf course neighborhood with fresh produce, fresh fish and meats, plus canned goods. We need more green space, not more development. 25 acres of "greenspace" that cannot be used because it is planned as a retention pond, this is so typical of developers.....bait and switch.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	6/27/2022	As the voters requested the gold course should not be developed in ANY way. Here is why we need the open space 8% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021 The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy) Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly) Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developer- run Metro Tax District At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision.
Online Comment Form	Sharon Kermiet	6/27/2022	I completely oppose the development of the Park Hill Golf Course. There is a lawful easement, and in addition, the voters have spoken. The Park Hill Golf Course must become a city park. No development!
Online Comment Form	Marianne Rinehart	6/27/2022	I am a concerned resident of Park Hill. Please do not develop the Park Hill Golf Course. Sacrificing green space to development instead of making it into a park is not only a terrible idea given our climate crisis and rising temperatures, it is unnecessary, given the nearby available properties that need reinvigorating and redevelopment without sacrificing mature trees and permeable soil for clean air and water. Also, the \$2 million we taxpayers invested in the easement in 1997 is now worth at least \$60 million. If it is terminated we don't get the \$60 million -- the developer does. That is a giveaway by the city to the developer, who can then turn around and sell off portions of the property at the much higher market value since the easement no longer suppresses the fair market value. Honestly, this is shameful and I am surprised it is legal.
Online Comment Form	Bridget Walsh	6/28/2022	What part of "NO" do you not understand. GPHC survey found that over 70% of Park Hill residents want regional park , not more cement on the Park Hill Golf Course. The voters of Denver also told you "NO". Yet you persist. We know that Westside Development delivered \$400,000 to Hancock for his campaign that unfortunately, with the help of the dirty tricksters at CRL, succeeded. Denver has some of the dirtiest air in the nation. It's urban hot spot is one of the top in the nation. We need green open space. Go put your so called,"affordable housing" on all of the parcels owned by Hancock cronies. Hancock should be in jail for his abuse of women... not sitting in the Mayor's chair. Go away.
Online Comment Form	William Dresser	6/28/2022	I find it outrageous that this plan is being put forward in DIRECT opposition to the will of the voters. I will certainly do all I can to oppose this miss guided use of public funds to benefit of a private developer.
Online Comment Form	Donna Krentz	6/28/2022	To the City of Denver and CPD, The VOTERS have spoken and 2/3rds of Denver VOTERS agreed to NO to development ON the PHGC land. STOP ignoring the voters in the attempt to circumvent that which the voters have already told you. STOP wasting taxpayer MONEY on these ill-advised attempts and trying to make Denver an over-developed cement jungle! There was overwhelming support for Initiative 301 that voters told the city and the developer that we need to protect the perpetual conservation easement and the PHGC land from development. It passed in nearly 300 precincts, barely losing just 7 precincts – none located close to PHGC land! Community Planning and Development is a TOTAL SHAM PROCESS that continues to waste taxpayer MONEY! Why We Should Build Around The PHGC Land, Not On It 68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021 The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy) Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly) Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developerrun Metro Tax District At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision
Online Comment Form	D Aubin	6/28/2022	When the developer who purchased the old YMCA in Skyland was trying to get the lot re-zoned, we went through this same process. The neighborhood was led by our district rep and the developer to think that there would still be community space, setbacks, and density/street parking wouldn't be an issue. We were naive. No community space, high density, and issues with street parking. No outdoor areas for residents except for a small dog area. It's not the type of building that adds to community. I don't think Park Hill zoning should be changed or that the conservation easement should be lifted. Voters spoke already, and we've learned that developers aren't required to follow through with the promises they make to you.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	John Lietz	6/28/2022	To the City of Denver and CPD, The VOTERS have spoken and 2/3rds of Denver VOTERS agreed to NO development ON the PHGC land. STOP ignoring the voters in the attempt to circumvent that which the voters have already told you. STOP wasting taxpayer MONEY on these ill-advised attempts and trying to make Denver an over-developed cement jungle! There was overwhelming support for Initiative 301 that voters told the city and the developer that we need to protect the perpetual conservation easement and the PHGC land from development. It passed in nearly 300 precincts, barely losing just 7 precincts – none located close to PHGC land! Community Planning and Development is a TOTAL SHAM PROCESS that continues to waste taxpayer MONEY! Why We Should Build Around The PHGC Land, Not On It 68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021. The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own. The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong. Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy). Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly). Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developer run Metro Tax District. At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park. Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision.
Online Comment Form	Jerry Doerksen	6/28/2022	I'm wondering why the City is continuing to explore ways to create Park Hill Golf Course into a gigantic housing development when voters convincingly indicated this is not a desired purpose. I think the desire of Denver residents is to retain this property as open space. Please explain why alternate options are being pursued.
Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	6/28/2022	The city is ignoring the will of the voters by proceeding as if there never was a vote. As a 71-year resident, I find this whole process infuriating.
Online Comment Form	Karen Libby	6/29/2022	I am opposed to development on PHGC land. I am asking that you keep what little is left of open space in the city of Denver free from the proliferation of development of apartments and other buildings. Great cities need green open space and planners should keep the wishes of their constituents in mind when making decisions. The voters clearly spoke and seem to be ignored in the planning process. As a long-time resident of Denver, I believe that development should not overshadow the need for open space.
Online Comment Form	Margaret Case	6/29/2022	After the election, I truly do not understand how this question is still being debated. How is that possible?
Online Comment Form	Frederick Klann	6/29/2022	The City has disappointed me more on this subject than anything since I moved here in 1979. The City has ignored the clear message from the 301 vote. People want open space and parks not more development and congestion. The City could pay the developer a fair price and use the space wisely. Instead, the City is trying to ram through what the developer's wants and acts as though this is what people want. The moderators have avoided directly dealing with the view that no development is the popular wish. Not so. This project will impact a much larger group of people than the small group that the City alleges supports the development of the property. Former Mayor Webb said that the City made a deal with the developer long ago and it sure seems that way. The city calls the developer its client. That's wrong. The people of the City are the clients. The developer doesn't even live in Denver. This is politics at its worst.
Online Comment Form	Georgianna	6/29/2022	Please hear me and hear me well!!! I am sick and tired of all these non-progress meetings and I am about to resolve the issue. To have the investment (new owner) "Resale" the Park Hill Golf Course. Advertise the sale of PHGC in numerous golf and sports magazines in Colorado, all over the US, including other countries to buy, invest, and retain as a golf course, and nothing else. Thank you for your time.
Online Comment Form	Carly Lenderts	6/29/2022	Please support housing development in conjunction with part of the land being developed into a park. Denver desperately needs more housing, both for-sale and for-rent, to mitigate the impact of rising housing costs. A park that provides better pedestrian and bicycle access to the 40th & Colorado RTD station along with housing would be a great improvement for this under-utilized land. Grocery store would be great, too! Even if it's a small one.
Online Comment Form	Tom Romine	6/29/2022	What is the regional detention area?
Online Comment Form	Martha Foxhoven	6/29/2022	In the November ballot of last year 63% of Denver residents voted against development of the Park Hill Golf Course and for open space conservation. Currently, Northeast Park Hill is an urban heat island. Will this development just compound the issue by increasing the infrastructure of buildings and roads and the elimination of mature trees and vegetation? What is the cost to the community in deteriorating air quality, higher heat index, and poor quality of life? 8% of Denver's 155 square miles is designated parkland compared to 21% in New York. Regarding development, there is already designated housing planned for 38th & Holly by DelWest. It just seems that high priced developers yield more influence and power in this city than the communities, who have to live with their decisions and the environmental impact of development.
Online Comment Form	Susan Young	6/30/2022	Here is the language used by the city for their questionnaire on the development of Park Hill Golf Course: "A paper survey was mailed on March 8th and responses were tabulated through April 16th. 100% of respondents live within one mile of PHGC. Results from this survey are referred to in this report as the "mailed survey" or "mailed invite." The mailed survey is statistically valid." We live .9 miles from the golf course and were told tonight at the Open House at the Club House, the questionnaire was mailed to those .8 miles from the golf course. You wonder why people don't trust the city and Westside Development, this is a perfect example. Technically true, but misleading. Why not say it was mailed to those .8 miles from the golf course. Give an inch, take a mile. That is what I see.
Online Comment Form	Terri Hobart	7/1/2022	This is an opportunity to create a development model of justice oriented gentrification. I would like to see the city work with the developer to focus primarily on the needs of the current surrounding neighborhoods. I do not feel the strategies have enough details to know if they will be effective. I am concerned that the strategies and programs identified to protect current residents and businesses or not sufficient. The plan needs built-in funding sources and longterm protection guarantees. The Development Agreement should require the establishment of a green fund based on the amount of green space that will be developed. This green fund could be used to plant and water trees in the surrounding neighborhoods. This would lower the temperatures in North Park Hill and Clayton, create healthier neighborhoods and help accomplish the City's canopy goals. I believe that the Developer should be encouraged to employ green and sustainable building practices and materials in return for the City giving up substantial green space.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	7/5/2022	I am opposed to any development of the Park Hill Golf Course land except as a public park. I understand that housing is an important issue, but there are other properties in the nearby areas that can accommodate those needs without ruining one of the last, if not the last large open space area for a park in NE Denver. The dispute over the easement has not been resolved yet and I hate to see my tax dollars being spent on developing a plan which may not even be adopted. The Urban Land Conservancy is building hundreds of income restricted residential units just adjacent to the open space. There are other areas nearby which can be developed similarly. Once that open space is gone, it is gone forever. In this fractious times, the mental and physical health of Denver residents out weighs the need for development of this particular property. The people voted and approved protecting the conservation easement. Listen to your constituents and not to the developers who will make a financial killing developing this property. And read the article from Sunday's (July 3) Denver Post Business Section, front page. Our problem is not unique and there are groups across the country trying to protect large parcels from development and there are developers challenging those groups. Let's make a decision that is environmentally sound and people oriented.
Online Comment Form	Marc Nelson	7/5/2022	Can we look at putting a large pickleball facility? There is not facility in Denver that more the 4 courts
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	Here are my overall comments on the Community Planning and Development Department (CPD) Sham Process: CPD's June 30th "Community Open House" is a continuation of the sham planning and development process conceived and implemented by CPD with the predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans. Starting soon after Westside purchased the PHGC land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the Hancock Administration began working with Westside on plans to break the conservation easement and construct a mini-city of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." Working for its "client" Westside, it's not surprising that CPD's hand-picked "Steering Committee" was primarily composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal "area plan" that CPD will draft and likely present to the Planning Board and City Council for approval later in 2022. The next hurdle for the Hancock Administration and Westside will then be for the Hancock Administration to submit a ballot measure to Denver voters in accordance with Ballot Initiative 301 that passed city-wide in November 2021 by 63% to 37%.
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<p>The Hancock Administration/Westside ballot measure will seek voter approval for breaking the PHGC land conservation easement and allowing residential and commercial construction on the land. Presumably, the Hancock Administration and Westside will use CPD's "area plan" in their campaign to support their ballot measure. Why CPD's Planning Process Is a Sham The CPD planning process is a sham and it's irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers?</li> <li>• CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development.</li> <li>• CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.</li> <li>• Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space.</li> <li>• CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens.</li> </ul>

Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned “Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment” dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods “are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita” and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights).</li> <li>• CPD hand-picked the “Steering Committee” to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this “area plan” phase— despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement “Steering Committee” member—CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed “Steering Committee” member who needed to resign.</li> <li>• CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an “area plan” process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become “impossible” to continue fulfilling the easement’s open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Vicki Kelley	7/8/2022	The city of Denver needs to HONOR THE WISH OF VOTERS and citizens and stop trying to steal this land away. Park Hill Golf Course is a beautiful monument to the city itself, and WHY this mayor/city council continue to try and deceive its citizens is disgusting. Just for once in this Hancock administration is it too much to ask they conduct themselves with some honor and integrity. Leave the conservation easement ALONE.
Online Comment Form	Amy Golden	7/8/2022	We voted, clearly, to protect the easement and honor our city’s need for green space. The mayor and the developers have moved forward as though we haven’t voted, resoundingly, against their plans. What gives? Why is the city pursuing plans and overriding the people’s will?
Online Comment Form	Dina	7/8/2022	The park hill golf course is far larger than most people realize. Far bigger than city park. There is space for both thoughtful conservation and affordable housing and access to a grocery. North park hill residents have had limited access to fresh food and need additional affordable housing to remain in their community. These are also directives to fulfill by the city’s strategic plan. There can be a solution on this land that helps support all of these needs.
Online Comment Form	Mary Maguire	7/8/2022	Developing the site will mean the the cutting down of hundreds of old growth trees not to mention to the loss of critical open space and parkland at a time when our available space for greenscape is rapidly decreasing. Denver’s Game Plan calls for increases in Denver’s tree canopy and the acquisition of more parkland in areas are lacking, which includes this area and surrounding neighborhoods. Denver’s park access of 9 acres per thousand residents is well below the national average of 13.
Online Comment Form	Concerned Denver Resident	7/9/2022	Please consider preserving this land as a park for the citizens of Denver, in a neighborhood that would truly benefit from the cooling, aesthetic, and recreational benefits. Denver is approximately 8% dedicated park area. NYC is 21%, by comparison. Even LA is 13%. It is understood that affordable housing is a national crisis, very much afflicting Denver, but giving up the last remaining opportunities for significant, low water, adaptive species parks for residents that will support the ability of this city to exist into the future is quite definitely not the solution.
Online Comment Form	Edward Yoo	7/13/2022	I would use the golf course to create a big park, something similar to wash park. The safety of this neighborhood needs to be improved overall and more parks need to be created for the neighborhood
Online Comment Form	Edward Yoo	7/13/2022	I think it's really messed up that I didn't get any mail or email regarding the park hill golf course poll. I found the poll link from one of the news article and the poll has closed already. I seriously question if the city is interested in getting feedback from from the actual residents when there was no notification sent out to the neighborhood. Very poor way to collect feedback.
Online Comment Form	Robert Goppelt	7/17/2022	20-40 % reduction in open park We need More affordable housing. Make a Dense Urban forest. Use fruit trees of all types. How about a wild flower open park, less wasted on grass. A water park at the new rec.center. A anchor Grocery store for the local population. A farmers market area. A 10-15 acre working urban farm.
Online Comment Form	Ingrid Hewitson	7/18/2022	I can't believe the city planners are continuing to go against the wishes of the voters and working to develop the golf course. Not only is this a waste of tax payer money it also makes it pretty clear who's pockets you are all in. We have less green space than most large cities, the residents want more green space and you continue to disregard this. We voted to protect it! It's disgusting!
Email	Janet Rahmani	7/25/2022	Forever and ever now I have been hearing about the Park Hill Golf Course land. And it's always how the City wants to work with the developer who bought the land to develop housing on the site. Then somewhere in the article there will be mention of the conservation easement by the way. While I know that housing is a big need in Denver, especially affordable housing, I also know that there is a severe shortage of green spaces and tree canopy. Given that there is an existing conservation easement on this land and given the dire need for more green space, which, as this planet warms, will be even more essential in urban areas, it should be clear to you all that development should not happen on the Park Hill land. Comply with the conservation easement and preserve this precious space. Too bad for the developer who should have been fully cognizant that the easement existed.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	7/20/2022	I would like to express my concern with the "partner" chosen to work on the community benefits agreement for this project. How is James Roy, who presented in your meeting last evening, and his organization DMCI qualified to carry out this task? What was the process used to evaluate them against other possible partners for this? I have attempted to research ANY similar work that they have done and really any of their accomplishments and have not been able to. Can you help me understand their qualifications? Furthermore, I question the professionalism and stability of Mr. Roy. He was visibly frustrated with any common questions that were asked of him in last night's meeting, and even stated " I don't like you" to a member of the steering committee. This is highly unacceptable and reflects his level of ability to carry out such an important task.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	7/20/2022	To be clear, I expressed similar concerns about Mr. Roy and DMCI's qualifications to engage in the community navigator program, which is now well-known to be fraught with inherent bias and missed the mark on engaging with the larger community. This also seems to bring up a conflict of interest issue given his longstanding and continued involvement with this process. I look forward to your response.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log 10/14/2022**

Online Comment Form	Adriene Callahan	7/20/2022	Hello, why does the City have an entire planning/development committee already in place when this clearly has to go to public Vote (the conservation easement). The City has vastly under-estimated the general public concern for : The lack of Water to Sustainability for a Development of this size. Doesn't the developer have to prove that there is a 100 years of sustainable water to support this development? Where is the Water going to come from? LESS people need to move to Colorado, NOT MORE. THERE is not enough water to sustain this kind of GROWTH. So please answer this question, Where is the water going to come from?
Online Comment Form	Kevin Standbridge	7/20/2022	What percent of the proposed park/open space area will be used for stormwater management purposes? Are those stormwater management areas indicated on the plan?
Online Comment Form	Naomi Grunditz	7/21/2022	Hi! I've been following this and intended to do the survey and attend meetings but life gets in the way. Please record my opinion as in support of the draft plan to both develop and preserve open space. It's a win-win. In terms of the arguments that Denver needs more park space, it's true, but as our population grows we will NEVER be able to catch up to the "ideal" ratio and it's a distraction to focus on this when quality counts as much if not more than quantity. In addition, this area is close to a TOD and is an opportunity to bring much needed housing and services, as well as a park, to the area as WELL as provide housing for people who can then have access to the park. I live three blocks away in Clayton. In casual conversations with my neighbors, half of who are relative new-comers, and half who are long time residents (15+ years), none of them want to see the entire area preserved as a park and don't understand why some people are so adamant about that. One thing I do see missing in the current proposal is preserving some of the amazing mountain views from this park, which will mostly be blocked by the plan to develop along Colorado Blvd. I know the chances of establishing a new viewplane is zero, but its the only place near me I can go for a panoramic mountain view and I can't deny that I will miss that.
Online Comment Form	Hanna Aharonov	7/24/2022	We just bought in the park hill community. We are curious to see the time frame for the project and expected building start dates.
Online Comment Form	John DiMattia	7/26/2022	I'm happy with the current plan. I would have preferred more dense infill housing though, it's a shame the voters have to approve such a common sense thing for the city to do (replace golf courses with housing in a housing and climate crisis)

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Source Type	Name	Date	Comment
Email	Ben Ramuno	1/20/2021	<p>We purchased in NE Park Hill in 2019 and have been excited about the PHGC Redevelopment ever since. We are part of a growing number of people having to pay extraordinary prices to live in rather ordinary homes. I am an RN and an Army Nurse Corps Reservist. My wife is an engineer who was laid off due to Covid and began her Masters Degree program this week. I have written to the future developer many times regarding our requests for the site as well as Westword and other media outlets. Park Hill is a great community, but it seems that once you go North of MLK the neighborhood seems to lose some of its luster. The sidewalks are especially small for walking on. There is a NOTICEABLE lack of trees. The amount of trash in the streets and alleys increases. There are some small microparks but nothing to get excited about. The Park Hill Center (specifically Horizon Lounge) has consistently been in the news due to multiple gunshots being fired. It needs to be torn down and rebuilt. Station 26 Brewery seems to be the lone bright spot in this neighborhood where one can simply walk to and have some fun. Housing prices are only going UP, and it is time the neighborhood caught up with the cost of living in this area. We care about improving the quality of this community. What we would like to see is this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A large beautiful park space (Cheeseman-ish) with a nice lake and beautiful trees - at least 80 acres. Sheltered from the traffic of Colorado Blvd.</li> <li>- Retail/Restaurants: Independent shops, restaurants, and breweries. A Rino-esque model if you will. This could easily spill over into the adjacent industrial district north of 38th.</li> <li>- No ugly affordable housing. There are already 3 nearby apartment complexes and a strip mall of junk food and chain shops just north of 40th. This is a chance to improve the quality of the offerings in the area.</li> <li>- We are realistic and understand the developer will want some homes built, but perhaps something similar to Park Hill Commons can be done - Microtownhomes with retail underneath. Or again, something like Rino has done, incorporating restaurants and independent business with contemporary housing.</li> <li>- We understand some people want a grocery store, but there is a King Soopers and a Safeway nearby already. Perhaps a Sprouts or an independent healthy neighborhood market, such as Marzcyk. Again, healthy, improvements.</li> <li>- A music venue or state-of-the-Art Recreation Center would be awesome. We see this as a legitimate opportunity to spark progress in this the community and move towards much needed improvements. There is so much opportunity when you factor in the adjacent industrial district and we are tremendously excited. We know and understand that there is pressure to just leave it "open space" or just throw a bunch of affordable apartments and a grocery store at this site, but I hope you understand that there are MANY of us living in this community who would like to see something along the lines of the above bullet points. Progress, Beautification, Walkable fun. A catalyst for the future of NE Park Hill.</li> </ul> <p>We have no idea if our opinions really matter or if there is already a plan and a deal in the works, but I would love to discuss this further, hear your thoughts, learn what is being said. I am subscribed to all the relevant newsletters, etc, but I would also appreciate your feedback on our thoughts specifically. Thank you so much for taking the time to read this!!</p>
Email	Jeffrey Hersch	1/27/2021	I strongly wish the conservation easement that taxpayers paid for and wanted honored. The area should be open space, reforested planted. This insatiable drive to develop has to stop, as does mayor Hancock's wink and nod to developers.
Email	Cameron Omlid	2/1/2021	Thank you all for your continuing work. I hope we can reach a situation with this large piece of undeveloped land that benefits everyone in our community. Best wishes to everyone involved.
Email	Kellie Donahoe	2/1/2021	A few questions I have: There is a lot of chatter about how much of the golf course would end up being a park. I realize it's private and therefore needs to be profitable, so what type of commercial buildings would need to be created to ensure a large park? Would a grocery store and a housing complex suffice, or how much would need to be used as profitable land to ensure a quality size park? There are currently a lot of wonderfully aged trees on the property, is there any initiatives in place to keep as many trees intact as possible? Can the park be a part of the entire development (small parks throughout) or does it need to be one solid chunk in a specific area?
Email	James Aubrey	2/5/2021	I am writing to advocate for the Park Hill golf course to become a park, the "open space" option, I guess. Plant some trees, and maybe float a lake? Think like Frederick Law Olmstead ("Central Park" would be an apt name here, too, since it's near former "Stapleton"). I happen to be one of the Park Hill residents who is still disappointed that there was local opposition to the proposed historic district, a couple of years ago. Keep trying to provide vision for this area!

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora, SOS	2/5/2021	<p>As you know, Save Open Space Denver ("SOS Denver") is a grassroots community group that has been working for over four years on issues related to the future of the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land open space and conservation easement. Members of SOS Denver have participated in RNO meetings in which Community Planning and Development ("CPD") has presented a "Visioning Process" and a Small Area Plan Process that CPD is planning to launch, and we now have learned that the first Zoom Steering Committee meeting will take place on February 9, 2021 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. SOS Denver is genuinely concerned that to date this planning process entirely reflects Mayor Hancock's public support for development of the PHGC land by landowner real estate developer Westside Investment Partners, Inc. ("Westside"). As Ms. Aldrete explained in her January 7, 2021 presentation to the City Council Budget and Policy Committee, the announced planning process for the PHGC land is "market driven by a developer." Most blatantly, the pro-development bias of this process is reflected in the following: As Ms. Aldrete also explained to the Budget and Policy Committee, CPD inserted this PHGC land planning process ahead of many other planning projects that had been in the CPD planning queue for several years. Although her District 9 Council District abuts the PHGC land on the west along Colorado Boulevard, Councilwoman Candi CdeBaca, an opponent of development on the PHGC land, has not been afforded the opportunity to have CPD appoint a Steering Committee member from District 9. On the other hand, District 8 Councilman Chris Herndon, a proponent of development on the land, has been able to have CPD appoint his new PRAB appointee Andre McGregor to the Steering Committee. CPD has loaded the Steering Committee with people who will support development on the PHGC land, and they have already publicly taken positions to that effect. The Steering Committee lacks members who identify as representing the Colorado conservation easement community, the environmental health community, or the public health community. All materials posted to date on the CPD website reflect only the Hancock Administration's support for development on the PHGC land. For example, since CPD launched the website, it has prominently featured the pro-development video of the October 23, 2020 Brother Jeff Fard interview identified as "Meet the property owners: Westside Investment Partners with the Holleran Group" and it has failed to post videos that Brother Jeff Fard has conducted with open space supporters Penfield Tate and Tony Pigford. For further example, the CPD website has only included City-produced pro-development documents regarding the history of the PHGC land and its conservation easement without providing any balance by including on its website any documents on these same subjects generated by SOS Denver. Mayor Hancock and his administration to date have refused to answer repeated questions from SOS Denver and its members regarding how the City and Westside intend to deal with the conservation easement termination restrictions of the Colorado conservation easement statute as they move forward with their development plans for the PHGC land. When again asked these questions in connection with a recent meeting of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., the CPD presenters responded that they could not answer "in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege." Initially, SOS Denver requests that CPD cease moving forward with any "visioning" or planning process regarding the PHGC land. The PHGC land is protected from development by the conservation easement dated July 11, 2019 and recorded on July 12, 2019 at Reception No. 2019090259. The conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order pursuant to C.R.S. §38-30.5-107 that based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land since the easement was granted on July 11, 2019- it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the conservation purposes of the easement. Since no such court order has been entered, it is premature as of now for CPD to engage in any such "visioning" or planning process for this land that cannot now be legally developed. Doing so will waste taxpayer money in payments to consultants and other third parties and to city employees working on the project. It will also force interested Denver citizens to unnecessarily spend valuable time and effort.</p>
Email (Cont)	Maria Flora, SOS (cont.)	2/5/2021	<p>( continued from above) If the City insists on proceeding with this "visioning" and planning process, it should at the very least be done in an authentic, honest, balanced and transparent manner. That is not happening now. To this end, SOS Denver makes the following requests: 1. Prior to launching any planning process for the PHGC land, create a balanced Steering Committee that does not reflect Mayor Hancock's strong desire to support Westside's development plans for the PHGC land. 2. Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of why it is now appropriate for CPD to spend the money and to require expenditure of City staff time on a "visioning" and planning process for this land that cannot be developed without a court order pursuant to C.R.S. §38-30.5-107. 3. Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of facts that would support a judicial determination that based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land since July 11, 2019- it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the conservation purposes of the PHGC land conservation easement. 4. Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of how the City intends to comply with the provisions of C.R.S. §38-30.5-107 in connection with any plan for development on the PHGC land. And, if the City takes the position that it does not need to comply with C.R.S. §38-30.5-107, we request a written explanation of the bases for that position. 5. Promptly add content to the CPD website to provide a balanced and transparent discussion of the Park Hill Golf Course land. The CPD website includes the following documents prepared by the City: (a) "GOLF COURSE USE RESTRICTIONS, Conservation Easement on the Park Hill Golf Course, October 1, 2019" and (b) "PARK HILL GOLF COURSE FAQ Updated and Revised: November 4, 2019." For balance, provide to members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website the following additional documents: a. the SOS Denver document captioned "What Is A Colorado Conservation Easement?" (attached to this letter) b. the SOS Denver document captioned "Analysis of the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement" dated December 15, 2020 (attached to this letter) Promptly add all the Brother Jeff Fard interviews regarding the Park Hill Golf Course land. As stated above, the CPD website includes the video of the October 23, 2020 Brother Jeff Fard's interview identified as "Meet the property owners: Westside Investment Partners with the Holleran Group." To provide balance, post videos of Brother Jeff Fard's September 2, 2020 interview with Penfield Tate and his December 8, 2020 interview with Tony Pigford. 7. Promptly provide the members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website the following additional documents: a. the SOS Denver document captioned "Facts Regarding Denver's Need for Parks and Open Space" updated December 15, 2020 (attached to this letter) b. the SOS Denver document captioned "A Short History of the Park Hill Golf Course Land" dated October 2020 (attached to this letter) c. The SOS Denver document captioned "POSITION PAPER Regarding the Future of the Park Hill Golf Course Land Open Space" dated August 14, 2019 (attached to this letter) 8. All Steering Committee members should promptly and publicly disclose the following at the outset of the Steering Committee process: any past or present contractual or employment relationship with the City or any of its agencies; any past or present contractual or employment relationship with or equity interest in Westside and/or any of its principals and/or its subsidiary companies; any past or present contractual or employment relationship with or equity interest in any entity under contract or negotiating a contract or interest with Westside and/or any of its principals and/or its subsidiary companies for the proposed development of the PHGC land; any past or present personal relationships with principals of Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies; any past or present personal relationships with anyone in a senior position with the City; any commitments, promises or things of value received from Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies; any present, promised, and/or anticipated pecuniary interest in development on the PHGC land.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email (Cont.)	Maria Flora, SOS (cont.)	2/5/2021	9.Include presentations and discussions in the early meetings of the Steering Committee that address the public health and environmental implications of open space and public park land as it relates to the PHGC land and the local and extended neighborhoods. SOS Denver should be included as a primary participant in such presentations and discussions.10.In addition to Steering Committee meetings, all meetings, including CommunityNavigator events such as #ParkHillGolfCourseTalks, should be publicly noticed at least seven days in advance and should be accessible to the public via remote teleconference and should be recorded with the recordings posted on the CPD website for public access. Meaningful time should be reserved at all meetings for public comment and questions and after each meeting CPD staff should post on the CPD website answers to all questions that were asked by participants and attendees and that were not fully answered during the meeting. 11.Allow Councilwoman CdeBaca to appoint a representative to the Steering Committee and ensure that residents of her Council District 9 are fully represented on the Steering Committee.12.SOS Denver has previously notified Ms. Livingston that it was appointing Penfield Tate to be the alternate to Sandra Robnett on the Steering Committee, and we understand that other organizations have also requested appointment of alternates. Promptly provide confirmation that CPD has accepted these appointments of Steering Committee alternates. Thank you for your attention to these issues. We request that CPD promptly provides a copy of this letter and its attachments to members of the Steering Committee.
Email	Cindy Johnstone	2/8/2021	I want to thank you for your work and acknowledge your background and your understanding of the need to consider all things when looking at zoning and development.I was curious when I saw CPD's suggestion to the steering committee to read the "Color of Law". The takeaway for me from the book is that Blacks were denied home ownership which created an economic inequity. Home ownership is a backbone of how our grandparents, and parents attained and passed one to their children the economic advantage white people have today. Believing the takeaway one would have to consider, if this land is developed, how the City would guarantee a reparation to the Black community surrounding the golf course. I would consider at least a 50 percent guaranteed home ownership for Blacks. The ownership would be backed financially by the City. It is a heavy lift for the City. Please give me a little more of your time. I am the City, as you are, and my thoughts are important, there is an need for someone outside of the catchment area to have a seat at the steering committee table. I am not asking to be at the table but the point is obvious. My compass says there is a divergence of thought as to what is best for the City, me. I believe our City is dying because of development without additional open space. As you know this has been a mantra I have advocated for many years. I love that you started in Parks and we have had brief conversations about the importance of open space. I will be dead in 10 to 15 years and really I think I may die before the effects of development begin to significantly hurt you and our younger population.The train has left the station and I have little hope it will be stopped. I have faith that you and your department have the best interest of the City at heart. I don't believe the same of our Mayor. Please think about what I have written to you. I don't know what you can do to make it better, even being an important cog in the City wheel. I hope you have influence to guide the process without bowing to vested interests of the City and the developer. What more can I say. I am sad.
Email	John Cochran	2/9/2021	Given the hard work and expense that has gone into protecting open space in Denver, why does the current administration AND the existing property owner both think that they can consider overturning the existing 1997 conservation easement on the property? Wasn't this easement created by the city in order to specifically prevent and prohibit this sort of upcoming proposed development?
Email	Jacob Southard	2/9/2021	I urge you to keep Park Hill Golf Course as an open space and do not develop the land. The City is in desperate need of more parks and open spaces that help mitigate climate change, air pollution, heat islands, and are healthy locations for people to congregate and exercise. I understand that Denver needs more housing, but there are plenty of parking lots all over Denver that could be developed to provide that housing. Please do not develop Park Hill Golf Course, this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something amazing for the City of Denver.
Email	Chris Johnson	2/9/2021	My family & I reside in nearby Central Park. We strongly support honoring former Mayor Webb's vision of keeping Park Hill open space in perpetuity. Specifically, we prefer for Park Hill to remain a PUBLIC golf course.
Email	Tim Dea	2/9/2021	How is it this is even being considered, given the legal brief on the Parkhill golf course land. Additionally, Denver is so behind the times when it comes to open green space. This needs to be shut down immediately as an option for development. Obey the law and protect open green space.
Email	Leif Thomas	2/9/2021	Why are we planning anything on this land until the Courts have decided that the easement on the land is impossible to maintain? Why is the neighborhood North, East South and West of the property not included in the Vision Planning for this area? Given the Parks and Rec Advisory board said the easement should stand and the city should purchase the land why haven't this recommendation by the citizens of Denver voices been listened too?
Email	Katherine Cornwell	2/9/2021	What is the fair market value of land in central Denver with proximity to light rail, freeway access, the airport, downtown, and abundant community amenities? \$165k/acre is not anywhere close to fair market value. Has there been a study of the fair market value of the land? If so, has it had any public review? Without such a study, how can any decision be made about the disposition of the easement? Is the steering committee prepared to put a value on the conservation easement equal to the fair market value of central city land? The speculative developers should pay the fair market value of the conservation easement if it is to be lifted to compensate the taxpayers for the loss of a strategically negotiated open space agreement. Otherwise the easement should remain the easement should remain in place.If development moves forward will there be any requirements for affordable housing and permanent supportive housing?

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Jeffrey Bennis	2/9/2021	<p>I am incredibly disappointed in the fact that there is no public Q&amp;A in the agenda for the meeting today. A couple of questions I would like to have asked the City and County of Denver hosting this event. How many green spaces the size of Park Hill Golf Course have been added within the city and county of Denver in the last 20 years? How many new green spaces of any size have been added in terms of the number of new parks and new open spaces in the past twenty years compared to how many new high density commercial, residential and retail development projects have occurred? How many properties that were previously developed in Denver have been destroyed and turned into green spaces?</p> <p>A couple of thoughts I would have liked to share. 1. We will never have a green space in Denver of this size and scale to preserve again. 2. Denver green space is shrinking, not growing 3. This property should remain a green space either as a public park, open space or golf course or mixed use green space. 4. There is plenty of property around Denver to build more apartments and retail. Try Colfax from Colorado to Quebec to start. It needs a lot of help. There are so many unused retail and dilapidated residential units that need to be redeveloped. The developer could build 5 Park Hills. 5. This property if it was sold on the open market would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to developers if it could be fully developed. The 25 million dollar price tag these developers purchased the property for is not the real value to the citizens of the city and county of Denver. It is only because its a conservation easement was in place that the price was so low. 6. The city and county of Denver should only do one thing, buy the property back from the developer and remove their seat at the table. This property was never theirs and they should not have a seat at the table. I moved to Denver in 1997 purchasing my first home near DU. I moved here because it was a city with parks. Please preserve this space and reverse the trend. This city is heading in the wrong direction and developing the golf course / green space would be the wrong idea and send the wrong message about what's important to keep this city alive.</p>
Email	Dylan Mackay	2/9/2021	<p>I was just on that Zoom meeting. Trying to raise my hand up and down but was not given a mic to speak. Why is the meeting about the past and race? I live across the street from the golf course. Been living here 11 years. Was told not to live in this neighborhood but did so anyway. LOVE my neighbors. Majority of which are LATINO not black. The blacks have moved in up the street in the low income housing or homeless shelter on the corner of 40th and Colorado or kate corner at Smith Rd and Albion St. There were no black neighbors other than my friend on the corner of Harrison and 39th when I moved here 11 years ago. What a sham. Either way, when the victimhood discussion ends and the discussion on what to do with Park Hill Golf Course begins. Please let me know. There are more people in this neighborhood than just black people.... who'd actually like to be heard by the "committee". And equity? Equity is getting something out from what you put in. Period. Capital produces equity.</p>
Email	John Cochran	2/11/2021	<p>I truly appreciate you taking the time to deal with my question and bring me up to speed with the two links that you provided. Thank you!!! I'm impressed by your efforts going above and beyond!! The links were also well done and very helpful. I'm curious to know if George Clayton, d. 1899, had any land use or land preservation requests in his will regarding this property? I can more clearly now see how this is tricky but I still suspect that it might be a stretch to use this opportunity to open up the property to determine some sort of desired neighborhood development utilizing new building uses. Instead, I had hoped that the land use limitations would have been clearly identified BEFORE this was opened up for community input. (perhaps it was and I am still playing catch up?). It goes without any doubt that the neighborhood would prefer a community inputted set of uses built out (local grocery, community center, etc) all to the detriment of open space. So I fear that the cart is now ahead of the horse, but perhaps not. As you know, once open space is gone, there is no getting it back and this site has the potential to be a jewel of natural beauty for generations to come if properly protected.</p>
Email	Brian and Kathy O'Shaughnessy	2/13/2021	<p>I am a Denver resident living in Hilltop. I am sending in my recommendation to keep the area in question a golf course. No more high rise apartments or retail. That has just been done at 8th and Colorado.</p> <p>We need to increase outdoor activity for our community, especially after this pandemic. Golf interest has increased and I vote that you restore the Park Hill Golf course. That is what the land was intended to be since the beginning. Do not let greedy developers come in and destroy the beauty and peacefulness of that area. Allow Coloradoans the privilege of enjoying our wonderful climate and outdoor facilities by allowing us to socialize and exercise - restore the golf course.</p>
Email	Andrew Sweet	2/14/2021	<p>Got your Email information from an article about the Park Hill Golf course. This surely has been quite the debacle, and quite the process. Yet, this land is really a unique thing here in NE Denver and so I wanted to weigh in.</p> <p>Given our growing city, our diverse population, our problems with housing and transportation, I can easily see all sides of these arguments. I also want to say that the IMMEDIATE community input needs to be the KEY and CENTRAL population who should be listened to. I am now a resident of Crestmoor Park, but for 32 years lived in South Park Hill. When I look at all the constituencies involved, I keep coming back to one theme; GREEN SPACE. You know the statistics on this - we are losing our enviable % of green spaces in the city. We have prided ourselves for years for being outstanding about planting trees, having parks, nurturing people with walking paths, etc. Today I want to reiterate those themes and suggest strongly that PH Golf course remain a green space for ALL PEOPLE in the city. We have paved over enough land. We have built enough community space. We have worked on, and still need to work on transportation for all our residents, but the one thing we CANNOT REPLACE, is accessible GREEN SPACE.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	John Cochran	2/14/2021	<p>In the meantime I was able to find a copy of the 1997 easement, attached. I believe that the easement language is critical and should be readily posted for any that care to know more. I interpret the easement very differently than the two Denvergov summary links that you shared with me and so now want to share my input with you:</p> <p>I see the easement as clearly speaking to and identifying TWO important uses. One for the Land as open space in general and the other as Golf Course in particular. Meaning that for \$2m received, the owner must; 1. maintain the land as open space AND 2. Allow use of it as golf course or other permitted recreational uses.</p> <p>The easement of the Land is preserved for recreational uses (paragraph 2) and specifically permitted for golf as well as other unrelated to golf recreational uses "( ...ball fields, tennis courts, etc." (end of par 6a.).</p> <p>In summary, now that I have a deeper understanding of the history and of the easement language I no longer hope or think that the Will might shed some clarity on the situation. Clearly the Will left the farm land to the city as trustee and then the City was allowed to eventually build a golf course for public on the land, 1932. Then in 1997 the CEL as Trustee was willing to take \$2M in return for preserving the land as open space and to continue operating the golf course or to use the land for other recreational open space uses. I also discovered that Mayor Webb and his attorneys in 1997 and forward from that time have clearly believed that the land was to be preserved as open space. Its he that signed the Easement on behalf of the City and then spoke out in 2019 on behalf of preserving this open space from development. I do understand the importance of letting the local residents have input and decision making rights into the future of the Golf course but before that happens I believe that the City has a responsibility to properly and thoroughly interpret the easement that it created and paid for. It stirs the hornets' nest and gives the neighbors false hope to have them involved in the current Zoom process when a court has not yet had the opportunity to rule on how to interpret the easement for future development. It appears that the City wants the neighbors at this time to help lead the process for future development and perhaps this is because the City has decided that the land IS able to go thru a process for limited future development. If so, I respectfully do not agree. I know that you should not have time for all of my input here let alone to respond to it so I sincerely hope that I have not gone too far. I enjoyed your link to the City's success with C. Vientos Park. Well done Denvergov! Three weeks ago I was truly unaware of this issue but as I move between</p>
Email	Patrick Lavin	2/21/2021	<p>I live in Park Hill at 29th and Elm, less than a mile from the Park Hill Golf Course. I am writing to ask the City to maintain the conservation easement on this property. It's important that we keep the parks and open spaces available to us for both recreation and our health.</p>
Email	Jennifer Anderson	2/22/2021	<p>I wanted to let you know that I live in Park Hill, and I would like to see the Park Hill Golf course retain its conservation easement, as purchased by the City of Denver for \$2M in the 1990's. I would like the property to become an open space property or park that will have a positive impact on the climate/environment and ensure that residents have a place to recreate.</p>
Email	Jennifer Anderson	2/23/2021	<p>I do know that and think that is why it is perfect for an open space/park. The fact that it is privately owned has no bearing on the conservation easement. The developer knew that easement existed when they bought it, and the price was less because of it. The city paid for the easement with taxpayer dollars, and we must continue to get the benefit of what we paid for.</p>
Email	Maria Flora, SOS	3/3/2021	<p>We have had no response to our February 5, 2021 letter addressing, among other things, the makeup of the Steering Committee, the posting of only pro-development content on the CPD website, the refusal of the City to address the termination provisions of the perpetual conservation easement, and the commencement of an expensive planning process in the face of the conservation easement which prohibits development. SOS Denver would appreciate the courtesy of a thorough response. Members of SOS Denver observed the first "Visioning Process" Steering Committee meeting and have seen the Agenda, Voluntary Disclosure Form and draft Charter for the second Steering Committee meeting on March 9. From these documents and the conduct of the first meeting, it is apparent that this planning process is, in the words of Ms. Aldrete, "market driven by a developer." It is not authentic, honest, balanced or transparent. It is a sham "push" campaign with a predetermined development outcome. "General issues associated with the legality around modifying conservation easements are excluded from the Steering Committee's scope. While these issues are important and related, they cannot be resolved in this venue." Draft Charter, page 2. Only CPD is allowed to discuss the "legality" of the Conservation Easement, parroting the simplistic and misleading CAO legal theory that the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land always "has to be a golf course" if the Conservation Easement is preserved: "In 1997, a conservation easement was signed between the City and County of Denver and the property owner at the time, Clayton Early Learning, stating that the property would be restricted for use as an 18-hole golf course. In 2019, the property was purchased by a private company, Westside Development Partners. There are some in the community that wish for the property to remain as-is with the conservation easement in place restricting the use to a golf course. Draft Charter, page 1. It is an inconvenient fact from the City's perspective that the PHGC land cannot be developed in the face of the Conservation Easement. That fact is the elephant in the room. Any process that does not include a robust explanation and discussion of the legal issues involved with the Conservation Easement and the benefits of the Conservation Easement is not authentic, honest, balanced or transparent. The Draft Charter requires Steering Committee members to accept ten Committee Member Agreements. They include: "Consider equity as a guiding principal for all the Steering Committee's work" and "Seek solutions to any disagreements that are mutually satisfying for all committee members, considering equity to help guide discussions" Draft Charter, p. 4. SOS Denver is in favor of "equity". Without context and clear definition, however, the term "equity" has no meaning in the proposed Charter. "Equity" should not be used to steer discussion towards a predetermined pro-development outcome or to portray those who disagree with development on the PHGC land as insensitive to "equity." It is certainly not "equitable" to eliminate discussion of the conservation easement or public health and environmental equity. •The draft Charter is silent on conflicts of interest. That is left to the Voluntary Disclosure Form. •The draft Charter does not address the ability of the public to participate in the Steering Committee meetings. Participants from the public are not allowed to see who is on the Zoom call, to comment in the chat or see other participant's comments. CPD should accept questions from the public in the chat and follow up with written responses. Alternatively, CPD should run the meetings like City Council, with a 30-minute comment period before each meeting. Voluntary Disclosure Form. However, we disagree with CDP's narrow approach to conflicts of interest. We also disagree that disclosures should be voluntary and that conflicts of interest will not disqualify a Steering Committee member. Unfortunately, we are already aware of a number of the Steering Committee members appointed by Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes who have actual or potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed to the public and result in disqualification. Steering Committee members should publicly disclose these and any other conflicts of interest: commitments, promises or things of value received from Westside Investment Partners and/or any of its subsidiary companies;</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora (cont.)	3/3/2021 (cont)	(continued from above) past and present relationships with Westside Investment Partners as a contractor, subcontractor or equity interest holder;-present or anticipated pecuniary interest in development on the PHGC land;-past or present relationships with the City and any of its agencies, as an employee, contractor or subcontractor;-past or present personal relationships with principals of Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies;-past or present personal relationships with anyone in a senior position with the City. There are serious flaws in the "Visioning Process" as discussed in our February 5 letter, and the "Visioning Process" should not go forward without those flaws first being addressed and fully remedied. And, the "Visioning Process" cannot possibly be authentic, honest, balanced or transparent unless there is a full and frank discussion of the perpetual Conservation Easement, how it prohibits development, how it cannot be readily terminated and how it could be modified to permit use of the land consistent with the recreation and open space purposes of the Conservation Easement. Thank you for your attention to these issues. We once again request that CPD promptly provide all Steering Committee members our February 5 letter, with its attachments, that CPD fully respond to our February 5 letter and take actions to resolve the issues addressed in our February 5 letter, and that CPD promptly provide a copy of this letter to all Steering Committee members and promptly address the issues discussed in this letter.
Email	Lacie Jennings	3/9/2021	I would like to strongly recommend that the Hon. Candi CdeBaca be included in the visioning process for the 155 acres of the Park Hill Golf course. While I live in District 8, we need to have representation from neighboring areas to ensure all needs are served/ addressed. Please let me know how to ensure the process is inclusive of all area neighborhoods that will be impacted.
Email	Ken Walker	3/9/2021	I was on the zoom meeting yesterday for Park Hill Golf Course and I was configured as "view only" participate mode is their some process that I need do or register for to be able to ask questions? I would like to more involved in any committee regarding the future of the land usage if possible? A little about myself I was born and raised within the neighborhood clayton neighbor still a current resident of 60 years (ouch) I've seen many changes within the community and I would like to hear what other neighbor members thoughts and opinions are and maybe contribute if possible. Little comedy I remember as a kid shopping at King Soopers and Safeway store at Holly shopping center lots of memories
Email	Harry Doby	3/10/2021	I wanted to bring to your attention an opportunity to fulfill our city's promise to its citizens to provide an equitable, healthy and affordable place to live and prosper. I just read in this morning's Denver Post that the Federal government is planning to sell a large parcel in East Denver formerly occupied by the VA Hospital on the corner of 9th and Clermont. This 8 acre campus is located in a mixed residential, commercial and retail neighborhood within walking distance of an existing grocery store and would be an ideal location for affordable, mixed use development. If the city could work with a non-profit organization to quickly secure this location at a favorable price, it could be transformed into a wonderful place for families to have access to the kinds of health and lifestyle amenities so often denied them."A spokesman for the Department of Veterans Affairs said it has "excessed" 8 acres at the corner of Ninth Avenue and Clermont Street, in the Hale neighborhood, to the General Services Administration."With 8 acres of walkable neighborhood, surely one or two of those acres could be transformed into a green commons area with trees and permeable surfaces to mitigate heat island effects, provide walk paths for exercise, picnic tables for family and social gatherings, and benches for resting and relaxation.If the city has the will to put forth a compelling case to the General Services Administration for the purchase for such a socially beneficial purpose, I think it would be a much more satisfactory solution than yet another "Luxury Apartment" development that has flooded our city in recent years.
Email	Joanna Johnson	3/22/2021	I just submitted the below to The Denver Post as a Letter to the Editor, and thought I'd cc you as well as my support of Park Hill remaining open green space, and a public golf course in particular. 'Regarding "We Can't Gamble Away Last Piece of Protected Open Space" I'm surprised that I haven't read and heard more about Park Hill Golf Course's open space visioning process in the local media, as this is virtually the last and largest parcel of open green space that the City of Denver has remaining. Denver acquired this large parcel of land under former Mayor Wellington Webb who protected this green space into perpetuity with a conservation easement requiring the land to remain a golf course open to all. The fact that the current administration is considering developing this land makes me furious. Once green space is developed, one cannot go back. Furthermore, I support Mayor Webb's intention that this land be used a public golf course. I am biased however, as I live nearby, I play golf, and I cannot afford a private golf club.

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora, SOS	3/23/2021	<p>Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes responded only superficially to our February 5, 2021 letter on March 3, 2021. I am not surprised that they assert that “the Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process ... has been fair, neutral and transparent” and the steering committee is “well-rounded and diverse,” while denying that it is a “developer led” process. In fact, the Visioning process to date is far from fair, neutral or transparent. To the contrary, it is increasingly apparent that the Visioning process is, in the words of Ms. Aldrete to City Council, “market driven by a developer” with a predetermined development outcome. Most importantly, the Steering Committee will not be allowed to discuss the Conservation Easement; at the same time, CPD has advanced at every turn the simplistic and misleading CAO legal theory that the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land always “has to be a golf course” if the Conservation Easement is preserved. Any process that does not include a robust explanation and discussion of the legal issues involved with the Conservation Easement and the benefits of the Conservation Easement is not fair, neutral or transparent. The Steering Committee is asked to “consider equity as a guiding principal for all the Steering Committee’s work,” without context or definition. “Equity” should not be used to steer discussion towards a predetermined pro-development outcome or to portray those who disagree with development on the PHGC land as insensitive to “equity.” It is certainly not “equitable” to eliminate discussion of the conservation easement or public health and environmental equity. Despite our requests, participants from the public are still not allowed to see who is on the Visioning Zoom calls, to comment in the chat or see other participant’s comments. We again ask that CPD accept questions from the public in the chat and follow up with written responses, or alternatively, run the meetings like City Council, with a 30-minute comment period before each meeting. The Steering Committee is not “well-rounded and diverse.” We are aware of a number of members who have actual or potential conflicts of interest. We agree with CPD that “disclosure of any potential conflict of interest promotes transparency and public trust.” CPD, however, improperly insists that disclosures should be voluntary, narrowly defines conflicts of interest, and states that conflicts of interest will not disqualify a Steering Committee member. The selection process pointedly excluded the District 9 PRAB appointee, yet includes several members who are in leadership positions with facilitator DMCI, or Smart Growth Initiatives. Smart Growth Initiatives’ board includes Holleran Group principals Norman Harris and Ty Hubbard. The Holleran group is a “partner” of Westside Investment Partners. Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes purport to be conducting a “community conversation about the future of this property.” However, only pro-development content is posted on the CPD website. All presenters to the Steering Committee to date are either City employees or City contractors. We have had no response to our request to schedule presentations and discussions regarding the public health and environmental implications of open space and public park land as it relates to the PHGC land and the local and extended neighborhoods, with SOS Denver included as a primary participant. This is in no way a community conversation, but a sham “push” campaign by CPD with a predetermined development outcome. During the week of March 9, CPD mailed a survey to homes within a mile of the Park Hill Golf Course land. The Steering Committee was not provided with the survey before it was mailed and had no say in its design. THE SURVEY OMITTS ANY MENTION OF THE CONSERVATION EASEMENT. Question 3 asks: What statement do you most agree with? (SELECT ONLY ONE.) a.Keep the Park Hill Golf Course site as 100% golf course, or b.Use the site to provide a variety of open space, recreation and/or other community- serving uses The survey perpetuates the lie that the land must be used as a golf course under the conservation easement, creating a false premise. For that reason, it is fatally flawed from the outset and should be rejected in any fair, neutral and transparent process. The “Visioning Process” cannot possibly be fair, neutral or transparent without a full and frank discussion of the perpetual Conservation Easement, how it prohibits development, how it cannot be readily terminated and how it could be modified to permit use of the land consistent with the recreation and open space purposes of the Conservation Easement. Thank you for your attention to these issues. <del>We once again request that CPD promptly provide all Steering Committee members this letter and our February 5 and March 2 letters and attachments fully respond to our</del></p>
Email	Elliott Joern	3/24/2021	<p>I am on the Board of Denver Squid - Aquatics Club, the largest LGBT+ aquatics club in Denver and we need badly a Natatorium that this city could be proud of and be of great use to the adults aquatic community / underserved communities. What's great about the Park Hills location is that the area is: On the RTD A-Line and is close to a station, which gives great access to downtown and travel from the airport. This access from the airport is great for tournaments / events / swim meets. Would help serve lower income areas who do not have the same privileges/access to proper aquatic facilities like the Metropolitan area. Would provide easier public transportation by rail and bus to LGBT+ communities Is located near I-70 that would easy access by car. I would love to share Ideas and get involved as I also have an architectural background and have an interest in planning / public transportation.</p>
Email	Kathryn Jantz	3/24/2021	<p>Has there been any thoughts about using some of the space for a long course swimming pool? There is a huge shortage of swimming options in Denver and no indoor fifty meter pool open to the public</p>
Email	Stephanie Haskett	3/24/2021	<p>Please consider a pool with multi uses including a competition pool. Pools are expensive I know and because we have so many aging pools around they are being closed up without renovating and this is leading to a lack of pool space. Learning to swim, swimming for enjoyment or exercise, kids honing their swimming skills is important for our community. Competition pools can be money generators if thought through to offer what’s needed. The swimming community is a tight knit community and would appreciate your thoughts on providing more opportunity for swimming space.</p>
Email	Crystal Polis	3/24/2021	<p>I just wanted to voice my support for a 50 meter pool as you consider options to redevelop Park Hill Golf Course. O saw a notice on Facebook to send comments to you. There isn’t a good 50 meter pool in Denver and with so many competitive swimmers here, it would be utilized heavily. Also, it could become a destination for meets and competitions and help positively impact the economy in the surrounding neighborhood.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process – Comment Log**

Email	Michelle Bergen	3/24/2021	<p>I am a Denver resident and a life-long competitive swimmer. I have been swimming at DU on their Masters team for 18 years. As Masters swimmers, we are down the priority list for DU as they focus on their student athletes and younger kid teams. Since COVID hit, we have not been able to swim at DU at all. All members of our team are dispersed and have had to scramble to find other alternatives for swimming. This is made even more difficult because the Denver rec centers remain closed. Additionally, I am a resident of Congress Park and that 50 meter pool is currently planned for construction/expansion and will not be back open until 2022. There is easily enough room on the (Park Hill Golf Course) land being considered for redevelopment for a recreation center and an indoor 50 meter pool. Benefits to the City from this investment: Creating a destination Aquatic Facility! • Big swim meets mean bookings for hotels, meals for hundreds of hungry swimmers and transportation to and from the meet. With the close proximity to the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station, swimmers, coaches and spectators can stay and support local businesses near any of the rail stations on the Denver Metro mass transportation system. • This pool would serve an underserved community by including pool access with learn to swim lessons for children and adults, swimming development programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for athletes on the USA Swimming Olympic track.</li> <li>• Building this facility would provide a landmark place to host the Denver Parks and Recreation summer/winter league championship.</li> <li>• Providing long course meters (LCM), short course yards (SCY) and short course meters (SCM) access will help the Denver swimming community, including year-round swimming leagues, Denver high schools and college swimming leagues. There are over 38 USA swimming teams based out of Denver metro area who need LCM lanes in the summer. With good scheduling, this facility could be booked and generating revenue for Denver Parks and Rec all day long, just about every day! Beyond our local community needs, an indoor LCM pool will draw in swimming programs with elite swimmers from all over the country who are looking for high altitude training venues for their swimmers early in their competition seasons, much like when La Alma was rented for Missy Franklin and Clark Smith's (both former Olympians) and their swimming teams in 2009. The revenue from renting lanes at this facility can be scheduled year-round as different programs ramp up for different swimming seasons. In your review for this planning and visioning, please consider an indoor 50 meter swimming pool to serve Denver and surrounding areas. It's very difficult to find a place to put in our practices and laps and this pool is very needed by the community.</li> </ul>
Email	Dr. Michael J. Kosnett	3/25/2021	<p>Will there be a formal assessment by environmental and public health professionals of the environmental and public health impacts of all potential options possible for the former PHGC, ranging from partial development and a 60 acre park, to complete use of the entire 155 acres as open space or parkland? Why or why not?</p>
Email	Geoffrey Chappell	3/25/2021	<p>Thank you, Courtney, for the wonderful presentation. Both my partner and I watched the entire show and we're very hopeful for an outcome that will please the residents of Park Hill. My partner grew up here and is very invested in Park Hill's future. I attended most of the meetings at Holly Square with Gerry Grimes and company. I hope to better understand the process as it moves along. I appreciate what you are working so hard at on our behalf.</p>
Email	Andrew Levasseur	3/25/2021	<p>There are a lot of factors and stakeholders involved with planning and steering this project. I truly believe that just about everyone's needs can be met. Consider going bigger rather than smaller. Benefits for the area and city in building a large comprehensive recreation center and regional aquatic complex: There will be major tax revenue for the city generated from increased usage of Airbnb's, hotels, restaurants and service businesses when large events are hosted at the facility. This facility will create job opportunities for our youth, trainers, coaches and sports program facilitators as well as administrators. Having new state of the art meeting rooms and community center area with in the facility will build support for and with the residents of the area.</p> <p>A nine hole par 3 training golf course could be maintained on the land and used by the Rec center for teaching golf. The recently rebuilt City Park golf course is a short distance away and will provide a state of the art 18 hole championship golf course for the advanced youth golfers, high school teams and adult leagues.</p> <p>There is room on the land for athletic fields for soccer, football, baseball/softball, tennis and frisbee golf all of which could be supported and maintained by instructors and staff from the Rec center.</p> <p>There is still room to leave open space and a groomed park at the north end of the property where there is a pond with abundant wildlife and a recently built very large retention reservoir to alleviate street flooding in the area.</p> <p>The Rec center needs to include the following: Parking Administration and staff offices Meeting and exercise rooms A main cold water 50 meter swimming pool with bulkheads to allow for SCM, LCM and SCY configurations with the ability to host swimming, water polo, diving and underwater hockey. A secondary 25 yard warm water pool to be used for swim lessons, senior sneakers and water fitness classes.</p> <p>A child aqua play zone with a slide, 0 depth entry, fountains and sprays and a lazy river. There should be a gymnasium suitable for indoor basketball, volleyball and other hard court games. A weight room with free weights, weight machines, tread mills and ellipticals. Several multipurpose rooms for fitness classes that can be used for dry land training, yoga, spin class and other physical activity classes. Low income, minority and underserved communities should be afforded a state of the art recreation center and the opportunity to be immersed in aquatic and land physical education programs as they grow up in a welcoming and nurturing environment in their neighborhood and all within biking distance and close to the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station for increased access to youth and adults from all over the City! If you build it, they will come! The planners and steering committee need to know that the needs of the swimming population are not being met by continuing to build facilities that are not conducive or safe training or competition in swimming, diving or water polo. Our current inventory of 50 meter pools is Congress park. Due to the fact that the shallow end is only 3 feet and the pool of an unusual shape, it cannot really be used for swimming training, water polo or diving during the 2 months in the summer when it is open. We need something better!</p>
Email	Nancy Ulrich	3/25/2021	<p>Who is on the steering committee? who presently owns the property. what is the status of the City's easement and what does it mean for the process going forward. Why does this have to be voted on by all the city residents? The name change from Stapleton did not have to do that.</p>
Email	Robyn Fishman	3/25/2021	<p>It was stated in the open house that 100% development is not allowed- but, what is the MINIMUM park/open space that would be required? Could it be 95% developed? 75%? Only 20%? Is that specific to what the easement vote change would be? Your survey feels highly manipulative. Question 2 asks us to choose a statement we agree with most: 1. 100% golf course 2. Use the site to provide a variety of open space, recreation, "and/or other community-serving uses" - I am concerned that answering yes to #2 will be used to say "X% majority of people want to see it serve the community such as a grocery store and housing" when really they might want ONLY open space that ISN'T a golf course. Why isn't there an option for people to answer they want to see the conservation easement changed to provide for a park/wildlife preserve or 100% open space but NOT specifically limited to a golf course? - Is the 3 year visioning process a minimum or a maximum? I think I heard conflicting info tonight</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Michael Kosnett	4/5/2021	<p>Thank you for your Email of March 26 responding to the question I submitted for the Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Meeting of March 25. I sincerely believe your Email was not responsive to my query. There has never been a question as to whether the City of Denver general in considers "community health" important. My question inquired specifically whether the City will have environmental and public health professionals consider the environmental and public health impact of specific future options for the future of PHGC. For example, consider two of several potential options that have been discussed: Option 1: 155 acres of open space or parkland Option 2: 60 acres of open space or parkland, and 95 acres of residential and commercial development. The impact of these two respective options can be examined and compared in a formal impact assessment. Potential outcomes subject to assessment could include, but not be limited to:</p> <p>a. The impact of each option on recreational and exercise opportunities for the residents of Park Hill and the City of Denver, and indirectly, the relative contribution that each option might have on the physical and psychological health of these populations based on reasonably predicted usage rates. For example, if one option yielded an estimate of X number of person hours of outdoor physical exercise for community members, and the other option estimated Y person hours of outdoor physical exercise, this could pose a differential impact on health outcomes influenced by outdoor exercise, including obesity and cardiovascular disease, among others.</p> <p>b. The impact of each option on climate and outdoor air quality in the vicinity of the former PHGC. The options may have different impacts based on levels of projected vehicular traffic and emissions, climatic implications of different acreage of paved areas and greenscape, differential effects on water run-off and sewer system infrastructure, and so on.</p> <p>c. The impact of each option on ambient noise (in decibels) in and around the former PHGC site. Ambient noise has been shown in several studies to have an impact on physical and mental health. Each of the above impacts can be assessed in terms of monetized and non-monetized metrics. Environmental and public health professionals are skilled in making these assessments. The process is similar to formal Environmental Impact Statements that for decades have been required for federal projects in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The future status of the 155 acre site of the former PHGC in the Park Hill neighborhood will have major implications for the residents of Denver. Accordingly, I consider it essential for any decision making process that will influence that future status to be informed in advance by a formal environmental and public health assessment of specific options.</p>
Email/letter	Jerome Grosskopf	4/7/2021	<p>I am very grateful to have a voice in the planning for the Parkhill golf course space. I realize that the parks department and the community planning and development hold a difficult space in meeting the needs of the growing Denver community. I applaud your efforts in working to fulfill that responsibility in the midst of a polarized community. I filled out the survey and mailed it. Thank you very much. My name is Jerome Grosskopf and my wife is Martha Grosskopf. We have been part of Northeast Parkhill for seven years. We enjoy the community very much. Part of my context and values is that we are senior citizens so to speak. I have spent most of my life in area of sales, negotiations and mediations. I just wanted to write this letter as a means to assist you in the success of creating new spaces for the greater good of everyone in the community including the developers. Some of the principles I use in mediation are values, realities, agreements and strategies. I have included my template. Collect the values of the whole together space no matter who is present in that together space. (Which seems to be a part of your survey) Treat that together space as the most important space. Treat all values as equal and part of the whole solution. Collaborate with individuals and their values to work toward the all important together space that will give the greatest fulfillment. It has been my experience the greatest happiness comes from individuals and their unique contributions working toward that together space. The alternative to not collaborating is misery and polarization where the valued individuals/groups clash with the values of other individuals/groups. Usually the ones with the most power and money triumph over the ones with least power and money. And as you may realize also that the reverse is as equally miserable where the minority values would rule over other values in the group. This is why I believe in the together template that I use in all my negotiations. The other part of the together template includes realities. There are realities of time, limited money and resources, realities of a growing Denver population, realities of the actual physical space, realities of previous historical agreements for the use of that space, realities of a political system that introduces our own biases and political agendas, there also is the reality of my own alignment and pride that impacts the greater whole to name a very few. There also is the unique reality of having such a large tract of land and what that uniqueness contributes to the greater together space of Denver. As an example, I would like to highlight the uniqueness of the jewel of Denver- City Park- which is hard to quantify in terms of pure economic value but the power, healing influence of that space is felt through the greater Denver community. It is a unique together gathering space of diverse individuals that normally would not congregate together. So when considering values of the whole- I would urge reflection on what this park hill tract of land would contribute to the greater whole for future generations that a building, education facility, athletic facility, business, homes is not able to contribute to the well being of the together Denver space. I would also ask you to consider the realities of the past violence and healing needed in this neighborhood as you consider strategies for this park hill tract of land. I am always impacted by the history of the burning of Holly Square and the gang wars of crips and bloods and still desire healing for members of this community. Thank you.</p>
Email	Brooke Benson-Redpath	4/13/2021	<p>I am writing this Email in regard to the city of Denver's visioning process that is currently underway for the Park Hill Golf Course. I was born and raised in Park Hill and currently still live in the area.</p> <p>As I understand, the group Save Our Open Space is attempting to be the "voice" of Park Hill. They are stating that the most efficient use of this land would be 100% park/open space. I believe that as our city continues to grow we as a community need to provide affordable housing, resource centers, grocery stores and amenities to every resident. Those residents with median household incomes or below bring diversity, culture and enrichment to our community. These households should not be forced out of the city. It is important to hear multiple ideas and options from government officials as well as respected developers. This will allow us as a community to decide what is best for the area we reside and to be a part of the process.</p>
Email	Stefanie Bell	4/13/2021	<p>I am beyond irritated. (Recollections of how the East Area "planning" went relative to residents' input!) You all have the registration info from the last meeting. Is there any justifiable reason why you didn't Email the participants from that meeting about the meeting tonight? Especially since the committee just sent out an Email that info from the last meeting is now available? The only info I've seen is courtesy of a poster on Nextdoor!</p>
Telephone	Stefan Drewes	4/16/2021	<p>Consider 18 hole daily fee golf course and allowing one or two days a week daily fee 18 hole disc golf course. The conservation easement does not specify golf or disc. It should be up to the neighbors in that area to determine if they would like some sort of development on the site but we do need more parkland in the city.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Email &amp; Webpage form</p>	<p>Bill Boortz</p>	<p>4/28/2021</p>	<p>Thank you for your service. As a Denver resident, I have been following the Park Hill Golf Course situation. I am a real estate appraiser, and I regularly appraise perpetual conservation easements and property encumbered by perpetual conservation easements. I am shocked that the City and County of Denver would even consider amending or extinguishing the Conservation Easement conveyed to Denver by the George W. Clayton Trust. Clearly the Trust acted in an attempt to fulfill the wishes of George W. Clayton. Denver acquired this Conservation Easement in perpetuity. Perpetuity does not mean only until a better way to make money comes along. I've read the documents. The Conservation Easement is valid and very specific. The Property shall be used as a golf course in perpetuity. That was accepted by Denver. To change course now would be catastrophic in many ways. If the Conservation Easement is somehow invalidated, it will open up the possibility for serious litigation. No one will trust Denver to protect their wishes. The implication upon other conservation easements held by the City or State will be a disaster. Any entity, at any time, will look to this instance as precedent to destroy the good will and hard work of so many. There are countless areas in Colorado that are protected from just this type of money grab by PERPETUAL conservation easements. The sanctity of perpetuity must be protected. If it is not, so many critical protected areas will again be at risk. I realize that Western Investment Partners has invested a great deal in Denver. The list of political contributions made by this group obviously matters and has some impact. I realize that this issue has many layers. The issue should not be whether the community needs affordable housing or a golf course with greater urgency. The issue is honoring the will of donors, living up to Denver's part of the bargain, maintaining respect and trust for Denver and not bowing to today's political will or economic return. Do the right thing. Golf course. In perpetuity. Like Denver promised. Anything else would be a horrible disaster. Thank you for reading this.</p>
<p>Email</p>	<p>Leslie Ratley-Beach, Land Trust Alliance</p>	<p>4/30/2021</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Land Trust Alliance concerning the proposed amendment or extinguishment of a conservation easement by the City and County of Denver on land located on the Park Hill Golf Course. The Land Trust Alliance is the voice of the national land trust community, representing about 1,000 conservation organizations dedicated to supporting the efforts of land trusts and government entities to conserve land now for future generations. As the national leader in conservation policy, standards, education, training and law, we provide information to government agents, attorneys and other professionals on the many aspects of safeguarding protected land in perpetuity. The City and County of Denver holds conservation easements that were granted solely for the public benefit. We hope that you will review the following information and the legal regimes governing conservation easements as you consider Denver's responsibilities to the public in continuing to safeguard conservation of this property. Most conservation easements are granted "in perpetuity," meaning they are intended to protect forever the land they encumber for the conservation purposes specified in the deed of conveyance. Placing land in a conservation easement is a promise that it will not be converted to another use. By funding the purchase of this conservation easement the citizens of Denver have invested in the conservation of their land-based heritage and affirmed the importance of conserving this property. Conservation easements keep land in private ownership and on the tax rolls while preserving resources that are vital to the public interest. As a public investment, they are a more affordable alternative to outright purchase. For private landowners, conservation easements are an opportunity to protect land from development with the added benefit of income from the sale or tax savings from the donation of the easement. Landowners, and their successors, retain the right to possess and use the land consistent with the conservation purpose of the public promise of permanent land conservation. easement, and to sell the land, also subject to the easement. Many conservation easements are donated in full, as a charitable gift to government agencies or nonprofit land conservation organizations. Recognizing the public value of this investment, 49 states and the District of Columbia have enacted some form of legislation that removes the common law impediments to the creation and validity of conservation easements (the "easement-enabling statutes"). Congress enacted Internal Revenue Code Section 170(h) and the accompanying Treasury Regulations, which provide significant tax benefits to individuals who donate (or who receive a portion of the purchase price for the conservation easement and then donate the remaining value) a qualified conservation easement to tax-exempt organizations. The Internal Revenue Code and Treasury Regulations make it clear that to be tax deductible, a conservation easement must be "granted in perpetuity" and its conservation purpose "protected in perpetuity." Easement holders, whether land trusts or government agencies, are responsible for permanently upholding their conservation easements and protecting them against all challenges regardless of whether the easement was donated, purchased or exacted. Easement holders are also required by regulation to have the resources to defend their easements and ensure their permanence. The federal Tax Code requires that the termination of any conservation easement, including purchased easements, be reported to the IRS. This ensures that tax-exempt organizations operate in accordance with their missions, and that they do not convey impermissible private benefits in administering their easements.</p>

Email (Cont)	Leslie Ratley-Beach, Land Trust Alliance (cont)	4/30/2021 (cont)	<p>The past several decades saw an increase in conservation easements as a public policy solution for the protection of land. The evidence for this is in the enactment of easement-enabling statutes, the generous federal (and, in this case, state) tax benefits offered to easement donors and the dedication of taxpayer money for easement purchase programs. This public investment is not only direct, with tax incentives granted and public funds appropriated for easement purchase programs, but also indirect. The public invests in conservation easements by funding government entities that hold and enforce easements; by approving tax-exempt status for more than 1,363 land conservation organizations across the nation; by supporting substantial tax deductions and credits for easement donations, land donations and cash; and by funding oversight of the administration and enforcement of easements on behalf of the public. Dozens of charitable foundations and corporations and thousands of citizens have donated millions of dollars to land trusts for land conservation over decades. This investment must be honored. The most important asset of a land conservation organization – or any government entity holding conservation easements – is public confidence in its mission. When easement holders fail to defend their conservation easements; when governments condemn land or easements by eminent domain; when adverse judicial decisions and statutory changes weaken the laws upholding conservation easements, these losses erode confidence in conservation efforts across America.</p> <p>Extinguishing a conservation easement to promote development contravenes the state enabling statutes and federal regulations. It undermines public confidence in the conservation easements themselves and in the entities charged with the permanent protection of important conservation lands. It thwarts the landowner's voluntary choice to permanently protect private land from development. America loses a football field worth of forests, grasslands, ag land, deserts, and natural places to development every 30 seconds.1 This amounts to approximately 1.39 million acres per year of natural areas, wilderness, historic sites, farms and forests, resources that are critical to our economic future, our public health and our quality of life. Federal and state lawmakers across the country have enacted laws and adopted policies supporting the permanent protection of our rapidly diminishing yet critically important natural capital of clean air and water, wildlife habitat and natural lands. Conservation easements are key to these efforts. They serve a vital public need that has been recognized by lawmakers, scientists and scholars. In comment (a) of Section 7.11 of the Restatement (Third) of Property - Servitudes, the American Law Institute explains that the importance of conservation easements, "underscored by statutory requirements that they be perpetual, will continue to increase as population growth exerts ever-greater pressures on undeveloped land, ecosystems, and wildlife." The Land Trust Alliance is dedicated to the defense of land conservation efforts and stands fully prepared to meet challenges to the integrity of conservation easements, including the abuse of tax incentives, hostile interpretation of state law or the tax code, conversion of conservation values to development or taking land held by land trusts. To support these national conservation interests, the Land Trust Alliance has created a Conservation Defense Center that assists land trusts in defending the permanence of their conservation easements. Ten prominent law firms committed to provide pro bono litigation services to defend easements. We also have a conservation defense fund to pay for costs associated with intervening in cases such as this. It is our hope that you will carefully consider the public costs of extinguishing these conservation easements and choose instead to preserve and keep the land they protect intact. Thank you for your time and consideration of these critical public benefits of conservation.</p>
Email	Maria Flora, SOS	5/11/2021	<p>The Community Planning and Development Department ("CPD") announced on May 5, 2021 that it has appointed Dr. Ryan Ross to replace Dr. Nita Mosby Tyler as the "Steering Committee" facilitator for the CPD planning and development process regarding the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land. With all due respect to Dr. Ross, we must object to his appointment to fill what should be a neutral facilitator position. In the May 5th Email announcement to City Council, CPD attached a biography of Dr. Ross as Chief Operating Officer of the Urban Leadership Foundation of Colorado but failed to disclose that Dr. Ross and Norman Harris are teammates in the Five Points Development Corporation ("FPDC") with Dr. Ross being identified with FPDC's "Business Development" work and with Mr. Harris being identified with FPDC's "Community Engagement" work. FPDC identifies itself on its website as "an active owner, developer and manager of several properties in Denver, Colorado." FPDC identifies the Urban Leadership Foundation of Colorado as one of "Our Partners." See <a href="https://fivepointsdevelopmentcorporation.com/about/">https://fivepointsdevelopmentcorporation.com/about/</a>. What's wrong with this appointment? First, Dr. Ross--through his position as a "Business Development" "team" member of FPDC --is actively involved in the real estate development business. Such involvement by itself disqualifies Dr. Ross from legitimately being considered as a neutral facilitator for CPD's planning and development process for the PHGC land. The threshold issue in this process is whether there should be mixed use development on the land or whether the land should be preserved for open space and recreational purposes consistent with the 2019 conservation easement's conservation purposes.</p> <p>Second, Dr. Ross' FPDC teammate Mr. Harris is an equity owner in two active companies doing business under the name "Holleran": (1) Holleran Property Management &amp; Development LLC (also dba The Holleran Group) and (2) Holleran PHGC Holdings, LLC. One or both Holleran companies is a partner with Westside Investment Partners, Inc. in Westside's real estate development project for the PHGC land. See <a href="https://www.parkhillgolfcourseimagined.info/story/">https://www.parkhillgolfcourseimagined.info/story/</a>. We have no reason to doubt Dr. Ross' integrity, but his work as the FPDC "Business Development" "team" member and these business and personal relationships cast serious doubt on his ability to serve successfully as a neutral facilitator for CPD's planning and development project regarding the future of the PHGC land. It would be difficult for Dr. Ross to be completely neutral regarding a plan that would be contrary to the pro-development financial interests of Mr. Harris, the Holleran companies, and Westside--and potentially himself, since we do not know the full nature of the relationships but can only rely on what they chose to disclose publicly. At the very least, this appointment creates the appearance of a conflict of interest that undermines the ability of Dr. Ross to be viewed properly as a neutral facilitator in this planning and development process. We must also once again challenge this entire pro-development CPD planning and development process regarding the PHGC land. The City is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars and committing many hundred hours of City employee time and energy to invent a public narrative supporting Westside's real estate development plans for the PHGC land. And the City is taking these actions despite the fact that the land's 2019 open space and recreational conservation easement protects the PHGC land in perpetuity from any such development. Under the circumstances discussed above, we demand that CPD immediately removes Dr. Ross from his new position as CPD's "Steering Committee" facilitator and that--if CPD chooses to continue this wasteful planning and development process--it at the very least can appoint a replacement who can truly be neutral regarding the competing issues between preservation of the PHGC land as open recreational space, on the one hand, and mixed use development of the land by Westside and its partners, on the other. We request that you fully and promptly provide substantive responses to this letter and our February 5, 2021, March 3, 2021, and March 23, 2021 letters. Save Open Space Denver</p>
Email	Caroline Cammack	5/17/2021	<p>My opinion is to leave the golf course as open space, with a few amenities such as restrooms, picnic tables, area for food trucks and a small field for sports. We do not need any more development in this city. We do not need condos and shopping areas. When I moved to Denver 21 years ago, I marveled at all of the green space. However, these spaces have been gobbled up by greedy developers. We need to stop slapping concrete everywhere and be kinder to the earth by keeping open space.</p>
Webpage comment form	Ben Ramuno	5/3/2021	<p>We are homeowners in NE Park Hill and we want a large upscale park space with restaurants, cafes, small locally owned retail, entertainment venues, etc. Lots of trees and walking paths. We would like to see the area developed similar to RINO or WASH PARK.</p>

Email	Bill Boortz	5/17/2021	I had a bit of time and checked in on the Park Hill Golf Course situation today...sigh. I watched some of the Community Steering Committee meetings and the Open House. I also read the announcement that Dr. Tyler had stepped down and Dr. Ross is now involved. I looked for an Email address for Dr. Ross but could not find one that seemed to apply directly to him.Gosh, Courtney...thank you to you and everyone involved. It is obvious that so many people have invested time and effort with regard to this cause. While I consider myself an interested party, Denver resident and hope for the best...it is clear that the fate of the Park Hill Golf Course Property is important for significant reasons.I have to be on a ranch west of Canon City all day tomorrow or I would plan to tune in to the meeting planned for tomorrow night.I don't want to be negative, and really would like to help if I can, but I admit I was very disappointed with the City and County's legal take that kind of opened the door to just changing the Conservation Easement at the will of the City Council. From the discourse I saw it seemed that "some development" was a given and the golf course alone was not given any real support or consideration. I get it, but....gosh. Of course I have much more experience with conservation easements than most, but that take just seems like it could lead to a lot of frustration. To travel a long way down the road toward whatever the final recommendations might be, only to discover later that the Conservation Easement can't really be changed...or can't be changed in a way that would afford any private benefit (as I read the law), would seem to eliminate a lot of the options being considered. Again, I don't want to be a wet blanket or provide bad information. Maybe there is a way to legally change things that I am not aware of.My prevalent interest is not endangering the many wonderful places that are protected via perpetual conservation easements in Colorado. I fear that a bad precedent, or loophole exploited by Denver, might create a major problem for other natural resources in this state. I always advise my clients to be very careful and make sure they are getting language they can live with in any conservation easement they consider. Perpetuity is a long time. Conservation easements really are meant to lock in a set of conditions forever. Changing, amending or extinguishing them is not easy.
Webpage comment form	Courtney Hysaw	5/17/2021	Will affordable housing and business opportunities for displaced residents of north park hill be seriously considered?
Webpage comment form	Andy Cushen	5/17/2021	When you consider the possibility of mixed-use development on this spot in the city, more affordable housing, housing close to high-frequency transit: it feels like a no-brainer that this process of redevelopment goes forward. I like the notion of open space for all, but the site as it is currently is not an open space, it's retained for specific uses. I've biked by the Park Hill Golf Course and never really noticed it was green before, mostly noticed it was flat and empty and blocked my ideal bike route. 40th and Colorado is a pretty sad LR station right now, and I can see wonderful new transit-oriented development in that area, it makes more sense to me than the status quo.
Webpage comment form	Karen Kropa	5/17/2021	I live on 34th and Birch St. I would like to see the former PH golf course land developed similar to Lowery, Central Park and Northfield. Our community needs a grocery store, restaurants and mixed housing as well as dog park etc. We don't need a golf course.
Webpage comment form	Woody Garnsey	5/17/2021	(1) When will Save Open Space Denver receive complete substantive responses to its letters dated February 5, 2021, March 3, 2021, March 23, 2021, and May 11, 2021? (2) When will the answers to questions submitted on-line at the first community meeting be posted on the CPD website?
Webpage comment form	Daria Jouzdani	5/17/2021	I live north of the golf course and while I appreciate plans to keep part of it open and a park, I also believe the community is in need of an accessible grocery store. I am fortunate enough to have a car, but I know that is not true for the whole community. Also affordable housing and employment opportunities for the youth in the community through small businesses would be an enormous help in my opinion.
Webpage comment form	Karen Kropa	5/17/2021	I am requesting the City modify the easement to allow the developers to develop the land and NOT be required to make it a golf course. The demographic of my neighborhood does not support a golf course. Affordable housing, restaurants a grocery store will give an opportunity for residents to work and to utilize these services. In addition, sales tax and property tax revenue will greatly benefit the City. My question is: If the land owners walk away from the land and City takes it over, will the City then be required to construct an 18 hole golf course when they already have a public course a mile away down Colorado Blvd--City Park? This makes no sense to me.
Webpage comment form	Mark Marshall	5/18/2021	As a member of the Park Hill neighborhood, I fully support the plans to open the Park Hill Golf Course for some level of development. The City of Denver is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis that been going on for years, and has now been worsened by the pandemic. When the conservation easement was put into place on this land, no one could have envisioned the current state of housing instability that we're experiencing not only here in Colorado, but across the country. There are those who don't necessarily live in the neighborhood, who prioritize the tranquility they experience when driving by the current open space, over the ability of vulnerable Northeast Park Hill residents receiving access to the wealth of community stabilizing resources that could be possible with the redevelopment of this site. I find it difficult to understand and appreciate that type of value system, which is based on entitlement and exclusion. While many homeowners are seeing the value of their homes appreciate at an historic rate, many of our City's lower-income and more vulnerable citizens are being priced out of the neighborhoods and communities that they and their families have called home for decades. By opening up the golf course for responsible development that includes; a significant amount of affordable housing among the overall income-mix; business and employment opportunities; services and amenities; recreational spaces and open park land, we are ensuring that current residents not only have an opportunity to stay in the neighborhood, but have the ability to thrive. The forces of gentrification are at work across the City of Denver and the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood is no exception. Providing more affordable housing at PHGC helps to mitigate one of the most negative effects of these forces - involuntary displacement. Stable housing opens to the doors to many opportunities, including better educational and health outcomes. Responsible development at this site could also be the catalyst for opening the doors for Black-owned businesses to serve the neighborhood in which they live.
Webpage comment form	Ann K. Long	5/18/2021	Park Hill Golf Course property was purchased by Denver to fulfill the goal of no change, ever. I support any plans to maintain the entire property for citizens. Fifty years from now, this open space will show the foresight citizens in 2021 had for those who follow them in 2071.
Webpage comment form	Michael Shannon	5/18/2021	My question is "Will the current developer (or future developers) be seeking any city or urban renewal financial incentives for this project". This question might be early, but should be a part of the upcoming discussions.
Webpage comment form	Elisha Novak	5/18/2021	Please do not develop this land! We need it to remain an open space. The push poll that was sent out was leading and deceptive. We do not need "affordable housing" that will not be affordable or accessible to current residents.

12/1/2022			
Webpage comment form	Ben and Kim Ramuno	5/19/2021	<b>Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log</b> My wife and I are homeowners in NE Park Hill. We want change, revitalization, and LOTS of green space. We want something that encourages community cleanliness and pride. Large 80+ acre park space, some breweries/cafes/restaurants, maybe a small market (Marczyk), and maybe some local small retail. Art, trees, walking trails. An offset to the busy Colorado Blvd so we aren't screaming over traffic while in the park. Perhaps an elevated pedestrian bridge that crosses Colorado for safety walking westbound. This would be an excellent opportunity to expand into the adjacent industrial district north of 38th. Elevate the entire neighborhood. larger sidewalks, more trees, less litter. We hope our voice is heard. Be like RINO, WASH PARK, CHEESEMAN. =) We have lots of ideas and would love to discuss. Please NO ugly large chain grocery stores or affordable housing, and MINIMAL if any housing, period.
Webpage comment form	Adrien Horton	5/22/2021	I think the golf course should have a community center with free showers, mental health resources, art classes, career development resources (like resume workshops), printers, computers, and a community garden.
Email	Eli Katz	5/24/2021	Has a Phase 1 ESA already been commissioned or completed for the Park Hill Golf Course site?
Webpage comment form	Jake Houston	5/25/2021	Is it normal to allow city wide votes on small area plans, i.e. residents of other neighborhoods? It seems unfair to allow individuals from properly developed/planned neighborhoods to weigh-in and impact the development of a historically underinvested neighborhood.
Webpage comment form	Gloria Kochan	5/25/2021	I wonder if there is a way the city can guarantee that home values around PHGC won't go down. I'm about ten years to retirement and worry it will end up mostly affordable-housing-that-does-not-build-wealth and that that will bring down my property value. I think the developer may promise all kinds of good stuff and we will change zoning etc., then nothing we want will come to fruition and all we will get is whatever makes the developer the most money. You know if you stand in the right place on PHGC you can see both the flame from Suncore and the I70. In another place you can see three gas stations while the exhaust from the traffic on Colorado Blvd. whips back your hair. I want PHGC to be an air cleaning green space that is healthy for mind and body. I know we aren't rich in this neighborhood so it will probably be paved over, etc. It's too bad. Nature heals and we need it. We deserve to have nice things, too, even if we are poorer than average in Denver/underserved. Like clean air and nice sidewalks, for example.
Email	Rae McCall-Hunn	6/8/2021	What is the reason the Golf Course cannot remain? Other than the fact that the developers want to make Billions of dollars?
Email	Merry Davis	6/8/2021	Park Hill Golf Course has been an important component of the Park Hill Community for many years. It offers an opportunity to golf at reasonable cost, gather with others and preserves the open space (via the purchased land conservation easement). These are the things that contribute to the high standard of living here, and what makes Denver special. Why not leave it as a golf course? Second, how is it possible to maintain the integrity and intent of conservation easements if the easement can be reversed?
Email	Georgia Garnsey	6/8/2021	I served on the Clayton Visioning Committee and your process is very similar. For over a year I and many others attended meetings, filled out sticky notes, played games devised by CRL and at the end of the day a Recommendation Report was published that reflected what they (Clayton and the city) wanted from Day One, despite the views of those who wanted the 155 acres to be open space for the community to benefit from and enjoy. They even ignored their own survey that showed a significant majority of respondents wanted open space and recreational space. Eleven members of PCAC issued their objection to the report. That didn't matter either. I have no doubt watching these proceedings that you know right now exactly what the Recommendation will look like. I am alarmed how this city administration continues to manipulate the public to get what they want. Who are you serving? I'm afraid I know. And it's bety disillusioning.
Webpage comment form	Jeanne Granville	6/9/2021	This is a follow-up to a comment I submitted on 6-08-21 regarding Committee member attendance at the Steering Committee where I was very concerned so few members were in attendance. At the end of the meeting, I realized there were probably more than the 6-7 who were visible on the screen. This is either a problem with the Webinar format or the way it is being set up as there was no way actual way to determine the committee members who were in attendance. I think the format you used barely meets Sunshine policies so I am suggesting that either you reformat the webinar so that all of the Committee members who attend are able to visible/known or on the Webpage following the meeting, publish a list of Committee members that attended. This is important work, the Committee selection process was very competitive, and it's important for the public to be aware as to who is attending, participating and making decisions for the future of PHGC and Denver. I would still also like to know how questions/concerns that are raised during the public comment will be acknowledged and addressed. Understandably not all of the issues/concerns can be solved but they need to be acknowledged and a rationale given at some point for CPD/Committee's disposition in relation to the work they have undertaken. Thank you
Webpage comment form	Rachael Barabak	6/27/2021	Disc golf course - tennis courts
Webpage comment form	Emily Stone	6/27/2021	It would be amazing to have some sort of off-leash space for dogs! Community stores, grocers, or even a little "Park Hill Downtown" would be amazing additions to the area.
Webpage comment form	Matt S.	7/6/2021	I live a mile from Park Hill Golf Course, but it was the nearest open space to me larger than 1/2 square block. If you look at a map of the city, a park or open space belongs here. That's why the city paid 2 million dollars in the early 90s; the planners then knew this area needed open space. Whether a golf course or a park, leave this space open. Stapleton/Central Park is less than a few miles away, continue to pour new homes into that relatively open area (with bountiful parks). Don't gobble up the few remaining open spaces in the interest of corporate profits going to non-Colorado based firms. Development here makes zero sense.
Webpage comment form	Shawn Gomez	7/6/2021	why dont you turn the golf course into a nature reserve to help reintroduce the wolves that are supposed to be reintroduced to our environment and eco system.
Webpage comment form	Kristen	7/24/2021	Grocery stores, local shops, dining opportunities

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Webpage comment form	Andy	7/25/2021	It seems disingenuous to say " over 50% of " said they wanted outdoor space preserved. The tabulated data push that number OVER 70%!!!!Why fudge? Call this what it is- a majority! An overwhelming majority! Nuff said
Webpage comment form	Gloria Kochan	7/29/2021	I'm just listening to NPR about urban heat <a href="https://treecanada.ca/resources/canadian-urban-forest-compendium/3-benefits-of-urban-forests/">https://treecanada.ca/resources/canadian-urban-forest-compendium/3-benefits-of-urban-forests/</a>
Webpage comment form	Christine O'Connor	8/3/2021	(1) Who sees my questions? (2) specifically "where" in the planning process are we? I have not been involved in other meetings. (3) why are you collecting so much personal data on the following pages? Who has access to that data or summaries? I am not giving feedback here, I am asking questions that I would appreciate answers to. Thank you.
Email	Harry Doby, SOS	8/16/2021	First, we are writing again to express our continued objection to the CPD planning and development process for the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land that cannot be legally developed without a court order pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute. The statute mandates that the PHGC land conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land—it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the conservation easement. We have made this position clear in our prior letters and more recently in the lawsuit captioned Save Open Space Denver, et al. v. City and County of Denver, et al., 2021CV31982, Denver District Court. Second, we are writing to object to CPD's apparent current plan for some kind of recommendation and final report to be made by Dr. Ross apparently regarding moving forward to another phase of a CPD planning and development process. On August 12, 2021, Dr. Ross wrote the following to the Steering Committee regarding the upcoming non-public August 17 "small group workshop session" and a planned follow-up meeting: The presentations and information you provide will be the artifacts I use to create a final reports summary and recommendation. The summary and recommendation will be comprehensive, including the vision of each perspective. Additionally, we object that the public is not able to attend and observe this August 17th meeting, as our understanding is that all steering committee meetings are open to the public. It would be premature at this time or any time soon for any legitimate recommendation or report to be made to move forward to another phase of a CPD planning and development process because many critical issues have not yet been discussed with the Steering Committee including, but not limited to, the following: a. the public health and environmental benefits of preserving the full 155 acres of PHGC land b. the expected dense residential and commercial infill development that will take place on presently underutilized land near the PHGC land including most importantly in the area near the 40th and Colorado light rail station (we have identified two developer groups that together have assembled approximately 35 acres of land in that area and there undoubtedly are other developers who have purchased land for the same development purposes in that area); c. the actual situation regarding the current availability of fresh food in neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC land (the only presentation related to food issues has been Patricia Iwasaki's July 27 short lecture without any Steering Committee discussion whatsoever in which she failed even to mention the excellent Park Hill Supermarket located at 40th and Jackson Streets); d. the Save Open Space Denver interpretation of the PHGC land conservation easement which differs from the interpretations that have been provided to the public and the Steering Committee by the City Attorney's Office and CPD; e. a critical analysis of the CPD's invalid "push survey" f. a critical analysis of the report provided by Denver Metro Impact regarding its "Community Navigator" project; and g. the availability of existing affordable housing in the area and planned new affordable housing in the area. Finally, it would seem that this is an attempt to produce an incomplete and artificial narrative by withholding or ignoring key facts (e.g., the information identified above; the lack of any large format grocery store chain's plan to build even if the land is developed; the fact that the city's own survey revealed only 3% of responding Northeast Park Hill residents feel market rate housing is a priority – of which the developer would likely build one to two thousand units, sacrificing hundreds of mature trees in the process) and asking the Steering Committee members to provide some form of input in an attempt for CPD to claim to have listened to the community, while in reality serving the interests of the developer.

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Melissa Daruna on Behalf of Keep it Colorado Policy Committee	9/7/2021	We are Keep It Colorado, a statewide coalition of conservation organizations including land trusts, public agencies, open space departments and conservation professionals. Our members extensively use conservation easements to help landowners across Colorado protect land in perpetuity. We are writing to share information and concern about perpetual conservation easements as they relate to the City and County of Denver's perpetual conservation easement on the Park Hill Golf Course. We would like to better understand the City and County of Denver's approach to the potential amendment or extinguishment of this perpetual conservation easement, as it will have sweeping implications for the treatment of perpetual conservation easements across the state and beyond. Our concerns about the standard used to address the perpetual conservation easement stem from a series of communications by and with City of Denver staff and the property owner. In a February 9, 2021 Denver Post article, "Denver launches planning process for 155-acre Park Hill land protected from development," Assistant City Attorney John McGrath suggested that the City of Denver could invoke "home rule" authority to allow City Council to change the perpetual conservation easement. In subsequent public community visioning meetings, there has been discussion about amending or terminating the easement without any clear explanation about the process the City plans to take to achieve that outcome. This position was made explicit in the City and County of Denver's recent Motion to Dismiss filed in Save Open Space Denver, et. al. v. City and County of Denver, et al. Mot. to Dismiss, p.11. In recent conversations with Westside Investment Partners, the current landowners, they expressed an understanding of the state statute cited in the perpetual conservation easement that requires a court ruling to terminate an easement but were not able to comment on the City and County of Denver's inclination to follow that standard related to this easement. In some of these meetings and discussions, we have also been led to believe that there may be a question as to whether the easement on the Park Hill Golf Course is, in fact, a perpetual conservation easement as outlined in state law. In addition to these discussions and media reports, we understand that there are two ballot measures that will go before Denver voters related to conservation easements. If used as a new or different standard for the City and County of Denver to follow, apart from state law, when addressing perpetual conservation easements, we have a strong concern about the implications for both measures. We would like to provide some perspective as a collective authority on perpetual conservation easements and the applicable state statute. The current conservation easement was placed on the property on July 11, 2019 and cites the enabling state statute for perpetual conservation easements (C.R.S. §38-30.5), and as such should be held to the same standards required by that statute for amendment or termination. The current statute allows for termination but requires a judicial process (C.R.S. §38-30.5-107), a standard which is accepted best practice by the larger conservation community. Based on the above-mentioned communications, we have concern that the City and County of Denver may be considering different means or standards for this perpetual conservation easement. This causes us deep concern and creates unnecessary confusion, putting the conservation easement tool at risk across Colorado and beyond. An inconsistent approach not only poses a threat to the broader conservation community, but it also damages the public's trust in this critical conservation tool. Conservation easement holders, whether they be local governments or land trusts, are required to uphold the easements for the public benefit. Protecting the public's investment in perpetual easements is especially critical in ensuring the tool can be trusted and relied upon by landowners and the surrounding community. We want to emphasize that we are not interested in taking a position on what should or should not happen with the Park Hill Golf Course property. Our interest and concern focuses narrowly on the treatment of the conservation easement. We urge the City and County of Denver to adhere to state law, which provides standards and a clear process for amending or extinguishing perpetual conservation easements. Landowners and conservation organizations across Colorado rely on this tool to protect land in perpetuity and thereby create healthy, thriving communities into the future. We must ensure that when organizations use the tool, they use it in a consistent manner and follow the same high standards for extinguishment or amendment uniformly. We welcome an
Webpage comment form	Dan	9/4/2021	I like the Thursday food trucks, the music playing at 8am was very uncool to wake to.
Email	Shane Murphy	9/14/2021	I find it concerning that this committee was to be made up of individuals who leave in the Parkhill community. Why would Mr. Ho be allowed to be on the committee when he does not even reside in the community? This has been a question on my mind for a long time and decided tonight was the night to ask I guess.
Webpage comment form	Angela Burns	9/16/2021	We already have affordable housing less than a mile in all directions from the park....why can't we have more than 60 acres of open.space...we don't need another Grocery store we have 5 or.more within a mile..we don't need anymore liquor stores or cannabis shops .I live one block from Park hill golf course you will.impact our lives horribly with what your trying to do..
Webpage comment form	Guadalupe Lloyd	9/14/2021	I want to speak on behalf of Westside Investment Partners. They are developers that bought the Loretto Heights campus in Oct. 2018. I share the backyard fence just north of the 72 acre Loretto Heights campus and have spent the last 3yrs going to monthly community meetings, in person and now zoom and continue to as our area plan is ongoing and continuing. The project includes homes, town homes and apartments with affordability across a wide range of household income. Some of the homes will be among the first built under the sustainability focused "Denver Green Code". Original zoning of land allowed for 13 story buildings on all land equaling more units per square feet. Westside listened to the community's desire to have more green area thereby reducing the number of units per square feet it could have made a profit with. Westside has encompassed the historic core of Loretto Heights campus by preserving the Loretto Heights Academy building, Chapel, Priest's house, Library, Machebeuf Hall, May Bonfils Stanton Theatre and Pancretia Hall. Our community consensus made it a priority that the site retain the feel of a campus district and Westside has complied that most homes, single and family and town home units would face open space rather than streets. Dying and dead trees were removed at the suggestion of Denver's arborist with the promise to populate the campus with trees upon development. 1,000 plus trees of 2", 3" and 4" caliber will be planted. The 74 units of Pancretia Hall, which is set to be done in December 2021 are (2) 4BR's at 1500 to 1700SF, (15) 3BR's at 800 to 900SF, (20) 2BR's at 600 to 700SF, (31) 1BR's 500 to 600SF and (6) studios at 350 to 400SF. as with any negotiation, there is always give and take and Westside Investment Partners listened to the desires of the community, RNO's an interested parties who attended the monthly meetings to brainstorm the project together. Thank you.
Webpage comment form	Angela Burns	9/16/2021	We already have affordable housing less than a mile in all directions from the park....why can't we have more than 60 acres of open.space...we don't need another Grocery store we have 5 or.more within a mile..we don't need anymore liquor stores or cannabis shops .I live one block from Park hill golf course you will.impact our lives horribly with what your trying to do...
Webpage comment form	Efe Egbeighu	10/17/2021	Will part of this become a park and a grocery store? The nice neighborhoods of Denver have both, and I fear that they won't convert part of it into a park. Our neighborhood needs a grocery store.
Webpage comment form	Kyle Peplinski	10/22/2021	Put a disc golf course on the property!

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Webpage comment form</p>	<p>Pauline P. Reetz, Conservation Committee Chairperson, Denver Audubon</p>	<p>12/2/2021</p>	<p>Denver Audubon supports the preservation of the conservation easement of the Park Hill Golf Course consistent with the Guiding Principles of the City’s 20 year Game Plan for a Healthy City. Denver Audubon sees the value in adding businesses that advance the public’s use and enjoyment of the park to the perimeter, which should not require more than 10% of the remaining 130 acres. The City purchased 25 acres for construction of a storm water detention basin, a component of its Platte to Park Hill flood control project. Conservation of the remaining 130 acres would significantly advance the following important social and environmental objectives:</p> <p>First, Northeast Park Hill is known to the City to be an underserved community in High Need of walkable access to a park. Increasing the 91 acres now available to the surrounding communities by the entire 130 acres available here would still only bring these communities up to just over one-third of the acreage available to the communities of Berkeley, Gateway-Green Valley Ranch and Washington Park. Denver formerly had one of the highest ratios of open space per resident – we were a leader in that field! Now, however, Denver ranks 12th out of 15 of the nation’s largest cities with only 170 sq. ft. per person, compared to 1,023 sq. ft./person in #1 Atlanta (1).</p> <p>Second, the Denver region is a part of a principal route of the Central Migration Flyway used by millions of migrating birds in spring and fall. A multi-agency study discovered that North America has lost over 25% of its birds, some 3 billion, over the past 50 years. (2) The widespread loss and degradation of habitat is the biggest driver of bird population declines. Audubon considers 113 species using this Flyway to be highly vulnerable to changes from human activity and climate changes here. Preserving large intact areas of habitat is crucial to the survival of North American bird species. Our failure will bring on Silent Spring, merely by a different means.</p> <p>Habitat size matters to migrating bird species for a number of reasons. Species that can only migrate over restricted corridors cannot afford to lose opportunities to stop, rest and refuel when they pass over Denver. Loss of this stop-over habitat, caused by humans and by climate change, constitutes a serious threat to species survival. These types of species tend to have fewer individuals and tend to be less abundant than species that can make use of a wider variety of habitats over wider corridors, which further increases the risk of extinction for those species. Also, as habitat size increases, habitat health increases, as damage occurring along habitat edges, caused by interface with human activity, decreases relative to total habitat size. Third, the value to Denver’s residents of preserving a single, large block of open space has important, and different, benefits from any commercial advantage to be enjoyed from development. As The Urban Institute concluded many years ago, (<a href="http://web.archive.urban.org/publications/900719.html">http://web.archive.urban.org/publications/900719.html</a>) , city parks advance important urban policy objectives, such as job preparation for youths and adults and stronger neighborhoods. Parks, their research showed, can advance the community’s objectives to help children develop physically, intellectually, psychologically and socially. The COVID-19 pandemic has clearly demonstrated the importance of natural areas close to home for residents’ physical and mental health.</p> <p>Finally, transformation and reforestation of the golf course supports the City’s ongoing efforts to restore the urban canopy. The Office of the Denver City Forester is charged with responsibility for improving the overall quality of Denver’s urban tree canopy to add shade which reduces the heat island effect of streets, parking lots and buildings, traps and removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and cleanses air-borne pollutants from the air we breathe.</p>
<p>Webpage comment form</p>	<p>Pauline P. Reetz (comment cont. from above)</p>	<p>12/2/2021 (cont.)</p>	<p>Denver’s canopy presently shades about 19% of the city, which the City Forester calculates to provide some \$122M in benefits to all Denver’s residents. (3) Presently, the golf course has some 440 trees providing a canopy shading approximately 7% of the acreage. Undivided preservation and reforestation of this site presents a substantial opportunity to add shaded land to counter record heat that the entire City experiences. Each tree-shaded acre will weaken the heat-trapping greenhouse effect at the source: removing 80 to 200 pounds of combined air pollutants, removing more than a ton of carbon and storing an additional 40 tons of carbon per acre, annually.</p> <p>All these factors strongly suggest that at least 90% of the Park Hill Golf Course should be retained as open space, as natural as possible, using native plants for any necessary revegetation. Well-planned development around the area’s periphery can create opportunities for “buy-in” by adjacent neighborhoods that would support a sense of stewardship and conserve area resources.</p> <p>(1) The Allocation of Space in US Cities. <a href="http://www.geotab.com/urban-footprint/">www.geotab.com/urban-footprint/</a>. July 9, 2019.  (2) Rosenberg, Ken et al. 2019. Decline of the North American Avifauna. Science 366: 120-124, 4 October 2019.  (3) The Park Hill Golf Course Technical Assessment cites average tree canopy of 24.6%, at p. 24.</p>

12/1/2022

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process – Comment Log**

Email	Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison, David Martin, Sandra Robnett	12/12/2021	<p>We are members of the Park Hill Golf Course Steering Committee (SC), and we have met consistently since February 9, 2021, for eight Steering Committee meetings, two Open House sessions, one Community Workshop, and one Working Group. We also had to prepare for these meetings and were issued Study Materials in preparation for the meetings. Together, we have invested over 270 hours of our own time in hopes that our voices would be heard, that our opinions would be respected, and that our participation would be fairly and accurately represented in any official communications from the Community and Planning Department (CPD) of the City of Denver (the City). Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Visioning Process overall, nor the Summary that was published by CPD on its website. Specifically, we have the following issues with the Summary as published:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The composition of the 27-member SC is heavily weighted in favor of development. In fact, the "Visioning Process" of "public engagement" really amounts to a public relations campaign to push the developer's agenda. Nevertheless, we have tried to advocate for open space as a tiny, five-member minority.</li> <li>2. The City's clear and proven bias in favor of Westside and its development plans has negatively impacted the entire process.</li> <li>3. Those of us who participated in the entire process did not have an opportunity to review or comment on the final Vision Summary sent to us on November 8, after it was already posted on the CPD website.</li> <li>4. Although there were two community Open House sessions, the community was not provided an opportunity to give public comment. The lack of public engagement in this process was problematic in general. CPD attempted to quiet those in the community whose visions differed from theirs and those of Westside by not allowing public comment at all during the SC meetings. But through our protest, CPD eventually allowed a mere 10 minutes after each SC meeting for public comment. The lack of public engagement seen in public -- not behind closed doors in what CPD referred to as community navigator sessions -- shows a lack of respect for the residents of Denver and further demonstrates a flawed visioning process full of bias and favoritism for the developer Westside.</li> <li>5. The attorney-expert invited by the City of Denver to discuss conservation easements clearly explained that the fundamental purpose of a conservation easement is to perpetually preserve and protect the land's conservation values. Unsurprisingly, CPD continued the visioning process with predominantly pro-development narratives. As well, CPD and the City of Denver did not address whether it is "impossible" per Colorado statute, due to changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land, to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> <li>6. There has never been serious discussion on the SC of the value of 155 acres of open, green, park space to urban life. Its role in cleaning our air, water, and soil; restoring natural habitat; cooling the planet; offering residents access to nature and healthy respite from the stresses of modern, urban life; have never been considerations of the SC. The developer's agenda and interests have always dominated and guided the discussions.</li> </ol>
Email	Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison, David Martin, Sandra Robnett (comment cont. from above)	12/12/2021 (cont.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The SC has never considered the future development that will inevitably occur near the 40th/Colorado RTD station, and its TOD possibilities; nor near 38th/Holly; nor land surrounding PHGC. There will be a huge increase in residents around PHGC: Why has the need for open space for all these new residents not been considered?8. We know there is affordable housing planned at 40th/Colorado and 38th/Holly. These planned affordable housing projects should be part of the SC discussions, but never have been.</li> <li>9. There are many more severe flaws in this process and the Summary that are too numerous to detail here.</li> </ol> <p>We are citizen-representatives volunteering our time to be on this SC because we care passionately about our neighborhoods and this great City. We are deeply concerned about the way this process has unfolded, and the misleading and false representations made by CPD in the Summary. Furthermore, it is apparent that CPD is doing the bidding of the developer, Westside, and consciously ignoring, sidelining, and dividing residents surrounding PHGC, and residents of the City of Denver as a whole. This is evidenced by the recent election results for Initiatives 301 and 302, where Denver voters clearly stated their concern about developing existing open space with a conservation easement. And yet, it seems the City and Westside are doubling down to push their development plans, ignoring the lessons from November 2. Sadly, the Summary in its current form furthers their agenda. It is our sincere hope that CPD and the City administration will respect and fairly represent our voices in this important discussion about the future of this vital area of Denver. We insist that our comments here be included in official City documents for this project, including posting on the City's web page for this project. These comments must be part of the official record and documentation for this project. Thank you for your consideration, Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison David Martin, Sandra Robnett</p>
Email	John Holmes	12/13/2021	<p>I can not believe that our elected officials continue to not listen to the voters. This so-called plan that you are pushing is not different from what you were trying to achieve before the election. This is just what you did to the Green roof initiative that was passed several years ago requiring roof-top gardens. That vote passed with a large percentage and then you whittled away at it until nothing came of it. Denying what the voters clearly wanted. Now you're right back at it, lying to the public about some community gatherings. As if the local community where I live, Park Hill wants this. We don't! Listen to the voters, not your general contractors that will no doubt find a way to make the public pay for the park area, just like they did on Fairfax block between 28th and 29th. reference: <a href="https://www.axios.com/local/denver/2021/08/03/denver-fairfax-park-cost-developer-new-controversy">https://www.axios.com/local/denver/2021/08/03/denver-fairfax-park-cost-developer-new-controversy</a></p> <p>I can not wait for the day that Hancock can no longer run for Mayor and when you city planners are removed from your position. This administration is a perfect example of capitalism gone wrong, where election results mean nothing to you.</p> <p>Shame on the City Planning Committee and the Mayor, hopefully you get enough resistance between now and your next 18 months. I will be one celebrating your departure. I am ashamed to say I actually voted for Hancock, lesson learned, NEVER AGAIN. Hope he has no plans for state-wide, I'll make sure my voice is heard</p>
Online form	Christa DeHerrera	12/16/2021	<p>What were the actual results of the election and what does the votes received mean? Who will be a part of the planning committees? And how can we get involved as I have previously be apart of the main street initiative council for Welton Street?</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Online form	Pam Jobin	12/16/2021	What happened to the easement???.How can we sell out to developers just so they can make a lot of bucks?We can never regain green space once it is trashed with development!We supported 301 and rejected 302 (sleazy wording BTW).Stop the visioning! Just keep it as a green park!
Online form	Georgia Garnsey	12/12/2021	<p>The Park Hill Golf Course land can't be developed because it is protected from development by a Perpetual Conservation Easement. Westside has not been released from that obligation. Why is that cart being put before the horse at the cost of the tax-paying public's precious money and time?</p> <p>That said, the Committee was predominantly composed of members supporting development of the PHGC land. The surveys were blatant push polls created to elicit pro-development answers. The Summary did not accurately reflect the sentiments of many of its members. It was often stated that the PHGC land did not have to be a golf course per the language of the easement. The Summary once again repeats a pro-development slogan (that the PHGC land must be a golf course) instead of speaking to the interpretations of qualified citizens to the contrary.</p> <p>Why should the PHGC easement stay in place? Because the 155 acres border the most polluted zip code in the United States of America. Because development is occurring all around the PHGC land, including at least 2 major low income housing projects. There will be significant development all around the 40th &amp; Colorado Light Rail station in the near future. I hope many investors of color will be a large part of these projects. With all the density, residents will need a park where they can recreate, meet their neighbors, breathe in fresh air, stroll in the cool shade of trees, and watch their kids play. Community gardens could be located in the park as well.</p>
Online form	Sandra Robnett	12/13/2021	I would like to see the City purchase the land and make it into a park. Its despicable that CPD made every attempt to say that this is only a neighborhood decision and yet NOW you make this available for everyone in the City to provide their thoughts. Are you once again going to lie about what the City wants? Despite a vote which indicates that 63% of the people favor open space? Shame on you!
Online form	Richard Balstad	12/13/2021	Return it to a Golf course.
Online form	Jonathan Shikes	12/13/2021	I would like to see it remain as a park, with youth sports fields, and a bike path connecting to both the 39th ave. Greenway and city park. I would also like to see a food truck pod with trucks from underrepresented minorities
Online form	Deryk Standing	12/13/2021	I would like this space to remain a golf course or an open green space.
Online form	Michael McCumber	12/13/2021	<p>my main concern is this statement being presented to the public and used to determine the next steps in the process for the former Park Hill Golf Course. "70% of mailed survey respondents favored some development of the site"</p> <p>This is only true because of the flawed structure of the survey. Respondents were forced (in question 6) to select a form of development. The only option for someone wanting to uphold the conservation easement and keep the land undeveloped was to leave it blank. As we know, leaving a question blank only increases the % of respondents in favor. The survey was flawed in its forced choice for question 6 and others. These flawed results are now being used to spend yet more time/money on an area plan. This next step is again not acknowledging the conservation easement that is in place.</p>
Online form	Amy Harris	12/13/2021	As a resident of Northeast Park Hill, I can tell you that parkland and open space in our neighborhood is extremely limited. We also have a new development going in at 38th and Holly that will bring an estimated 750 additional people to NEPH. Those people will also need access to open space especially as they are going to be living in low-income apartments. In my view, the only option is for the City to purchase the land with 2A money and turn it into a park with desperately needed public amenities (sports fields, pavilions, natural spaces, walking/running track, etc.). We cannot trust the developer to do anything but seek to maximize profits and that will mean construction of townhomes, condos, and apartments that will bring even MORE people into our neighborhood and those people will also need parks and open space - which we don't have here. I place much greater weight on the community survey that was conducted by the Greater Park Hill Community which showed that 75% of residents prefer that the land be entirely maintained as parkland/open space. The survey sent out by the City was deeply flawed in that it was obviously trying to build a case for development. We have tons of development planned for this neighborhood - take a look at the 40th & Colorado area. We breathe in fumes from the Purina Dog Chow Plant, I-70 and I-25, the oil refinery, Colorado Blvd....we are surrounded by development and construction and have terrible air quality and an utter lack of tree canopy to show for it. We desperately need relief. Please do the right thing: buy the land and build a park.
Online form	Charlene Harlow	12/13/2021	A park would be nice
Online form	Alec cortez	12/13/2021	Can we make it a golf course again? Good for the community and kids.
Online form	Erin Wenz	12/13/2021	We would love for this to remain open space for use by the surrounding community. Walking trails, playgrounds, community pool would all get great use! Once something is developed, the open space will never come back. Keep green spaces for our future generations to enjoy!

Online form	Julie Banta	12/13/2021	<p>I live and North Park Hill and encourage that you follow the recommendations of the community, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Create a new, large park and community gathering places</li> <li>- Stand up an oversight committee to guide future planning and development</li> <li>- Preserve and expand the tree canopy to combat urban heat island effects in this area</li> <li>- Add youth and recreational sports opportunities</li> <li>- Address food insecurity by including space for grocery and fresh food choices</li> <li>- Employ strategies to mitigate involuntary displacement</li> </ul> <p>As we know by the late winter (not seen since the height of the dustbowl) we are contributing to the climate crisis continually - reducing green space in the city will only contribute to creating an inhabitable environment for everyone - and housing developers have proven over and over again that their definition of 'affordable' is out of range for most working class families. Please support the health of the community by maintaining greenspace and preventing the displacement of working class families who already live near the park.</p>
Online form	Katherine Swan	12/13/2021	<p>The entire area should become parks space -- we need a public outdoor pool in the area, a splash pad, playing fields, an amazing playground, walking paths. Since this space is protected as open space by an easement, it provides the perfect opportunity to make this into a great regional park for the benefit of all city residents.</p> <p>I oppose building on any of this land, for any purposes other than those associated with recreational uses (e.g., I would not oppose building a pool house to go with a new pool), , first, because the easement prohibits it, and, second, because with the multiple opportunities for development in the areas surrounding the golf course, there are likely to see a good deal of building in the area in years to come. The need for parks spaces is already evident (Denver already lags behind other major cities like New York and Washington, D.C., in providing parks space), and there will be all the more need for places for people to recreate if further development occurs. We need to preserve the golf course as open space as part of a plan for sustainable growth.</p>
Online form	Justin Petaccio	12/13/2021	I would love to see a great mix of use. Dense, transit friendly housing, a very large park/recreation space, and business opportunities for the community.
Online form	Julie Orth	12/13/2021	Some off leash dog park allotment.
Online form	Sue Baldwin	12/13/2021	Number one, I would like for the City and City Council not to be shills for developers. But apart from that I would like to see a significant portion of the space be kept as green space. The remaining to be affordable housing - not the lame percentages that you have put in place. Low purchase price, not resellable for market value. Developers have made millions off city approvals - it is time for them to give back. Period.
Online form	Michael Frank	12/13/2021	It would be great have a whole foods or another high end grocery store. Develop it with luxury townhomes and open green space. A private dog park would be great too.
Online form	Derrick R.	12/13/2021	Park hill golf course should be a park. Keep it open space. That is it. Zero buildings.
Online form	Lane D.	12/13/2021	Keep the park. Plant trees and redo the cart paths. Leave it as a park. Do not build on this land.
Online form	Gloria Kochan	12/13/2021	I think residents made it clear we do not want any residences or businesses on that property.
Online form	Eric Banner	12/13/202	I think it should remain 100% open space. No development.
Online form	Karen Kogel	12/13/2021	Leave open space! Some could be a park with soccer fields and baseball diamonds but the rest open space with trees. No development!
Online form	John Holmes	12/13/2021	<p>I can not believe that our elected officials continue to not listen to the voters. This so-called plan that you are pushing is not different from what you were trying to achieve before the election. This is just what you did to the Green roof initiative that was passed several years ago requiring roof-top gardens. That vote passed with a large percentage and then you whittled away at it until nothing came of it. Denying what the voters clearly wanted. Now you're right back at it, lying to the public about some community gatherings. As if the local community where I live, Park Hill wants this. We don't! Listen to the voters, not your general contractors that will no doubt find a way to make the public pay for the park area, just like they did on Fairfax block between 28th and 29th.</p> <p>reference: <a href="https://www.axios.com/local/denver/2021/08/03/denver-fairfax-park-cost-developer-new-controversy">https://www.axios.com/local/denver/2021/08/03/denver-fairfax-park-cost-developer-new-controversy</a></p> <p>I can not wait for the day that Hancock can no longer run for Mayor and when you city planners are removed from your position. This administration is a perfect example of capitalism gone wrong, where election results mean nothing to you.</p> <p>Shame on the City Planning Committee and the Mayor, hopefully you get enough resistance between now and your next 18 months. I will be one celebrating your departure. I am ashamed to say I actually voted for Handcock, lesson learned, NEVER AGAIN. Hope he has no plans for state-wide, I'll make sure my voice is heard</p> <p>-- John Holmes, 28 year Park Hill resident</p>
Online form	Herb Choate	12/13/202	NO DEVELOPERS ALLOWED - should remain an open green space. AS AGREED BY TAXPAYERS, MULTIPLE TIMES.
Online form	Ashford Duffy	12/13/2021	This area should remain a green space for the community to use — in particular youth and children. There should NOT be development or construction, as this city is already overcrowded and cannot handle traffic with the current infrastructure. Residents should vote on any decisions related to this space's usage. Mayor Hancock should respect the Nov vote.
Online form	Betsy Boudreau	12/13/2021	Open space, park, golf course. Thank you.

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Online form	MARIA FLORA	12/13/2021	<p>I have closely followed the selection of the Steering Committee (SC) members and the meetings which Community Planning and Development (CPD) held. Here are some of my observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been no informed discussion of the conservation easement, which prohibits development of the Park Hill Golf Course land. In fact, CPD specifically prohibited discussion of the easement as beyond the scope of the SC, only providing one speaker on conservation easements in general. That speaker said that conservation easements are intended to be perpetual and difficult to terminate, but could not elaborate on the PHGC conservation easement within his charge by CPD, and didn't appear to have read the document. Many on the SC expressed frustration at this lack of relevant information.</li> <li>2. CPD spent in excess of \$125,000 on planning consultants, between David Evans and Associates, ArLand and others. The reports of these consultants are available on the CPD website, but were not utilized in the materials provided to the SC or discussed in the meetings. This information would have been invaluable to the SC members.</li> <li>3. CPD contracted with RRC Associates to conduct a survey regarding use of the PHGC land. That survey did not mention the conservation easement whatsoever. Instead, the survey was a "push" survey designed to create demand for the hypothetical uses desired by the developer, all of which are prohibited by the conservation easement. The SC was not presented with the 2019 statistically valid survey conducted by National Research Center, Inc. for Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., which concluded that 77% of respondents in Greater Park Hill (which includes South Park Hill, North Park Hill and Northeast Park Hill) wanted the PHGC land to remain 100% open space.</li> <li>4. The report ignores the result of the November 2 election. Initiative 301 requires a vote of the people before the easement can be terminated. This measure won every precinct in Greater Park Hill. Westside Development Partners' countermeasure 302 carried only one precinct in Greater Park Hill. This is a landslide result and a clear mandate for open space. In the face of this mandate, why is CPD forging ahead with a Large Development Review for the land? This is a further waste of taxpayer money.</li> </ol> <p>Clearly, the SC process has been used by CPD as a way of creating demand for development of the PHGC land. The clear message on November 2 is that the land should not be developed, but maintained as open space.</p>
Online form	Katell Marmasse	12/13/2021	<p>Would be nice to keep it as a park. More trees. More bees. More flowers.  A place where people could go reconnect with nature. And learn about it. Maybe even have some animals. Sheeps?  Please. No more construction. We need trees. The air quality has been awful in Denver. Let Nature helps. We need more places to breathe.</p>
Online form	Rebecca Bitti	12/13/2021	<p>Can we please have an indoor sports complex for youth. The city of Denver have no indoor facilities for swimming, soccer, basketball, lacrosse, and so much more. There are more opportunities in all other surrounding counties for the youth of Colorado to grow and have fun with sports year round, and unless you are willing to drive or move, the denver youth residents do not have an equal opportunity</p>
Online form	Emily Henke-Groves	12/13/2021	<p>I would like to see more trees put in, playgrounds added, use the old golf clubhouse as the office/concession stand/party room and restrooms for a new waterpark for the neighborhood and create an urban garden.</p>
Online form	Chloe Pulliam	12/13/2021	<p>Please keep this 155 acre parcel open space! We can't afford to lose this much land and trees to development. I would love if it could be a park. I've been walking around it with my dog since they closed the golf course and it is a wonderful outdoor space. I live in the neighborhood.</p>
Online form	Mary DeSimone	12/13/2021	<p>My request is a large park that includes a large outdoor public pool, similar to Cheesman Pool. This part of town is sorely lacking that.</p>
Online form	Walter	12/13/2021	<p>Respect what the citizens of Denver Voted for. Do not allow development where there is a conservation easement. Be honest with the visioning process and do not promise a grocery store when you know that no grocery store will actually operate on this site.</p>
Online form	Caroline S Cammack	12/14/2021	<p>I don't believe your stats. People want green space and relief from concrete. But you're gonna have it your way.</p>
Online form	Shane Sutherland	12/14/2021	<p>Respect the voters and keep the conservation easement!</p>
Online form	Nan Young	12/14/2021	<p>On November 2nd, the citizens of Denver DID weigh in: we want the entire 155 acres open space. 301 won by a landslide. And, still, Hancock and city of Denver is refusing to listen to its own citizens.</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Online form	Woody Garnsey	12/14/2021	<p>I submit this statement in response to (1) the process to-date of the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) Steering Committee, (2) the document titled "Park Hill Golf Course Steering Committee Vision Summary 2021 (October 2021)" (Vision Summary), and (3) the CPD news release dated December 13, 2021 announcing CPD's plans to move forward with an area plan for the PHGC land.</p> <p>The Fundamental Fatal Flaw in the CPD Process</p> <p>It is undisputed that the PHGC land is protected from development by the conservation easement dated July 11, 2019 that was created pursuant to and is governed by the Colorado conservation easement statute.</p> <p>A conservation easement is an interest in real property that is defined and governed by Colorado statutory law. A conservation easement, by legal definition, imposes limits on the use of land to maintain it, among other things, "predominantly in a natural, scenic or open condition, or for wildlife habitat...or recreational...or other use or condition consistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity." While a variety of land uses may be allowed, these uses must be consistent with this statutory definition and the specific "conservation purposes" described in the conservation easement document.</p> <p>The "conservation purposes" of the PHGC land conservation easement are to maintain the land's "scenic and open condition" and to preserve the land "for recreational use". The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation.</p> <p>Pursuant to the governing Colorado conservation easement statute, the PHGC land conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land—is it now "impossible" to continue fulfilling the "conservation purposes" of the easement.</p> <p>Any CPD planning and development process regarding the PHGC land is premature until there might be a court order allowing termination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement. This Vision Process has entirely failed to address the factual question as to whether there have been any changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land that have now made it "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational "conservation purposes."</p> <p>CPD's premature planning process regarding the PHGC land is wasting hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and thousands of hours of City employee time on land use planning for conservation easement-protected land that cannot be legally developed.</p>
Online form	Hilary OByrne	12/14/2021	Please consider a large public pool and splash pad.
Online form	cheryl Solko	12/14/2021	I would like to see the vast element of the property stay as a park, with reuse of the club house as a public event/rec center
Online form	Whitney Raymer	12/14/2021	<p>I wish that the planning process was more clear. I feel that there are some organizations backed by Westside which are sharing information under the pretense of being a neutral third-party neighborhood group. It can also be difficult to follow what's happening and what the timeline is for specific decisions, not to mention the exact steps which would be necessary to actually develop the land.</p> <p>I strongly believe we need to preserve this as a park. I cannot stress that enough. There are very few green spaces in the city with mature trees, and this is a critical location to preserve for the surrounding neighborhoods. It would be an irreversible mistake to develop this land for commercial or residential use. It's well documented that urban green spaces benefit physical and mental health. They also improve air quality, sequester carbon, and reduce noise--all things which are especially important in a city with air quality issues and in a location so close to I-70. Access to green space is an environmental justice and equality issue, and it's important for these historically under-served communities to maintain such an asset.</p> <p>I think at a minimum the park should include a small community center or simply a pavilion with picnic tables and restrooms, various walking paths, a community garden, a basketball court, and perhaps other recreation options. It doesn't need tennis courts or a golf course, though if necessary to partially fulfill the existing easement language, it could include a public nine-hole course. To ensure that the park is truly a healthy environment, I believe it should almost exclusively feature drought-tolerant and/or native plants that don't require any fertilizer and don't require much irrigation if any.</p> <p>This is NOT a food desert at all and we don't need a grocery store in this particular location. There are convenience stores and the Park Hill Supermarket (Asian/global groceries) within walking distance of the Park Hill Golf Course. There are also very close King Soopers and Safeway along bus lines, and I strongly believe there is excellent commercial opportunity if the small commercial strip on 33rd Ave between Holly and Hudson is made more robust.</p> <p>The fact that this land was bought by a development company on the assumption that they would be able to strong-arm overturning the easement and securing a zoning change is utterly appalling. It's beyond presumptuous and galling and I don't know how it could be seen as anything but a huge money grab. As a resident of North Park Hill, I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts on this critical matter.</p>
Online form	Gary Martyn	12/14/2021	Why is CPD working on this when a private developer owns the land and a court will have decide the matter? Serious question.
Online form	Laurel Mohr	12/14/2021	<p>Why are you continuing with this sham visioning process when the people have spoken? There is a conservation easement on this 155 acres. 301 passed and 302 lost. But if you are only accepting the voters of Park Hill, well, you lost there, too.</p> <p>Let's begin working together to make this a beautiful open space for Denver.</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Online form	Andrea Morrow-Kraljic	12/14/2021	I feel the questions on the survey sent to PH neighbors last year were biased. The third party who was hired to administer the survey did not present neutral questions. I felt forced to choose between keeping this space only a golf course or allow for development. What about just leaving it as a park with no development? I feel the Kenneth Ho and Westside are only interested in getting the most return on their investment. They are going through this "reimagining" process but it's really just for show so neighbors feel like they "have a voice" in the development. Developers are only concerned with profits not people. Park Hill needs PARKS in the neighborhood. Why do we need to bulldoze mature trees in the name of "affordable housing"? There's an empty field across from Parkhill Village on 40th and that plot of land is being developed for affordable housing. Why is that not ever talked about? I also feel that it's BS to say we need a grocery store in this area. We have a grocery store on 40th & Jackson. It has all the basics. If you need 24-7 access to a store, there's a Super Walmart, Super Target, King Soopers, and a Sprouts within 2-3 miles of PHGC. Leave the easement alone and allow a big beautiful PARK in Parkhill.
Online form	Sarah Catanzarite	12/14/2021	Green space! We need all the trees we can get. Would also love to see walking/ running/ biking paths. Recreation fields and natural play spaces. Perhaps small stalls/ cafes but no large development- keep it green.
Online form	Kate Hakala	12/14/2021	I think the city should stop spending taxpayer money to help a profit-driven developer try to convince people that this property should be developed. Funds that we know are available should be funneled into purchasing this property for park space, with efforts to keep much of it as natural open space instead of green lawn that requires maintenance. Plans should also include as much permaculture as possible and revamping the existing clubhouse to be structurally stable for use by the public. A large playground is absolutely mandatory, imo
Online form	Richard E. Young	12/15/2021	I have lived in Park Hill since 1960 and help organize the then Park Hill Acton committee and was its 2nd Chair from 1961 to 1963 when Mayor Tom Currigan appointed me Chair of the city's Commission of Community Relations. I have remained active. Would appreciate know who is heading up the effort which I gather is still planning something. I would expect to get your answer at your earliest convenience. Thank you.
Online form	Ryan Feldhoff	12/16/2021	Keep it a golf course. If not, make it a park and open space with sports and activities
Online form	Andrea Mather	12/16/2021	Not a high-end grocery store.
Online form	Pam Jobin	12/16/2021	What happened to the easement??? How can we sell out to developers just so they can make a lot of bucks? We can never regain green space once it is trashed with development! We supported 301 and rejected 302 (sleazy wording BTW). Stop the visioning! Just keep it as a green park!
Online form	Christa DeHerrera	12/16/2021	What were the actual results of the election and what does the votes received mean? Who will be a part of the planning committees? And how can we I get involved as I have previously be apart of the main street initiative council for Welton Street?
Online form	Ingrid Hewitson	12/29/2021	The golf course should remain open space. As a tax payer I paid for the easement and deeply resent elected officials wasting my money and discounting my feelings. The election was clear in people not wanting it developed yet Hancock and crooked city planners are ignoring our wishes and wasting more tax payer money on planning to develop the area.