

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Rezoning - CPD
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2026 8:56 AM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] public comment on behalf of the Westwood Community Action Team (WCAT) regarding Case #2025-REZONE-0000039.

Hi Libbie,

I'm not sure if you need to review these comments, but just in case you do, here it is.

Best,



Lucia Garcia | Support Assistant IV
Community Planning and
Development City and County of Denver
[Pronouns](#) | She/Her/Hers
(720) 913-4018

[311](#) | denvergov.org/CPD | [Denver 8 TV](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

Please be advised: Some development applicants have reported receiving fraudulent emails requesting payment of fees. The City and County of Denver will never request payment for any rezoning, permitting or licensing fees via wire transfer, cryptocurrency, or prepaid gift cards. If you believe you have been targeted by a scam or have received a fraudulent request, please report it immediately to city staff and the Denver Police Department's non-emergency line 720-913-2000.

From: Westwood Community Action Team <westwoodcommunityactionteam@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 12:36 PM
To: Rezoning - CPD <Rezoning@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] public comment on behalf of the Westwood Community Action Team (WCAT) regarding Case #2025-REZONE-0000039.

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Community Planning and Development,
City and County of Denver

I am submitting public comment on behalf of the Westwood Community Action Team (WCAT) regarding Case #2025-REZONE-0000039.

According to the city's own displacement index, Westwood is one of the neighborhoods most vulnerable to involuntary displacement. As zoning changes move forward, it is important that the people who

already live and work here are not put at greater risk due to rising property values, rent increases, or development pressure.

WCAT is not opposed to added housing options. Our concern is ensuring that current residents can remain in place and benefit from these changes. Many of our starter homes are valued around \$400,000, and homeowners are already receiving fast cash offers. These offers do not reflect the long-term value of the property, and families should not lose generational wealth because they feel rushed or pressured.

We also want to ensure that small businesses along corridors such as Morrison Road are supported as zoning changes increase costs. Programs like the Legacy Business Registry and the BIO Fund should be prioritized for Westwood businesses so they can remain stable through redevelopment.

The city does provide language access, and we appreciate that. What we are asking for now is clear and consistent communication during the Site Development phase so residents are not caught off guard by construction or changes happening around them.

WCAT participated in the Southwest Area Plan in good faith. We are asking that this rezoning move forward with protections that reflect the real-world conditions in Westwood and support the people who are already part of this community.

Thank you for including this comment in the public record.

Respectfully,
Moriah Rodriguez
President, Westwood Community Action Team (WCAT)



Community Planning and Development
City and County of Denver
201 W. Colfax, Adept 205
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Community Planning and Development,

Habitat for Humanity of Metro Denver (Habitat) fully supports the Southwest Area Plan Legislative Rezoning sponsored by Council President Torres. In 2025, Habitat for Humanity acquired two properties that are included in the rezoning package for the Southwest Area Plan:

1155 S. Zenobia Street: Habitat acquired this property in Mar Lee in July 2025. Since the acquisition, we have completed an interior renovation of the existing home. Rezoning the property from E-SU-DX to E-TU-C will allow Habitat to split the 7,500 SF lot and build an additional tandem home on the back portion of the lot. This rezoning will provide two permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in the Mar Lee neighborhood to homeowners at or below 80% AMI.

598 S. Navajo Street Habitat acquired this property in Athmar Park in November 2025. We are currently in the process of preparing to demolish the current structures. Rezoning this 13,000 SF corner lot from E-SU-B1 to E-TU-B will allow Habitat to redevelop a dilapidated home into new construction, permanently affordable housing. We are in the early stage of conceptual planning that may allow either 4 or 6 homes on the property.

Rezoning these properties will increase affordable homeownership opportunities in these neighborhoods for families earning at or below 80% AMI, aligning with our mission to help families achieve stability through affordable homeownership. The rezoning and subsequent development of these properties aligns with the Southwest Area Plan's high-level recommendations under Housing Stability and Options including creating affordable and stable housing options in every neighborhood, ensuring an adequate supply of high-quality, well-maintained housing and moderately increasing housing density in residential areas.

Thank you for considering our endorsement and understanding the importance of this rezoning initiative.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Whitaker".

Kory Whitaker
Vice President of Housing Strategy
Habitat for Humanity of Metro Denver

Physical/Mailing Address:
430 S Navajo St,
Denver, CO 80223

Donations by Mail:
PO Box 5202
Denver, CO 80217-5202



Community Planning and Development
City and County of Denver
201 W. Colfax, Dept 205
Denver, CO 80202

April 2 2026

Dear Community Planning and Development:

The Housing Authority for the City & County of Denver (DHA) fully supports the Southwest Area Plan Legislative Rezoning sponsored by council members Kevin Flynn, Jamie Torres, and Flor Alvidrez. DHA in partnership to address the affordable housing needs of Denver has identified 18 distinct properties that align with the Southwest Area Plan community vision and are included in the rezoning package.


DHA owned properties are listed on page 2 of this letter and include 12 properties in City Council District 3 and 6 properties in City Council District 7. DHA sent a letter to each resident living on the proposed properties March 9th informing them of the legislative rezoning and providing direct contacts and a virtual office hour to answer questions on Friday, March 20th. To date, no residents attended the virtual office hours or have reached out with questions.

Rezoning these properties will increase affordable housing opportunities in line with affordability covenants currently in place on these properties allowing DHA to continue to invest in infill development across the city to offer a range of affordable housing types including potential affordable homeownership opportunities. *The rezoning and subsequent development of these properties aligns with the Southwest Area Plan's high-level recommendations under Housing Stability and Options including creating affordable and stable housing options in every neighborhood, ensuring an adequate supply of high-quality, well-maintained housing and moderately increasing housing density in residential areas.*

We applaud the leadership of Community Planning and Development to pursue the legislative rezonings that illustrate to the community that their time and input to NPI plans matter and will guide future neighborhood investments.

Thank you for considering our endorsement and understanding the importance of this rezoning initiative.

Sincerely,



Joaquín Cifraon Vega
Chief Executive Officer
Denver Housing Authority

DHA owned properties

	Property Address	Residential units	CC Dist
1	944 S Sheridan Blvd	19	3
2	2645 W Colorado Ave	14	7
3	3460 & 3470 W Mississippi Ave, King & Knox addresses	10	3
4	2880 & 2890 W Iowa Ave	2	7
5	1069 S Quitman St (unit A & unit B)	2	3
6	3262 W Custer Pl (unit A & unit B)	2	3
7	3299 W Ada Place, unit A & B	2	3
8	3491 W Exposition, unit A & B	2	3
9	4540 & 4560 W Bingham Pl	2	3
10	3592 W Ada Pl (unit A & unit B)	2	3
11	3551 & 3555 W Kentucky	2	3
12	3170 W Gill Pl, unit A & B	2	3
13	2240 W Gill Pl	1	7
14	405 S Canosa Ct	1	7
15	4699 W Exposition Ave	1	3
16	817 S Peterson Wy	1	7
17	881 S Tejon	1	7
18	1425 S Osceola	1	3

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 10:55 AM
To: 'Richard Taylor'
Cc: Anita Banuelos; Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed Rezoning to Implement the Southwest Area Plan

Hi Richard,

Thanks for reaching out. Outreach during the planning process included placing flyers on businesses to notify them about upcoming events. There were focus groups held specially for industrial business and commercial businesses. I've copied Fernando, the plan's project manager, on this rezoning to speak more about how businesses were engaged in the planning process.

Outreach for the rezoning includes mailing postcards to all property owners and tenants notifying of a rezoning application. Additionally, I directly reached out to property owners and businesses along Lipan as those businesses will be most impacted. Lipan is proposed to be rezoned from an industrial mixed-use district to residential, which will make all of the existing industrial and commercial businesses nonconforming. That being said, all of the existing businesses in the corridors can remain and continue to operate as they have been doing. Changes will be required when new development occurs.

The allowed uses along Federal and Mississippi aren't really changing. The proposed rezoning for these areas is adding a design overlay to the existing zoning to ensure any new development is more pedestrian friendly. The overlay does not allow the drive thru building forms (it allows drive thru uses but not the form) and requires parking to be located in the back of a building. However, existing drive thru buildings can continue to operate and even change users – so Burger King can become a Taco Bell, for example.

There are no plans to comprehensively rezone the residential areas in Athmar Park. We are just rezoning a few scattered sites that are owned by Denver Housing Authority and Habitat for Humanity from single-unit to two unit to allow for more affordable units. There's also one DHA property next to the Athmar Park Recreation Center that will be rezoned to a multi-unit district (this is already a multi-unit property).

Please let me know if you have any additional questions. Fernando, please chime in on how you all reached out to businesses in the Southwest plan area.

Thanks,
Libbie

From: Richard Taylor <zoning@athmarpark.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 11:03 PM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>
Cc: Anita Banuelos <president@athmarpark.com>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed Rezoning to Implement the Southwest Area Plan

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Ms Glick,

Thank you for contacting the Athmar Park Neighborhood Association concerning proposed rezoning to implement the Southwest Area Plan.

The proposed rezoning for Athmar Park is concentrated in the commercial corridors along Alameda, Federal, Mississippi and Lipan. My question is, are the businesses in the impacted areas in agreement with their properties being rezoned? What outreach was done in the planning process to include property and business owners? I don't recall meeting anyone from the commercial corridors while attending events concerning the plan.

Also, are there plans for a comprehensive rezoning of the residential areas of Athmar Park?

Thank you,

Richard Taylor

On Wed, Mar 11, 2026 at 1:25 PM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Great! Please let me know if you all have any comments about this proposal.

Libbie

From: Anita Banuelos <president@athmarpark.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 12:15 PM

To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Cc: Richard Taylor <zoning@athmarpark.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed Rezoning to Implement the Southwest Area Plan

Thank you Libbie,

I have forwarded this email to Richard Taylor who is our zoning expert for our neighborhood. I have added his email on this chain. Please include him in future emails as well.

Thank you,

Anita

On Thu, Feb 26, 2026 at 4:02 PM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Registered Neighborhood Organizations of Southwest Denver,

On Monday, the Southwest Area Plan, the community's vision for the future of Westwood, Mar Lee, Athmar Park, Ruby Hill, and Overland, goes before City Council for adoption. Plan recommendations include improved design standards for community centers and corridors, right zoning industrial areas, and allowing more affordable housing. To implement this vision, Council Members Flynn, Torres, and Alvidrez and Community Planning and Development (CPD) development a zoning proposal for key areas.

Centers and Corridors

This portion of the rezoning package involves rezoning centers and corridors to appropriate mixed-use and main street districts that will allow for a mix of commercial and residential uses. For some areas along Federal Boulevard and Mississippi Ave., this would involve rezoning to include the Active Centers and Corridors Design Overlay, which would require nonresidential active uses for a portion of the ground floor and does not allow the drive thru building forms. Areas along Broadway are proposed to be rezoned to main street districts, and certain properties along Morrison Rd. and at Evans Station are proposed to be rezoned to mixed-use districts.

Industrial

This involves rezoning properties along Lipan, near Aspgren Park, from industrial mixed-use to row house (E-RH-2.5), and then the two blocks north of Ruby Hill Park from industrial mixed use to main street (E-MS-3). Certain properties east of the tracks between Arizona and Florida are proposed to be rezoned from industrial mixed use to light industrial (I-A). Finally, the Santa Fe industrial area, south of Mississippi, is proposed to be rezoned from light industrial to industrial mixed use, 5 stories (I-MX-5).

Affordable Housing Properties

There are 20 properties that are proposed to be rezoned to allow for more affordable units. 18 of these properties are owned by the Denver Housing Authority and 2 are owned by Habitat for Humanity. 16 of the sites are currently zoned single-unit and will be rezoned to two-unit zone districts. The other four sites currently have several units on them but have single- or two-unit zoning. These properties will be rezoned to multi-unit (S-MU-3 and G-MU-3) and mixed-use (E-MX-3).

Institutional Properties

There are two properties that currently have Former Chapter 59 zoning and are institutional/civic uses that are proposed to be rezoned as part of the package. The first is the Denver Health Westwood Family Health Center. This is currently zoned H2 with waivers and conditions and is proposed to be rezoned to CMP-H2, which is a campus healthcare district. The second is the Westwood library, which is currently zoned R5 (a multi-unit district), and it's proposed to be rezoned to a multi-unit residential district (G-MU-3). The library has no plans to move, but this rezoning allows for future housing in addition to the existing library.

Visit the Southwest Area Plan website and denvergov.org/SouthwestPlan to learn more about the proposal. The application will be submitted in early March. Registered Neighborhood Organizations will receive an official notice at that time. Contact Senior City Planner Libbie Glick (Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org) if you have any questions about the rezoning.

Best,

Libbie



Libbie Glick, AICP | Senior City Planner
Community Planning and Development | City and County of
Denver

[Pronouns](#) | she/her/hers

phone: (720) 865-3267 / Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org

[311](#) | pocketgov.com | denvergov.org/CPD | [Take Our Survey](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

--

Anita Banuelos

Co-President Board

Athmar Park Neighborhood Association

w: www.athmarpark.com e: president@athmarpark.com

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 4:40 PM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Cc: Gautam Sachania; Rezoning - CPD; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council; District 3; City Council District 7
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Formal Opposition to Legislative Rezoning Case #2025-REZONE-0000039 – Evans Station Area
Attachments: Car Parked in No Parking - Daylighting - S Acoma and Warren - 3.20.2026.jpeg
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Libbie,

Thank you very much for providing the additional map and the clarification on the color-coded height tiers. Having this visual representation of where the 8, 5, and 3-story districts are proposed is extremely helpful for our understanding of the project's scope.

We appreciate your transparency and for ensuring our “boots on the ground”, daily real-life experiences—regarding congested parking and parking enforcement challenges, lack of green space, and property damage—are part of the official record that the Planning Board reviews.

And for what it's worth – the car I called into DOTI this morning at 7:00am is still out there, and DOTI has still not showed up to ticket them....9.5 hours later, picture attached.

We look forward to following the next steps in this process.

Respectfully,

Monica Williams and Gautam Sachania

2197 S Acoma St, Denver CO 80223

Southwest Denver/Overland Park Homeowners


On Fri, Mar 20, 2026 at 8:50 AM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Monica,

Thank you for your comments. Below you'll see a slide that shows some more information on where 3, 5, and 8 stories are proposed near the Evans Station. It might be a little hard to see, but the blue is 8 stories, green is 5, and orange is 3.

1. Centers and Corridors – Evans Station Area

- Guidance: Community Center
- Proposal:
 - Rezone industrial and industrial mixed-use properties to **Mixed Use**
 - 8 stories – C-MX-8 (blue)
 - 5 stories – C-MX-5 (green)
 - 3 stories – C-MX-3 (orange)



I will also forward the comments you just sent to Planning Board.

Thanks,

Libbie |

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 8:29 AM

To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Cc: Gautam Sachania <gautamsachania@gmail.com>; Rezoning - CPD <Rezoning@denvergov.org>; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council <Kevin.Flynn@denvergov.org>; District 3 <District3@denvergov.org>; City Council District 7 <district7@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Formal Opposition to Legislative Rezoning Case #2025-REZONE-0000039 – Evans Station Area

Hi Libbie,

Thank you for the response and clarification that the 8-story units are proposed for north of Evans, and that the areas south of the Evans Station are proposed for 5-story units, and 3-story units as you get closer to Warren. This is very informative and helpful.

We are active members of the Overland Park Neighborhood Association (OPNA) and have been in contact with the President regarding these concerns. Our collective experience with the Alexan Evans Apartments serves as a "case study" for why even the proposed 5-story densities are incompatible with this neighborhood without extreme-level mitigations that are currently missing from the plan. Our concerns regarding the cumulative impact on the neighborhood remain.

Please include these specific points in the staff report:

- **Documented Traffic Safety Issues:** We currently face a hazardous situation at the intersection of Warren and Acoma. Despite "No Parking" zones designed for daylighting and visibility, illegal parking is a constant issue. I have personally contacted DOTI over 200 times in the last 2.5 years to report these violations. In March alone, we have called DOTI 9 times (including this morning, 3/20).
- **Failed Parking Management:** The current high-density development (Alexan Evans) demonstrates that "transit-oriented" residents do not necessarily forgo cars; instead, many bypass the \$115/month garage fees to park illegally or saturate the limited street parking. Increasing density without a comprehensive parking solution will move this from a "challenge" to even more safety issues.
- **Public Safety and Walkability:** Because street parking is over-capacity, residents—including those of us with only one-car garages (or no garages)—are frequently forced to park two blocks away. After dark, walking these distances is intimidating and presents a genuine safety concern, particularly given the unhoused population currently in the neighborhood (and speaking from my own personal incident). I know it might not seem this way if you drive through the neighborhood during 9am – to 4pm, but this is what our reality turns into during the early morning/afternoon/evening.
- **Enforcement Realities:** DOTI's response times (varies anywhere from 20min to 4+ hours) means that by the time enforcement arrives, the safety hazard has sometimes moved already. But this then creates habitual offenders who think that they can now get away with constantly parking in the hazardous intersection with no repercussions. The call I made this morning is for a car I've called 3x this week on. I called at 7am when DOTI opened, but as of the time of this note—around 8:20 a.m.—DOTI still has not responded. I am doubtful that DOTI will increase their patrol and response units to match this growth. And for what it is worth, we have tried addressing the parking challenges with Scott Burton from DOTI, and we have been told there is effectively no solution.
- **Preservation of Historic Character:** The Southwest area's appeal is rooted in its historic character. We strongly oppose the introduction of "towering" multi-unit builds that deviate from this established identity. While the 3-story limit closer to Warren preserves views for some, the 5-story will still negatively impact a significant number of homes in the broader neighborhood. This creates an inconsistent "Urban Center" that disregards the surrounding residential context. We believe these high-intensity developments will negatively impact the long-term value and appreciation of existing

homes. Per the Equity in Adopted Plans guide, the city must consider how rezonings affect the economic stability of current homeowners.

- **Additional Items to Note:** We have spoken with many residents who have lived in this neighborhood prior to the Alexan Evans apartments being built. All of those we have spoken to disapprove of and regret the apartments being built. First reason being the parking congestion (including an elderly neighbor with medical issues who can no longer park close to their home, issues with having contract work being completed such as carpets being cleaned because they are not able to park their vehicles close enough to the home, etc.). Second (and unforeseen) reason is the excessive number of dogs living at the Alexan Evans and the property not being equipped. There is no dog park or green space. Our yards have become the de facto bathrooms for 100+ dogs. Many residents (us included) have posted signs in our yards asking those with dogs to be respectful and not let them pee/poop in our yards. Majority of the tenants ignore these signs. We've even put signs stating "Warning – pesticides applied." They still do not care. I have counted on our camera dogs peeing/pooping in our yard 11 times in one single day. That is easily 300 times in one month, 3,600 times in one year. Our yard is very, very small – 10' x 15'. There has been significant damage done to our yard – and all of the neighbors' yards. I have tried to nicely ask multiple tenants to respect our signs and keep their dogs out of our yard (and kindly try to explain that we spend a lot of time and money to keep up our landscaping so the community looks nice), but I've mostly been mostly met with hostility. "Your yard isn't private property", "welcome to living in a community", "this is a community", "I can't control where my dogs go", "get a life, there's more important things in the world". I've been told off, I've been flipped off, I've been threatened that from now on they will always come to our yard, and the list goes on. All the local residents are fed up with the dog owners. And yes, multiple of us have tried addressing this with Chelsea the property manager. Her response every time is "We frequently send friendly reminders to our residents to be respectful of others in the surrounding neighborhoods. Unfortunately, we're not able to control behavior that occurs outside of the community.". I share this because if there truly is going to be approval for larger units – there should be additional requirements for these units to include parking garages that don't charge, a limit on the number of tenants with dogs and greenspace for the dogs to offset the damage to local residents' property.

Conclusion: These are real-life, daily impacts that we are dealing with because of the decision to allow a 5-story unit the size of Alexan Evans to be built. The current "Transit Oriented Development" model is broken and shouldn't be expanded until fixed. For the rezoning to be "consistent with adopted plans" regarding neighborhood safety and quality of life, the city must address how it will mitigate these issues. Without a dedicated plan addressing these issues, we maintain our opposition to anything exceeding 3 stories in the Evans Station Area.

Thank you for ensuring these documented experiences are shared with the Planning Board.

Respectfully,

Monica Williams and Gautam Sachania

2197 S Acoma St, Denver CO 80223

Southwest Denver/Overland Park Homeowners

On Thu, Mar 19, 2026 at 11:39 AM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Monica,

Thank you for your comment on the Southwest Rezoning Proposal. Your comments will be included in the staff report and forwarded on to Planning Board. I do want to make clear the C-MX-8 story district is proposed north of Evans along the tracks. The properties directly south of the station are proposed for 5 stories and then 3 stories closer to Warren.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Best,

Libbie

From: Rezoning - CPD <Rezoning@denvergov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:01 PM

To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Formal Opposition to Legislative Rezoning Case #2025-REZONE-0000039 – Evans Station Area

Thanks,



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Joe Green | Associate City Planner
Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
[Pronouns](#) | He/Him/His
phone: 720-913-0426

[311](#) | pocketgov.com | denvergov.org/CPD | [Take Our Survey](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 4:06 PM

To: Rezoning - CPD <Rezoning@denvergov.org>

Cc: Gautam Sachania <gautamsachania@gmail.com>; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council

<Kevin.Flynn@denvergov.org>; District 3 <District3@denvergov.org>; City Council District 7

<district7@denvergov.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Formal Opposition to Legislative Rezoning Case #2025-REZONE-0000039 – Evans Station Area

To the Department of Community Planning & Development and Members of the City Council,

We are writing to you as local homeowners in the Southwest Area to formally express our strong opposition to the proposed 8-story height recommendation (C-MX-8) near the Evans Station as part of the Southwest Area Plan rezoning.

While we understand the goals of the Southwest Area Plan, we believe the proposal for 8-story structures in this specific area is inappropriate for the following reasons:

1. Existing Parking and Traffic Congestion

Our neighborhood is already struggling with significant parking and traffic issues resulting from the Alexan Evans Apartments. Increasing the allowable density to 8 stories will exacerbate these existing problems, leading to further congestion on our local streets and a decrease in the quality of life for current residents who already face difficulties with parking and navigation in their own neighborhood.

2. Preservation of Scenic Views

One of the primary reasons we chose to live in this area is for the breathtaking views of the Rocky Mountain foothills and the Front Range. Any structure exceeding 3 stories would significantly block these views, which are a defining characteristic of our community. Preserving these sightlines is essential to maintaining the value and character of our homes.

3. Maintaining Neighborhood Character

The appeal of the Southwest area lies in its balance; it is a community that is not yet sprawling with multiple large-scale units. We wish to keep it that way. Transitioning to 8-story developments shifts the context of our neighborhood from a balanced residential area to an overly dense urban center that does not align with the current aesthetic or lifestyle of the surrounding blocks. Additionally, by blocking our historic mountain views—a primary natural amenity of this area—the 8-story proposal fails to protect the very features that make this a high-opportunity neighborhood. We believe a 3-story maximum better aligns with the goal of Expanding Housing Diversity while respecting the existing environmental and aesthetic context.

4. Failure to Meet Rezoning Review Criteria

We argue that the proposed rezoning to C-MX-8 does not meet the city's mandatory review criteria for the following reasons:

- **Public Interest:** The negative impacts on parking and view corridors indicate that this specific height increase is not in the best interest of the existing public.
- **Consistency with Neighborhood Context:** While the plan describes this as an "Urban Center," 8-story heights are a drastic departure from the current "Neighborhood Context" and fail to provide a compatible transition to the existing single- and two-unit homes nearby, as recommended in the Southwest Area Plan's guidance on "gentle density".

We urge the Planning Board and City Council to reconsider this recommendation and limit building heights in the Evans Station Area to a maximum of 3 stories to ensure the continued stability and character of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Monica Williams and Gautam Sachania

2197 S Acoma St, Denver CO 80223

Southwest Denver Homeowners

Southwest Area Plan - General Comment Form



Submitted on	16 March 2026, 10:52AM
Receipt number	17
Related form version	3

Tell us what you think!

General questions and comments about the Southwest Area planning process can be shared in the text box below.

Hi! I live in the Athmar Park neighborhood and would love to start a small coffee shop near Huston Lake (similar to Wash Perk). Would the Athmar Park rezoning allow for this? It looks like it is planned to become an "Urban Edge" zone.

Please let us know if you are submitting a question or a comment.

Question

Name:

Wes Straker

Email Address:

wstraker@gmail.com

Would you like to receive email updates on the Southwest Area Plan?

Yes

Tell us about yourself

What is your gender?

Man

How old are you?

19-34

What is your race or ethnicity? Please select all that apply. You may report more than one group.

White

Do you live in the planning area?

Athmar Park

Do you work or run a business in the planning area? If so, select the neighborhood below

Not applicable

Do you rent or own your home?

Own

Please estimate your total household income, before taxes, in the last 12 months. Please include all sources of income for all adult household members.

February 16, 2026

Councilwoman Flor Alvidrez
1437 Bannock St, Room 451
Denver, CO 80202

Councilwoman Alvidrez,

I and my family own the building at 1360 S. Lipan in Denver.

In this past week we have been made aware that there is a proposed zoning change from I-MX-3 to E-MS-3 if the SW Area plan is implemented by vote of the Denver City Council. We feel that this change will adversely affect our building, business and the neighborhood.

We are completely opposed to this change of zoning to E-MS-3. We are long-time owners of this building and have been good neighbors by keeping up our building and the surrounding property and employing a large number of people over the years. There is no reason to restrict the uses of this building to achieve Denver's vision for this area. It can be done under the I-MX-3 zoning.

In addition, the 1200 S block of Lipan, directly to the north of us, abuts residential homes and the plan allows for that block to keep the Innovation/Flex District status that will have I-MX-3.

Neither we as property owners, nor our tenants, were ever advised that a change was being proposed, nor were we ever asked for our input for such a dramatic change to the zoning of our street/building.

As you are our representative, I am asking that the 1300 South block of Lipan be included in the Innovation/Flex District and/or it remains with the I-MX-3 zoning.

Thank you for your consideration,



Keith Lange
(303) 885-9620

Simon Zhen
General Manager
Kwan San Noodle Company
1140 W Louisiana
Denver, CO 80223

Denver Councilmember Flor Alvidrez
1437 Bannock St, Room 451
Denver, CO 80202

February 16, 2026

Councilwoman Alvidrez,

My family owns the building at 1140 W. Louisiana St. in Denver and our company manufactures noodle products in our warehouse there.

We recently found out that the city of Denver has a SW Area Plan that would change our zoning from I-MX-3 to E-MS-3. We are very concerned that this will limit the future uses of our building and we are against this change in zoning for the 1300 S block of Lipan.

In particular, our building faces North and our address is on Louisiana Street. So to include us in "local corridor/Main Street zoning" for Lipan does not make sense. We are not integrated into Lipan street, as you can see by the location of our building being way below street level.

We are part of the industrial area, provide local jobs and want to remain with the flexibility to continue our small business in Denver. Leaving the zoning with I-MX-3 will permit change, but also not adversely affect our building, business and the neighborhood.

Why is the block just north of us allowed to stay with its I-MX-3 and they have houses behind them? We have no houses by us and we are more similar in use to the warehouses and industrial area to the East of us.

No one ever contacted anyone in my family about this change and we feel we would like to have input so that we can keep our small business going and have other businesses be able to operate in our building if we ever retired.

Please leave our block of Lipan as I-MX-3 and include it in the Innovation/Flex District.

I appreciate your help,



Simon Zheng
General Manager
Kwan Sang Noodle Co.
KwanSangNoodle@gmail.com
720-421-4827

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 7:36 PM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Cc: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior; Edington, Lisa M. - DOTI CE0431 Engineer Senior; Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate; Alvidrez, Flor C. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Libbie,

I appreciate the perspective on the need for diverse land uses within the city. I understand that manufacturing and industrial uses provide value. My concern is not about their importance, but about **who is expected to live with their impacts**. These uses have consistently been concentrated in historically marginalized communities, bringing environmental impacts, truck traffic, noise, and physical separation from surrounding neighborhoods.

The proposed I-A and industrial zoning changes continue that pattern, and it raises a significant equity concern. In Overland, there are proposed rezonings that allow for more mixed-use flexibility and broader access to opportunity. In Athmar Park and Ruby Hill, the changes move in the opposite direction, toward more restrictive industrial zoning. Based on the proposed rezonings, ALL changes from I-A to more flexible mixed-use designations are occurring in Overland, while there are NO proposed changes from mixed-use to I-A in Overland. In contrast, the changes from more flexible zoning to I-A are ALL occurring in Athmar Park and Ruby Hill.

This results in a clear pattern where one area is gaining flexibility and opportunity, while others are being further constrained. Given the historical concentration of industrial uses in these neighborhoods, this raises serious concerns about how equity is being applied in these decisions and whether existing disparities are being addressed or reinforced.

Regarding the current zoning, I understand that much of the area is already zoned I-A. My concern is with the parcels that are not. The proposal explicitly moves properties from industrial mixed use (I-MX), which allows residential uses, to I-A, which does not. The stated intent is clear - "rezoning certain I-MX properties to I-A...will ensure these properties retain their industrial uses," and "rezoning to I-A...will ensure these areas continue to promote manufacturing and warehousing uses." This removes future flexibility and limits what these areas can become.

I have reviewed the Southwest Area Plan general comment tracking and can only find 2 general comments supporting maintaining industrial uses in these specific locations. If that input exists, it would be helpful to understand how it was gathered and how it directly supports these zoning decisions.

I am not arguing against industrial uses or the jobs they provide. I am questioning why those uses continue to be reinforced in the same neighborhoods while other areas are being allowed to evolve toward more mixed-use flexibility and broader access to opportunity.

Thank you for including these comments in the record. Could you also confirm how my comments will be shared with the Planning Board, and whether they will be included in full or summarized? I want to ensure they are accurately reflected as part of the record.

Thank you for your time and continued engagement.

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP
540-830-3630

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026 at 11:50 AM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Thank you for your comments, Kane. They will be forwarded on to the Planning Board.

You're correct that the area near Vanderbilt Park is largely Value Manufacturing except for the area directly south of the park, which has innovation flex guidance. This area is already largely zoned I-A so it's unlikely we'll see rezonings in this area in the future as it's already zoned in accordance with plan guidance. The main exception is the area directly south of the park, which could be rezoned to industrial mixed-use districts in the future.

While I wasn't as involved with the engagement process as Fernando, it's my understanding that the feedback we received from the outreach was to maintain the industrial areas and focus on mixed-use development elsewhere in the area, along Federal and Mississippi, for example. It's important that the city has places for lots of different types of uses. Areas that allow a mix of uses are very important to the city as they provide a variety of amenities to residents and can promote connectivity and walkability, it's also important for there to be space for industrial, warehousing, and manufacturing uses within the city as these types of uses can provide valuable jobs and necessary services.

Best,

Libbie

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:16 PM

To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Cc: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior <Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org>; Edington, Lisa M. - DOTI CE0431 Engineer Senior <Lisa.Edington@denvergov.org>; Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate <William.Prince@denvergov.org>; Alvidrez, Flor C. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council

<Flor.Alvidrez@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Hi Libbie,

Thank you for the detailed information and for outlining the upcoming timeline and proposed changes - I appreciate the clarity.

I wanted to share a concern regarding the proposed rezoning of the parcels at 377 and 389 S Lipan from industrial mixed use (I-MX-3) to light industrial (I-A). As these properties currently allow for mixed use, including residential, shifting to I-A would limit future opportunities for more integrated land use over time. Maintaining flexibility in these areas feels important given the broader goals around connectivity, access, and long-term investment.

Related to this, the definition of the “Value Manufacturing” designation raises additional concern. It notes that properties with this designation may currently allow residential uses, and that rezoning to I-A would ensure these areas continue to promote manufacturing and warehousing uses. That language suggests a broader intent to move toward restricting residential uses in these areas, not just at the specific parcels identified.

Looking at the map, the Value Manufacturing designation appears to cover a large portion of the area surrounding Vanderbilt Park - including the west, south, and southwest sides. This raises concern that the long-term direction for this area could involve a broader shift toward I-A zoning, which would significantly limit residential and mixed-use opportunities over time.

Taken together, this raises concern about how these zoning patterns may continue to reinforce separation and limit opportunities for more balanced, mixed-use development - particularly in an area that has already experienced impacts related to industrial activity, including traffic, noise, and environmental conditions.

I appreciate the opportunity to share this input and for it to be included as part of the broader discussion.

Best,

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 4:11 PM Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Kane,

Thank you for your comments! The Southwest rezoning is scheduled to go to Planning Board on May 6 and then City Council on July 13. There will be public comment at both of those hearings, and you can also send any comments to me directly to be included with the staff report. We are not proposing to rezone properties near Vanderbilt Park, but we are proposing to rezone properties along Lipan as part of the rezoning package. The properties along Lipan between W. Virginia Ave and W. Gill Pl. are proposed to be rezoned from industrial mixed use (I-MX-3) to row house (E-RH-2.5). This is to provide a buffer between the single unit properties in Athmar Park and the more intense industrial to the east. We are also proposing to rezone a property at 377 and [389 S Lipan St](#) from industrial mixed use to light industrial (I-A). As stated previously, rezoning the properties on the east side of Lipan will help create a buffer and transition between the lower scale single unit and the more intense industrial uses.

As for bringing more amenities to the Athmar Park area, we are rezoning the commercial properties along Mississippi from E-MX-3A (mixed use three story district) to E-MX-3A, DO-8 (Active Centers and Corridors Design Overlay). This overlay requires a portion of the ground floor to be nonresidential commercial uses, and it does not allow the drive thru building forms. Mapping the DO-8 along this corridor will prevent a new all-residential development from going up and will ensure that the corridor continues to have commercial uses.

For a map of the properties that are included in the rezoning, you can visit this webpage: <https://denvergov.org/Government/Agencies-Departments-Offices/Agencies-Departments-Offices-Directory/Community-Planning-and-Development/Denver-Zoning-Code/Map-Amendments>. Here's the official webpage for the Southwest Legislative Rezoning: <https://denvergov.org/Government/Agencies-Departments-Offices/Agencies-Departments-Offices-Directory/Community-Planning-and-Development/Denver-Zoning-Code/Map-Amendments/2025-REZONE-0000039>.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Best,

Libbie

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:36 PM

To: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior <Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org>

Cc: Edington, Lisa M. - DOTI CE0431 Engineer Senior <Lisa.Edington@denvergov.org>; Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate <William.Prince@denvergov.org>; Alvidrez, Flor C. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council <Flor.Alvidrez@denvergov.org>; Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Hi Fernando,

Thank you for the clarification regarding the opportunities mentioned in RC-M1.D.1 and RC-M1.D.2. Could you clarify which systems or decision-making bodies are guiding those opportunities at this point? For example, are these primarily being advanced through DOTI, City Council, or another process? Additionally, will you and your team be directly involved in these decisions? I want to ensure that my advocacy is as high-leverage as possible and aligned with the appropriate channels.

Regarding the industrial zoning, BRT, and the Mississippi Avenue Vision Zero plan, I look forward to hearing from Libbie and Lisa on those topics. I will also follow up with them directly, but I wanted to share my specific questions in advance:

Lisa- I saw that the contract for the Mississippi Avenue Vision Zero project was recently approved, with a notice to proceed and a 365-day construction timeline. Could you clarify the anticipated start date for construction and how this aligns with the originally communicated early 2026 timeline? I would also appreciate more clarity on how this work aligns with the planned BRT investment and whether it supports equitable pedestrian and infrastructure improvements in the area.

Libbie- Could you provide more detail on how and when zoning decisions will be made? Additionally, what specific opportunities will there be for community feedback, particularly regarding the I-A designation of large parcels surrounding Vanderbilt Park? More specifically, how does this zoning approach support community equity, given the area's history of separation from amenities and the longstanding impacts of adjacent industrial uses including environmental concerns, traffic volume, and noise and air pollution, that have disproportionately affected the surrounding neighborhood?

Best,

Kane Hamilton

On Mon, Apr 13, 2026 at 11:40 AM Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior
<Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Kane,

Thank you for your engagement and advocacy for your neighborhood. That is the part of the goal of the plan like this, to be able to use this plan for advocacy for the next 20 years.

Regarding your question about more direct, pedestrian-focused opportunities as they relate to Athmar Park, the plan does include some opportunities on RC-M1.D.1 and RC-M1.D.2 (pg 116):

- **RC-M1.D.1:** An opportunity for an east/west bike and pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks at Exposition Avenue or Gill place
- **RC-M1.D.2:** An opportunity for an east/west bike and pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks connecting Tennessee route to Vanderbilt Park, the river, the South Platte River trail and the area where the future Denver Summit FC stadium will be.

These more direct opportunities as well as the overall description of the Riverside Communities focus areas intends to describe better east west connectivity in terms of mobility, land uses, and quality of life, which is what we heard from the process.

I hope this information helped provide some clarification. Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thank you,



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Fernando Abbud, AICP | Senior City Planner | *hablo español*
Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
[Pronouns](#) | He/Him/His
phone: (720) 865-3229

[311](#) | denvergov.org/CPD | [Denver 8 TV](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 10, 2026 2:50 PM

To: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior <Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org>

Cc: Edington, Lisa M. - DOTI CE0431 Engineer Senior <Lisa.Edington@denvergov.org>; Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate <William.Prince@denvergov.org>; Alvidrez, Flor C. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council <Flor.Alvidrez@denvergov.org>; Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development <Libbie.Glick@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Hi Fernando,

Thank you for your continued time, responsiveness, and engagement throughout this process.

I understand that the plan is intended to guide long-term improvements (including future east/west connections and zoning). My intention now is to focus my engagement and advocacy on how the plan will be interpreted and implemented moving forward to benefit my neighborhood, Athmar park. Therefore, it is important to continue to name specific elements of the plan I have concerns with to help ensure they do not unintentionally reinforce existing barriers or limit opportunities to create more equitable infrastructure investment, access, and connectivity.

My concern with east/west connectivity is not solely related to where activity is currently occurring, but also to how near-term and future infrastructure investments will be prioritized and shaped by the plan. While it is true and concerning that more activity is currently happening in other neighborhoods, what is more concerning is that the plan itself reflects and reinforces that pattern. It outlines a pedestrian bridge connecting Baker and West Wash Park to a future amenity zone, and there is already a bridge being constructed connecting Overland to existing amenities. Athmar Park does not have any planned comparable, purpose-built connections to existing or near-term planned amenities identified.

The current planned pedestrian access to amenities for Athmar Park does not fully address existing barriers or reflect equitable pedestrian infrastructure investment. The proposed pedestrian infrastructure is largely integrated along major vehicular corridors, tying east/west movement in this area to busy roadways rather than providing direct, pedestrian-first connections. This represents a different level of access, connectivity, and infrastructure investment compared to nearby neighborhoods.

While long-term amenity planning and safety improvements along corridors like Mississippi and Federal are encouraging, these do not fully address these inequities. I agree that improving safety along existing corridors is important; however, roadway safety improvements are not equivalent to direct, pedestrian-focused connections. Similarly, creating new amenity areas closer to Athmar Park over time is a positive step, but it does not fully address current access gaps. Without strong, direct connections to existing amenities, I am concerned that future amenities will be less likely to locate in or near Athmar Park. Without more intentional, pedestrian-focused connections across existing barriers to existing amenities, these patterns of limited and indirect access are likely to persist. Because access is primarily framed through roadway-based improvements, this approach may continue to limit connectivity for Athmar Park, particularly given barriers such as industrial zoning and the possible expansion of Santa Fe Ave.

Can you speak to how the plan will be applied in practice to support those types of connections, and how flexibility will be maintained to pursue more direct, pedestrian-focused opportunities as they arise?

Regarding noise mitigation along Santa Fe, I appreciate the clarification on how the plan's high-level guidance can still support future improvements for Vanderbilt Park. I agree that the plan is not written in a way that would limit these opportunities and can serve as a strong foundation for future advocacy. However, this continues to highlight disparities in infrastructure investment between neighborhoods.

Regarding Mississippi Avenue and the future BRT, I look forward to hearing more from Lisa about how that project will prioritize pedestrian access, amenity connectivity, and infrastructure investment that directly benefits residents of Athmar Park and Ruby Hill.

Finally, thank you for including Libbie Glick. I look forward to hearing from her regarding how Athmar Park residents can engage in the rezoning process. Beyond the industrial designations, there are additional small-scale rezoning considerations within the Southwest Area Plan that impact Athmar directly, and I look forward to engaging on those as well.

Thank you again for your time and for continuing to engage in this conversation.

Best,

Kane Hamilton

On Thu, Apr 9, 2026 at 2:17 PM Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior
<Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Kane,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts and concerns about the industrial areas. I'm including my coworker, Libbie Glick, who is working on the rezoning process so she can make sure your comments are captured.

Regarding noise along Santa Fe, the intent of the plan is to reflect the overall vision and needs of this large area at a high level. When we receive comments about specific opportunities, we incorporate them as appropriate. I apologize that the details related to Santa Fe and its connection to Vanderbilt Park were not included explicitly. Many of the comments we received about Santa Fe referred to the section in Overland, which led us believe comments without a specific location were talking about that same area.

As you mentioned, the plan can't be revised now that it has been adopted. However, several sections still provide a foundation for advocating for improvements. For example:

- "5.2.2 South Platte River Today" highlights current conditions and needs.
- "RC-Q1" supports enhancements to river-adjacent parks, including Johnson Habitat Park and Vanderbilt Park.

- Sections addressing noise improvements along Santa Fe can also support similar efforts outside of Overland.

This is one of the advantages of planning at an area scale rather than by individual neighborhoods.

Regarding east/west connectivity, we did hear this from the community quite a bit. While more activity may currently be happening east of the river, the plan is intended to guide the next 20 years and can help inform future opportunities for improved connections on the west side as well, including many opportunities for improved east/west pedestrian and bicycle connectivity included in the plan.

Regarding the Mississippi Vision Zero Project, I believe the project is about to start construction soon aiming to address pressing safety improvements and would be able to be modified or adapt for future more detail planning of how the BRT could be accommodated along Mississippi once the more detailed planning and design for that takes place in the future. I'm not as aware of all the details, please reach out to Lisa directly if you have more specific questions regarding the project itself.

Thank you again for sharing your comments with us,



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Fernando Abbud, AICP | Senior City Planner | *hablo español*
Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
[Pronouns](#) | He/Him/His
phone: (720) 865-3229

[311](#) | denvergov.org/CPD | [Denver 8 TV](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 3:29 PM

To: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior <Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org>; Edington, Lisa M. - DOTI CE0431 Engineer Senior <Lisa.Edington@denvergov.org>

Cc: Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate <William.Prince@denvergov.org>; Alvidrez, Flor C. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council <Flor.Alvidrez@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Hi Fernando,

Thank you for the thoughtful and detailed response.

I wanted to follow up specifically on the rezoning component, as that raises some additional concerns for me after reviewing the legislative rezoning proposal.

Regarding the “Value Manufacturing” designation, I’m concerned by the statement that “residential uses are not compatible” and the corresponding proposal to rezone certain properties to I-A, which would prohibit residential uses. While I understand the goal of supporting existing industrial businesses, a zoning approach that outright prohibits residential feels misaligned with the broader goals of mixed-use, walkable, and connected neighborhoods outlined in the Southwest Area Plan. Zoning that allows both residential and industrial uses creates flexibility and opportunity for evolution over time. In contrast, prohibiting residential entirely risks continuing patterns that have historically separated and marginalized neighborhoods to the west. If these industrial uses are truly viable and valuable, they should be able to persist without requiring the exclusion of residential uses. From an equity and long-term planning perspective, it is difficult to understand why residential would be fully restricted in these areas.

I also wanted to follow up on the earlier community feedback regarding noise mitigation along Santa Fe. I understand that it may be too late to incorporate new elements into this specific plan at this stage, and I understand that not all feedback can be included. However, noise mitigation near Vanderbilt Park (west of Santa Fe) was raised by the community and documented in the [Phase 3 Public Comment Summary](#). Given that this park directly borders a high-speed, multi-lane roadway, the current conditions make it an unsafe and often unpleasant space to use. I would strongly encourage that this be carried forward and considered in future planning or implementation efforts, even if it is not included in this plan.

I also want to reiterate my concern regarding east/west connectivity. While I appreciate the clarifications provided, it continues to feel that in areas like Athmar Park and Mar Lee, vehicular access is being prioritized over pedestrian connectivity, while pedestrian access improvements are being more strongly advanced in other nearby neighborhoods. The lack of meaningful east/west connections across Santa Fe and the South Platte in the Athmar Park area continues to reinforce barriers for this neighborhood, while access to amenities on the east side and south of Athmar Park (Baker, West Wash Park, and Overland) is improving. From both an equity and access standpoint, this remains a significant concern.

I’ve also included Councilwoman Alvidrez to ensure visibility on these questions and ongoing community concerns.

Thank you as well for sharing Lisa’s contact information. I’ve included her here to better understand how the planned BRT corridor along Mississippi aligns with the approved Vision Zero lane reduction project, as these efforts do not currently appear fully aligned with the goal of creating a more walkable, people-oriented corridor.

Thank you for all your work on this plan and your ongoing engagement with the community. I intend to stay engaged as this moves forward and look forward to continued discussion on these items.

Best,

Kane

On Thu, Feb 12, 2026 at 2:32 PM Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior
<Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Kane,

I apologize about the late reply; we had been working on getting ready for a big meeting this week. We appreciate your patience on this response.

Thank you for your involvement throughout this process and for sharing your input with us. See below for my responses to your questions:

Land Use Designations (Map 5.2.5)

- Area G is different than area C because Area C has a future place designation of community corridor which better aligns with what is already there (commercial corridor of Santa Fe Avenue) and with the guidance for a vision of a more walkable corridor.
- Regarding Area G and Area D, throughout this process we did hear input about improving the industrial areas and allowing other uses that better serve the surrounding communities. However, we also heard from industrial business that supporting existing industrial business in the area was important. We balanced that by creating spaces such as the local commercial node along Lipan street (close to Ruby Hill Park), and by allowing limited residential and taking them out of the Manufacturing Preservation Boundary in areas where we heard that was desired yet previously had been within a Manufacturing Preservation Area. This includes Area G and Lipan Street.
- Zoning implementation of these recommendations could occur through individual property owner rezonings or legislative rezonings where applicable.

Noise and Sound Barriers

- We called out the area in the overland neighborhood because during the review of Draft #2 back in November we got some specific comments about that. We had not heard anything specific about the norther section of Santa Fe. While the norther section might not be called out, outcomes from the Overland Section could also be used to advocate for improvements in the Athmar Park section of Santa Fe.

East/West Connectivity

- The intent and information on connectivity and proposed crossings are located on the Major Multimodal Projects Map on page 77.
- The plans for connecting Vanderbilt West Park across South Platte River Drive and across Santa Fe to the future Vanderbilt East as part of the Denver FC Summit Stadium is to use the recently constructed vehicular bridge with includes a wide sidewalk and bicycle facilities. Regarding the details of how the intersections of these two streets will be improved, I do not have that information. I believe more of those details could be being worked out with the planning of the Denver FC Summit stadium.
- For Lipan Street, we have two proposed crossings: 1) at Gill/Exposition near Aspgren Park and 2) near Tennessee.
- I'm noticing some of these proposed crossings are not being displayed correctly in the Athmar Park Neighborhood Map since they are being covered by a number. I will make sure that the crossings on the map on page 77 are reflected on the neighborhood maps as well as the Riverside Communities section.

Mississippi Avenue and BRT

- Yes, you are correct. There are future plans for Mississippi as a future BRT corridor. Those are long-term plans. The Vision Zero Safety Project is a current project with short term improvements. Since I have not been involved in that project, I'm unaware of how the Vision Zero Safety Project relates to future BRT plans. I would advise you to contact the Project Manager for the Vision Zero Safety Project Lisa Edington (Lisa.Edington@denvergov.org). I think she will be able to provide you with more information about how these two projects relate.

I hope this information helps clarify your questions. At this time, the Southwest Area Plan has started the legislative process. We went to planning board on 01/21 and are scheduled to go to City Council hearing for adoption on 03/02. Since the legislative process has already started we can't modify the plan for any content. We can only make revisions that do not change the content such as the ones I mentioned about moving the number so the crossings can show better.

I hope this email was clear, but I know it is quite a bit of information, so happy to join a call if you want to discuss any of these items further. Let me know if you are interested and we can coordinate on a time.

Thank you,



DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Fernando Abbud, AICP | Senior City Planner | *hablo español*
Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
[Pronouns](#) | He/Him/His
phone: (720) 865-3229

[311](#) | denvergov.org/CPD | [Denver 8 TV](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Kane Hamilton <kane.m.hamilton@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 1:19 PM

To: Abbud, Fernando - CPD CE0429 City Planner Senior <Fernando.Abbud@denvergov.org>; Prince, William G. - CPD CE0371 City Planner Associate <William.Prince@denvergov.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Community feedback on Southwest Area Plan – Draft 2

Hi Fernando and Will,

Thank you both for the time, engagement, and responsiveness you've shown throughout the Southwest Area Plan process. I recognize the amount of work and coordination that has gone into the second draft, and I appreciate the opportunities the team has created for community input. After reviewing the updated draft plan, I wanted to share some feedback and ask for clarification on a few items where I think adjustments could better reflect community needs and long-standing concerns.

Land Use Designations (Map 5.2.5)

Regarding Area G, could you please explain why it is designated for "Industrial uses mixed with commercial and limited residential uses"? I would advocate for this area to be designated similarly to Areas C or D, focusing on a "mixed-use walkable corridor that connects to the river."

From a zoning perspective, how will these designations be implemented? I am concerned about whether the current plan will prevent residential and retail development in this area. Furthermore, why are industrial uses still being prioritized here? This prioritization has historically marginalized

neighborhoods to the west, cutting them off from resources and contributing to environmental pollution.

Noise and Sound Barriers

I noticed that certain sections of Santa Fe Drive were called out for upgraded fencing and noise barriers, such as in the Overland area. However, the section of Santa Fe directly west of the soccer stadium and Athmar park experiences similar noise issues. Will sound barriers be considered for Vanderbilt Park to help it become a more pleasant public space?

East/West Connectivity

Regarding the maps, could you clarify if there is a planned overpass for Santa Fe Drive and South Platte River Drive just north of Tennessee? While a currently inaccessible vehicle bridge exists, I would like to know the plans for making this pedestrian-friendly.

Additionally, it appears there are still no plans to connect Lipan Street to the east without using Alameda or Mississippi. Am I interpreting the maps correctly, or is a connection planned that I have overlooked?

Mississippi Avenue and BRT

The plan mentions Mississippi Avenue as a future BRT route. However [Mississippi Avenue Vision Zero Safety](#) projects also calls for a reduction in lanes on Mississippi, which I believe has already been approved and funded by the Council. Was this lane reduction considered in the context of the future BRT route?

Thank you for your time and for engaging with this feedback. I would appreciate any clarification you can provide on these questions and look forward to continuing the conversation.

Best,

--

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP

540-830-3630

--

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP

540-830-3630

--

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP

540-830-3630

--

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP

540-830-3630

--

Kane Hamilton, M.A., Ed.S., NCSP

540-830-3630

Southwest Area Plan - General Comment Form



Submitted on	16 May 2026, 7:56AM
Receipt number	19
Related form version	4

Tell us what you think!

General questions and comments about the Southwest Area planning process can be shared in the text box below.	It would be a spectacular update if marlee could get a fenced off area for a dog park. Either at Garfield lake park or harvey park. Please consider!
Please let us know if you are submitting a question or a comment.	Comment
Name:	Jack Storti
Email Address:	Jack.storti5@gmail.com
Would you like to receive email updates on the Southwest Area Plan?	No

Tell us about yourself

What is your gender?	Other: Transgender male
How old are you?	35-44
What is your race or ethnicity? Please select all that apply. You may report more than one group.	White
Do you live in the planning area?	Mar Lee
Do you work or run a business in the planning area? If so, select the neighborhood below	Not applicable
Do you rent or own your home?	Own
Please estimate your total household income, before taxes, in the last 12 months. Please include all sources of income for all adult household members.	\$100,000 - \$149,999

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Neev Properties LLC <neevllc4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2026 3:32 PM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Cc: Planning Services - CPD
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Business Owner on Mississippi Avenue

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Libbie,

I hope this note finds you well. I am emailing because I own the Athmar Park Plaza shopping center located at 1865-1935 West Mississippi Ave Denver, CO 80223, and I am concerned about how the rezoning may impact us.

We are intersted in devloping that area into more affordable housing complexes and even stores that benefit the local comminity, but are unsure of how the new rezoning proposal might impact us.

Can you please provide some clarity?

Thank you,

Neeru Jain

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: City Council District 7
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2026 5:17 PM
To: Martina Hauptmann
Cc: Martinez, Victoria - CC City Council Aide; Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] SW Denver zoning changes

Hello Martina,

I have been trying to get some clarification from our CPD team about your concerns, however, I think we need some more information from you. Are you concerned about the properties at Lipan and W Gill that are being rezoned from E-SU-B and I-MX-3 to allow for row houses (E-RH-2.5) or are you concerned about the individual properties owned by DHA and Habitat that are proposed to be rezoned from single-unit to two-unit? I want to reiterate that not all residential properties in Athmar Park are being rezoned.

In regards to the setbacks, all of our residential zone districts have the same setback requirements.

Here's the map where you can see what properties are included in the rezoning:

<https://denvergov.org/Government/Agencies-Departments-Offices/Agencies-Departments-Offices-Directory/Community-Planning-and-Development/Denver-Zoning-Code/Map-Amendments>.

I have also CC'ed my colleague Libbie Glick who has been championing the legislative rezoning project in Community Planning and Development.

Thank you,
Victoria Martinez



Office of
Councilwoman
Flor Alvidrez,
District 7

Phone. 720-337-
7777

Web. denvergov.org/district7



[Sign up for the District 7 newsletter to stay up-to-date!](#)
[311](#) | denvergov.org | [Denver 8 TV](#)

From: Martina Hauptmann <martina.e.h@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 5:32 AM
To: City Council District 7 <district7@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SW Denver zoning changes

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Good Morning Flor!

I hope you had a good weekend. Over the weekend I became aware of zoning changes proposed for SW Denver.

I was surprised by the proposed zoning changes to RESIDENTIAL properties. I realize Denver has an affordable housing problem. The zoning changes in SW Denver seem intended to solve this problem by allowing adjustments to the number of units and setbacks on a parcel of land.

I completely oppose these zoning ideas. It will negatively affect ALL aspects of the communities in SW Denver. It will change the character of the communities. Issues arising from having more people living in small areas will create problems with traffic, noise, parking and interpersonal interactions.

From your website, I see you grew up in Athmar Park. I have lived in Athmar Park since 2016 and enjoy the quiet, friendly neighborhood. I have seen changes during that time. It seems like this happened when a house came up for sale. The home wasn't demolished; it was renovated. This was positive for the neighborhood.

Recently, setbacks on Lipan and Nevada were changed to enable the developer to create large low income housing and maximize the number of units. It has increased traffic and parking issues, and I believe the residents on these streets are unhappy with the changes. **To understand the effects on residents of changing setbacks to accommodate larger buildings, survey the residents on those streets.**

Low-income housing exists on Zuni and Virginia, built with appropriate setbacks and parking for residents. This housing fits the character of Athmar Park and is not obtrusive.

The proposed zoning changes will cause developers to demolish single-family homes in favor of buildings with more units. **The developers are searching for ways to continue their business model: constructing large, cheaply built buildings and/or several small buildings on one RESIDENTIAL parcel. Changing the setbacks and allowing more buildings on a single RESIDENTIAL parcel of land is the ONLY way this will make it possible for developers to get a return on their investment.**

I used to rent in the Berkeley neighborhood. I saw what occurred there. When a house came up for sale, a developer demolished the single-family home and built two-to-three-story duplexes.

The focus for creating low-income housing should be on underutilized businesses and buildings in Denver's inner city. These buildings are close to public transit, which would increase RTD ridership and thus decrease traffic issues. This would also revitalize the inner city and help decrease gridlock. However, **increasing density in SW Denver will increase traffic issues and negatively affect the character of these communities.**

Urban planning and revitalization should NOT be about creating new buildings to help developers make money, but to improve communities and neighborhoods.

I look forward to your response to understand your position on these proposed changes and what the community residents can do to protect their neighborhoods from developers who would alter so many aspects of SW Denver.

Sincerely,

Martina Hauptmann
2295 W Exposition Ave Denver 80223

Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development

From: Rezoning - CPD
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2026 1:46 PM
To: Glick, Libbie A. - CPD Senior City Planner - Community Planning and Development
Subject: Fw: 2025-REZONE-0000039

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Libbie,

Please take a look at these comments for Southwest.

Thanks!
Lucia

From: j tucker <jtucker55@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2026 11:54 AM
To: Rezoning - CPD <Rezoning@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2025-REZONE-0000039

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello,

I wanted to offer below as community input regarding application number 2025-REZONE-0000039

I am a resident within one mile of this location.

I am enthusiastically in favor of this Rezone!

I would propose adding to the area of rezoning. Suggest E and W sides of Lipan from Louisiana, to Alameda. Or at minimum include S Lipan from Louisiana to Mississippi.

This inclusion would enhance non-motorized connectivity, benefit the community, provide more opportunity for redevelopment, and would be a more complete approach to the concept.

Thanks!
J

The following 27 pages are documents Monica Williams of the Overland neighborhood submitted to Planning Board.

Public Hearing Statement: Case #2025-REZONE-0000039

Good afternoon. The material is in your packets. My name is Monica Williams, and my partner and I are Southwest Denver home owners and OPNA members. We are here to express our firm opposition to the proposed 5 and 8-story height districts in the Evans Station Area, as well as the Urban Center Mixed Use 3-story change in our residential neighborhood. While we support modernization, the intensity of this proposal is a direct threat to the stability, **safety**, and character of our community.

NEXT page

We are not speaking from a place of 'what-ifs.' We are speaking from our day to day, documented reality. The Alexan Evans Apartments on the corner of Broadway and Evans is a failed case study, and quite frankly, the city is failing to manage it. Our neighborhood is already struggling with significant parking and traffic issues resulting from the apartments. Increasing the allowable density to 3, 5 or 8 stories will exacerbate these existing problems, leading to further decrease in the quality of life **and safety** for our current residents who already face difficulties with parking and navigation in our own neighborhood. The apartments demonstrate that "transit-oriented" residents do not necessarily forgo cars; instead, many bypass the \$115/month garage fees to park illegally and/or saturate the limited street parking.

I have contacted DOTI over 200 times in the last two and a half years regarding illegal parking at Warren, Acoma and Bannock. This isn't just a nuisance; it's a safety hazard that blocks 'daylighting' visibility for drivers. More often than not DOTI fails to respond in a timely manner, if at all. We have been told by DOTI staff that there is 'no solution' to this congestion. If the city cannot manage the density we have now, it is highly irresponsible and reckless to triple it. If you have any doubts in my claims, I encourage you to ask DOTI for their records. I personally would love to see this data published publicly.

NEXT page

Furthermore, these large-scale builds are offloading their operating costs onto us. Without on-site green space, our front yards have become the de facto bathrooms for hundreds of dogs. I have recorded up to 11 instances of animal waste on our property in a single day. This isn't 'community living'—it is the destruction of private property and a drain on the quality of life for long-term residents who are investing time and resources to maintain the welcoming aesthetics of the neighborhood. And yes, we have tried to address this with the individuals themselves, where we are mostly met with hostility, as well as the property manager Chelsea Richardson, who essentially tells us they are not responsible for the actions/behaviors of their tenants when they are off their property.

NEXT page




Additionally, the 'character' of Southwest Denver is defined by its historic homes, its open sky and mountain views. Scaling to 3, 5 or 8 stories permanently severs our connection to the Front Range, a natural amenity that belongs to the whole community, not just a few developers. The proposed 'tiering' doesn't solve this; a 3, 5 or 8-story wall along the tracks is still a wall. It also negatively impacts the long-term value and appreciation of our homes.

The 'Public Interest' is not served by density that outpaces infrastructure. If the city persists in these heights, the plan must be amended to require **mandatory, free parking** and **on-site green space** for tenants and their dogs proportional to the unit count. Without those enforceable protections, we ask that you limit all new development in the Evans Station Area to a **3-story maximum, as well as leave the residential areas as Urban Row House 2.5 stories**. Let's grow our neighborhood with 'gentle density' that respects the people who already live here, and address the infrastructure issues that are already happening, before compounding these issues further. Thank you.

This is an email exchange with Jay J. LaPointe DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II April 2025, in regards to an apartment tenant who let his dogs run around the neighborhood off their leashes (but would leave their leash attached to them). Screenshots from the videos below.

We tried to address directly with the individual and it turned into a verbal altercation – which we can provide the video of.

After multiple attempts to have Alexan Evans Apartment Manager Chelsea Richardson address the individual who let their dog run around the neighborhood off leash. Her response was consistently “we are not responsible for what tenants do off of our property”.







Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Notice of Public Health Nuisance and Request for Remediation – Alexan Evans Station

4 messages

Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Fri, Apr 24, 2026 at 10:35 AM

To: Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>, alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com

RE: Notice of Public Health Nuisance and Request for Remediation – Alexan Evans Station

Attn: Chelsea Richardson, Property Management Alexan Evans Station Apartments

Hello Chelsea,

I am writing to formally request addressing maintenance and structural changes to the landscaping on the perimeter of your property, Alexan Evans Station Apartments, specifically the tree lawn areas adjacent to the public sidewalk.

Currently, the condition of these areas has reached a point of public health concern. The existing mulch has become so saturated with pet waste and urine that the resulting odor is clearly detectable from across the street and within neighboring properties (i.e. we can smell it from our front porch, and during the summers with the heat the smell is even worse, and the mulch turns into green fungus). As you are aware, Denver Revised Municipal Code (D.R.M.C. § 25-11) prohibits any condition that allows offensive odors to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life and property in the neighborhood.

To rectify this ongoing nuisance, I am requesting the following actions:

- 1) Removal and Replacement of Contaminated Mulch:** Remove and replace the existing mulch in the tree lawn areas on the corner of S. Acoma St and W. Warren Ave. Organic mulch acts as a sponge for uric acid and bacteria; simply adding a "top layer" will not resolve the odor.
- 2) Removal of the Decorative Wooden Fence:** Remove the wooden fencing currently installed along the sidewalk. This barrier has proven to be counterproductive; it prevents dogs from easily entering the intended mulch areas, leading owners to neighboring private property for dogs to relieve themselves. This creates a "bottleneck" of waste in a high-traffic pedestrian zone.

As the property manager, you are responsible for ensuring that the external maintenance of your community does not negatively impact the surrounding residents. I am hopeful these decisions are within your delegation of authority. If not, please review this request with your leadership and/or Bryten Property headquarters, and/or the property owners.

Please provide a timeline for when these requests can be addressed.

Sincerely,

Monica Williams

Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Fri, Apr 24, 2026 at 12:30 PM

To: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>, Destri Jimenez <alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com>

Hello Monica,

Thank you for bringing your concerns regarding the landscaping along the perimeter of Alexan Evans Station to our attention.

We take matters related to property maintenance and neighborhood impact seriously. Our team will be inspecting the areas you've identified to assess current conditions and determine what steps may be appropriate to address any sanitation or odor concerns.

While we cannot commit to specific changes at this time, we are actively reviewing maintenance practices for these areas and will take appropriate action as needed to ensure compliance with applicable standards and to maintain a clean and pleasant environment for both residents and neighbors.

We appreciate your patience while we evaluate this and will follow up as appropriate.

Sincerely,
Chelsea Richardson
Property Management
Alexan Evans Station



Chelsea Richardson
Community Manager

alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com | 720.727.9100

alexanevansstationapartments.com

2121 S Broadway, Denver, CO 80210



IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 24, 2026 10:35 AM

To: Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>; Destri Jimenez <alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com>

Subject: Notice of Public Health Nuisance and Request for Remediation – Alexan Evans Station

[EXTERNAL]

[Quoted text hidden]

Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sat, Apr 25, 2026 at 9:43 AM

To: Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>, Destri Jimenez <alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com>

Thank you Chelsea for the response. I appreciate that you are taking these maintenance and sanitation concerns seriously and that an inspection is underway to address the sanitation and odor issues.

Regarding that inspection, can you also please advise on the timeline for a decision regarding the decorative wooden fence? As noted, this barrier effectively funnels resident pet waste off of the Alexan Evans Station property and directly into our neighboring yards, where it is causing documented damage (and as you probably recall, hostile interactions with most of your tenants when neighbors ask them to respect their private property).

As long as this decorative barrier remains it will continue to divert pets onto our private property. I would like to see this addressed as part of the immediate sanitation plan to ensure your residents have sufficient space to manage their pets on Alexan Evans Station property.

I look forward to your update on the inspection findings and the proposed next steps.

Monica Williams

[Quoted text hidden]

Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Tue, Apr 28, 2026 at 3:32 PM

To: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>, Destri Jimenez <alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com>

Hi Monica,

Thank you for your message and for sharing your concerns in such detail. I understand this situation has been frustrating and appreciate you taking the time to outline the impact you're seeing.

At this time, we are not considering removal of the decorative wooden fence. That said, we are actively taking steps to address the sanitation and odor concerns in the area. This includes implementing periodic enzyme treatments and installing new mulch in the near future to help improve overall conditions.

We are continuing to monitor the situation as part of our ongoing inspection process and will keep your feedback in mind as we evaluate next steps.

Thank you again for reaching out and for your continued communication.

Best regards,
Chelsea



Chelsea Richardson
Community Manager

alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com | 720.727.9100

alexanevansstationapartments.com

2121 S Broadway, Denver, CO 80210



IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2026 9:43 AM

To: Chelsea Richardson <alexanevansstationmanager@livebryten.com>

Cc: Leasing Manager <leasing@alexanevansstation.com>; Destri Jimenez <alexanevansstationassistant@livebryten.com>

Subject: Re: Notice of Public Health Nuisance and Request for Remediation – Alexan Evans Station

[Quoted text hidden]



Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

4th video 3/9 1:44pm

5 messages

Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>
To: john.lapointe@denvergov.org

Tue, Apr 15, 2025 at 12:36 PM

Ok I think this might be the last one actually - but will double check this afternoon.
Thank you again!!!!

 **IMG_1772.mp4**
20241K

LaPointe, Jay J. - DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II
<John.LaPointe@denvergov.org>
To: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 15, 2025 at 12:53 PM

I received them all and were able to open them. Thank you.

From: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 12:37 PM
To: LaPointe, Jay J. - DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II <John.LaPointe@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 4th video 3/9 1:44pm

[Quoted text hidden]

Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>
To: "LaPointe, Jay J. - DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II" <John.LaPointe@denvergov.org>

Thu, Apr 17, 2025 at 8:25 AM

Hello Officer LaPointe,

Following up on this - are you able to advise if you were able to make contact with this individual?

Thank you,
Monica Williams
[Quoted text hidden]

LaPointe, Jay J. - DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II
<John.LaPointe@denvergov.org>
To: Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sun, Apr 20, 2025 at 9:52 AM

We are following up with the person in question.

[Quoted text hidden]

Monica Williams <m.williams7673@gmail.com>

Sun, Apr 20, 2025 at 3:47 PM

4/23/26, 5:35 PM

Gmail - 4th video 3/9 1:44pm

To: "LaPointe, Jay J. - DPHE Environmental Public Health Investigator II" <John.LaPointe@denvergov.org>

Ok great, thank you for the update.

[Quoted text hidden]

****This note added to document for Public Hearing on 5/6/2026:**

Public address and phone number redacted, and also blurred out faces to protect privacy, but the original, unredacted timestamps and locations are available for verification upon request.**

To: Chelsea with Bryten Property Management, of the Alexan Evans Station

From: Monica Williams

Date: January 2, 2026

Via: Email and Certified Mail

RE: Systematic Property Damage and Hostile Resident Conduct

To Chelsea and the Bryten Property Management Team,

Please accept this letter as a formal notice regarding ongoing property damage and illegal conduct by the residents of your building.

We have made exhaustive efforts to handle this matter neighborly by installing clear signage and engaging in polite, verbal requests with your tenants. While some residents have been understanding and apologetic, a significant number have responded with blatant disregard for the law and, in several instances, verbal hostility.

Documented Hostility and Residents' Statements: When politely asked to respect our private property and the significant time and financial investment we make in our landscaping, your tenants have provided the following responses (all recorded on camera):

- *"It's not private property and my dogs can go wherever they want... from now on we'll always be going in your yard, so go ahead and call the cops on me."*
- *"Why did you buy a house in a neighborhood with so many dogs then?"*
- *"So what do you do then when you walk your dogs?"* (Followed by eye-rolling when informed we do not have dogs).

Legal Violations and Property Damage: As evidenced by the **attached photographs**, the accumulation of pet waste is not a minor inconvenience; it is a destruction of property. Nitrogen-rich waste has caused extensive lawn death and is currently **killing two established bushes**. Under **Denver Revised Municipal Code (D.R.M.C.) § 8-73**, it is unlawful for any person to allow an animal to defecate or urinate on private property without the owner's consent. We

have also observed multiple residents walking dogs off-leash on and around our property. Furthermore, under **D.R.M.C. § 8-5**, these actions constitute a public nuisance.

Required Action: The "difficulty" of managing a pet in an apartment is not a legal defense for trespassing or property damage. As the management company, you share the responsibility for the conduct of your tenants. We require the following immediate actions:

- **Formal Building-Wide Notice:** Issue a notice explicitly citing D.R.M.C. § 8-73 and § 8-16. Residents must be informed that our yard is private property, not a community pet relief area.
- **Conduct Correction:** Inform residents that hostile interactions with neighbors and intentional damage to property are violations of community standards and lease agreements.
- **Restitution Awareness:** We are currently tracking the health of our bushes. Should they require replacement, we will seek full restitution for the cost of professional removal and the purchase of mature landscaping.

We have been recording these interactions via our security cameras. We will not hesitate to provide this footage to **Denver Animal Protection** and the **Denver Police Department** to pursue individual citations and civil damages.

Thank you in advance for taking this matter seriously. We expect a prompt response outlining the steps you are taking to rectify your residents' behavior.


Sincerely,



Monica Williams



1/2/2026 at 11:02 AM MT. Same individual who stated *"It's not private property and my dogs can go wherever they want... from now on we'll always be going in your yard, so go ahead and call the cops on me."*



1/1/2026 at 9:40 PM MT. Dog peeing on front yard sign.



1/1/2026 at 10:47 AM MT. Continues to let dog off leash. Used to keep dog "closer" to them. However, over the past few weeks the dog has been able to be further and further away from owner, and not "right next to them".




1/1/2026 at 10:47 AM MT. Same individual/dog – now letting it pee in bush.



1/1/2026 at 10:47 AM MT. Same individual/dog – has now dropped their poop bags on the sidewalk. When politely asking this individual to please be respectful of our signs and to not leave their dog poop on the sidewalk their response was “There’s a lot of dogs that live in the apartments, that’s really going to be hard to do”.



12/31/2025 at 9:16 PM MT. Dog peeing in bush.




12/31/2025 at 9:16 PM MT. Dog kicking up mulch after peeing in bush. Individual did not clean up mulch and we had to clean up the next day.


I did discuss this with this individual the next day and they were very polite, apologized and stated they would be more mindful in the future.



12/19/2025 at 9:50 AM MT. Another dog off leash.



12/18/2025 at 11:18 AM MT. Clearing watching their dog pee in the bush.



12/15/2025 at 11:28 PM MT. Clearing watching their dog pee in the yard.



1/2/2026 at 11:33 AM MT. May be hard to tell in these photos – but the front half of these bushes are starting to turn brown and die. You are more than welcome to walk over and see them for yourselves.



1/2/2026 at 11:33 AM MT. May be hard to tell in these photos – but the front half of these bushes are starting to turn brown and die. You are more than welcome to walk over and see them for yourselves.

Tracking Log of Dogs Peeing, Pooping and/or Off Leash - January 2026

Address:

S Acoma St and W Warren Ave, Denver CO 80223 (Overland, 3-blocks from Evans Station)

Total Count for January 2026:

96 incidents

Average of 3x per day

9.5 ft wide by 11.5 ft deep

Data based on what our cameras picked up. They do not detect every person/dog that passes by, so the count is *likely higher*.

Color codes indicate same individual/couple identified

Date	Time	Description	Owner M/F/Twi	# Of Dogs	Location	Action
12/15/2025	11:28pm	black heavier large dog peeing in yard, 2nd black dog, owners are heavierset female and male, female walks them mostly	M&F	2	Yard	Peeing
12/18/2025	11:18am	golden retriever peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
12/19/2025	9:50am	gray mid-size dog and pug both off leash, owner white female long blond hair	F	2		Off leash
12/31/2025	9:16pm	husky dog peeing in bush, kicked mulch onto sidewalk (2nd time) - did discuss with him and he was nice, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing, Kicked mulch
1/1/2026	10:47am	husky dog off leash, peeing in bush, 2nd small white dog, left poop on sidewalk - owner heavysset white female	F	2	Bush	Peeing, Off leash, left poop
1/1/2026	9:40pm	cream larger dog peeing in yard on sign, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/2/2026	11:02am	white golden retriever peeing in 2199, 2nd brown short hair dog - Same individual who stated "It's not private property and my dogs can go wherever they want... from now on we'll always be going in your yard, so go ahead and call the cops	M	2	2199	Peeing
1/3/2026	10:31am	brown golden retriever peeing in bush and other little dog, owner white male	M	2	Yard	Peeing
1/3/2026	9:01pm	black dog peeing in bush, owner long blond hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/4/2026	10:42am	black dog peeing in bush, owner black male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/4/2026	11:32am	black dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/4/2026	12:06am	white dog with brown ears peeing 2199 yard, owner white heavysset female	F	1	2199	Peeing
1/5/2026	8:05am	white dog small peeing in bush, owner I think white male	M ?	1	Bush	Peeing
1/5/2026	12:28pm	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/6/2026	4:10am	black heavier large dog off leash 2nd black dog, owners are heavierset female and male, female walks them mostly	M&F	2		Off leash
1/6/2026	5:08pm	white dog small peeing/pooping in bush, also peeing/pooping in 2199 yard, owner I think white male	M ?	1	Bush/2199	Peeing/ Pooping
1/7/2026	10:09am	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/7/2026	3:22pm	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/7/2026	1:23am	black large dog peeing on tree, owner is woman wears long black coat	F	1	Tree	Peeing
1/7/2026	6:53am	black dog, brown legs -medium to large pooping in front yard, owner white female	F	1	Yard	Pooping
1/7/2026	9:10am	small cream dog missing an eye peeing in 2199 yard, owner hispanic female	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/7/2026	10:55am	husky dog peeing on bush and tree, very long leash, owner hispanic female	F	1	Bush/Tree	Peeing
1/7/2026	1:23pm	small cream dog missing an eye peeing in yard, owner hispanic female	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/7/2026	3:12pm	brown medium dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/8/2026	3:32pm	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/8/2026	7:03am	black dog (labrador?) with vest pooping in bush, owner white female	F	1	Bush	Pooping
1/8/2026	8:59am	black medium dog pooping in 2199 yard, owner white male	M	1	2199	Pooping
1/8/2026	9:30am	husky dog peeing on tree, very long leash, owner hispanic female	F	1	Tree	Peeing
1/8/2026	10:22am	dalmation peeing in 2199 yard, 2nd dog is husky, owners are male and female, live in apt with balcony across from us 3rd floor	M&F	2	2199	Peeing
1/8/2026	11:26am	black dog possible labrador peeing on sign front yard, owner white female	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/8/2026	7:16pm	cream golden retriever peeing pooping in front yard, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing/ Pooping
1/8/2026	8:53pm	husky dog peeing on sign in yard, very long leash, owner hispanic female	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/8/2026	9:13pm	black heavier large dog peeing in front yard on sign, 2nd black dog, owners are heavierset female and male, female walks them mostly	M&F	2	Yard	Peeing
1/8/2026	10:19pm	black medium dog possible labrador peeing on sign front yard, owner I think white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/8/2026	10:39pm	white dog small peeing in bush, owner I think white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/10/2026	8:19am	medium black and brown dog with white paws peeing in bush, owner white female	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/10/2026	10:04am	white dog small peeing in bush, owner I think white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/10/2026	12:35pm	white retriever peeing in bush, 2nd dog golden retriever, owner white female - told me she can't control where her dogs pee and I told her yes she can she can pull them off	F	2	Bush	Peeing
1/10/2026	2:30pm	black medium dog pooping in 2199 yard, owner white male	M	1	2199	Pooping
1/10/2026	6:07pm	cream medium dog peeing on sign in yard, 2nd white medium dog, owner female with long brown hair	F	2	Yard	Peeing
1/10/2026	6:39PM	cream and black larger dog peeing in bush, owner TBD female and male	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/11/2026	1:53am	medium black dog peeing in 2199 yard, 2nd medium darker color dog, owner hard to make out	M ?	1	2199	Peeing
1/11/2026	6:30pm	large black dog pooping in yard, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Pooping
1/11/2026	7:25pm	large black dog peeing in 2199 yard, 2nd white dog with them, owners white male and female	M&F	2	2199	Peeing
1/11/2026	8:10pm	large black dog peeing in bush, owner white female hair pulled up	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/11/2026	11:11pm	large black dog peeing in bush, owner female with long black hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/12/2026	4:16pm	medium brown dog peeing on tree, owner white male black hair	M	1	Tree	Peeing
1/12/2026	4:28pm	large black dog peeing on bush, owner white female blond hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/12/2026	4:48pm	large brown dog peeing on tree, owner white male yellow jacket	M	1	Tree	Peeing
1/12/2026	5:11pm	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/12/2026	6:44pm	small white dog peeing in bush, 2nd small black dog, owners are white male and female, male wears multicolor cotopaxi jacket	M&F	2	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	12:42pm	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	7:11am	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/13/2026	7:34am	large black dog peeing in bush, owner white female blond hair in clip	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	8:11am	large black dog pooping in 2199 yard, owner white female long brown hair	F	1	2199	Pooping
1/13/2026	11:39am	small brown dog peeing on bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	2:39pm	medium brown dog with vest peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	3:00pm	husky dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	3:22pm	large black dog peeing in bush, owner white female blond hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/13/2026	5:12pm	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/13/2026	9:40pm	larger black dog peeing on sign in yard, 2nd larger black dog with reflective vest, owners one white female unsure on other person	M&F (?)	2	Yard	Peeing
1/13/2026	11:10pm	smaller black dog peeing in yard, 2nd medium dog cream and brown longer hair, owner white female	F	2	Yard	Peeing
1/14/2026	7:07am	large white dog, slightly longer hair and curled tail peeing in yard, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/14/2026	9:06am	small white fluffier dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/14/2026	9:07am	large black dog with blue vest peeing in bush, owner white female very short brown hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/14/2026	9:15am	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/14/2026	12:07pm	small long hair cream dog peeing in yard, 2nd small long hair gray dog pooping in yard, owner white female with blond hair	F	2	Yard	Peeing & Pooping
1/14/2026	4:21pm	husky dog off leash again, 2nd small white dog, owner heavysset white female	F	2		Off leash
1/14/2026	5:17pm	smaller brown dog with vest peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/14/2026	8:59am	small white fluffier dog peeing in yard, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/16/2026	11:00am	black labrador pooping in yard by flowers, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Yard	Pooping
1/16/2026	9:21am	smaller brown dog with vest peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/19/2026	1:55pm	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/19/2026	8:25am	medium brown dog, longer hair, peeing on bush, owners male and female white with black hair	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing

Date	Time	Description	Owner M/F/Twi	# Of Dogs	Location	Action
1/19/2026	9:07am	medium-large dog black with white legs, peeing on bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/19/2026	9:20am	large black dog with blue vest peeing in bush, owner white female very short brown hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/19/2026	10:23am	large brown dog with vest, peeing in bush, owner white female	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/19/2026	2:07pm	smaller brown dog with vest peeing in yard, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/19/2026	6:12pm	larger cream dog peeing in 2199 yard, owner male	M	1	2199	Peeing
1/19/2026	10:55pm	large brown down with vest peeing in yard, owner white female long black hair	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/20/2026	1:47pm	large brown dog with fluffy tail, owner hispanic or black male - poop in our trash bin 1.20.26	M	1	Trash Bin	Poop
1/20/2026	4:55pm	smaller brown dog with vest peeing in yard, owner white male - spoke to him 1.20.26 and asked him to stop	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/21/2026	7:13am	husky dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/21/2026	7:13am	large black, brown and white legs dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/21/2026	8:32am	large brown dog peeing in 2199 yard, and large black dog, owner white female	F	2	2199	Peeing
1/21/2026	8:51am	small brown dog long hair tail peeing on bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
1/21/2026	4:47pm	small cream dog with red coat pooping in 2199 yard, owner white or hispanic female black hair	F	1	2199	Poop
1/21/2026	8:07pm	husky dog peeing in yard on sign, very long leash, owner hispanic female	F	1	Yard	Peeing
1/21/2026	8:26pm	medium large black dog peeing in yard on sign, owner white male	M	1	Yard	Peeing
1/21/2026	9:10pm	large black dog peeing in yard on sign, 2nd large brown dog, assuming owners are white male and female	M&F	2	Yard	Peeing
1/21/2026	10:01pm	husky dog peeing in yard on sign, 2nd large white cream dog, assuming owners are white male and female	M&F	2	Yard	Peeing
1/23/2026	2:47pm	small white dog with black ears and furry tail pooping in mulch, 2nd larger brown dog in large orange vest, owner heavier set white female brown hair	F	2	Mulch	Pooping
1/24/2026	5:27pm	medium gray sparkled dog with large black spots peeing in bush, owner mexican female	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/24/2026	6:47PM	small long hair cream, 2nd small long hair gray dog off leash, owner white female with blond hair	F	2	Yard	Off leash
1/24/2026	7:41pm	large black dog peeing on tree, 2nd large black dog, assuming owners white male and female	M&F	2	Tree	Peeing
1/27/2026	10:03pm	large black dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/27/2026	7:16am	large black dog peeing in 2199 yard, owner white male	M	1	2199	Peeing
1/27/2026	6:03pm	large cream dog peeing in bush, owner female with long black jacket	F	1	Bush	Peeing
1/28/2026	9:44pm	small long hair cream, 2nd small long hair gray dog off leash, owner white female with blond hair	F	2	Yard	Off leash
1/29/2026	10:43pm	large cream dog peeing on tree, owner white male wearing flannel	M	1	Tree	Peeing
2/1/2026	9:44am	large cream dog peeing in 2199 yard, owner female	F	1	2199	Peeing
2/1/2026	12:32pm	large black dog peeing on sign in yard, owner hispanic female long black coat	F	1	Yard	Peeing
2/1/2026	4:54pm	German Shepard peeing in yard, owner white female brown and blond hair	F	1	Yard	Peeing
2/1/2026	9:05pm	largbe brown dog with reflective harness peeing on sign in yard, owner white male?	M	1	Yard	Peeing
2/6/2026	3:56pm	black labrador peeing on sign in yard, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Yard	Peeing
2/6/2026	9:07pm	black labrador rolling on and breaking sign in yard, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Yard	Peeing
2/7/2026	11:11am	small white and brown dog peeing in bush, 2nd larger brown dog brown retriever	M	2	Bush	Peeing
2/7/2026	6:56pm	large white cream dog pooping in 2199, 2nd husky dog , assuming owners are white male and female	M&F	2	2199	Pooping
2/8/2026	10:06am	small white dog peeing by tree, owner white male - asked politely to keep dog from peeing and it turned into an argument	M	1	Tree	Peeing
2/8/2026	8:47pm	large dog with neon green collar peeing on bush, owner white male in white and brown flannel	M	1	Bush	Peeing
2/9/2026	5:46am	small white dog peeing in yard, owner white female with blond hair	F	1	Yard	Peeing
2/10/2026	3:55pm	small brown doog, white spot in middle of head, poeing in 2199 yard, owners white male and female	M&F	1	2199	Pooping
2/11/2026	8:14am	black labrador peeing on bush, owner is white woman blond short hair wears up in bun	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
2/11/2026	7:08am	large black doog pooping on bush, pink harness, owner hispanic femal shortish black hair	F	1	Bush	Pooping
2/11/2026	8:05am	medium black dog, leg surgery, pink coat, pooping in 2199 yard, owner white male	M	1	2199	Pooping
2/11/2026	8:20am	large black dog peeing on bush, owner hispanic female long black coat	F	1	Bush	Peeing
2/11/2026	10:51am	small cream-ish grey-ish dog peeing in bush, owner white male short beard	M	1	Bush	Peeing
2/11/2026	5:58pm	large cream golden retriever peeing on bush, owners white male and female	M&F	1	Bush	Peeing
2/11/2026	9:09pm	large black, brown and white legs dog peeing in bush, owner white male	M	1	Bush	Peeing
2/12/2026	7:26am	large black dog peeing in 2199 yard, owner white male	M	1	2199	Peeing
2/12/2026	12:50pm	large golden retriever peeing in bush, owner whie female brown hair	F	1	Bush	Peeing

Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave


- Another example of how much people in this area care about the “No Parking” daylighting areas and safety
 - This took place between Saturday 5/2 9:25 PM and Sunday 5/3 8:30 AM (when I went outside and noticed)




Habitual “No Parking” individual,
Behind where the post is supposed to be



Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave, cont.




May be hard to see, but can actually see the “post” for the sign.
5/2 6:21 AM for reference




Still visible.
5/2 9:25 PM for reference

Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave, cont.




Now a truck is blocking it, because they are parked in the “No Parking”, so unsure if the sign is still there. And I’m sure this other vehicle turning is having a difficult time seeing around it for safety.
5/2 9:55 PM for reference



Still there, now with a group of individuals.
5/2 10:50 PM for reference



Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave, cont.




Unsure when truck left, so unable to see if pole was there. This is the next video showing a different vehicle, one that is a habitual offender. 5/2 11:58 AM for reference



Next video captured at 5/3 6:26 AM, so has parked there all night. And actually, doesn't move their car until 5/3 at 2:40 PM.



Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave, cont.



Then at 3:06 PM on 5/3, another habitual offender parks in the “No Parking” daylighting area.



And at the time of creating this, 8:20 PM on 5/3, they are still parked there.

Removal of Daylighting “No Parking” & “Street Sweeping Sign – S Acoma St & W Warren Ave, cont.

- **Enforcement Gap Analysis:** It is critical to note that the majority of these safety infractions occur outside of DOTI’s standard enforcement hours (7:00 AM – 7:00 PM). Observations confirm that tenants treat "No Parking" daylighting zones as reserved overnight and weekend parking, knowing they can evade citations by moving their vehicles before 8:00 AM. Because the safety risks associated with obscured visibility do not disappear after business hours, the current enforcement model is insufficient to manage the density proposed.
- **Failed Reporting Systems:** The system for reporting these hazards is broken. When I use the non-emergency police line after hours, my personal contact information has been visible on the resulting tickets. Out of a legitimate concern for my own safety and to avoid retaliation, I can no longer report these dangerous violations over the weekend. The city is essentially asking us to choose between our safety on the road and our safety in our homes.