



**TO:** Land Use, Transportation, and Infrastructure Committee of the Denver City Council  
**FROM:** Libbie Adams, Senior City Planner  
**DATE:** December 9, 2022  
**RE:** Official Zoning Map Amendment Application #2022I-00158

### Staff Report and Recommendation

Based on the criteria for review in the Denver Zoning Code, staff recommends approval for Application #2022I-00158, as evaluated under the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan.

### Request for Rezoning



Address: 4141 E 35<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Neighborhood/Council District and CM: Northeast Park Hill / Council District 8, CM Herndon  
RNOs: Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood Association, Park Hill Village Neighborhood HOA, Overlook at Park Hill Neighborhood Association, Denver North Business Association, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., Clayton United, Opportunity Corridor Coalition of United Residents, United Community Action Network (UCAN), United Northeast Denver Residents, Northeast Park Hill Coalition, East Denver Residents Council, Reclaim the Eastside, Unite North Metro Denver, Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC)  
Area of Property: 6,729,836 square feet or approx. 154.5 acres  
Current Zoning: OS-B  
Proposed Zoning: OS-A, C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers, G-RX-5, G-RX-5 w/waivers  
Property Owner(s): ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC  
Owner Representative: none

### Summary of Rezoning Request


- The subject property is in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood, east of Colorado Blvd.
- The site is a former private golf course that has been closed since 2018. Single-unit residential surrounds the property to the south and southeast, industrial properties to the east, multi-unit residential to the north, and a mix of residential, commercial, and public/quasi-public to the west.
- In 2019 the property was sold to ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC, and the applicant is requesting this rezoning to enable a public park, which will be deeded to the city, and a mixed-use development consistent with the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan (2022)*.
- The property is subject to a conservation easement, which restricts the subject property's use to a privately-owned, 18-hole daily fee public golf course and certain ancillary uses as long as they don't prevent the land from being used as a golf course. A vote of eligible voters in the city is required to remove the easement.

- As part of one application, the applicant is requesting several zone districts for the site, detailed below:
  - The proposed Denver Zoning Code District of OS-A (Open Space – A) is intended for parks or open space owned, operated, or leased by the city. Further details of the OS-A district can be found in Article 9 of the Denver Zoning Code.
  - C-MS-5 w/DO-8 (Urban Center, Main Street, 5 stories with Active Centers and Corridors Design Overlay) is intended for use in the Urban Center neighborhood context, which is characterized by multi-unit residential and commercial strips and centers. The DO-8 intends to foster an active pedestrian area through ground floor commercial uses. More information can be found in Articles 7 and 9 of the Denver Zoning Code.
  - The Urban Center Mixed Use districts proposed (C-MX-12, C-MX-8, and C-MX-5) are also intended for use in the Urban Center neighborhood context where 5, 8, and 12 stories are desired. The heights gradually step down as you move east and south across the property with C-MX-12 located at the far northwest corner. Further details on these zone districts can be found in Article 7 of the Denver Zoning Code.
  - The proposed G-RX-5 (General Urban, Residential Mixed Use, 5 stories) is intended for use in the General Urban neighborhood context, which is mostly multi-unit residential uses with some neighborhood serving commercial uses. Additional information on the G-RX-5 district can be found in Article 6 of the Denver Zoning Code.
  - The applicant is proposing a waiver for maximum building height to both the C-MX-5 and G-RX-5 districts, which would allow up to 4 stories or 55 feet. The waiver request is consistent with the height guidance in the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*.

### Existing Context







The subject property is in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood, south of I-70 and east of Colorado Blvd. The RTD A Line route passes just to the north of the property, and the nearest stop is the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado Station, less than a half mile from the property.


The following table summarizes the existing context proximate to the subject site:

	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use	Existing Building Form/Scale	Existing Block, Lot, Street Pattern
Site	OS-B	Vacant golf course	1 story club house and vacant golf course	There is generally a pattern of rectangular blocks and orthogonal street south of 38 <sup>th</sup> Ave. North of 38 <sup>th</sup> Ave is mostly large industrial sites with curvilinear streets and irregular block patterns.
North	I-B, UO-2, B-3 w/waivers, and R-2-A w/conditions	Industrial, multi-unit residential, commercial/retail	RTD A Line tracks, 3 and 4 story apartment buildings, 1 story drive-thru restaurants	
South	E-SU-Dx and E-SU-D1x, E-MX-2x, and PUD 22	Single- and two-, and multi-unit residential, commercial/retail	1 and 2 story homes with attached sidewalks, 1 story gas station with convenience store	
East	R-2 w/waivers, I-MX-3, and I-A, UO-2	Single-unit residential, Industrial	2 story homes with detached sidewalks and curb cuts, 1 story	



	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use	Existing Building Form/Scale	Existing Block, Lot, Street Pattern
			industrial warehouses and outdoor storage	
West	C-MX-5, OS-A, U-MX-3, and E-SU-Dx	Multi-unit residential, public park/open space, public/quasi-public, commercial/retail	4 story apartment building, Colorado Boulevard Park, 1 and 2 story churches, and 1 story retail structure with surface parking lot	

### 1. Existing Zoning



The subject property is zoned OS-B, which is a district for privately owned parks and open space. It allows for community and public serving uses (community center, day care center, postal facility), cultural and special purpose uses including a library, cemetery, museum, and open space, educational uses, public and religious assembly, arts, recreation, and entertainment uses including a stadium and parking garage. OS-B allows only the General building form with a maximum height of 40 feet or 3 stories. Structures require a 20-foot setback from the primary street, street, interior side lot line, and rear. For additional details of the zone district, see DZC Section 9.3.3.2.

### 2. Parkway

Colorado Blvd. is a designated parkway from the south city limits at Hampden Ave. to Dartmouth and then from Interstate-25 to 44<sup>th</sup> Ave (Denver Revised Municipal Code Section 49-16). Any proposed structure on the subject property will be required to have a 20-foot setback from the property line.

### 3. Large Development Review

The rezoning was reviewed by the Development Review Committee to see if the proposal would be subject to the Large Development Review (LDR) process outlined in Section 12.4.12 of the Denver Zoning Code and require the creation of a Large Development Framework.



After review, it was determined the project is subject to LDR review for the following reasons:

- The specific circumstances warrant a coordinated master framework process to guide future development;
- The land use, open space, parks, housing, urban design, and infrastructure issues related to future development cannot be adequately resolved through other regulatory processes, such as subdivision or site development plan review; or
- The area at issue is subject to a previously approved regulatory plan or document that established a coordinated master framework process, including but not limited to a General Development Plan or LDR. In this case, the site is subject to a conservation easement and has been part of multiple visioning processes to discuss the future of the Park Hill Golf Course. Further, Blueprint Denver suggests the use of Large Development Review to address the constraints and opportunities of development concepts proposed for property greater than five acres in size.

The proposed Large Development Framework (LDF) outlines specific regulatory steps required for implementation of the development including but not limited to completion of a small area planning process, rezoning, infrastructure master plan, subdivision, and development agreement. These are prerequisites for the site development plan, horizontal infrastructure permitting, and building permitting process required to complete development. The LDF is anticipated to be finalized prior to City Council's consideration of the rezoning.

#### **4. Development Agreement**

Concurrent with the rezoning, the applicant is working with the city to formalize a development agreement that will include affordable housing, open space, and infrastructure improvements. The project is considered a high impact development under the Expanding Housing Affordability (EHA) regulations adopted by city council earlier this year. EHA requires high impact developments to complete a high impact affordable housing compliance plan, which is part of the development agreement. General components of the development agreement as of the writing of this report include:

- A commitment to construct at least 25% of total units as income restricted units (IRUs) affordable to a range of income levels. Rental IRUs will be affordable to incomes ranging from 30% to 80% of Area Median Income (AMI), with an average affordability of no greater than 60% AMI. For-sale IRUs will be affordable to incomes ranging from 70% to 120% AMI, with an average affordability of no greater than 100% AMI.
- The IRUs will include a minimum of 300 for-sale units, 200 of which will be large units with at least two or three bedrooms.
- The IRUs will include a range of rental units affordable to lower AMI levels with specific commitments to build at least 60 senior IRUs, 40 permanent supportive housing (PSH) IRUs and 150 family rental IRUs (at least 50% of which will have two or more bedrooms).
- The agreement also includes a commitment to create 100 acres of publicly accessible open space on-site, including a significant transfer of land to the city for city-owned park land, as well as a financial contribution toward the planning, design and construction of public open space

- The proposed development agreement includes commitments to build safety improvements for key intersections on Colorado Blvd., the reconstruction of the 40<sup>th</sup> and Albion intersection, and design and construction of the 303 Artway Heritage Trail. Additionally, the applicant will provide funding for the city to construct the Dahlia St. connection called for in the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan.

The development agreement will be finalized and executed prior to the City Council public hearing.


## **5. Conservation Easement**

In 1997, the city paid The George W. Clayton Trust (the golf course's owner at that time) \$2 million to acquire a set of use restrictions on the Park Hill Golf Course limiting the use of that land to a regulation-length 18-hole public golf course with a daily fee. To the extent that any other uses are permitted, under the conservation easement such uses must be either (1) accessory or incidental to the golf-related use, or (2) unrelated recreational uses which cannot be detrimental to the golf-related use. The use restrictions represent a private restrictive covenant and a real property interest owned by the city.

A vote of eligible voters in the city is required to remove the easement. City Council would need to generate an Ordinance referring the matter to a public vote. The referral Ordinance would need to describe the proposed change in reasonable detail, including how the permitted uses of the property could differ from the golf-related use requirement currently imposed by the conservation easement.



### 6. Existing Land Use Map



### 7. Existing Building Form and Scale (images from Google)



View of the subject property looking east from Colorado Blvd. (left) and subject property looking north from E. 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. (right).



Multi-unit residential directly north of subject property, looking north from the internal private roadway serving the development.



Industrial warehouses east of subject property, looking east.





Single-unit homes directly east of the subject property, looking west.



Single-unit homes directly south of subject property, looking west.



The applicant requests to rezone to OS-A, C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers, G-RX-5, and G-RX-5 w/waivers. More information on each zone district can be found below:

**OS-A – Open Space Public Parks District**

The purpose of the OS-A district is to “protect and promote open space and parks owned, operated, or leased by the City and managed by the City’s Department of Park and Recreation (“DPR”) for park purposes” (DZC Section 9.3.2.1.A.). Buildings over 3,000 square feet and 35 feet in height are required to be approved as part of a park building plan or approved in a park plan adopted as part of the comprehensive plan. City Council approves any park building plan. The Manager of Parks and Recreation determines the applicable building form standards for any structures under 3,000 square feet. Permitted uses in the OS-A zone district are determined by the Manager of Park and Recreation. For additional details on the requested zone district, see Article 9 in the Denver Zoning Code.

The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	OS-A (Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Forms permitted by Manager of Parks and Recreation or City Council
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40’	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan
Primary Setbacks (min)	20’	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan
Building Coverages	N/A	Determined by Manager or City Council in park building plan

**C-MS-5 w/DO-8 – Urban Center, Main Street, 5 stories with Active Centers and Corridors Design Overlay**

The requested C-MS-5 zone district is a main street zone district in the Urban Center neighborhood context. A variety of residential, commercial, and office uses are permitted as primary uses in the C-MS-5 district. The maximum height permitted is 70 feet or 5 stories. Per the proposed development agreement, the applicant will not be eligible to use the incentive heights for affordable housing. The DO-8 is an overlay district intended to encourage development of neighborhood mixed-use areas and inviting pedestrian realms. The building forms allowed are Shopfront and Town House. The minimum primary street setback is 2 feet for commercial uses and 7 feet for residential uses. A portion of the ground floor, depending on the width of the lot, is required to be street level nonresidential active uses. Parking is not permitted between the building and primary and side streets. For additional details on the C-MS-5 and DO-8, see Articles 7 and 9 of the Denver Zoning Code.



The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	C-MS-5 w/DO-8(Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Town House and Shopfront
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40'	5/70'
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	70% (Townhouse), 75% (Shopfront)
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	2' to 10'
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	N/A
Primary Setbacks (min)	20'	2', 7' (residential uses)
Building Coverages	N/A	N/A

**C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5 – Urban Center, Mixed-Use, 12, 8, and 5 stories**

C-MX-12, 8, and 5 are mixed-use districts in the Urban Center neighborhood context. The districts allow for a variety of residential, commercial, and office uses in the Town House, Drive Thru Services, Drive Thru Restaurant, General, and Shopfront building forms. Drive Thru Services and Drive Thru Restaurant forms are not permitted within ¼ mile of a transit station. Only a small portion of the northwest corner of the subject property is within ¼ mile of the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado RTD transit station so the drive thru building forms are mostly permitted within these districts. The maximum height permitted in 150 feet or 12 stories in C-MX-12, 110 feet or 8 stories in C-MX-8, and 70 feet or 5 stories in C-MX-5. The Town House building form allows a maximum height of 70 feet or 5 stories and the drive thru forms allow a maximum height of 45 feet or 3 stories for all three districts. Per the proposed development agreement, the applicant will not be eligible to use the incentive heights for affordable housing. For additional details of the requested zone district, see Article 7 of the Denver Zoning Code.

The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5 (Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Town House, Drive Thru Services*, Drive Thru Restaurant*, General, Shopfront
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40'	5/70' (Townhouse), 3/45' (Drive Thrus), 12/150' (C-MX-12), 8/110' (C-MX-8), 5/70' (C-MX-5)
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	50-75%**
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	0' to 15'***
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	N/A
Primary Setbacks (min)	20'	0' to 10'***
Building Coverages	N/A	N/A

\*Building form not allowed within a ¼ mile of a transit station platform

\*\*Standard varies between building forms



**C-MX-5 w/waivers – Urban Center, Mixed-Use, 5 stories with waiver to 4 stories**

Information on the C-MX-5 zone district can be found above. Section 12.4.10.6 of the Denver Zoning Code enables official map amendment applicants to request a waiver of certain rights or obligations under the proposed zone district. This application includes a request for a waiver to the C-MX-5 district, as outlined below. This waiver request is consistent with the height guidance in the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan. The waiver is as follows:

1. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories pursuant to Sections 7.3.3.3.A (Town House building form), a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.D (General building form), , or a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.I (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House or General primary building form standards shall exceed 4 stories in building height. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories pursuant to Sections 7.3.3.3.A (Town House building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.D (General building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House, General, or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 4 stories in building height.

Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 7.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the C-MX-5 zone district.

2. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.A (Town House building form), and a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Sections 7.3.3.3.D (General building form), or a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.I (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House, General, or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 55 feet in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 7.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the C-MX-5 zone district.

3. Waive the right to use maximum height with incentives in stories and feet pursuant to Section 10.12.1 (Height Incentives), DZC.

The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	C-MX-5 w/waiver (Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Town House, Drive Thru Services*, Drive Thru Restaurant*, General, Shopfront
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40'	3/45' (Drive Thrus), 4/55' (Townhouse and Shopfront)
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	50-75%**
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	0' to 15'**
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	N/A
Primary Setbacks (min)	20'	0' to 10'**
Building Coverages	N/A	N/A

\*Building form not allowed within a ¼ mile of a transit station platform

\*\*Standard varies between building forms

**G-RX-5 – General Urban, Residential Mixed-Use, 5 stories**

G-RX-5 is a district in the General Urban neighborhood context that allows primarily residential uses with commercial and office uses permitted on the ground floor. It allows the Town House and Shopfront building forms with a maximum height of 70 feet or 5 stories. Per the proposed development agreement, the applicant will not be eligible to use the incentive heights for affordable housing. The Town House allows for a minimum 10-foot primary street setback and the Shopfront form allows for a minimum 0-foot setback from the primary street. Additional information on the G-RX-5 zone district can be found in Article 6 of the Denver Zoning code.

The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	G-RX-5 (Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Town House and Shopfront
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40'	5/70'
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	75%
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	10' to 15' (Townhouse), 0' to 10' (Shopfront)
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	N/A
Primary Setbacks (min)	20'	10' (Townhouse), 0' (Shopfront)
Building Coverages	N/A	N/A

\*\*Standard varies between building forms

**G-RX-5 w/waivers – General Urban, Residential Mixed-Use, 5 stories with waiver to 4 stories**

Information on the G-RX-5 zone district can be found above. Section 12.4.10.6 of the Denver Zoning Code enables official map amendment applicants to request a waiver of certain rights or obligations under the proposed zone district. This application includes a request for one waiver, as outlined below.

This waiver request is consistent with the height guidance in the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan. The waiver is as follows:

1. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories pursuant to Sections 6.3.3.3.F (Town House building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.K (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 4 stories in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 6.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the G-RX-5 zone district.

2. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.F (Town House building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.K (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 55 feet in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 6.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the G-RX-5 zone district.

3. Waive the right to use maximum height with incentives in stories and feet pursuant to Section 10.12.1 (Height Incentives), DZC.

The primary building forms allowed in the existing zone district and the proposed zone district are summarized below.

Design Standards	OS-B (Existing)	G-RX-5 w/waiver (Proposed)
Primary Building Forms Allowed	General	Town House and Shopfront
Stories/Heights (max)	3/40'	4/55'
Primary Build-To Percentages (min)	N/A	75%
Primary Build-To Ranges	N/A	10' to 15' (Townhouse), 0' to 10' (Shopfront)
Minimum Zone Lot Size/Width	N/A	N/A
Primary Setbacks (min)	20'	10' (Townhouse), 0' (Shopfront)
Building Coverages	N/A	N/A

## **Summary of City Agency Referral Comments**

As part of the DZC review process, the rezoning application is referred to potentially affected city agencies and departments for comment. A summary of agency referral responses follows:

**Assessor:** Approved – No Response

**Asset Management:** Approved – No Comments.

**Denver Public Schools:** Approved – No Response

**Department of Public Health and Environment:** Approve Rezoning Only – Will require additional information at Site Plan Review. See Comments Below:

Denver Department of Public Health & Environment - Division of Environmental Quality (EQ) does not guarantee approval of any proposed development project at this site by providing a response to this Official Map Amendment Referral Agency Review Request. Future development is subject to existing land use controls and other environmental requirements in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal environmental regulations and statutes. EQ recommends the Property Owner conduct an environmental site assessment to determine the potential presence, nature, and extent of possible contamination on the site and to identify specific cleanup needs associated with future development. EQ may have additional information about localized potential environmental concerns at the site. However, providing such information about a specific site is beyond the scope of these zoning application comments.

**Denver Parks and Recreation:** Approved – No comments.

**Department of Transportation and Infrastructure – R.O.W. - City Surveyor:** Approved – No Comments.

**Development Services - Transportation:** Approved – See Comments Below:

DES Transportation approves the subject zoning change. The applicant should note that redevelopment of this site may require additional engineering, ROW dedication to the City, access changes, traffic studies and/or right of way improvements. The extent of the required design and improvements will be determined once this property begins the redevelopment process. The results of any traffic studies may require the construction of off-site mitigation or may limit the proposed density of the project.

**Development Services – Wastewater:** Approved – See Comments Below:

There is no objection to the rezone, however applicant should be under notice that DOTI will not approve any development of this property without assurance that there is sufficient sanitary and storm sewer capacity. Refer to comments provided under LDR review referenced. A sanitary study and drainage study will be required. These studies may result in a requirement for the developer to install major infrastructure improvements or a limit to development if current infrastructure is insufficient. Approval of this rezone on behalf of Wastewater does not state, or imply, public storm/sanitary infrastructure can, or cannot, support the proposed zoning.

**Development Services – Project Coordination:** Approve Rezoning Only – will require additional information at site plan review. See Comments Below:



- 1) Development in the proposed OS-A area will be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation department.
- 2) Development in all other districts will require a Concept Phase and formal Site Development Plan process through the CPD Site Design and Neighborhood Development department.
- 3) The property is subject to the Large Development Review process (in progress). A Subdivision process and Infrastructure Master Plan will be needed, in addition to other elements identified through the LDR process.
- 4) New development will need to meet the goals and policies set forth in the Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan, if and when approved.
- 5) A 100' depth in the C-MS-5 with waivers zone district will likely create physical challenges to feasibly provide development in those areas as 100' depth is more shallow than the standard 125' block depth found throughout the City.
- 6) The applicant is expected to draft a High Impact Development Compliance Plan in coordination with HOST. As part of that plan, we understand the applicant has agreed to waive the right to utilize height incentives associated with the EHA due to the need to comply with the small area plan, and this will be documented in the development agreement.

**Development Services – Fire Prevention:** Approved – No Response.

**Development Services – Zoning Administration:** Approved – No Comments.

**Public Review Process**

	<b>Date</b>
CPD informational notice of receipt of the rezoning application to all affected members of City Council, registered neighborhood organizations, and property owners:	<b>8/5/22</b>
Property legally posted for a period of 15 days and CPD written notice of the Planning Board public hearing sent to all affected members of City Council, registered neighborhood organizations, and property owners:	<b>10/4/22</b>
Planning Board Public Hearing (12 people commented during the hearing with 6 in support and 6 opposed; the Board unanimously recommended approval of the rezoning):	<b>10/19/22</b>
CPD written notice of the Land Use, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee meeting sent to all affected members of City Council and registered neighborhood	<b>11/28/22</b>

organizations, at least ten (10) working days before the meeting:	
Land Use, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the City Council moved the bill forward:	<b>12/13/22</b>
Property legally posted for a period of 21 days and CPD notice of the City Council public hearing sent to all affected members of City Council and registered neighborhood organizations (tentative):	<b>1/2/23</b>
City Council Public Hearing (tentative):	<b>1/23/23</b>

- **Public Outreach and Input**

- **Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs)**

The Overlook at Park Hill Neighborhood Association, directly east of the subject site, submitted a resolution opposing the rezoning.

The Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., a registered neighborhood encompassing South Park Hill, North Park Hill, and Northeast Park Hill, voted 16-0 on October 6, 2022 to approve a resolution opposing the rezoning request. The Resolution cited a critical need to protect parks and open space to keep pace with a growing population and rezoning would violate the existing Conservation Easement.

The Winston Downs Community Association, a registered neighborhood organization in the Washington Virginia Vale Neighborhood in southeast Denver, submitted a comment in opposition to the requested rezoning citing concerns that this rezoning would bring more buildings, heat islands, and traffic to an area that needs more open space. Additionally, there are concerns with this rezoning moving forward while the conservation easement remains in place.

- **General Public Comments**

Staff received over 400 comments from the date of application notification to the date of this staff report. Staff heard from residents who are in strong support and strong opposition to the requested rezoning. Those in support of the rezoning believe it will bring much needed amenities, affordable housing, and park space to the northeast Denver community. Those opposed cite concerns around reviewing and approving a rezoning while a conservation easement remains in place. Many writing in opposition to the request want the entirety of the property to remain as open space and not be developed, citing concerns around increased traffic and density, particularly 12-story structures.

See the attachments for the complete list of comments received from both the Planning Board webpage and Park Hill Golf Course project webpage.

## Criteria for Review / Staff Evaluation

The criteria for review of this rezoning application are found in DZC, Sections 12.4.10.7 and 12.4.10.8, as follows:

### **DZC Section 12.4.10.7**

1. Consistency with Adopted Plans
2. Uniformity of District Regulations and Restrictions
3. Public Health, Safety and General Welfare

### **DZC Section 12.4.10.8**

1. Justifying Circumstances
2. Consistency with Neighborhood Context Description, Zone District Purpose and Intent Statements

## **1. Consistency with Adopted Plans**

The following adopted plans apply to this property:

- *Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040 (2019)*
- *Blueprint Denver (2019)*
- *Game Plan for a Healthy City (2019)*
- *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan (2022)*

### ***Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040***

The proposed rezoning is consistent with many of the adopted *Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040* strategies, which are organized by vision element.

The proposed rezoning would allow for additional housing options, including affordable housing, near transit within an established neighborhood, consistent with the following strategies in the Equitable, Affordable and Inclusive vision element:

- Equitable, Affordable and Inclusive Goal 1, Strategy A – Increase development of housing units close to transit and mixed-use developments (p. 28).
- Equitable, Affordable and Inclusive Goal 2, Strategy B – Create a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood for all individuals and families (p. 28).

The proposed map amendment would allow for a new public park and a mixed-use development with appropriate mobility connections, improved design outcomes, and new amenities consistent with the following strategies in the Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods vision element:

- Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods Goal 1, Strategy A – Build a network of well connected, vibrant, mixed-use centers and corridors (p. 34).
- Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods Goal 1, Strategy D – Encourage quality infill development that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and offers opportunities for increased amenities (p. 34).



- Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods Goal 2, Strategy C – Create people-oriented places that embrace community character with thoughtful transitions, aspirational design, and an engaging public realm (p. 34).

The proposed map amendment would allow for compatible infill development in an established neighborhood and near transit, consistent with the following strategies from the Environmentally Resilient vision element:

- Environmentally Resilient Goal 8, Strategy B – Encourage mixed-use communities where residents can live, work and play in their own neighborhoods (p. 54).
- Environmentally Resilient Goal 8, Strategy C – Focus growth by transit stations and along high- and medium-capacity transit corridors (p. 54).

The proposed rezoning would facilitate the creation of a new public park in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood, which increases the number of residents who live within a 10-minute walk of a public park, consistent with the following strategy in the Health and Active vision element:


- Healthy and Active Goal 2, Strategy C – Expand the supply of parks, recreational facilities and programs relative to Denver’s population growth (p. 58).

The requested map amendment will promote housing growth in an appropriate area and facilitate a new public park. The proposed districts allow for a variety of employment, office, retail, and housing options consistent with the strategies in Comprehensive Plan 2040.

### ***Blueprint Denver***

*Blueprint Denver* was adopted in 2019 as a supplement to Comprehensive Plan 2040 and establishes an integrated framework for the city’s land use and transportation decisions. *Blueprint* identifies the subject property as part of the Other Park and Open Space place type within the Urban Edge neighborhood context and provides guidance from the future growth strategy of the city. However, if the proposed small area plan is adopted, it will update the *Blueprint Denver* future context, place type, growth strategy, and street type designations for the subject property. Under the proposed *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*, the subject property would be in the Urban Center, General Urban, and Districts contexts and Community Center, Residential High-Medium, and Regional Park place types. See below for more detail or the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*.

**Blueprint Denver Future Neighborhood Context**



In *Blueprint Denver*, future neighborhood contexts are used to help understand differences in things like land use and built form and mobility options at a higher scale, between neighborhoods. The future neighborhood context for the subject property was recently updated with the adoption of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*. The subject property is shown on the context map as Districts, General Urban, and Urban Center. The neighborhood context map and description help guide appropriate zone districts (p. 66). The following sections detail how the proposed zone districts comply with the updated neighborhood contexts with the adoption of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*.

**OS-A**

The Open Space, context, which includes OS-A, “consists of all forms of public and private parks and open spaces” (DZC 9.3.1). The Districts future context, “serve a specific purpose, usually highly specific based on uses, such as education, industry or healthcare” (p. 137). The proposed OS-A will allow for a public park consistent with the Districts context purpose because it serves a specific purpose.

**C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers**


The proposed Urban Center Main Street and Mixed Use districts are within the Urban Center neighborhood Context. The Urban Center context “consists of multi-unit residential and mixed-use commercial strips and commercial centers” (DZC 7.1.1). The Main Street and Mixed Use districts are proposed for the western portion of the subject property, which is mapped as the Urban Center future neighborhood context. Urban Center includes “a high mix of uses throughout the area, with multi-unit residential typically in multi-story, mixed-use building forms” (p. 137). The proposed C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-

MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers is consistent with the Urban Center future context because these districts will allow for a high mix of uses in multi-story structures.

G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

G-RX-5 is a district within the General Urban context, which is “characterized by multi-unit residential uses in a variety of building forms” (DZC 6.1.1). The future context of the central and southern portion of the subject site is General Urban, consistent with the boundaries of the proposed General Urban zone districts. This context “is predominately multi-unit structures” (p. 136). The proposed G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers is consistent with the proposed General Urban future context because it will allow for primarily multi-unit residential uses with some commercial permitted on the ground floor.

**Blueprint Denver Future Places**



The Future Places Map shows the subject property as Community Center, High-Medium Residential, and Regional Park. The following sections detail how the proposed zone districts comply with the updated neighborhood contexts with the adoption of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*.

OS-A

The future place type for the eastern portion of the site is Regional Park. In *Blueprint Denver*, the Regional Park place type “provides a large scale public open space, recreational space and event locations” (p. 293). The proposed rezoning of the eastern portion to OS-A is consistent with the Regional Park future place type because it will allow for a public park owned or operated by the city.




C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers

The future context for the western portion of the site is identified as Community Center. Community Centers within the Urban Center context are described as “provid[ing] a mix of office, commercial and residential uses...Buildings are larger in scale than local centers and orient to the street or other public spaces” (p. 256). The proposed C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers districts are consistent with the Community Center future place type because they allow for a variety of uses with regulations that will provide a strong degree of activation and urban design.

G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

With the adoption of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*, the future place designation for the central and southern portions of the subject property became High – Medium Residential. The High – Medium Residential place type in the General Urban context is “a mix of low- to medium-scale multi-unit residential uses with some neighborhood-serving mixed-use distributed throughout” (p. 246). The proposed G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers districts will allow for primarily residential uses with some commercial on the ground floor consistent with the future place type.


**Blueprint Denver Future Street Types**



In *Blueprint Denver*, street types work in concert with the future place to evaluate the appropriateness of the intensity of the adjacent development (p. 67). *Blueprint Denver* classifies Colorado Blvd. as a Mixed-Use Arterial and Smith Rd. as an Industrial Arterial. “Arterial streets are designed for the highest degree of property access and the lowest amount of through movement” (p. 154). East 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Albion St. (north of 40<sup>th</sup> Ave.) are classified as a Residential Collectors and Dahlia St., E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave., and a new street connection between Ash and Albion are classified as Mixed-Use Collectors, and a new

connection at E 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. is classified as a Main Street Collector. “Collector streets are in between a local street and an arterial street; they collect movement from local streets and convey it to arterial streets” (p.159). Mixed-use streets include a “varied mix of uses including retail, office, residential and restaurants. Buildings are pedestrian-oriented, typically multi-story, usually with high building coverage with a shallow front setback” (p. 159). Similarly, Main Streets are “characterized by a mix of uses including retail, services and restaurants, as well as residential. Buildings are pedestrian-oriented, with little front setback, a continuous street wall, and high transparency” (p.158). Blueprint describes Industrial streets as “characterized by manufacturing but may contain other uses” (p. 160). Conversely, Residential streets are “primarily residential uses, but may also include schools, civic uses, parks, small retail nodes and other similar uses” (p. 160). The proposed C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers will primarily be located along Colorado Blvd and E. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. consistent with the Main Street and Mixed Use street designations. The proposed OS-A district is consistent with the Residential, Mixed Use, and Industrial street type designations, and G-RX-5 w/waivers, a largely residential district, is consistent with the Residential designation along East 35<sup>th</sup> Ave.

### **Growth Strategy**



Blueprint Denver’s growth strategy map is a version of the future places map, showing the aspiration for distributing future growth in Denver (p. 51).

### **OS-A**

The growth area strategy for the eastern portion of the site is Districts. These areas are anticipated to accommodate “5% of new housing growth and 15% of new job growth by 2040” (p. 51). In Blueprint Denver, “Districts, including university and hospital campuses, the airport and value manufacturing

areas, add a broad range of job opportunities” (p. 49). This is consistent with the Districts future neighborhood context and OS-A zone district.

#### C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers

The western portion of the property, where the mixed use and main street districts are proposed in part of the Community Centers and Corridors growth strategy. These areas are anticipated to see around “25% of new housing growth and 20% of new employment growth by 2040” (p. 51). These districts will accommodate more commercial and residential uses, consistent with the Community Centers and Corridors growth strategy.

#### G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

The central portion of the subject property, where the General Urban, Residential Mixed Use districts are proposed, is identified as the “all other areas of the city” growth strategy where it’s anticipated to see “20% of new housing and 10% of new jobs” (p. 51). According to the plan, “the remaining parts of Denver, mostly residential areas with embedded local centers and corridors, take a smaller amount of growth intended to strengthen the existing character of our neighborhoods” (p. 49). The proposed districts would bring mostly housing growth with some employment growth to this portion of the site consistent with the growth area strategy.

### **Blueprint Denver Strategies**

*Blueprint Denver* provides additional recommendation relating to custom zoning:


- Land Use and Built form: General Policy 3, Strategy B – Limit the use of site-specific, customized zoning tools – such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and waivers/conditions – to unique and extraordinary circumstances. The zoning code offers a wide variety of zone districts that cover the diverse contexts and places of Denver. Custom zoning tools are most effective when a standard zone district does not exist to implement the adopted plans for an area (p. 73).

The proposed map amendment includes two districts with waivers to allow for a maximum of 4 stories in height. While *Blueprint Denver* generally discourages custom zoning, the proposed waivers are appropriate here because they are supported by the proposed *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*, which explicitly calls for allowing a maximum of 4 stories for certain portions of the area.

### **Blueprint Denver Equity Concepts**

*Blueprint Denver* contains three equity concepts to help guide change to benefit everyone. Each equity concept has associated measurements that helps inform implementation actions through large rezonings along with other implementation actions.

### I. Access to Opportunity




The subject property is in an area with average access to opportunity. The basis for measuring access to opportunity is a composite of the neighborhood equity index developed by Denver’s Department of Public Health and Environment, proximity to high-capacity and frequent transit, and access to centers and corridors. Analyzing an area’s access to opportunity helps us to consider if we are making progress towards achieving the vision for complete neighborhoods across the city. In areas with average access to opportunity, it is important to increase access to opportunities, including amenities such as a public park and a range of affordable housing options. The subject property is less equitable in life expectancy and child obesity and has less access to centers and corridors and grocery stores. The proposed rezoning will facilitate a mixed use development, which will bring more amenities to the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood.

Concurrent with the rezoning, the applicant is facilitating a development agreement that will include provisions for affordable housing and publicly accessible open space. In the proposed agreement as drafted as of the date of this report, the property owner will commit to make 100 acres of the subject property publicly accessible parks/open space, with a significant portion of the land to be deeded to the city. The agreement also proposes that 25% of the residential units will be income restricted units affordable to a range of income levels, including lower AMI levels that reflect the incomes of the surrounding community. The open space and affordable housing commitments help strengthen the application’s consistency with *Blueprint Denver* and may increase the access to opportunity metric for residents.





## II. Vulnerability to Involuntary Displacement





The subject property is in an area that is more vulnerable to involuntary displacement. The basis for measuring vulnerability to involuntary displacement is vulnerability to displacement index developed by Denver’s Economic Development and Opportunity office. This combines data from median household income, percentage of people who rent housing, and percent of population with less than a college degree. In areas with high vulnerability to involuntary displacement, it is important to increase affordable housing options so that residents of all income levels can continue to live in Northeast Park Hill. Concurrent with the rezoning, the applicant is developing a high impact affordable housing compliance plan (part of the development agreement, as previously mentioned above). Through the proposed development agreement as drafted as of the date of this report, the property owner has committed to construct 25% of the total units as income restricted units (IRUs). The IRUs include rental units at lower Area Median Income (AMI) levels, including as low as 30% AMI. A portion of the income restricted units will be for sale units with two to three bedrooms, which will provide affordable homeownership opportunities in the area. In addition, the proposed agreement commits the applicant to ensure that all IRUs comply with the city’s new prioritization policy. This commitment helps mitigate involuntary displacement and may help to keep current residents who live near the site in place. The proposed housing commitments in the draft development agreement strengthen the application’s consistency with *Blueprint Denver*.

The equity analysis also contains supplemental data that highlights demographic changes and housing market conditions for the area. This data can be used to better understand vulnerability to displacement, including how the demographics of the area have changed over time. As the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood is more vulnerable to displacement, key data points from the supplemental


analysis that illustrate economic and demographic changes that sharply contrast with citywide trends are highlighted below.



In 2018, Northeast Park Hill has a smaller percentage of non-Hispanic, White residents than Denver. However, it saw a greater increase in the racial composition (percent of non-Hispanic, White) of residents between 2015 and 2018 compared to Denver. This could indicate that some displacement has already occurred in this neighborhood.



The median household income is lower in Northeast Park Hill (\$44,626) than citywide (\$63,793), but incomes are increasing at a higher rate than in Denver as a whole. This may indicate that some displacement has already occurred.




Lastly, Northeast Park Hill experienced some of the highest increases in median residential property tax in the city. The neighborhood saw a 26.16% increase while the citywide increase was 7.63% for 2018.


As part of the proposed development agreement concurrent with the rezoning, the applicant is proposing commitments to affordable housing, including for sale units to mitigate future displacement in this area.



### III. Expanding Housing and Jobs Diversity



The subject property is in an area that has below average housing diversity. The housing diversity map combines census tract-level data measuring the percentage of middle-density housing (housing with 2-19 units), home size diversity, ownership vs. rental, housing costs and the number of income-restricted units. This area scores as less diverse in terms of diversity in housing costs, mix of rented and owned homes, and bedroom counts in homes. This area has more renters compared to owners, and generally has housing higher housing costs. To improve housing diversity, it's important to include ownership opportunities and homes at a variety of price points. As previously mentioned, concurrent with the rezoning request, the applicant is planning to enter into a development agreement with provisions for affordable housing. Through this agreement, the property owner is planning to construct 25% of the total units as affordable income restricted units. A portion of the affordable units will be for-sale units with two to three bedrooms. This commitment helps improve housing diversity in the area by providing a variety of housing options, including affordable homeownership opportunities.



The map shows the mix jobs depicted by color. The area which the subject property is within has a mix of jobs that is dissimilar to the city's overall mix of job types with a higher proportion of manufacturing jobs compared to the citywide average. The proposed zone district allows for various commercial, office and retail jobs, which will increase the mix of jobs in Northeast Park Hill.

### ***Game Plan for a Healthy City***

*Game Plan for a Healthy City* provides both a vision and a strategic roadmap for the future of Denver's parks, hundreds of facilities, and recreation programs, and 20,000 acres of park landscapes. Rezoning to allow for a new public park is consistent with the following recommendations:


- Recommendation 3.1: Acquire land and build facilities to keep pace with growth and meet 10-minute walk standard and service goals (p. 115).
- Recommendation 3.5: Ensure a ten minute walk for park and open space for every neighborhood (p. 115).

A portion of Northeast Park Hill is identified as an existing residential area without walkable park access and the highest priority and need neighborhood for a public park. The proposed rezoning to OS-A will further the recommendations in *Game Plan for a Healthy City* by bringing more residents within a 10 minute walk of a public park.

### **Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan**

The *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* was adopted in December 2022 and is consistent with many citywide goals and policies. The Neighborhood Context and Future Place maps in the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* provide detailed guidance for use in rezonings and other policy decisions. These maps update the same *Blueprint Denver* maps. The Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan supersedes the existing small area plans for the subject property.

### **Future Neighborhood Context**



The neighborhood context designation is Urban Center, General Urban, and Districts/Regional Park.



OS-A

The Districts context is an area with “a specifically designed purpose, such as regional parks or industrial areas [in this case a regional park]. Although they have a strong primary purpose, these places can offer a diverse range of amenities and complementary services to support the district’s primary function” (p. 42). The OS-A district is proposed where the Districts context is mapped and will allow for a regional park consistent with the small area plan future context map.

C-MS-5 DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers

The plan describes the Urban Center context as “featur[ing] a high mix of uses where the highest densities are planned on the Park Hill Golf Course site. This context includes multi-story, mixed-use building forms located close to streets that have excellent transit access and diverse mobility options” (p. 42). The proposed districts for the areas identified as Urban Center on the map above are C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-12, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers. All of these districts are within the Urban Center context and will facilitate a high-density mixed-us development.

G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

The General Urban context is described as “consist[ing] of higher-density development like larger multi-story residential buildings. This context serves as a transition between the urban center and district context” (p. 42). G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers are proposed to be located in the center of the site to transition to the residential neighborhoods to the north and south and the proposed park to the east, consistent with the description of the General Urban context.





### G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

The Residential – High/Medium areas “have predominately multi-unit buildings located closer to centers. While the focus is residential, neighborhood serving uses may be found especially along Colorado Blvd., E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave, 38<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. and intersections” (p. 44). The G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers districts will allow for mostly multi-unit residential uses with some compatible commercial uses on the ground floor, consistent with the future place type.


### Maximum Buildings Heights



The Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan recommends maximum building heights for the property. The plan recommends the tallest heights, up to 12 stories, near the corner of Colorado Blvd. and E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave with heights gradually stepping down to 4 stories along E. 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. and the eastern edge of the regional park. In line with the proposed small area plan, C-MX-12 is proposed for the northwest portion of the site and the proposed zone district heights step down moving south and east to C-MX-8 and then C-MX-5 and G-RX-5 with C-MX-5 w/waivers and G-RX-5 w/waivers allowing up to 4 stories proposed along the

edge of the OS-A district and E. 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. The plan indicates the map shows maximum building heights and no additional height incentives will apply to the subject property.

### Future Street Types



The *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* contemplates a new street connection between Ash St. and Albion St and the creation of a new main street along E. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. Additionally, the small area plan updates the Blueprint the future street type designations for Dahlia St., E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave (east of Colorado Blvd.), and Albion St (north of 40<sup>th</sup> Ave.). Ash St., E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave., and Dahlia St. are identified as Mixed-use Collectors, which have a “varied mix of uses including retail, office, residential and restaurants” (p. 60). The Urban Center Mixed-Use districts are proposed to be located along Ash St. and E. 40<sup>th</sup> Ave. consistent with the mixed-use future street type. Dahlia St. will separate the proposed public park from the industrial uses to the east, which is consistent with the Mixed-use designation to include a variety of uses. E 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. is designated as a Main Street collector which is “characterized by a mix of uses including retail, services and restaurants, as well as residential. Buildings are pedestrian-oriented, with little front setback, and continuous street wall, and high transparency” (p. 60). C-MS-5 w/DO-8 is

proposed along E. 38<sup>th</sup> St. and includes regulations for enhanced design to create pedestrian-oriented public spaces, consistent with the Main Street designation. Albion St. is identified as a Residential Collector, which are “primarily residential uses, but may also include schools, civic uses, parks, small retail nodes, and other similar uses” (p. 60), and there are currently multi-unit residential uses along Albion consistent with the Residential street type.

The area-wide framework recommendations of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* are grouped under three main topics: Quality of Life, Land Use and Built Form, and Mobility. The proposed OS-A district, which would facilitate the creation of a new public park will further the following recommendations:

- Strategy Q1 A. – “Establish 70-80 acres of contiguous park space that can support a spectrum of recreational activities and serve as a place of connection for the surrounding neighborhoods” (p. 34).

The proposed C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers will further the following recommendations:

- L2 A. – “Transition building height and intensity from highest in the northwest of the site, which is closest to 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado rail station, to lowest at the south and east, which is closest to existing neighborhoods and to the future regional scale park” (p. 46).

The proposed C-MS-5 w/DO-8 includes a design overlay that would allow for a pedestrian-oriented, active main street with enhanced design standards consistent with the following recommendations:

- D3 A. – “Promote design of a future neighborhood main street that encourages an enjoyable experience through engaging and active uses, such as shops and restaurants located at the street level adjacent to sidewalks and open spaces” (p. 50).
- D3 B. – “Ensure main street building designs have a strong connection between sidewalks, open spaces, and building activities, which could include design elements such as window and specific first-floor building heights to create engaging storefronts” (p. 50).
- D3 C. – “Encourage the application of a custom zoning tool like a design overlay to promote an active mix of uses at the street level” (p. 50).
- D4 B – “Consider additional regulatory tools to promote specific design outcomes such as buildings designed to incorporate variation in height/scale, open-up views from the regional park or integrate an active and engaging street frontage. Potential regulatory tools could include:
  - Customized zoning solutions such as a design overlay to achieve street level activation” (p. 51).

The proposed C-MX-5 and G-RX-5 districts with waivers allowing a maximum building height of 4 stories further the following strategy:

- D4 B. – “consider additional regulatory tools to promote specific design outcomes such as buildings designed to incorporate variation in height/scale, open-up views from the regional park or integrate an active and engaging street frontage. Potential regulatory tools could include:
  - Customized zoning solutions such as waivers to achieve maximum height recommendations” (p. 51).



The proposed zone districts will be consistent with the contexts, place types, street types, and framework recommendations of the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*.

## **2. Uniformity of District Regulations and Restrictions**

The proposed rezoning to C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/waivers, G-RX-5, G-RX-5 w/waivers will result in the uniform application of zone district building form, use and design regulations.

## **3. Public Health, Safety and General Welfare**

The proposed official map amendment furthers the public health, safety, and general welfare of the city primarily through the implementation of the city's adopted plans. This rezoning will facilitate the creation of a new public park, and according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention "having access to places for physical activity, such as parks and trails, encourages community residents to participate in physical activity and do so more often" (Parks, Trails and Health: <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/healthtopics/parks.htm>). In the equity analysis, this area's scores as less equitable in life expectancy and child obesity so the addition of new open space that is free and publicly accessible could improve these metrics.

The proposed mixed-use and residential mixed-use districts will allow for a development that will increase employment and housing options in the area fostering the creation of a walkable, urban area within close proximity to the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado RTD Station. As such, a broadened mix of uses and mobility improvements can provide better health outcomes through increased physical activity and lessen the need for driving as services and amenities can be accessed within walkable and bikeable distances.

## **4. Justifying Circumstance**

The application identifies several changed or changing conditions as the Justifying Circumstance under DZC Section 12.4.10.8, "Since the date of the approval of the existing Zone District, there has been a change to such a degree that the proposed rezoning is in the public interest. Such a change may include: a city adopted plan...."

The recently adopted *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* serves as the justifying circumstance for the rezoning. The plan envisions a new public park and mixed-use development with varying intensities for the former private golf course site, and the proposed rezoning is consistent with the updated guidance that the plan provides. This is an appropriate justifying circumstance for the proposed rezoning.

## **5. Consistency with Neighborhood Context Description, Zone District Purpose and Intent Statements**

### OS-A

The requested OS-A zone district is within the Open Space Context, which “consists of all forms of public and private parks and open spaces. The context accommodates sites ranging from very active to completely passive, and from those embedded in a neighborhood to sites that are large enough to stand alone. Active sites may include high use areas such as ball fields, while passive areas focus on resource protection, trails, walking and biking... Buildings in the Open Space Context are typically placed where access is highest, and are often located away from view of the general public...Buildings are typically low in scale, although some open space areas with active recreational uses support large-scale facilities” (DZC 9.3.1). In the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan*, the future park space is designated as Districts, which includes uses for a specific purpose, such as a regional park consistent with the Open Space context.

Open Space Public Park District (OS-A) “is intended to protect and preserve public parks owned, operated or leased by the City and managed by the City’s Department of Parks and Recreation (“DPR”) for park purposes” (DZC 9.3.2.1.A). The portion of the property proposed to be rezoned to OS-A is intended for a new public park owned by the city.

### C-MS-5 w/DO-8

The requested C-MS-5 with the DO-8 is a zone district within the Urban Center neighborhood context. The context is characterized by “multi-unit residential and mixed-use commercial strips and commercial centers” (DZC Section 7.1.1). These areas consist of “a regular pattern of block shapes surrounded by an orthogonal street grid” (DZC 7.1.2). The proposed rezoning to C-MS-5 will allow for a mixed-use strip along E. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. Therefore, the proposed rezoning to C-MS-5 is consistent with the Urban Center neighborhood context description.

According to DZC Section 7.2.4.1, the Main Street districts are focused on “promoting safe, active, and pedestrian-scaled commercial streets.” The proposed rezoning will allow for a pedestrian-scaled main street with uses that promote activity along E. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave.

The C-MS-5 zone district “applies primarily to collector or arterial street corridors, or may be embedded within a larger commercial shopping center or mixed-use area, where a building scale or 2 to 5 stories is desired” (DZC Section 7.2.4.2.A.). The area proposed to be rezoned to C-MS-5 is along a proposed main street and allow heights up to 5 and 8 stories in the small area plan. Therefore, rezoning this site is consistent with the specific intent of the zone district.

The intent of the Design Overlay 8 (DO-8) is “to encourage neighborhood mixed-use areas that support nonresidential active uses at the Street Level, promote active pedestrian-oriented building frontages, and provide sufficient space for transitions between the public realm and private residential dwellings” (DZC Section 9.4.5.12.B.). The DO-8 is proposed where the small area plan is calling for shops and restaurants at the street level. Therefore, mapping the DO-8 along E. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave. is consistent with the overlay’s intent and proposed plan guidance.

C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, and C-MX-5 w/waivers

The requested C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5 and C-MX-5 w/waivers districts are within the Urban Center neighborhood context. The context is characterized by “multi-unit residential and mixed-use commercial strips and commercial centers” (DZC Section 7.1.1). These areas consist of “a regular pattern of block shapes surrounded by an orthogonal street grid” (DZC 7.1.2). The proposed mixed use districts will allow for a commercial center consistent with the neighborhood context description.

The general purpose of the C-MX districts is “to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering within and around the city’s neighborhoods” (DZC Section 7.2.2.1.B.). Mixed Use districts vary from Main Street districts in that they are “focused on creating mixed, diverse neighborhoods...and are intended for broader application at the neighborhood scale” (DZC Section 7.2.2.1.D.). The proposed rezoning would allow for a variety of uses and facilitate the development of a mixed, diverse neighborhood.

According to the zone district intent statements, C-MX-12 “applies to areas or intersections served primarily by major arterials” (DZC Section 7.2.2.2.D.), C-MX-8 “applies to areas or intersections served primarily by arterial streets” (DZC Section 7.2.2.2.C), and C-MX-5 “applies to areas or intersections served primarily by collector or arterial streets” (DZC Section 7.2.2.2.B). Colorado Blvd., where the mixed use districts will be applied, is a major arterial consistent with the intent.

G-RX-5 and G-RX-5 w/waivers

The General Urban context is “characterized by multi-unit residential uses in a variety of building forms...Low-scale commercial areas are embedded within residential areas” (DZC Section 6.1.1). The proposed G-RX-5 districts are mostly residential and allow some commercial uses on the ground floor, consistent with the General Urban neighborhood context.

DZC Section 6.2.4.1 describes the Residential Mixed Use districts as “intended to ensure new development contributes positively to established residential neighborhoods and character, encourages affordable housing, and improves the transition between commercial development and adjacent residential neighborhoods.” Within the subject property the proposed G-RX-5 districts will act as a transition from the more intense mixed use district along Colorado Blvd. to the residential neighborhood to the south and the proposed public park to the east consistent with the purpose of the Residential Mixed Use districts.

G-RX-5 “applies to residentially-dominated areas served primarily by local or collector streets where a building scale of 1 to 5 stories is desired” (DZC 6.2.4.2.B.). The properties proposed to be rezoned to G-RX-5 are located along collector streets where a building height of 5 stories is desired in the proposed small area plan. Additionally, waivers to the G-RX-5 to allow a maximum height of 4 stories are included for two portions of the subject property where 4 stories is desired in the plan.

Rezoning Application #2022I-00158

4141 E. 35<sup>th</sup> Ave.

December 9, 2022

Page 44

### **Attachments**

1. Application
2. Public comments
3. Development Agreement Summary
4. Conservation Easement





# **PARK HILL GOLF COURSE**

**20221-00158**

## **ZONE MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

*Park Hill Golf Course Property (155 acres)*

*September 27, 2022*

### **Submitted by:**

Westside Investment Partners, Inc

ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC

4100 East Mississippi Avenue, Suite 500

Denver, CO 80246

p (303) 984-9800



# Table of Contents

3	ZONE MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION FORM
8	REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS
9	Legal Description
26	Proof of Ownership
28	Review Criteria Narrative
50	ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS
51	Outreach Documentation
53	Individual Authorization to Sign
57	Rezoning Waivers Request Form
60	Proposed Waivers
63	Supplemental Information - LDR Parks and Open Space Concept



1.

Zone Map  
Amendment  
Application Form



## Zone Map Amendment (Rezoning) - Application

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION*		PROPERTY OWNER(S) REPRESENTATIVE**	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF POINT OF CONTACT FOR APPLICATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF POINT OF CONTACT FOR FEE PAYMENT***		<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF POINT OF CONTACT FOR APPLICATION <input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF POINT OF CONTACT FOR FEE PAYMENT***	
Property Owner Name	ACM PARK HILL JV VII LLC	Representative Name	
Address	4100 E MISSISSIPPI AVE STE 500	Address	
City, State, Zip	GLENDALE, CO 80246-3053	City, State, Zip	
Telephone	Office: (303) 984-9800	Telephone	
Email	kho@westsideinv.com, aklein@westsideinv.com	Email	
<p>*All standard zone map amendment applications must be initiated by owners (or authorized representatives) of at least 51% of the total area of the zone lots subject to the rezoning. See page 4.</p>		<p>**Property owner shall provide a written letter authorizing the representative to act on his/her behalf.            ***If contact for fee payment is other than above, please provide contact name and contact information on an attachment.</p>	
SUBJECT PROPERTY INFORMATION			
Location (address):	4141 E 35TH AVE		
Assessor's Parcel Numbers:	01193-00-032-000		
Area in Acres or Square Feet:	155.41		
Current Zone District(s):	OS-B		
PROPOSAL			
Proposed Zone District:	OS-A, C-MS-5 w/DO-8, C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5, C-MX-5 w/Wvrs, G-RX-5, and G-RX-5 w/Wvr		
PRE-APPLICATION INFORMATION			
In addition to the required pre-application meeting with Planning Services, did you have a concept or a pre-application meeting with Development Services?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes - State the contact name &amp; meeting date</b> <u>7/29/22 - Deirdre Oss</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No - Describe why not (in outreach attachment, see bottom of p. 3)</b>		
Did you contact the City Council District Office regarding this application ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes - if yes, state date and method</b> <u>8/1/2022 - via text message</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No - if no, describe why not (in outreach attachment, see bottom of p. 3)</b>		



REZONING REVIEW CRITERIA (ACKNOWLEDGE EACH SECTION)	
<p>General Review Criteria DZC Sec. 12.4.10.7.A</p> <p>Check box to affirm <b>and</b> include sections in the review criteria narrative attachment</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Consistency with Adopted Plans: The proposed official map amendment is consistent with the City's adopted plans, or the proposed rezoning is necessary to provide land for a community need that was not anticipated at the time of adoption of the City's Plan.</b></p> <p>Please provide a review criteria narrative attachment describing <b>how</b> the requested zone district is consistent with the policies and recommendations found in <b>each</b> of the adopted plans below. Each plan should have its' own subsection.</p> <p><b>1. Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040</b></p> <p>In this section of the attachment, describe <b>how</b> the proposed map amendment is consistent with <i>Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040's</i> a) equity goals, b) climate goals, and c) any other applicable goals/strategies.</p> <p><b>2. Blueprint Denver</b></p> <p>In this section of the attachment, describe <b>how</b> the proposed map amendment is consistent with: a) the neighborhood context, b) the future place type, c) the growth strategy, d) adjacent street types, e) plan policies and strategies, and f) equity concepts contained in <i>Blueprint Denver</i>.</p> <p><b>3. Neighborhood/ Small Area Plan and Other Plans (List all from pre-application meeting, if applicable):</b></p> <p>Draft Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan</p>
<p>General Review Criteria: DZC Sec. 12.4.10.7. B &amp; C</p> <p>Check boxes to the right to affirm <b>and</b> include a section in the review criteria for Public Health, Safety and General Welfare narrative attachment.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Uniformity of District Regulations and Restrictions: The proposed official map amendment results in regulations and restrictions that are uniform for each kind of building throughout each district having the same classification and bearing the same symbol or designation on the official map, but the regulations in one district may differ from those in other districts.</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Public Health, Safety and General Welfare: The proposed official map amendment furthers the public health, safety, and general welfare of the City.</b></p> <p>In the review criteria narrative attachment, please provide an additional section describing <b>how</b> the requested rezoning furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the City.</p>
<p>Review Criteria for Non-Legislative Rezoning: DZC Sec. 12.4.10.8</p> <p>For Justifying Circumstances, check box and include a section in the review criteria narrative attachment.</p> <p>For Neighborhood Context, Purpose and Intent, check box <b>and</b> include a section in the review criteria narrative attachment.</p>	<p><b>Justifying Circumstances - One of the following circumstances exists:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The existing zoning of the land was the result of an error;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The existing zoning of the land was based on a mistake of fact;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The existing zoning of the land failed to take into account the constraints of development created by the natural characteristics of the land, including, but not limited to , steep slopes, floodplain, unstable soils, and inadequate drainage;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Since the date of the approval of the existing Zone District, there has been a change to such a degree that the proposed rezoning is in the public interest. Such change may include:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Changed or changing conditions in a particular area, or in the city generally; or,</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. A City adopted plan; or</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">c. That the City adopted the Denver Zoning Code and the property retained Former Chapter 59 zoning.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is in the public interest to encourage a departure from the existing zoning through application of supplemental zoning regulations that are consistent with the intent and purpose of, and meet the specific criteria stated in, Article 9, Division 9.4 (overlay Zone Districts) of this Code.</p> <p>In the review criteria narrative attachment, please provide an additional section describing the selected justifying circumstance. If the changing conditions circumstance is selected, describe changes since the site was last zoned. Contact your pre-application case manager if you have questions.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>The proposed official map amendment is consistent with the description of the applicable neighborhood context, and with the stated purpose and intent of the proposed Zone District.</b></p> <p>In the review criteria narrative attachment, please provide a separate section describing <b>how</b> the rezoning aligns with a) the proposed district neighborhood context description, b) the general purpose statement, and c) the specific intent statement found in the Denver Zoning Code.</p>

**REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS**

Please check boxes below to affirm the following **required** attachments are submitted with this rezoning application:

- Legal Description of subject property(s). **Submit as a separate Microsoft Word document.** View guidelines at: <https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/transportation-infrastructure/programs-services/right-of-way-survey/guidelines-for-land-descriptions.html>
- Proof of ownership document for each property owner signing the application, such as (a) Assessor's Record, (b) Warranty deed, or (c) Title policy or commitment dated no earlier than 60 days prior to application date. If the owner is a corporate entity, proof of authorization for an individual to sign on behalf of the organization is required. This can include board resolutions authorizing the signer, bylaws, a Statement of Authority, or other legal documents as approved by the City Attorney's Office.
- Review Criteria Narratives. See page 2 for details.

**ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS (IF APPLICABLE)**

Additional information may be needed and/or required. Please check boxes below identifying additional attachments provided with this application.

- Written narrative explaining reason for the request** (optional)
- Outreach documentation attachment(s).** Please describe any community outreach to City Council district office(s), Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs) and surrounding neighbors. If outreach was via email- please include email chain. If the outreach was conducted by telephone or meeting, please include contact date(s), names and a description of feedback received. If you have not reached out to the City Council district office, please explain why not. (optional - encouraged )
- Letters of Support.** If surrounding neighbors or community members have provided letters in support of the rezoning request, please include them with the application as an attachment (optional).
- Written Authorization to Represent Property Owner(s)** (if applicable)
- Individual Authorization to Sign on Behalf of a Corporate Entity** (e.g. if the deed of the subject property lists a corporate entity such as an LLC as the owner, this is document is required.)
- Other Attachments.** Please describe below.

Waivers Request Form

Proposed Waivers

Supplemental Information - LDR Parks and Open Space Concept

**PROPERTY OWNER OR PROPERTY OWNER(S) REPRESENTATIVE CERTIFICATION**

We, the undersigned represent that we are the owner(s) of the property described opposite our names, or have the authorization to sign on behalf of the owner as evidenced by a Power of Attorney or other authorization attached, and that we do hereby request initiation of this application. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all information supplied with this application is true and accurate. I understand that without such owner consent, the requested official map amendment action cannot lawfully be accomplished.

Property Owner Name(s) (please type or print legibly)	Property Address City, State, Zip Phone Email	Property Owner Interest % of the Area of the Zone Lots to Be Rezoned	Please sign below as an indication of your consent to the above certification statement	Date	Indicate the type of ownership documentation provided: (A) Assessor's record, (B) warranty deed, (C) title policy or commitment, or (D) other as approved	Has the owner authorized a representative in writing? (YES/NO)
<b>EXAMPLE</b> John Alan Smith and Josie Q. Smith	123 Sesame Street Denver, CO 80202 (303) 555-5555 sample@sample.gov	100%	<i>John Alan Smith</i> <i>Josie Q. Smith</i>	01/12/20	(A)	YES
Andrew R. Klein	4141 E 35TH AVE Denver, CO 80207 ph: (303) 984-9800 kho@westsideinv.com	100%	<i>Andrew Klein</i>	08/03/22	A	YES NO
						YES
						YES
						YES






2.

Required  
Attachments



# Legal Descriptions

---



ZONE OS-A

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19 AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 29°35'28" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 2,910.35 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SMITH RD AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE AND ALONG THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE RIGHT AN ARC LENGTH OF 219.71 FEET, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 5,607.93 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 02°14'41" AND A CHORD WHICH BEARS SOUTH 87°47'25" EAST A CHORD DISTANCE OF 219.70 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF THAT PARCEL DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2013029217;  
THENCE ALONG THE PERIMETER OF SAID PARCEL THE FOLLOWING SEVEN (7) COURSES:

- 1) SOUTH 02°46'05" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 3.26 FEET;
- 2) SOUTH 82°05'50" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 369.97 FEET;
- 3) SOUTH 78°49'16" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 260.34 FEET;
- 4) SOUTH 67°50'21" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 49.23 FEET;
- 5) NORTH 89°08'19" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 81.19 FEET;
- 6) SOUTH 47°29'27" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 22.71 FEET;
- 7) SOUTH 15°18'46" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 45.07 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF DAHLIA ST;

THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES:

- 1) SOUTH 00°08'45" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,002.52 FEET;
- 2) SOUTH 00°08'26" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,324.77 FEET;
- 3) SOUTH 00°08'24" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 3.47 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE OVERLOOK AT PARK HILL FILING NO. 1 RECORDED AT RECEPTION NO. 2001067475;

THENCE ALONG THE PERIMETER OF SAID OVERLOOK AT PARK HILL FILING NO. 1 THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES:

- 1) NORTH 82°06'53" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 24.24 FEET;
- 2) SOUTH 89°39'56" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 486.97 FEET;
- 3) SOUTH 00°38'08" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,263.16 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF 35<sup>TH</sup> AVE;

THENCE SOUTH 89°38'54" WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 629.57 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,747.37 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 86.54 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 924.16 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF PARK HILL TOWN CENTER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 RECORDED AT RECEPTION NO. 2004129062;

THENCE NORTH 89°55'56" EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 203.59 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF;

THENCE NORTH 00°04'04" WEST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID PARK HILL TOWN CENTER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1, A DISTANCE OF 1,114.42 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 3,489,799 SQUARE FEET OR 80.11 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-12

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 05°25'41" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 730.86 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THAT PARCEL DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2013029217 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE ALONG SAID EAST LINE THE FOLLOWING TEN (10) COURSES:  
1) NORTH 00°04'04" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 181.38 FEET;  
2) NORTH 03°44'46" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 150.39 FEET;  
3) NORTH 00°04'04" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 190.25 FEET;  
4) NORTH 44°56'12" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 57.12 FEET;  
5) NORTH 89°54'55" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 241.88 FEET;  
6) SOUTH 00°04'02" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 13.50 FEET;  
7) NORTH 88°43'12" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 100.00 FEET;  
8) NORTH 63°47'45" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 91.35 FEET;  
9) NORTH 52°59'52" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 77.66 FEET;  
10) NORTH 34°16'55" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 59.92 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARK HILL TOWN CENTER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 RECORDED AT RECEPTION NO. 2004129062;  
THENCE NORTH 89°55'56" EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE THEREOF, A DISTANCE OF 77.94 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 522.96 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 337.12 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°38'57" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 166.96 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 306.64 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 319,758 SQUARE FEET OR 7.34 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300





ZONE G-RX-5 PARCEL 1:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 36°27'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,760.45 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF PARK HILL TOWN CENTER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 RECORDED AT RECEPTION NO. 2004129062 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 923.35 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 329.76 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 921.93 FEET TO SAID SOUTH LINE;  
THENCE NORTH 89°55'56" EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 329.76 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 304,249 SQUARE FEET OR 6.98 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE G-RX-5 WVRS PARCEL 1:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 36°27'38" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,760.45 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF PARK HILL TOWN CENTER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 RECORDED AT RECEPTION NO. 2004129062 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE NORTH 89°55'56" EAST ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 188.71 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 924.16 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 188.70 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 923.35 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 174,313 SQUARE FEET OR 4.00 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-8 PARCEL 1:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 05°25'41" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 730.86 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF THAT PARCEL DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2013029217 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 306.64 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°38'57" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 166.96 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 337.12 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 796.51 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 662.42 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF COLORADO BLVD;  
THENCE NORTH 00°04'04" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 261.53 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID PARCEL DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2013029217;  
THENCE ALONG THE PERIMETER OF SAID PARCEL THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES:  
1) NORTH 89°55'56" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 2.00 FEET;  
2) NORTH 03°15'39" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 310.00 FEET;  
3) NORTH 00°04'04" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 58.47 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 469,707 SQUARE FEET OR 10.78 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-5 PARCEL 1:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 62°45'15" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1076.43 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 397.54 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 243.46 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 397.54 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 243.46 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 96,787 SQUARE FEET OR 2.22 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-5 WVRS PARCEL 1:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19 AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 62°45'15" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,076.43 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 361.54 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 908.12 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 361.54 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 908.12 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 328,320 SQUARE FEET OR 7.54 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300





ZONE C-MS-5 DO-8:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 19 AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19;  
THENCE NORTH 89°39'56" EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 19, A DISTANCE OF 50.00 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF COLORADO BLVD AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE NORTH 00°04'04" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 97.79 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 905.88 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 194.00 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 905.16 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID COLORADO BLVD;  
THENCE NORTH 00°00'18" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 96.21 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 175,666 SQUARE FEET OR 4.03 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-5 WVRS PARCEL 2:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 29°20'46" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,444.81 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF 35<sup>TH</sup> AVE AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°38'54" WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 657.98 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF COLORADO BLVD;  
THENCE NORTH 00°00'18" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 425.88 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 659.32 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 419.79 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 278,495 SQUARE FEET OR 6.39 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE G-RX-5 WVRS PARCEL 2:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 29°20'46" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 1,444.81 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF 35<sup>TH</sup> AVE AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 419.79 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 329.76 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 425.06 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 275.24 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 839.25 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID 35<sup>TH</sup> AVE;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°38'54" WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 605.02 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 369,271 SQUARE FEET OR 8.48 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-5 PARCEL 2:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 59°44'41" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 822.78 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 316.58 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 243.46 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 316.58 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 243.46 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 77,076 SQUARE FEET OR 1.77 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE G-RX-5 PARCEL 2:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 59°44'41" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 822.78 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 329.76 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 425.06 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 329.76 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 00°10'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 425.06 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 140,168 SQUARE FEET OR 3.22 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300





ZONE C-MX-5 PARCEL 3:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 06°54'58" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 415.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF COLORADO BLVD AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 660.68 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 425.06 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 659.32 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF SAID COLORADO BLVD;  
THENCE NORTH 00°00'18" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 425.06 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 280,537 SQUARE FEET OR 6.44 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



ZONE C-MX-8 PARCEL 2:

A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 30;  
THENCE SOUTH 06°54'58" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 415.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EAST LINE OF COLORADO BLVD AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;  
THENCE NORTH 00°00'18" WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 316.59 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 89°49'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 661.69 FEET;  
THENCE SOUTH 00°10'43" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 316.58 FEET;  
THENCE NORTH 89°49'17" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 660.68 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 209,320 SQUARE FEET OR 4.81 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN ASSUMED AS BEARING SOUTH 00°00'18" EAST.

PREPARED BY: AARON MURPHY  
PLS 38162  
ON BEHALF OF: HARRIS KOCHER SMITH  
1120 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 1000  
DENVER, CO 80203  
303.623.6300



# Proof of Ownership

---

4141 E 35TH AVE

Owner	Schedule Number	Legal Description	Property Type	Tax District
ACM PARK HILL JV VII LLC 4100 E MISSISSIPPI AVE STE500 GLENDALE, CO 80246-3053	01193-00-032-000	SW/4 OF SW/4 OF SW/4 OF S19 T3 R67 PT & NE/4 OF SE/4 OF NW/4OF S30 T3 R67 BEG 50FT E OF SW/4 OF SW/4 OF SW/4 OF S19 N909.31FT NLY 150.33FT N 175FT NELY 91.95FT E 290FT N 115FT E1025.05FT N 1114.17FT CV/R 884.37FT SLY 89.72FT SLY 28.82 FTS 1086.52FT S 1324.84FT S 2.96FT WLY 28.58FT W 483.58FT1264.16FT W 1891.72FT N 1263.62FT EXC DIF RCP 2013029217	INDUSTRIAL- MISC RECREATION	DENVER

<a href="#">Summary</a>	<a href="#">Property Map</a>	<a href="#">Assessed Values</a>	<a href="#">Assessment Protest</a>	<a href="#">Taxes</a>	<a href="#">Neighborhood Sales</a>	<a href="#">Chain of Title</a>
-------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------

Print Summary

Property Description			
Style:	OTHER	Building Sqr. Foot:	36181
Bedrooms:		Baths Full/Half:	0/0
Effective Year Built:	1976	Basement/Finish:	0/0
Lot Size:	6,729,836	Zoned As:	OS-B
Mill Levy:	74.618	Document Type:	NC
<p><small>Valuation zoning may be different from City's new zoning code.</small></p>			



# Review Criteria Narrative

---


This narrative is submitted on behalf of ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC (“**Applicant**”). The Applicant owns the real property located in the City and County of Denver (the “**City**”) generally located north of East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue, east of North Colorado Boulevard, south of Smith Road, and west of North Dahlia Street (the “**Property**”), which comprises approximately 155 acres and is commonly known as the “**Park Hill Golf Course.**” The Applicant proposes to redevelop the Property into a mix of public and private uses, including 100 acres of public parks, and an urban, mixed-use community containing housing, commercial, and community uses (the “**Project**”).

The Project has been reviewed through the City’s Large Development Review process. In order for the Project to develop, the Property must be rezoned. Currently, the entirety of the Property is zoned within the City’s Open Space B zone district (the “**OS-B District**”), which is intended to accommodate privately-owned, active recreation parks and open space. The Applicant respectfully requests that the City approve an Official Map Amendment (the “**Rezoning**”) to rezone the Property into the following zone districts:

- Open Space A zone district (“**OS-A District**”) – An approximately 80 acre area including all land within the site roughly east of the alley between Bellaire and Birch Streets.
- General Urban Residential Mixed Use Five-Story zone district (“**G-RX-5 District**”) – Areas generally between of the centerlines of Ash and Bellaire street from the south and between 36<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Avenues and 39<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> Avenues.
- G-RX-5 District with Waivers (to 4 stories) – All areas east of the G-RX-5 districts and west of the OS-A district described above as well as areas south of 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Ash Street and the OS-A district.
- Urban Center Main Street Five-Story zone district (“**C-MS-5 District**”), with Active Centers and Corridors Design Overlay District (the “**DO-8 Overlay**”) – An area approximately 100 feet on either side of a future 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue centerline between Colorado Boulevard and Bellaire Street. This area will incorporate the DO-8 Overlay, which will require greater street-level activation along this main street.
- Urban Center Mixed-Use Five-Story zone district (“**C-MX-5 District**”) – Several areas including between 36<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> Avenues and Colorado Boulevard and Ash Street and between Ash Street and Bellaire street north of the C-MS-5 district to 39<sup>th</sup> avenue and south of the C-MS-5 district to 37<sup>th</sup> avenue.
- C-MX-5 District with Waivers (to 4 stories) – south of 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the southern property line from Colorado Boulevard to Ash Street and west of Bellaire Street from 37<sup>th</sup> to 39<sup>th</sup> street.
- Urban Center Mixed-Use Eight-Story zone district (“**C-MX-8 District**”) – South of the C-MS-5 district described above to 37<sup>th</sup> Street from Colorado Boulevard to Ash Street and north of the C-MS-5 district with a northern boundary that ranges in location but falls generally between 39<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> Avenues from Colorado Boulevard to Ash Street.

- Urban Center Mixed-Use Twelve-Story zone district (“**C-MX-12 District**”) – Areas generally north of the northern-most C-MX-8 district described above to the northern property line.

All streets used as boundaries in the above descriptions area rough extensions of those streets through the site from the south and west. Reference image below:



Concurrently with its processing of the present application, the Applicant will request the City's approval of a negotiated development agreement that will address the Applicant's legally binding commitments to construct affordable housing and public improvements, and provide for parks and open space within the Property, among other matters (the "**Development Agreement**").

It is the Applicant's position that the Rezoning meets all of the applicable approval criteria set forth in the Denver Zoning Code (the "**DZC**" or the "**Code**"), as explained in greater detail below.


### **The Property and Current Entitlements**

As noted above, the entire Property is presently located within the OS-B District. The Property is additionally encumbered by that certain Conservation Easement, recorded July 12, 2019 in the real property records of the City at Reception No. 2019090259 (the "**Use Restriction**"), which restricts the Property's use to a privately-owned, 18-hole daily fee public golf course and certain ancillary uses as long as they don't prevent the land from being used as a Golf Course.

### **The Project**

The Project contemplates a balance of development and open space, responding to the voluminous input received from the visioning and small area planning processes the city has been undertaking for the past 18 months. Of the Property's 155 acres, the Applicant will devote a minimum of 100 acres for publicly-accessible parks and open space, a majority of which will be dedicated to, and designed and maintained by the City as a public park. The remaining open space will be planned and maintained by the Applicant or another entity, and will be accessible by the general public. The parks and open space land will include an 80-acre contiguous open space area comprising the eastern half of the site, along with several greenway connections from Colorado Boulevard to the main park area, providing views and multi-modal access in and through the Project. LDR Concept Plan depicting parks and open space inserted below for reference:





**CONCEPT DIAGRAM**

- Property Boundary
- Park Space
- Landscape Promenade + Gardens + Play
- A-Line Train
- 303 Artway Heritage Trail
- Multimodal Corridors
- Roadway Connection

The remaining 55 acres will be a mixed-use neighborhood that extends the existing community, with infrastructure and a wide array of housing types, sizes, and price points to address diverse community needs. As will be more fully set forth in the Development Agreement, the Applicant will provide more affordable housing than is required under existing City regulations—including

the recently-adopted Expanding Housing Affordability regulations. In conformance with plan guidance, building heights will range from twelve stories in the northwestern portion of the site, providing the greatest density of homes closest to the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado rail station, to four stories in the areas fronting the future park land and the existing communities to the north and south.

The core of the Project will be a vibrant, highly walkable main street environment along a future extension of East 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This corridor will have high-comfort bike facilities linking the new park area with the 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue Greenway and City bike network to the west of the site. The Project contemplates shops, restaurants, and other active uses framing the East 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue main street corridor, leading into the park without going through the park. This will create the opportunity for a plaza to activate the park and create publicly accessible, active retail and community uses to provide needed adjacent to the new regional park.

C-MX zones are used along Colorado Boulevard so other community-serving commercial uses such as a grocery store, community non-profit offices, or live-work spaces can be located throughout the Project along Colorado Boulevard.

Overall, the rezoning allows the Project to be an extension of the existing City street grid and surrounding neighborhoods at densities appropriate for its location adjacent to a major commercial corridor and rail and bus transit. The mix of uses allowed by the rezoning will provide many of the elements of a complete neighborhood that have been lost to the Northeast Park Hill community over the years, such as a regional park, healthy food options, and other commercial uses that serve residents' daily needs. Most importantly, the Project will be accessible—both physically and economically—to all people, with a diversity of housing and employment options in close proximity to new, high-quality open space, and pedestrian and bicycle connections with streets and trails.

In connection with the Rezoning, the Applicant will request the City's approval of the Development Agreement, which will contain provisions pertaining to land dedication, construction of public improvements to support the Project, affordable housing obligations, vested property rights, and other matters.

### **Criteria for Rezoning**

Pursuant to the Code, all applications for rezoning must meet all of the “general review criteria” set forth in Section 12.4.10.7, as well as (i) at least one of the “justifying circumstances” of the first group of “additional review criteria” set forth in Section 12.4.10.8.A, and (ii) the additional review standard set forth in Section 12.4.10.8.B. The Rezoning meets these review criteria as follows.

#### ***I. CONSISTENCY WITH ADOPTED PLANS***

The proposed Rezoning is consistent with the City's adopted plans. Code § 12.4.10.7.A.

The City has adopted two major plans that guide the use and development of the Property: *Comprehensive Plan 2040* (the “**Comprehensive Plan**”) and *Blueprint Denver* (“**Blueprint**”). The Rezoning is consistent with each of these plans, as set forth in further detail below. In addition, the City is presently preparing the *Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan* (the “**Area Plan**”) to

guide development of the Property, a public draft (the “**Draft Area Plan**”) of which was released on August 2, 2022. This narrative describes the Rezoning’s consistency with the Draft Area Plan.

As discussed below, the Rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint. It is additionally consistent with the anticipated Area Plan.

#### *A. Comprehensive Plan*

The Comprehensive Plan envisions a city that (1) is equitable, affordable and inclusive; (2) has strong and authentic neighborhoods; (3) has connected, safe and accessible spaces; (4) is economically diverse and vibrant; (5) is environmentally resilient; and (6) is healthy and active. Comprehensive Plan, pp. 18-19.

As described in greater detail below, the Rezoning will advance each of the foregoing elements of the Comprehensive Plan. As a general matter, the Property’s current zoning designation and use as a privately-owned, fee-based golf course fails to advance any of the core elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Under the OS-B District, the Property is prohibited from being used for much-needed housing and commercial uses, and instead solely benefits the small fraction of the City’s population—which does not include families, people with disabilities, or other community members—that pays to use the golf course.

The Rezoning supports the following specific Comprehensive Plan goals:

##### Equitable, Affordable, and Inclusive.

- *Goal 1: Ensure all Denver residents have safe, convenient and affordable access to basic services and a variety of amenities.* The Rezoning will advance this goal in several respects. The Rezoning allows for the “development of housing units close to transit and mixed-use developments,” Comprehensive Plan p. 28, as the site is less than one-quarter mile from the 40th & Colorado transit station. The Rezoning will permit the development of needed commercial land uses—including a potential grocery store—in an area that presently lacks convenient access to basic commercial services. The neighborhood is presently considered a food desert and lacks access to fresh healthy food. Finally, the Rezoning will permit the creation of the City’s eleventh regional park within the Property, providing public, freely-accessible open space and recreational amenities. In contrast, if the Rezoning is not approved, a privately-owned, daily fee golf course is the sole permitted use on the Property.
- *Goal 2: Build housing as a continuum to serve residents across a range of incomes, ages and needs.* The Rezoning will permit a “greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood for all individuals and families” while also allowing for the “increase the development of senior-friendly and family friendly housing, including units with multiple bedrooms in multifamily developments.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 28. Current zoning does not allow for any new homes to be built on the site. The Rezoning will allow for the provision of a significant number of new housing types, from low-rise buildings to a higher-density, transit-oriented housing, allowing for a diversity of ages, incomes, and lifestyles. The diversity of housing types will create the opportunity for different price points, ownership structures, and accessibility. Combined with the quality of proposed

open spaces and amenities, the plan will create a complete neighborhood ecosystem for diverse residents to more easily age in place. The Development Agreement will require the Project to provide a significant proportion of for-sale affordable housing units that would serve middle-income households.

- *Goal 3: Develop housing that is affordable to residents of all income levels.* The Rezoning allows the City to use its “land use regulations to enable and encourage the private development of affordable, missing middle and mixed-income housing.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 28. The Project will incorporate significant affordable housing, the obligations related to which will be incorporated in the Development Agreement.
- *Goal 5: Reduce the involuntary displacement of residents and businesses.* The subject Property is presently undeveloped and does not contain any existing residences or businesses. As a result, no direct displacement will occur. However, to address displacement that may occur in the surrounding community, the Development Agreement will establish commitments for permanent affordable housing to be provided through a community land trust model and with non-profit partners who specialize in addressing the housing needs of Denver’s most vulnerable populations. The creation of affordable housing on site will help mitigate overall community displacement. In fact, when combined with the City’s anticipated affordable housing prioritization policy and certain other affordable housing strategies described above, the Project has the potential to bring residents and businesses that have been displaced in the past back to the neighborhood.
- *Goal 7: Make neighborhoods accessible to people of all ages and abilities.* The Rezoning permits the development of a mixed-use neighborhood with a variety of residential uses that will accommodate a diversity of ages and abilities. In contrast to this goal, the present zoning and use of the Property as a private golf course does not permit access for young children who do not play golf, people of limited means, or people with mobility impairments. By encouraging the development of a mixed-use community in a transit-accessible location which will include elevator-served multifamily for-sale and for-rent housing along with public parks and recreational opportunities, the Rezoning presents an opportunity to create a neighborhood that serves families, seniors, and people with disabilities.
- *Goal 8: Increase housing options for Denver’s most vulnerable populations.* The Area Plan recommends, and the Development Agreement will provide for, deeply affordable housing within the community. The Applicant has memoranda of understanding that establish development partnerships “with organizations to develop permanent and transitional housing affordable to very low-income populations.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 30. In addition, the Development Agreement will establish commitments for permanent affordability provided through a community land trust model and with non-profit partners who specialize in addressing the housing needs of Denver’s most vulnerable populations. The Northeast Park Hill community has a higher rate of poverty and other markers of vulnerability. The provision of affordable homes on site not only provides housing options for Denver as a whole, but will allow for many existing North Park Hill residents to remain in the neighborhood who may otherwise be displaced.

## Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods.

- *Goal 1: Create a city of complete neighborhoods.* The Rezoning permits the development of a vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood along a transit corridor and major arterial street. The Project is anticipated to incorporate a variety of housing types and community-oriented uses and services for a diverse population. The contiguous space and mixed-use commercial and main street zoning along Colorado Boulevard creates the ability for different scaled retail amenities such as a grocery store as well as small, local businesses to contribute to a complete neighborhood. Similarly, infrastructure such as wide sidewalks, greenways and a design overlay (DO-8) on the main street can support small, women- and minority-owned businesses as part of a dynamic retail district. Though the Project may be considered a complete neighborhood of its own, its true potential is to make the surrounding neighborhoods more complete by providing the elements they currently lack. The choices of lower intensity zone districts adjacent to existing neighborhoods will ensure appropriate transitions between existing neighborhoods and the Project. In contrast, under current restrictions, the Property fails to “offer a mix of housing types and services for a diverse population” or “build a network of well-connected, vibrant, mixed-use centers and corridors” Comprehensive Plan, p. 34.
- *Goal 2: Enhance Denver’s neighborhoods through high-quality urban design.* The Rezoning includes several elements that promote high-quality urban design. The proposed Waivers on the areas fronting the new open space and existing neighborhoods step building heights down to provide an appropriate transition of scale. The main street area along 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue incorporates the DO-8 Overlay to ensure a highly-walkable, transparent, and active environment. The Area Plan recognizes the importance of the new development honoring the design of the surrounding neighborhood in policy D1.B and suggests that design guidelines are used as a tool to guide the buildout of the Project. The design guidelines are anticipated to address matters such as architecture, streetscape design, and the interaction between the built environment and park areas. These guidelines will “improve design quality” while also creating “people-oriented places that embrace community character with thoughtful transitions, aspirational design and an engaging public realm” and using “urban design to contribute to economic viability, public health, safety, environmental well-being, neighborhood culture, and quality of life.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 34. Additionally, the Project is designed around core tenets of good urbanism such as a dynamic mix of uses, a connected, walkable grid, multi-modal access, and allocation of open space within easy access of all residents, open to the general public.
- *Goal 3: Preserve the authenticity of Denver’s neighborhoods and celebrate our history, architecture and culture.* The Project includes the preservation or creation of several important elements that reflect the stated desires and needs of the community. The existing clubhouse building on 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Ash Street will be preserved and available to the community for events and other uses, as it is currently used. The 303 Artway, a multi-modal cultural trail designed the community to reflect its heritage, will be enabled by the rezoning by removing the private golf course that stood in the way of a sensible alignment of the trail through the site. Current zoning and use restrictions do not allow the site to be operated as a publicly open space. The Rezoning allows for a large portion of the Property to become open space for the general public that reflects community culture.



- *Goal 4: Ensure every neighborhood is economically strong and dynamic.* The neighborhood surrounding the Property presently lacks needed community services, such as a fresh-food grocery store and other commercial uses. The Rezoning advances the Project goals of providing a large mixed-use site and main street for local businesses that will provide needed services and products for the surrounding community. The Property’s current zoning and use restriction prohibit any use beyond a golf course, however, the proposed Rezoning permits the Property to “grow and support neighborhood-serving businesses.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 35.
- *Goal 5: Create and preserve parks and public spaces that reflect the identity of Denver’s neighborhoods.* The Rezoning designates 80 acres into the OS-A District, and at its full buildout, the Project will create a total of 100 acres of new public and publicly-accessible parks and open space. The Property’s current use as a daily-fee, privately-owned golf course and OS-B District zoning designation do not advance this goal.

#### Connected, Safe, and Accessible Places.

- *Goal 1: Deliver a multimodal network that encourages more trips by walking, rolling, biking and transit.* The Property’s advantageous location, adjacent to the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado RTD station and along Colorado Boulevard, a transit-priority corridor, will enable the Project to take advantage of existing alternative transportation options. The Project also proposes pedestrian and bikeway connections on streets and within parks, including a high-comfort bikeway along 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and several parallel park greenways connecting to the proposed park area from the west. The 303 Artway will also create an important new multimodal path highlighting the culture and people of the community. As such, the Rezoning encourages the advancement of the Comprehensive Plan’s multimodal transportation goals and removes a private golf course that stood in the way of multimodal network connections to existing transit resources.
- *Goal 3: Maximize the public right-of-way to create great places.* The Rezoning applies the C-MX-5 district with the DO-8 overlay to a future extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Colorado Boulevard. The underlying main street zoning prioritizes active uses and engaging architecture along the 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor – a corridor proposed to be a walkable, shop- and restaurant-lined street within the Project. To provide a more extensive ROW area dedicated to pedestrian space, the DO-8 overlay provides for a two foot setback that can be used for an extended sidewalk area, seating and amenities, and other elements aimed to improve the urban design of the corridor and provide a more comfortable, safer pedestrian environment. The DO-8 overlay will also require higher quality building façade and transparency design along this frontage, which will improve the experience along the corridor. The proposed Project is expected to have additional building setbacks beyond those required in the underlying zoning to create a more extensive public realm. All streets within the project are expected to have pedestrian-oriented streetscape design to promote walkability within the community. In addition, the Project proposes several upgrades to existing streets and intersections to improve the safety and quality of the public rights of way.

- *Goal 8: Strengthen multimodal connections in mixed-use centers and focus growth near transit.* The Rezoning allows for “transit-oriented development encourage higher density development, including affordable housing, near transit to support ridership.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 42. The Rezoning allows for the greatest intensity of housing to be located closest to the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado RTD station with opportunities for density along Colorado Boulevard, a transit priority corridor. Incorporating the 303 Artway, which is only possible if the site is no longer a privately-owned golf course, also creates an enhanced non-vehicular connection to the newly planned mixed-use center and the existing multi-modal rail transit station at 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado.

#### Economically Diverse and Vibrant.

- *Goal 1: Ensure economic mobility and improve access to opportunity.* The Rezoning creates a diverse housing and commercial ecosystem that provides for household stability and wealth building. The wide range of building heights will allow for a wide range of housing types including forms of missing middle housing. Replacing an exclusive land use like a privately-owned golf course with housing that includes permanent affordability and commercial spaces near transit will allow for households to return to the neighborhood and stabilize in order to focus on education, career and family. In addition to the housing, the rezoning creates a main street zone along 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue that will have a variety of ground floor commercial spaces for local businesses to incubate and thrive.
- *Goal 3: Sustain and grow Denver’s local neighborhood businesses.* The Property is located in an area that is presently underserved by neighborhood-oriented commercial uses. The Rezoning presents a generational opportunity to create a neighborhood business district and allow more space for local business to expand. The Rezoning allows the development of the Property with a mix of uses, including ground-level commercial spaces that will serve community needs. Beyond the base requirement for affordable housing inherent in the rezoning and development of the project, the Development Agreement will include requirements for the creation of affordable housing that will provide local employees much-needed housing and thus assist local businesses with workforce attraction and retention.

#### Environmentally Resilient

- *Goal 1: Mitigate climate impact by significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions.* This goal identifies transit-oriented development as a key to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Rezoning permits mixed-use development in an area adjacent to existing public transit, and will integrate conservation efforts—including the creation of 100 acres of public parks and open space—into the Project. In addition, any buildings constructed on the Property will be subject to current City requirements related to the reduction of “energy use by buildings” and “green building design” (p. 52).
- *Goal 3: Conserve water and use it more efficiently.* Allowing for uses beyond a golf course, which is currently the only permitted use, will greatly advance this Comprehensive Plan goal. The Property’s existing use is antithetical to the conservation of water. In its final year in operation, the golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water and

three tons of fertilizer. Mixed-use, compact development permitted by the Rezoning will result in less water-consumptive uses per capita. The proposed regional park and the proposed greenways will allow for creative approaches to minimizing water usage in public open spaces as well as implement green stormwater infrastructure that can more responsibly manage water onsite.

- *Goal 4: Integrate stormwater into the built environment by using green infrastructure to improve water quality and reduce runoff.* The proposed Project contemplates the use of green stormwater infrastructure integrated into the design of its greenways and open spaces. These proposed approaches will more responsibly handle water and reduce runoff. Additionally, the Applicant will, subject to the terms of the Development Agreement, transfer fee ownership of the constructed 25-acre stormwater detention area to the City. Per Draft Area Plan in section 3.2.2 Quality-of-Life Recommendations, policies Q1.D, Q3.B and Q5, the detention facility can be incorporated into future parks on the Property, to serve as an amenity for the community.
- *Goal 6: Protect and expand Denver’s green infrastructure network.* The proposed OS-A District allows for a city-owned park where only a golf course is currently allowed. The plan, which devotes nearly two-thirds of the overall Property to parks and open space, “recognize(s) parks, public space, trees and plants as vital elements of green infrastructure.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 54. Additionally, the existing golf course does not help to “expand the citywide tree canopy,” Comprehensive Plan, p. 54. The Rezoning allows for development that is more compatible with the expansion of the City’s tree canopy.
- *Goal 8: Clean our soils, conserve land and grow responsibly.* The Rezoning advances this goal by permitting infill development where infrastructure and services presently exist, encouraging mixed-use development, focusing development near transit, and allows for the remediation of land that has been put to other uses.
- *Goal 9: Protect and improve air quality.* The Rezoning supports a new “mixed-use, walkable neighborhood,” Comprehensive Plan, p. 54, and helps expand the “the use of transit” to improve the City’s air quality. The rezoning concentrates housing near transit that would otherwise be pushed further away from transit resources.

#### Healthy and Active

- *Goal 1: Create and enhance environments that support physical activity and healthy living.* The Rezoning of a large portion of on the eastern half of the site to the OS-A district, a public park district, will facilitate the creation of the City’s 11<sup>th</sup> regional park and helps “recognize parks, recreation and the urban forest as vital components of a complete community.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 58. The Project’s proposed walkable form, sidewalks and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure furthers the goal by making feasible the use of active modes of transportation for a greater portion of daily trips. In addition, the

parks and open space will provide the opportunity for multiple active recreational opportunities.

- *Goal 2: Provide high-quality parks, recreation facilities and programs that serve all Denver residents.* Rezoning a large portion of the site to OS-A, a public park district, permits a high-quality regionally sized park, helping to “ensure equitable access to parks and recreation amenities for all residents” and making “Denver’s healthy outdoor lifestyle accessible to residents of all ages and backgrounds.” Comprehensive Plan, p. 58. The Rezoning will increase the number of City residents within a 10-minute walk of a park and provide diverse housing resources within that walkshed. The regional park will be a park facility that truly serves all Denver residents.

## **B. *Blueprint***

Neighborhood Context, Place Type, and Street Type Designation. The Rezoning is or will be consistent with the neighborhood context, the future place type, the growth strategy, adjacent street types, plan policies and strategies, and equity concepts contained in Blueprint. The Future Neighborhood Context as currently defined in Blueprint identifies the site as “Urban Edge”. Based on this designation, the growth area strategy is currently considered as “all other areas of the city”. Blueprint currently identifies the future places type as “Other Park and Open Space”. These places are privately-owned parks and/or open spaces, and "it is possible their use could change in the future. When large private open spaces are planned to change, the community should be engaged in planning for the future vision of the site" (p. 153). Through the Area Plan process and under direct consultation with the applicant, extensive engagement has been undertaken and the community has been an integral in envisioning the future uses of the site consistent with the Blueprint Denver guidance. As a result, the recommendations of the Draft Area Plan closely reflect the voice of the community and the Rezoning directly complies with the recommendations in that plan. The Future Neighborhood Context, Future Place type, and the growth area strategy will all be updated as part of the Area Plan. As Blueprint indicates, “Because NPI area plans address specific areas in more detail than is possible in citywide plans, they are also intended to update Blueprint Denver’s maps and to refine its strategies with respect to those areas.” Blueprint, p. 62. Thus, upon adoption of the Area Plan, proposed Rezoning will be consistent with updated plan designations in Blueprint. The Rezoning’s conformance to Draft Area Plan’s neighborhood context, place type, and street type designations is discussed below.

- Plan Policies and Strategies. The Rezoning meets several specific plan policies and strategies set forth in Blueprint as discussed below:*Policy 9: Promote coordinated development on large infill sites to ensure new development integrates with its surroundings and provides appropriate community benefits.* This Rezoning will follow the completion of a Large Development Framework for the Property, which guides coordination of the Project’s buildout. The Development Agreement will supplement the Rezoning to ensure the provision of public benefits such as regional parks, affordable housing, and other community amenities. Following the Rezoning, the Large Development Framework requires the Applicant to prepare an Infrastructure Master Plan to address infrastructure coordination on the Property. This Rezoning also includes a decreasing scale of proposed zone districts and the use of Waivers reducing height across the site with the

lowest, least-intensive areas fronting existing neighborhoods which helps further the goal of integrating with its surroundings.

#### *Land Use and Built Form: Housing*

- *Policy 6: Increase the development of affordable housing and mixed-income housing, particularly in areas near transit, services and amenities.* The Rezoning permits a significant amount of affordable housing in close proximity to the 40th & Colorado transit station. The Development Agreement will include the provision of a much higher proportion of affordable housing than is required by Code.

#### *Land Use and Built Form: Design Quality & Preservation*

- *Policy 3: Create exceptional design outcomes in key centers and corridors.* The Rezoning establishes building forms and design requirements that are consistent with the City's mixed-use zone districts. The Rezoning also establishes the DO-8 Overlay along the proposed "main street" environment planned for 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Colorado Boulevard. The use of waivers to step down in height adjacent to existing neighborhoods and the proposed park also promotes good urban form. In addition, the Applicant anticipates establishing privately-enforced design guidelines to enhance design review and quality built form in the Project.
- *Policy 4: Ensure an active and pedestrian-friendly environment that provides a true mixed-use character in centers and corridors.* The Project will create a walkable, mixed-use neighborhood with pedestrian-scale building facades and streetscapes and a small, walkable block structure, and will build upon Colorado Boulevard as a mixed-use arterial corridor. The Property's current use and zoning restrictions prohibit the creation of this type of pedestrian-friendly environment.

#### *Mobility*

- *Policy 1: Encourage mode-shift — more trips by walking and rolling, biking and transit — through efficient land use and infrastructure improvements.* The Rezoning supports the use of transit and non-motorized transportation, as it promotes higher density development adjacent to a transit station and along a transit-priority corridor. The Project's proposed mix of uses also allow for more trips to be made locally on foot or bike within the site or to areas nearby. The rezoning also allows the creation of publicly accessible multimodal connections through the site.
- *Policy 2: Protect and expand Denver's tree canopy on both public and private property.* The creation of a new public park, which will be allowed by the Rezoning, offers an opportunity to greatly increase the tree canopy in a neighborhood that presently lacks tree canopy. The Property's current restrictions prohibit expansion of the tree canopy, as increased tree canopy is inconsistent with the operation of the golf course.
- *Policy 5: Ensure attractive streets and outdoor spaces in all centers and corridors, giving priority to pedestrian spaces and amenities.* The use of the C-MS-5 district and DO-8 overlay on the future extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Colorado Boulevard will ensure a



high quality public realm by adding additional space behind the property line through required setbacks and by requiring more active and engaging architecture on the ground floor of any building fronting on this corridor. The rezoning also requests MX and RX zone districts which require a high degree of engagement with the street on the ground floor of buildings. The Project proposes additional setbacks to expand the public realm across the project. The expansion of the City’s street network through the Property offers an opportunity to develop pedestrian-oriented street infrastructure, with attractive streetscaping treatments.

Equity Concepts. Blueprint Denver identifies three equity concepts: Improving Access to Opportunity, Reducing Vulnerability to Displacement and Expanding Housing and Jobs Diversity. The area surrounding the Property presently has some of the lowest indicators of access to opportunity (p. 35). The Rezoning affords increased access to jobs, basic goods and services, entertainment and shopping. The neighborhood is also among the most vulnerable in the City to involuntary displacement (p. 39). By developing this privately-owned, underutilized Property with a mix of commercial uses and housing, the risks of involuntary displacement are mitigated. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the Development Agreement will offer prioritization for existing City and area residents, to ensure that residents at the greatest risk of displacement will have access to new affordable housing opportunities in the community. What is more, the Rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement will create economic development opportunities for small business owners and community members to build wealth, in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood. City data also indicate that the area around the Property needs more housing diversity (p. 43). The Rezoning will allow for a significant amount of both for-sale and rental housing at a mix of affordability levels, thus advancing the goal of bringing housing diversity to the neighborhood.

### ***C. Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan***



At the time of this application, the City is in the process of completing the Area Plan. The Draft Area Plan was released on August 2, 2022 for public comment. Once adopted, the Area Plan will be a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint. As a result, the plan guidance, Neighborhood Context, Future Place Types, and Future Street Types within the current version of Blueprint are expected to change to those that will be adopted as part of the Area Plan. As Blueprint indicates, “area plans address specific areas in more detail than is possible in citywide plans, they are also intended to update Blueprint Denver’s maps and to refine its strategies with respect to those areas.” Blueprint, p. 62.

Neighborhood Context. The Draft Area Plan designates the Property in three different context areas. The “Urban Center” context will run along the Colorado Boulevard frontage, extending the Urban Center area from north of 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue through the site, and along a future eastward extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The “General Urban” context is proposed for the area east of Ash Street on either side of the 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue Urban Center context to the proposed park area. Finally, the large park area on the eastern portion of the Property is designated in the “Districts/Regional Park” context. The Rezoning thus conforms with the proposed neighborhood contexts in the Draft Area Plan. Blueprint currently identifies the site as within the “Urban Edge” context. Draft Area Plan, Section 3.3 Land Use and Built Form, 3.3.1 Neighborhood Context, pp. 42-43. Blueprint currently

identifies the site as within the “Urban Edge” context. Draft Area Plan, Section 3.3 Land Use and Built Form, 3.3.1 Neighborhood Context, pp. 42-43.

**Future Place Type.** The Draft Area Plan proposes three future place types on the site: “Community Center” in the same area as the Urban Center context described above, “Residential High-Medium” in the same area as the General Urban context described above, and “Regional Park” in the same area as the Districts/Regional Park context described above.

The Draft Area Plan designates the Property within the Community Center, High-Medium Residential and Regional Park place types. The Community Center future place type “provides some mix of office, commercial and residential” (Blueprint, p. 210) within this context, all of which are allowable uses within the C-MX-12, C-MX-8, C-MX-5 districts. The G-RX-5 districts align with the future High-Medium Residential place type. The Area Plan’s proposed Regional Park place type directly aligns with the Rezoning’s OS-A zone district. Draft Area Plan, Section 3.3.2 Quality-of-Life Recommendations, Future Places 2040, pp. 44-45. Blueprint currently identifies the site as within the “Other Park and Open Space” future place type.



**Future Street Types.** Blueprint shows that the Property is bordered by four future street types:

- Colorado Boulevard: Mixed-use Arterial

- East 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue: Residential Collector
- Dahlia Street: Industrial Collector
- Smith Road: Industrial Arterial


The Draft Area Plan contemplates a change only to the Dahlia Street designation, proposing it as a future “Mixed-Use Collector.” The Rezoning is consistent with both the existing designations on the other three corridors and this future designation on Dahlia Street. Draft Area Plan, 3.4 Mobility, 3.4.1 Street Types, pp. 60-61.

Additionally, the Draft Area Plan recommends a “Main Street Collector” along a future eastward extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The Rezoning conforms with this recommendation. Blueprint explains that Main Streets are “characterized by a mix of uses including retail, services and restaurants, as well as residential. Buildings are pedestrian-oriented, with little front setback, a continuous street wall, and high transparency”. Blueprint, p. 159. The Rezoning proposes the C-MS-5 district along the future 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue in direct alignment with the Draft Area

Plan recommendation. Additionally, the Rezoning proposes the DO-8 Overlay, which allows for a corridor where “street level uses are highly activated, including cafe seating in the right-of-way.” Blueprint, p. 159.

Finally, the Draft Area Plan recommends a “Mixed-Use Collector” designation along a future extension of Ash Street from the south, connecting to Albion Street to the north. Any alignment of future roads within the Project will pass through a variety of Mixed-Use, Main Street, or Residential Mixed-Use zone districts, as proposed in the Rezoning. As a result, the Rezoning meets the intent of this recommendation.

**Building Heights.** The Draft Area Plan recommends building heights from twelve stories in the northwestern most corner of the Property, stepping down in concentric zones with the lowest, four-story areas fronting the proposed OS-A District and the neighborhoods to the north and south. The Rezoning directly conforms to this proposed height plan, although it proposes less acreage within 12-story zone districts in order to address community feedback received during the public engagement process. Draft Area Plan, 3.3 Land Use and Built Form, 3.3.3 Building Heights, pp.



46-47.

**Open Space.** The Draft Area Plan recommends a minimum of 100 acres of open space. The Rezoning includes 80 acres within the OS-A District, and the Development Agreement will commit additional publicly-accessible open space elsewhere within the Project. The Draft Area Plan recommends open space connections from Colorado Boulevard to the large park, via multiple greenway connections. The proposed Project will allow these connections to be realized, resulting in a minimum of 100 acres of parks and open space. Draft Area Plan, 3.2 Quality of Life, 3.2.2 Quality-of-Life Recommendations, pp. 34-41.

**Waivers and Design Overlay.** The Draft Area Plan recommends “a future main street,” a future extension of East 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, that encourages an enjoyable experience through engaged and active uses, such as shops and restaurants at the street level adjacent to sidewalks and open spaces, and recommends that building designs have strong connections between the sidewalk, open spaces, and building activities. To achieve this, the plan recommends the “application of a custom zoning tool like a design overlay to promote an active mix of uses at street level.” Draft Area Plan, 3.3 Land Use and Built Form, 3.3.5 Design Quality Recommendations, Policies D3 and D4, pp. 52-53.

The Rezoning proposes the use of the DO-8 Overlay in conjunction and coterminous with the proposed C-MS-5 zone district along the future extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The intent of the DO-8 “is to encourage neighborhood mixed-use areas that support nonresidential active uses at the Street Level, promote active pedestrian-oriented building frontages, and provide sufficient space for transitions between the public realm and private residential Dwellings.” DZC § 9.4.5.12.B

The Draft Area Plan recommends a height limit of four stories in areas fronting the existing neighborhoods to the north and south, as well as along the future regional park. The DZC does not provide a zone district with a height limit of four stories. As a result, the Rezoning proposes waivers on the portions of the C-MX-5 and G-RX-5 districts closest to those sensitive areas limiting the height of those areas to four stories. This use of waivers is supported by the Draft Area Plan recommendation to use “customized zoning solutions such as waivers to achieve maximum height recommendations.” Draft Area Plan p. 53, Policy D4.B. The Draft Area Plan recommends the use of use of “standard zone districts rather than a Planned Unit Development (PUD) on this site [to increase] transparency, predictability, and flexibility to respond to the community’s needs and desires.” Draft Area Plan p. 53, Policy D4. This Rezoning’s approach of using standard districts with waivers is consistent with both of these recommendations.

#### ***D. Equity Analysis***

The Rezoning addresses several elements of the City-prepared Equity Analysis relating to the Property, as follows.

Access to Opportunity. The neighborhood scores 2.33-2.56 out of 4.0 on this metric. The neighborhood is less equitable *in life expectancy and childhood obesity*.

The Rezoning proposes zoning 80 acres in the OS-A District, for the creation of a public park, with additional publicly-accessible open space. The Rezoning will facilitate the creation of a large regional park accessible to the general public as opposed to the privately-owned golf course use that is permitted under existing entitlements. A large regional park will promote greater levels of activity and recreation for the entire community. Open space is known to promote public health, including reducing obesity. The Rezoning also proposes zone districts that promote walkability and a varied street level experience which is known to promote walking and biking and other active uses. Life expectancy will likely be improved for a larger portion of the community through access to quality open space and a walkable district with housing options available to all ages, abilities, and income levels.

The site has *less access to Centers and Corridors and Grocery Stores*. The Rezoning proposes a main street environment with the DO-8 Overlay along the future extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, thus promoting a mixed-use, walkable corridor that is presently unavailable in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood. The Project also proposes a new pedestrian crossing at Colorado Boulevard and 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, providing new connectivity to centers and corridors. The Rezoning will permit community-oriented commercial uses, including a grocery store, near the corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard, addressing this equity metric directly.



Vulnerability to Involuntary Displacement. The neighborhood scores 3.0 out of 3.0 on this metric. The neighborhood is more vulnerable in the areas of *Median Household Income, Educational Attainment, and Percent Renter Occupied.*

The Rezoning will allow for a variety of housing types, sizes, price points, and ownership and rental options. The inclusion of affordable for-sale residential units, as will be required in the Development Agreement, will substantially benefit the site and the surrounding community in providing realistic ownership options. The Project proposes a mix of housing types that will ensure a more even balance of renter- and owner-occupied homes as well as provide housing options for those with limited means and lower household incomes.

Housing Diversity. The neighborhood scores 2.0 out of 5.0 on this metric. The neighborhood is less diverse in the areas of *Housing Cost, Mix of Rented and Owned Homes, and Bedroom Counts in Homes.*

As mentioned above, the Rezoning will allow for a variety of housing types, sizes, price points, and ownership and rental options. The Applicant's affordable housing commitments will be set forth in the Development Agreement, and will ensure that new housing options will be available to households with a variety of incomes. The wide range of housing options as contemplated by the Project will also provide the opportunity for housing options with a variety of bedroom counts. Most notably, not only does the Project contemplate a wide array of housing options, it stands in stark contrast to the prohibition of housing across the entire site due to the limitations of the existing zoning and the Use Restriction, which allows only a golf course use on the site and prohibits residential uses.

Jobs Diversity. The area currently has 5,932 jobs, totaling 5.91 jobs per acre. The site has lower than citywide averages of *retail jobs and innovation jobs.* Currently, the area has a higher than citywide average of manufacturing jobs as a result of the light industrial areas surrounding the site, primarily to the east.

The Project, facilitated by the Rezoning, contemplates a main street corridor along 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue that will provide the foundation for new jobs within the Property. The C-MS-5 District and DO-8 Overlay proposed in the Rezoning are both oriented towards promoting active non-residential commercial uses. Additionally, the Project contemplates commercial land uses, which may include a grocery store, near the corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard, which will provide additional jobs.

## **II. UNIFORMITY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS**

The proposed Rezoning results in the uniform application of zone district building form use and design regulations. The Rezoning will result in the application of existing zone districts and design overlays established pursuant to the Code

## **III. PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND GENERAL WELFARE**

In addition to implementing the City's adopted land use plans, the Rezoning will further the City's public health, safety and general welfare. Increasing density on a high-capacity transit corridor and in close proximity to a fixed transit station will support walking and multi-modal transit

options, which supports public health outcomes and benefits the City by mitigating climate change impacts of single-occupancy vehicles. Furthermore, the Rezoning will enable the creation of over 100 acres of parks and open space, bringing significant public health benefits by allowing for increased outdoor and recreation opportunities. Finally, the increased employment and housing opportunities in a presently-underserved neighborhood furthers the general welfare of the City.

#### ***IV. JUSTIFYING CIRCUMSTANCES***

Since the approval of the OS-B District on the Property, there has been a change to such a degree that the proposed rezoning is in the public interest. Specifically, the City's adoption of the Area Plan establishes the required justifying circumstance. In addition it is worth noting that when the Use Restriction was first put in place on the Property, the A-Line and the 40<sup>th</sup> and Colorado Station were not planned or implemented. In addition, the Denver Moves plan did not contemplate Colorado Boulevard for a bus rapid transit corridor.

#### ***V. CONSISTENCY WITH NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT DESCRIPTION, ZONE DISTRICT PURPOSE AND INTENT STATEMENTS***

The Rezoning meets the neighborhood context, zone district purpose, and intent statements for each of the proposed zone districts as follows:

- *C-MX-12, C-MX-8, and C-MX-5 District.* The Urban Center context is intended for mixed-use development, with regular block patterns, zero-lot line or otherwise shallow building placement, and a high pedestrian and bicycle orientation. DZC § 7.1. The C-MX districts in particular are intended: (a) “to promote safe, active, and pedestrian-scaled, diverse areas through the use of building forms that clearly define and activate the public street edge,” DZC § 7.2.2.1.A; (b) “to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering within and around the city’s neighborhoods,” DZC § 7.2.2.1.B; and (c) “to ensure new development contributes positively to established residential neighborhoods and character, and improves the transition between commercial development and adjacent residential neighborhoods,” DZC § 7.2.2.1.C. The proposed C-MX-12, C-MX-8, and C-MX-5 Districts are consistent with this intent, as they are intended to permit the development of a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood on the Property.
- *C-MS-5 District.* As with the Mixed-Use districts above, this Main Street zone district is intended for mixed-use development, with regular block patterns, zero-lot line or otherwise shallow building placement, and a high pedestrian and bicycle orientation. DZC § 7.1. The C-MS districts in particular are intended: (a) “to promote safe, active, and pedestrian-scaled commercial streets through the use of building forms that clearly define and activate the public street edge,” DZC § 7.2.4.1.A; (b) “to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering along the city’s commercial streets,” DZC § 7.2.4.1.B; and “applied where active Street Level retail is desired” DZC § 7.2.4.1.E. The proposed C-MS-5 District is consistent with this intent, as it is intended to permit the development of an active, walkable main street environment as is proposed along the future extension of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

- G-RX-5 District.* The General context is intended to support multi-unit residential buildings in a variety of building forms, with regular block patterns, zero lot-line or shallow building placement, and a balance of non-motorized and motorized transportation forms. DZC § 6.1. The G-RX-5 District in particular is intended: (a) “to promote safe, active, and pedestrian-scaled, diverse areas through the use of town house, row house, apartment, and shopfront building forms that clearly define and activate the public street edge,” DZC § 6.2.3.1.A; (b) “to promote safe, active, and pedestrian-scaled, diverse areas through the use of town house, row house, apartment, and shopfront building forms that clearly define and activate the public street edge,” DZC § 6.2.3.1.B; and (c) “to ensure new development contributes positively to established residential neighborhoods and character, and improves the transition between commercial development and adjacent residential neighborhoods” DZC § 6.2.3.1.C. As the G-RX-5 District will be located between the proposed neighborhood center and adjacent residential areas, the purpose of the G-RX-5 District is advanced by the Rezoning.
- OS-A District.* The proposed OS-A District zoning for the future regional park is consistent with the context, purpose, and intent statements for OS-A District zoning. The Open Space context supports public and private parks and open space. The OS-A District is specifically “intended to protect and preserve public parks owned, operated or leased by the City and managed by the City’s Department of Parks and Recreation (“**DPR**”) for park purposes.” DZC § 9.3.2.1.A. As the future regional park will be transferred to City ownership following the Rezoning, the proposed OS-A District is consistent with the context, purpose, and intent statements.





# 3.

# Additional Attachments

# Outreach Documentation

---



## **Outreach Summary**

Beginning in 2016, the future use of the Park Hill Golf Course property has undergone one of the most robust community input processes in the history of Denver.

The previous owner of the site, Clayton Early Learning, originally conducted an 18-month community outreach process which engaged several hundred community members through community forums and open houses, individual meetings, a survey, and meetings of a Citizens Advisory Committee.

Following our purchase of the property, we have met with the District 8 Council Member Chris Herndon on numerous occasions. We have also communicated with the majority of the remainder of City Council given the significance of this site and its potential to address various City needs and priorities.

Along with outreach to elected officials, we have had met on multiple occasions with RNO's representing both the immediate neighborhood such as the Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., Northeast Park Hill Coalition, Overlook at Park Hill Neighborhood Association, Clayton United, East Denver Residents Council, along with other RNO's across the City.

We also conducted outreach to: NAREB, NAACP, Urban League, all of the businesses along Dahlia, Owner of Park Hill 4000 and Park Hill Station, Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (Renaissance North Colorado Station), Urban land Conservancy, Prodigy Coffee and multiple neighborhood churches and Mosques.

Additionally, we have also had dozens of individual conversations with our neighbors to ensure this rezoning proposal reflects their vision for the neighborhood.

Combined with our outreach as the applicant, we have also participated in the City's year-long community-driven planning process for the property.

This process included: 1,302 completed mail surveys (from residents within one-mile of the property), 1,388 online surveys, 300 Open House attendees, 100 Community Workshop attendees, 18 Community Talks (small groups of 8-12 people), 101 individual conversations, 8 Community Steering Committee Meetings.

Overall, our community outreach, as well as the outreach conducted by Clayton Early Learning and the City & County of Denver have all lead to shared conclusions which are directly reflected in our rezoning proposal.

The community has consistently shown strong support for development on this site which can address neighborhood needs such as affordable housing, healthy food and shopping options. The community has also demonstrated support for parks and open space on the site instead of a water-intensive, privately-owned golf course.

To best reflect the results of our own community outreach in conjunction with the over six years of cumulative outreach, we have shaped this rezoning proposal to balance the neighborhood's support for a mix of development, as well as parks and open space.

# Individual Authorization to Sign

---

**UNANIMOUS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE MEMBERS  
OF  
ACM PARK HILL JV VII LLC**

The undersigned, being all of the members (the “**Members**”) of ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC, a Delaware limited liability company (the “**Company**”), hereby adopt the following resolutions by unanimous written consent as of August 2, 2022:

WHEREAS, the Company owns the Property (as defined in the Limited Liability Company Agreement of the Company dated July 11, 2019, as amended) and the Members desire to rezone the Property (the “**Rezoning**”) substantially in conformance with that certain Park Hill Golf Course Zone Map Amendment Application dated August 3, 2022 (the “**Rezoning Application**”);

WHEREAS, the Members desire to authorize, approve and ratify the Rezoning, including the execution and delivery of the Rezoning Application and all documents required to accomplish the Rezoning, all as more fully set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Members of the Company hereby authorize, approve and ratify in all respects the Rezoning and all acts heretofore done and all Company acts required in the future to accomplish the Rezoning;

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Members of the Company hereby authorize and direct Andrew R. Klein (solely with respect to the matters set forth herein, the “**Authorized Signatory**”) to perform all acts and execute and deliver, on behalf of the Company from time to time as necessary, all documents required to accomplish the Rezoning, including without limitation the Rezoning Application, and such execution and delivery by the Authorized Signatory shall evidence and be the binding acts and deeds of the Company; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that any number of counterparts hereof may be executed, each of which shall for all purposes be deemed an original and all of which shall constitute the same document.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being all of the Members of the Company, have executed this unanimous written consent to be effective as of the date first written above.

**MEMBERS:**


**ACM PARK HILL VII-C LLC,**  
a Delaware limited liability company

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Its: \_\_\_\_\_


**OZ PARK HILL LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By:   
Name: Andrew R. Klein  
Its: Manager

**GOPHER PH LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By:   
Name: Andrew R. Klein  
Its: Manager


**PARK HILL OOF, LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By:   
Name: WAYNE F. VADEN  
Its: MANAGER

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being all of the Members of the Company, have executed this unanimous written consent to be effective as of the date first written above.

**MEMBERS:**

**ACM PARK HILL VII-C LLC,**  
a Delaware limited liability company

By:   
Name: Ivan Zinn  
Its: Authorized Signatory

**OZ PARK HILL LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: Andrew R. Klein  
Its: Manager

**GOPHER PH LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: Andrew R. Klein  
Its: Manager

**PARK HILL QOF, LLC,**  
a Colorado limited liability company

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Its: \_\_\_\_\_



# Rezoning Waivers Request Form

---

## Rezoning Waiver(s) and/or Condition(s) Request Form

PROPERTY OWNER/ APPLICANT INFORMATION			
Property Owner/ Applicant Name	ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC / Westside Investment Partners, Inc.		
SUBJECT PROPERTY INFORMATION			
Address of property to be rezoned that waiver is requested	4141 E. 35th Avenue, Denver, CO <b>Note:</b> the proposed waivers will not apply to the entirety of the property at this address. The waivers will apply to certain portions of the site as described in the attached legal descriptions		
Current Zone District:	OS-B		
Requested/Proposed Zone District:	C-MX-5 and G-RX-5		
BACKGROUND AND INSTRUCTIONS			
<p>Section 12.4.10.6 of the Denver Zoning Code (DZC) authorizes the City Council to adopt waivers or reasonable conditions to an Official Map Amendment at the request of the applicant, provided the applicant approves such waivers in writing.</p> <p>In the first column of the table below, list the current code section (as it is today in the DZC) that is requested to be modified in the proposed zone district. In the second column, write the proposed alternative standard. In the third column, list the difference between the existing and proposed, if applicable. In the fourth column, provide justification or reasoning on why the current standard can't be met and a waiver/condition is necessary and justified.</p> <p>If requesting more than one waiver, repeat on the second page. Once completed, submit with your rezoning application or return to your case manager via email.</p> <p>Once the rezoning request with waivers is approved by City Council and adopted, the waivers cited below shall apply to all successors and assigns of the property, who along with the present owner(s), shall be deemed to have waived all objections as to the constitutionality of these provisions.</p>			
WAIVER REQUEST			
Current Standard	Proposed Waiver	Difference between current and proposed standard	Justification
<i>Example: DZC Sec. 3.3.4.5.A Detached accessory dwelling unit - minimum lot size 8,500 sq. ft.</i>	<i>Waive minimum lot size requirement from 8,500 sq ft to 7,000 sq ft for detached accessory unit in the S-SU-D1 zone district</i>	<i>A reduction of 1,500 sq. ft. to the minimum lot size in the S-SU-D1 zone district</i>	<i>There currently is not a zone district that allows for ADU's on parcels smaller than 8,500 sq. ft. in the Suburban Context. The subject parcel is 7,000 sq. ft. in size.</i>
DZC Sec. 7.3. The tallest allowed structures (excluding height exceptions in DZC Sec. 7.3.7) within the <b>C-MX-5</b> zone district are five stories and 70 feet.	Waive maximum height from five stories and 70 feet to four stories and 55 feet. Height exceptions will retain allowances permitted in the C-MX-5 zone.	A reduction in maximum height from 5 stories to 4 stories and from 70' to 55' in the identified C-MX-5 zone districts.	There currently is not a zone district with a maximum height limit of four stories within the Urban Center neighborhood context. Guidance within the draft Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan indicate a desire for a four story height limit in the areas reflected in this request. This plan guidance reflects community and steering committee feedback.

Last updated: September 21, 2021

201 W. Colfax Ave., Dept. 205


Denver, CO 80202

720-865-2974 • rezoning@denvergov.org

WAIVER REQUEST (CONTINUED, IF APPLICABLE)			
Current Standard	Proposed Waiver	Difference between current and proposed standard	Justification
DZC Sec. 6.3. The tallest allowed structures (excluding height exceptions in DZC Sec. 6.3.7) within the <b>G-RX-5</b> zone district are five stories and 70 feet.	Waive maximum height (excluding height exceptions in DZC Sec. 6.3.7) from five stories and 70 feet to four stories and <b>55 feet</b> .	A reduction in maximum height from 5 stories to 4 stories and from 70' to 55' in the identified G-RX-5 zone districts.	There currently is not a zone district with a maximum height limit of four stories within the General Urban neighborhood context. Guidance within the draft Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan indicate a desire for a four story height limit in the areas reflected in this request. This plan guidance reflects community and steering committee feedback.

### PROPERTY OWNER OR PROPERTY OWNER(S) REPRESENTATIVE CERTIFICATION

We, the undersigned represent that we are the owner(s) of the property described opposite our names, or have the authorization to sign on behalf of the owner as evidenced by a Power of Attorney or other authorization provided and attached to the official map amendment application and that we do hereby request consideration of the following waivers as part of the associated application. I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all information supplied with this application is true and accurate. I understand that without such owner consent, the requested official map amendment action cannot lawfully be accomplished.

Property Owner Name(s) (please type or print legibly)	Property Address City, State, Zip Email	Signature
<b>EXAMPLE</b> John Alan Smith and Josie Q. Smith	123 Sesame Street Denver, CO 80202 sample@sample.gov	
Westside Investment Partners, Inc ACM Park Hill JV VII LLC	4141 E. 35th Avenue, Denver, CO 80207	

# Proposed Waivers

---

Waivers for the properties located at 4141 E 35<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Per Denver Zoning Code Section 12.4.10.6, Waivers of Rights and Obligations and Approval of Reasonable Conditions, I, the undersigned applicant for the property under application for the rezoning referenced herein, request that the C-MX-5 zoning classification of the land described herein include the following waivers:

1. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories pursuant to Sections 7.3.3.3.A (Town House building form), a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.D (General building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.I (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:


No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House, General or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 4 stories in building height.

Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 7.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the C-MX-5 zone district.

2. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.A (Town House building form), a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.D (General building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Section 7.3.3.3.I (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House, General or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 55 feet in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 7.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the C-MX-5 zone district.

3. Waive the right to use maximum height with incentives in stories and feet pursuant to Section 10.12.1 (Height Incentives), DZC.



Andrew R. Klein, Authorized Representative



Waivers for the properties located at 4141 E 35<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Per Denver Zoning Code Section 12.4.10.6, Waivers of Rights and Obligations and Approval of Reasonable Conditions, I, the undersigned applicant for the property under application for the rezoning referenced herein, request that the G-RX-5 zoning classification of the land described herein include the following waivers:


1. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories pursuant to Sections 6.3.3.3.F (Town House building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 5 stories without incentives and 7 stories with incentives pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.K (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 4 stories in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 6.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the G-RX-5 zone district.

2. Waive the right to use or erect any primary structure with a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.F (Town House building form) or a maximum permitted building height of 70 feet without incentives and 95 feet with incentives pursuant to Section 6.3.3.3.K (Shopfront building form), DZC and instead comply with the following:

No primary structure erected on the subject property according to the Town House or Shopfront primary building form standards shall exceed 55 feet in building height. Height exceptions shall be allowed in accordance with Section 6.3.7.1 (Height Exceptions) as applicable to the G-RX-5 zone district.

3. Waive the right to use maximum height with incentives in stories and feet pursuant to Section 10.12.1 (Height Incentives), DZC.




---

Andrew R. Klein, Authorized Representative

# Supplemental Information - LDR Parks and Open Space Concept

---




**CONCEPT DIAGRAM**

- Property Boundary
- Park Space
- Landscape Promenade + Gardens + Play
- A-Line Train
- 303 Artway Heritage Trail
- Multimodal Corridors
- Roadway Connection



**CONCEPT MASTER PLAN - OPEN SPACE**

- Parcel Boundaries
- Setbacks
- Property Boundary
- Privately Improved, Publicly Accessible Park & Open Space
- Day 1, 80 Acre Park Donation, Includes 19.1 acre Flood Basin
- Regional Detention 100 Year Flood Basin
- 303 Artway



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



**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log**

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Shawn	8/12/2022	How many times do voters have to say no to this crap? Give up already and leave green space as green spaces!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gary Martyn	8/13/2022	Very frustrating that the flood detention area continues to be called park space when even the city's own parks director says that is not true. At best this is misleading, on the surface, though, it is lying. The storm this past week has shown how unusable the 25 or 30 acres are after a storm. And the drainage doesn't appear to work properly. I think the suddenness of the storm showed that this area could be lethal to any unfortunate soul using it as a park. I'm not understanding how the zoning can be changed on property that has a perpetual conservation easement on it. Asking for a zoning change while the easement is in place seems to be a waste of resources.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Linda Redstone	8/14/2022	Voters have already said No once to the development of the Park Hill Course. Why do we need to do this again? Denver already has a lower per cent age of open space than most other comparable cities, about 6 per cent. Why do we not have 11 per cent?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Tom Morris	8/14/2022	The people of Denver, including neighbors, have expressed their landslide opposition. The mayor is using the fact that he no longer needs votes (term limited) and he has the right to ignore the people because his sponsors have demanded it. If the development is approved in opposition to the people, Hancock and his smiling band of "yessir's" will buy cheap seats in the halls of Infamy. A reasonable legacy for a man who chose the rich over the people. I almost wish he would try it to remove him and his yes-men from any list of competent mayors.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Sarah Jo Hunter	8/14/2022	You have fundamentally ignored your own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by you all when you consider Westside to be your "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers? You all have failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Harr	8/14/2022	68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement The City should not allow a developer to build on PHGC land: 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021; the perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The City's plan assumes taxpayers should give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own. I oppose this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alan Dresser	8/14/2022	The entire Park Hill Golf Course should remain a park with park related structures and activities. NO COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT!!! There is an extremely small amount of undeveloped land in Denver and what little parkland type land that remains should remain parkland.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Karen Bergman	8/14/2022	I would like for this land, in its entirety, to become a regional park, as approved by vote of the people of Denver.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Nora Kelly	8/14/2022	We need to preserve a perpetual open space for the Park Hill Golf Course -- the acreage is as much as Washington Park and this area too, should remain open for the citizens of Denver to enjoy. NO DEVELOPMENT. The CPD process that has resulted in this draft area plan, is a sham. I do not support it.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Rachel McCracken	8/15/2022	Preserve the open space!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Richard McCanna	8/15/2022	The August 7 intense rainstorm and widespread flooding should show everyone the need for green space. The more Denver developers cover green spaces with concrete the worse our flooding problem gets. It makes no sense to pave over large sections of Park Hill Golf Course.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Joanna & Chris Johnson	8/15/2022	We are wholly AGAINST ANY DEVELOPMENT except for a public golf course or total open space on the former Park Hill GC land. This land has an easement to keep it development free + the Voters said they want Open Space again last year.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Regina K Dunn	8/16/2022	Every neighborhood in this city should be included in the low income apartment plans. Park hill is already doing it's part. Our families have apartments to SURVIVE in. Now they need outdoor areas to explore together and make life worth LIVING!!!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Douglas F Tweed	8/18/2022	Voters overwhelmingly approved Amendment 301 which stated that the property should be open space. I would love to know why the Mayor and City Council continued to spend unauthorized city money to plan unwanted development. I live three blocks from Parkhill Golf Course and we were never interviewed for our opinions. My understanding was that all residents within 1/2 mile were supposed to be personally interviewed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ford Frick	8/18/2022	Colorado state law requires a judicial finding that a conservation easement can no longer serve its original purpose before it can be nullified. Why isn't this limitation addressed? Why is the City spending tax dollars to prepare a private developer's plan when there is a valid easement present? Solve the easement issue first and then plan the property.
Email	Vic Lazzaro and Nan Odell	8/22/2022	You were listed as the contact person for the Office of City Planning. As a long time Denver resident and one who at one time golfed at Park Hill GC and now live across from City Park, the plan presented is a travesty. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Denver has among the worst ratio of parks to population of most major cities.</li> <li>•The PHGC had an easement that the City is ignoring and likely will result in community lawsuits if violated.</li> <li>•Shopping and housing can be provided by buying land near the PHGC and building there. – Even giving special abatements to encourage that development.</li> <li>•This is a rare, if even once in a lifetime opportunity to maintain open space in the urban landscape – the City, County, and related departments are irresponsibly blowing it.</li> </ul>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	8/20/2022	Westside does not own the development rights to this property. Those development rights, currently estimated to be worth \$60 million, are owned by the citizens of Denver who have made it abundantly clear they are not willing to give them up. Until the matter of the perpetual conservation easement is settled, this exercise by the city in playing Fantasy Football to perpetuate the illusion that development is inevitable is a monumental waste of time and taxpayer money.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Annie Pratt	8/20/2022	I feel that this brochure and website is total propaganda that implies that the City has the right to develop this property and this is a done deal. I've seen the proposed plan and am calling bullshit on this entire land grab move. This is just one more case of the City and Mayor Hancock allowing developers to realize big profits at the expense of communities. If this is allowed, by the time the developers are done, there will be very little affordable housing, no community services and no open space... because those things aren't profitable and developers only care about making a profit.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	David Pratt	8/20/2022	This is so one sided and barely even truthful! You all should be ashamed. This is not what I want my government doing for me. This is disgusting. Sorry, it's just wrong!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	FT	8/21/2022	Lets see some actual data on these results. Stop sending out these pro development puff pieces disguised as community engagement. Your survey questions and distribution were a joke. This planning process has been a joke.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	8/22/2022	CPD's June 30th "Community Open House" is a continuation of the sham planning and development process conceived and implemented by CPD with the predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans. Starting soon after Westside purchased the PHGC land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the Hancock Administration began working with Westside on plans to break the conservation easement and construct a mini-city of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." Working for its "client" Westside, it's not surprising that CPD's hand-picked "Steering Committee" was primarily composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal "area plan" that CPD will draft and likely present to the Planning Board and City Council for approval later in 2022. The next hurdle for the Hancock Administration and Westside will then be for the Hancock Administration to submit a ballot measure to Denver voters in accordance with Ballot Initiative 301 that passed city-wide in November 2021 by 63% to 37%. The Hancock Administration/Westside ballot measure will seek voter approval for breaking the PHGC land conservation easement and allowing residential and commercial construction on the land. Presumably, the Hancock Administration and Westside will use CPD's "area plan" in their campaign to support their ballot measure. Why CPD's Planning Process Is a Sham The CPD planning process is a sham and it's irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land. • Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers? • CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. • CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	8/22/2022	Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. • CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. • CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. • CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. • CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. • CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. • CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey (cont)	8/22/2022	• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. • CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). • CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase-- despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member--CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. • CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Chris Maj	8/22/2022	This area is supposed to be a conservation easement. Your entire plan is the opposite of that. Total scam.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Andrew Lefkowitz	8/22/2022	I'm concerned that, given the many things the community has said they want in this space (affordable housing, retail, community building spaces) that the ever growing number of acres committed to open space may be too much. I think park space is important, and I would gladly see slightly less, if it meant more retail space for small, local business, or a grocery store.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	8/22/2022	We voted that the people of Denver would say if that land could be developed. The people need to vote on it, right? So what is this all about? You are talking like it's a done deal.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Yukhananov	8/23/2022	A grave issue that many Denverites face is housing affordability. Our city's lack of affordable housing is notorious and impacts the poor, working class, and middle class. I have close friends that left Colorado because of high rental costs. I am hearing frequently from out-of-state acquaintances that wanted to move to Colorado, but avoided it because they were afraid of being cost burdened. I'm concerned that this housing crisis will undo Denver and make our city irreversibly inequitable. This draft mentions a desire to build affordable, mixed-use developments. I am generally happy with the direction of this sentiment, but it's not going far enough. Yes, build more housing and make the units affordable, but, to ensure they stay affordable, make at least a part of those units public. Public, as in owned and operated by the city of Denver. I say this because we have tried market-based solutions and they hardly made a difference. It's likely that the upcoming affordable housing ordinance will fail to reduce the overall cost of rent in the short and long term. There is a housing model that may serve as a useful blueprint, the Vienna housing model. In case there's an unfamiliarity with it, I added some resources below: Vienna's Unique Social Housing Program (HUD): <a href="https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_featd_article_011314.html">https://www.huduser.gov/portal/pdredge/pdr_edge_featd_article_011314.html</a> Vienna's Radical Idea? Affordable Housing For All (Bloomberg): <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41VudJdYXY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=41VudJdYXY</a> Social Housing (City of Vienna): <a href="https://socialhousing.wien/TheViennaModel">https://socialhousing.wien/TheViennaModel</a> <a href="https://www.vienna-model.at/en/prinzipien/">https://www.vienna-model.at/en/prinzipien/</a> Thank you for taking the time to read this comment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Walsh	8/23/2022	This draft plan is full of misleading and omitted information. Having listened to many steering committee meetings I can say that this process has been directed behind the scenes by members of CPD, Westside, DMCI, and others to produce a pre-determined outcome of development over preserving the long standing conservation easement on the land. I cannot see any plan that seeks to create a concrete corridor climbing 12 stories tall along Colorado Blvd being able to pass. The city should uphold the conservation easement and require that the land be used as open space or some sort of community amenity as prescribed in the easement. Even this plan barely acknowledges the easement, but the fallacy of "it can only be a golf course" is not true if you ask any lawyer that is not at the direction of the Mayor's office. Please stop wasting time and resources from our city officials to undermine the will of the voters. Meanwhile the neighborhood of Northeast Park Hill has insufficient drainage during rain storms, lead water pipes, and inadequate sidewalks for current residents. Coming all around the Golf Course is affordable housing at 40th and Colorado Blvd. and 38th and Holly. Along with more restaurant/retail at 40th and Colorado. There is also plenty of opportunity for additional development on 33rd and Hudson as well as other areas in the neighborhood that do not require lifting a perpetual conservation easement. The fact that there is an easement on the land is why there is so much opposition. Please take into consideration that an easement is meant to last forever and not just when convenient.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carroll Watkins Ali	8/23/2022	This is an instance where development is what the situation calls for. It is an opportunity to right some wrongs and to create equity as a once thriving community can be redeveloped. #ROC, #redevelopourcommunity, #reviveourcommunity, #restoreourcommunity.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	8/23/2022	When will a plan be developed for 100% park/open space? This land has a VERY protected perpetual conservation easement on it. Why is this being ignored in this plan? The narrative that 100 acres of park space is being "donated" is not true. 25 of these acres is an unusable portion that is a storm drain. With the recent rain, it is evident that this area is not suitable to be used for anything. It is flooded land and not usable as parkland.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Suzanne Tate	8/23/2022	The planning process was incomplete; groups were not allowed to discuss priorities in a large session, so that the most important aspect could be agreed upon. North Park Hill does not need anymore concrete or densifying. In order to combat traffic and heat, North Park Hill needs open space and additional green space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Katherine Asher	8/23/2022	Elyria- swansea and Clayton neighborhoods proximity to I-70, I-25 and industrial areas has led to decades of negative environmental impacts to soil, air and water. By preserving the open space that is now the City Park Golf course we have the opportunity to mitigate climate and pollution risks. The health and wellbeing of residents should be placed first and foremost. Denver residents value clean air and open spaces. Urban gardens, safe recreational areas along with trees and drought tolerant landscape reflect the future we want to see.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Sleeman	8/23/2022	This plan has always been oriented towards development. There was never any serious consideration of leaving the parcel as open space. This is true even though a majority of voters in the entire city voted to require a city wide vote before the conservation easement could be lifted.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Maria	8/23/2022	The citizens of Denver voted to keep open space why is Denver spending money trying to push through this development and voiding our rights! Climate change is here and we need to keep green space in an area that is so polluted and over crowded as it is now. DO NOT WANT YOUR PLAN city needs more parks/open space New York City even has more open space per capita than Denver. Look what your trying to do to our beautiful city. You talk about need for affordable/low income housing I would like to see a map or outline of all this type of housing in Denver owned by Denver or Private?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Teresa Kao	8/23/2022	5, 8, 12 story buildings are inappropriate for this neighborhood How would current neighborhood benefit from this development? This project would bring in a large number of residents, virtually a new neighborhood! Enormous increase of traffic congestion on Colorado Blvd would help no one. What grocery store would be interested in entering this area? A supermarket or 7/11 type , which we already have. Why not plant acreage with trees and turn it into carbon credit for denver? In spite of assurances that current neighbors will be involved in decision, it is clear that mayor is facilitating removal of perpetual conservation easement to allow development, that elected officials do not care in the slightest about the current neighborhood and how this project will degrade quality of life, and that nothing we can say will have any effect on mayor/westside plan to pave over and "develop" the land.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	In my opinion, the approach taken by the Department of Community Planning and Development to conclude that "the prevailing vision" of the community considers it appropriate to preserve only one half of the total acreage of the former PHGC for open space and recreation was biased, and unreliable. The methods supported by the City to inquire about the "vision" of the people of Denver never offered residents the option to endorse a plan that would require the entire 155 acres of the former GPHC to be utilized for recreation and open space. The recent vote by the community to reject the stated position of the Westside developers to favor some residential and commercial development was overwhelmingly rejected by the voters at the ballot box. The survey cited by the City and Westside as a basis to claim that the prevailing vision of residents living within one mile of the former PHGC was to favor mixed use was biased for several important reasons. First, the initial and main question asked respondents to choose between use of the land exclusively as a golf course, or as a mixed use site with residential development and park land. This dichotomous choice was by design biased in favor of an endorsement of mixed use. A fair and unbiased survey of opinion would have presented more options, including full residential and/or commercial development, or full preservation as parkland and open space. Second, there was no demonstration that the survey in fact reached a representative sample of the intended audience, nor that the number of responses received were adequate to rely on the survey results. Third, there was no reason to restrict the survey to addresses within one mile of the site. These biases, including the limited choice of options, was particularly objectionable in view of the City's knowledge that an active grass roots movement expressed vocal support for full preservation of the former GPHC as open space or parkland. The process undertaken by the City to promote a plan that would devote approximately half of the former PHGC for commercial and residential development was performed without a scientifically valid environmental and public health impact analysis intended to impartially present the costs and benefits of various options, including preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. This is in contravention to best practices for consideration of major development projects under consideration by a public entity such as the City and County of Denver. Based upon peer-reviewed research, and my experience as a physician and academic specializing in environmental health and public health, it is my opinion that consideration of these factors would strongly favor preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. Consider the following: Between 2010 and 2019, Denver was the country's fifth fastest growing large city. [ <a href="https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010">https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010</a> ]. Growth has come with an increased number of cars, roads, parking lots, shopping plazas and other buildings in our community: Nearly half the land in Denver's city limits is paved or built over. [ <a href="https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/">https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/</a> ]

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log			
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	<p>At the same time, the percentage of City land devoted to open space and parkland has fallen behind that of most other cities. With only 5% of its land used for parks and recreation, Denver has fallen from 13th place in 2012 to 18th place in the 2021 Trust for Public Land Park Score for America's 100 largest cities. In comparison, the percentages of land used for parks and recreation in some other cities are: Washington, D.C.—21%; New York City—16%; San Francisco—21%; San Diego—21%; Portland, Oregon—14%; Boston—19%; Minneapolis—10%; Los Angeles—13%; Seattle—11% and Chicago—9%. According to the Trust for Public Lands, the 2021 national median percentage of land used for parks and recreation in America's 100 largest cities is 15%. [https://www.tpl.org/parkscore]. Use of the former PHGC entirely as parkland would substantially strengthen the park system of our increasingly densified and developed city.</p> <p>The neighborhoods that include and generally abut the PHGC land south of I-70 are the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood that is east of Colorado Boulevard and the Elyria-Swansea, Clayton, and Cole neighborhoods that are west of Colorado Boulevard. These neighborhoods have substantial communities of color. The percentage of non-white residents in each neighborhood are as follows: Northeast Park Hill: 78.3%; Elyria-Swansea: 87.54%; Clayton: 67.1%, and Cole: 66.2%. [see https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/]. Many residents of these neighborhoods have limited income. For example, the median household income for Northeast Park Hill is \$37,501. [https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income]. These neighborhoods are close to the I-70 corridor and industrial sites. They are among the most polluted neighborhoods in the City. For example, the 80216 zip code, the area in which the Elyria Swansea neighborhood lies, in 2017 had the highest environmental hazard rating of any zip code in the United States. [https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/]. These neighborhoods now have a pressing need for open space and trees. For example, the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood ranks 473 out of 483 Denver census blocks in the Tree Equity Score created by the national conservation organization, American Forests. Only two percent of the land in this neighborhood has tree canopy cover which compares poorly with the 24% tree canopy cover that American Forests considers optimal. The Tree Equity Scores and tree canopy cover numbers for the other three neighborhoods are comparable to the deficient Northeast Park Hill neighborhood numbers. [https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222]</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett	8/23/2022	<p>Protection of the PHGC land conservation easement would protect the existing tree canopy and increase equity of access to open space for low-income communities of color. Because of the relative lack of open space and tree cover in the four neighborhoods generally abutting the PHGC land and south of I-70, the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment has given two of them (Northeast Park Hill and Swansea-Elyria) a rating of "High", the most severe rating, and the other two (Clayton and Cole) a "Medium-High" rating on the 2021 Neighborhood Heat Vulnerability Index. [https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#fc-13201793]. Commercial and residential development of the PHGC land, combined with increasing air temperatures associated with climate change, would contribute to the development of "heat islands" which, in turn, would threaten the health and well-being of those living and working in these neighborhoods. Urban heat islands are associated with heat exhaustion, heat stroke, heat-related respiratory problems, and death: trees and vegetation play key roles in countering urban heat islands and indirectly the negative health effects with which they are associated. [https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands; https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts]. The City's eventual acquisition of the PHGC land for a designated park would offer the opportunity for the City to augment the land's critical tree canopy thereby reducing heat island issues.</p> <p>The former PHGC tract, on which the City and County of Denver holds a conservation easement, represents an irreplaceable opportunity for Denver to utilize parkland to promote the health and well being of city residents. There are ample opportunities for commercial and residential development to be pursued at alternative locations.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Joe Mauro	8/23/2022	<p>Where in Denver will the loss of acres of open space that will occur in the development of Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) come from?? The loss of any of the open space at PHGC will result in a greater heat island affect, particularly in a section of town that has less trees overall and has a population much more susceptible to increasing urban heat. For the many mature trees that will be lost to the proposed development, how will Denver find those carbon sinks to take the place of these trees for their reduction in carbon as well as their cleansing of our air?? How can Denver afford to lose ANY open space to development that can occur in any number of other, better locations?</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Wendy Harring	8/23/2022	<p>I do not understand why this process has been undertaken and why the City is expending its (being the taxpayers') resources on it. The land is subject to a conservation easement bought and paid for by the taxpayers. There is a Colorado statute requiring that a Court find that the purpose of a conservation easement has become impossible to fulfill before an easement can be terminated. Denver voters overwhelmingly favor the land remaining as open space as evidenced by the vote in November 2021 on ballot measures 301 and 302. All the "surveys" taken to date with respect to the golf course are skewed in that there is never an option to keep the land as open space. Most importantly, Denver is growing rapidly, our open space is shrinking, and there are few, if any, opportunities to preserve what is left of our open space. The golf course is the largest open space tract left in the City. All 155 acres must be preserved as open space. If the golf course is developed, the opportunity to enhance and grow our open space will be lost forever. That would be a travesty.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Marian Curtis	8/23/2022	<p>I am deeply concerned that we may lose a most rare parcel of open space in Denver. Our ratio of public land to people is already LOWER than the median for ALL cities comparable to Denver in size! Denver residents voted to protect this land but Hancock found a way to invalidate the will of the people; eager as ever to say "Yes!" to developers!</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	8/23/2022	<p>The Park Hill Golf Course property is protected by a perpetual easement purchased for the public's use and enjoyment of the land as recreational open space in 1997 with Denver taxpayer funds. Now, the City is working hand-in-glove with Westside Investment Partners to pave the way for development of the property by undoing that easement, contrary to Colorado law, the overwhelming public support for Ballot Measure 301 and the provisions of the easement.</p> <p>Westside surely knew about the 1997 easement in 2019, when it paid just \$3.55 per square foot for the land. That's about one percent of the price other developers are paying for developable property in Denver these days. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend that the City purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space.</p> <p>Instead of following the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the City has worked at cross-purposes with those recommendations. Indeed, City documents explicitly state that its Community Planning and Development bureaucracy considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its "client" in the Westside Investment Partners-driven planning process for the land.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	8/23/2022	<p>From its very outset, the City's "community engagement" process has been designed only to ratify what the developer wants and only heed the pro-development voices it wants to hear. The 1997 perpetual conservation easement should be the default condition in any plan for the area. However, CPD's process presumes development and largely ignores the easement. To CPD and the vetted pro-development supporters on its Steering Committee, the only possible outcome of the planning and community participation process is development, irrespective of concerns about the impacts of developing the land, the loss of open space and future parkland and the land use changes already underway in the vicinity of the Park Hill Golf Course.</p> <p>CPD falsely claims that the community supports development of the land. This ignores surveys showing that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former golf course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Furthermore, it ignores the overwhelming support of open space by voters last November via their approval of Ballot Measure 301 and the resounding defeat of Ballot Measure 302, the City and Westside's attempt to make it easier to remove the conservation easement and destroy any chance of creating a full-scale park for all of Denver's citizens.</p> <p>The CPD process is unwaveringly biased against considering or even acknowledging nearby land development activities and opportunities that would meet many of the "needs" and provide many of the "benefits" that Westside promises would arise from developing Park Hill Golf Course. Likewise, the CPD process assiduously ignores any adverse fiscal or environmental impacts of developing Park Hill Golf Course. There are better ways to meet Denver's needs for more affordable housing and the other alleged benefits touted in the Draft Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course.</p> <p>The City's expenditure of resources to benefit of Westside Investment Partners has been a colossal waste of tax dollars. Those tax dollars and funds from the 2019 bond measure to acquire more parkland would be better spent on implementing the Save Open Space Denver vision for a regional park at the Park Hill Golf Course property (See https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b ) My family and I remain unalterably opposed to this corrupt boondoggle.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Abdur-Rahim Ali	8/23/2022	<p>There needs to have equity. One hundred acres for open space as opposed to fifty acres for housing, retail and all other community needs is unacceptable. Northeast Park Hill was once a thriving community. I can be redeveloped to meet community needs—attainable/affordable housing, super market, credit union, incubator for small business for community commerce and potential for building generational wealth. It is a moral imperative to address the hierarchy of human needs over special interest to preserve open space.</p>

## Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Timothy Tipton	8/23/2022	I think the city should not be using resources for planning purposes until the issue with the conservation easement is resolved. Citizens of the city paid for this easement with their tax dollars, and it should be honored. The city and Westside Investment Partners act as if the easement does not exist. I think the site should remain open space to enhance the neighborhood and the whole city environment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William DeGroot	8/23/2022	The purpose of the conservation easement was to prevent development of the golf course. This plan is an affront to the entire idea of conservation easements. We aren't creating any new land, while the ratio of open spaces to people in Denver is declining.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Georgia Garnsey	8/23/2022	#1: It is illegal to develop on the PHGC land.#2: CPD has spent over \$200,000 of taxpayer money on an illegal plan.#3: NE Denver needs open space because of all the dense development planned for the area, including affordable housing.#4: NE Denver is already suffering from the heat island effect as documented by Trust for Public Land data.#5: The CPD Steering Committee does not represent the community. The words "perpetual conservation easement" cannot be stated in meetings. This is undemocratic by any standard.#6: The NE Denver community suffers from the "heat island effect" according to TPL data. This effect will deepen with Westside's development proposals. Traffic studies have not been completed.#7: The view plane to the west that the PHGC land now affords will be obliterated by Westside's plans for 12 story (and other levels?) buildings lining Colorado Blvd.#8: There is no legitimate process governing the PHGC Steering Committee. No one is allowed to mutter the words "perpetual conservation easement." This is not a democratic process.#9: I grieve for my city. All this talk about equity. I only see greed. And congestion and ugliness.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	8/24/2022	I do not support any development on the former Park Hill Golf Course. Denver presently has insufficient open space to protect its residents from heat and pollution and to provide them respite from the built environment.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carolyn Pauls	8/24/2022	Keep it open space and youth athletic fields, as the conservation easement requires. The city of Denver should have never sold it to Westside Development in the first place. It was and should still be intended to keep as green space. Northeast Denver has an enormous lack of tree canopy and recreational green space for our youth. The will of the voters has been sold out by the City of Denver to Westside Development. The city needs to honor the intent of the Conservation Easement and the overwhelming need for keeping what little green space we have.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Stuart Hayden	8/25/2022	I received your "Thank You!" note in the mail, but found it both overtly insincere and wildly inappropriate. On one side, you thank me for sharing my voice "to guide the future of the FORMER Park Hill Golf Course." On the other side, you ignore my guidance, give me "A Look Ahead" at what you plan to do instead, and defend "The Vision," your vision, your Small Area Plan. Unless you actually prove it to be "responsible, sustainable, and community-led," such statements sound simply propagandistic. Shamelessly promoting an agenda that benefits the private owner despite a public promise and commitment to the contrary perpetuates concerns about political corruption within the City. Your plan undermines the very concept and value of conservation easements writ large. The private owners purchased Park Hill Golf Course well aware of the conservation easement, effectively betting millions of dollars against the City's willingness to uphold its legal and moral obligation. The benefits promised by the private owner are not worth losing the public trust.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kelil Barasso	8/30/2022	I believe in the change. Like stlepton area . Development For every thing we need.Especially park and Retairment community. Small business owner and health care facility. Open more apportine for Elder and Retaire people. Accibility Transport.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ed Bell	9/2/2022	Please include me in future communications as I am a stakeholder at 42nd & Madison.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Vicki Kelley	9/5/2022	This bamboozle had been attempted multiple times by this clown car mayor and city council. Voters spoke last November. NO developers please. Hancock will have to find another way to reimburse Westside for funding his mayoral runoff.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Darren McKinnis	9/7/2022	When I look at the plan presented I think oh wouldn't that be nice. Housing and storefronts and a park that will change the landscape. Who wouldn't love chic boutiques, a grocery store and maybe a restaurant or two. Affordable housing is another great catchphrase that is being used to entice people to catch the dream of the development. There are two issues with all of this. The first is that is going against the principle of keeping the space as an open buffer from the city. The second problem is that it is an investment group leading the rally. Please tell me when investment companies have ever had the best interest for the people. Their only interest it to make a return on investment. By allowing development to happen in this area the city is only allowing increased traffic and changes in the environment. The other night I drove from Park hill to South Broadway. The difference in temperature was a 10 degrees difference. South Broadway is an example of what is not needed in the Park hill area. Although I am a new transplant to Denver I feel that the investment company and the city are trying to sell the residents of Park hill snake oil. Hopefully the will of the people will be heard. No to development and yes to a beautiful green space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	9/7/2022	It's just so aggravating what happened here and how this all went down. From the sale to the development. We begged the city for a grocery store at Holly and the again at Dahlia. We didn't get anything! Now all of a sudden the city is all concerned we don't have a grocery store. I can't stand it. I hope the whole city votes against lifting the conservation easement. At this point I'd rather it a vacant abandoned lot.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jennifer Glitsos	9/9/2022	I am very excited about this project and developing the land. I'd love to see something like the Northfield shops in Stapleton and Main Street they have, along with parks and bike paths! I know this is just the planning/zoning process but when do you think development will actually get started? Just a rough estimate if everything goes well?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	9/29/2022	Please provide me the links for someone to use (1) for submitting written online comments to the Planning Board for its October 19 Public Hearing and (2) for registering to attend online and make oral comments at the October 19 Planning Board Public Hearing
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Shiloy Sanders	10/3/2022	How do I submit my opposition to the Westside proposal for rezoning Park Hill Golf Course to build 12 story buildings?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Ann Cisneros	10/3/2022	I was under the impression that this matter had been submitted to voters and decided. It seems underhanded for the process to continue in hopes that voters have moved on to other issues. I strongly object to the plan to build on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I do not believe that the proposed residential structures are in the best interest of the community. Certainly, giving a windfall to the developers on weak claims of "affordable housing" is not in the interests of the community. The community would benefit most by preserving this open space. Maintaining the areas as a golf course is preferable to the proposed re-zoning, though I hope the space will be used for more trees, walking/biking/running paths, and a mountain bike/jump course. For environmental reasons, I hope the area will remain green space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	Written Comments to the Planning Board from Woody Garnsey in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application [October 22, 2022] I am a Denver native, a 51-year resident of Park Hill, and a retired attorney. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application. CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Scoufis	10/3/2022	Fully support this project. As someone who lives less than a mile from the golf course, we need more park space and shopping options, including a grocery store.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Harr	10/3/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacob Wooden	10/3/2022	I'm a park hill resident and I approve of this plan. We need more housing, and more density, particularly near existing transit options like the A line and Colorado Boulevard bus routes.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	10/3/2022	I strongly oppose the plan. I don't want more tall buildings along Colorado Blvd. and the associated traffic that goes with it. The voters have opposed development of this land where Westside will make a killing financially. The Conservation easement should be honored. Not enough open space in the plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Elaine Granata	10/3/2020	Because of the conservation easement area planning is premature. Once the easement issue is resolved then appropriate planning should commence. I strongly oppose the planning process and the proposed plans that are being floated by Community Planning and Development. The process has been skewed toward the developer and has not maintained appropriate neutrality.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mather Ferguson	10/4/2022	I do not want to see our limited green space in the city be overtaken with more concrete, more houses, and more businesses. Colorado Boulevard is littered with businesses and doesn't need more in the PHGC area. There is simply no need. One of the beautiful things about our city is the presence of green spaces. It adds value to our city, our mental health, our physical health, and our environment and climate. As I understand it, when the land was donated to the city, it was meant to remain green space, albeit a golf course. The city and the people must not go back on their word and agreement to honor that condition. The company that bought the golf course knew what they were getting into when they bought. Do not let money and corporate interest take even one inch of this beautiful green space away from our residents by building commercial and residential properties on it. Keep all of the green space for all of our residents.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Terri Hobart	10/4/2022	I am writing in support of the proposed Park Hill Golf Course development and the residents of NE Park Hill who have expressed a need for affordable housing, healthy food options, commerce, and economic opportunities. I believe the proposed plan addresses the concerns that have been raised and the 100 acre park is sufficient to protect open space and provide opportunities for the community and youth. I ask that you give greater weight to the Community Voice Report that reflects the needs and desires of the residents in the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the Golf Course recognizing that the avenues to provide comment so far have been biased against the local residents given the current demographics and historical disenfranchisement of these voices.
Online Comment Form	Amy Golden	10/4/2022	We voted to protect the easement. We continue to do a absurd dance with the developers. This is an oasis. A needed protection in an urban area that will suffer from the impacts of cutting down old growth trees. Denver is getting hotter- we need to protect this green space. The traffic on Colorado is horrendous already and there has been no commitment from a real grocer to establish within this "proposed" development. This is a hardcore "No" from me and my family.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan C Wofford	10/4/2022	As a 45 year resident of Park Hill, I feel strongly that the Park Hill Golf Course should remain open/park space, no development whatsoever except as enhances park setting. There is plenty of industrial, un developed land nearby to build affordable housing and a grocery store
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Timothy Kennedy	10/4/2022	Buildings are too tall. Little to no elements to reduce global warming or carbon dependent heating/cooling. All roofs should have solar with battery storage on site. Heating a cooling should include heat pumps of scale. Low income housing inadequate as a % of project thus not addressing the needs of teachers, healthcare worker, police and fire workers etc. Not enough open space (less than promised). No plan for electric cars
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kenton Burns	10/5/2022	Denver needs trees and open space, not more concrete, shops and buildings. Plenty of space for affordable housing can be found nearby (fact). Do not destroy open space of high public value for the profit (windfall) of a group of developers who, for the most part do not even live nearby. The original conservation plan purchased by the city of Denver is what will, for years, provide the greatest value to residents who will appreciate the space, cooling environment and park amenities which can (eventually) be planned and offered therein.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jerome Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I want to register my strong opposition to the rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course. Our voice has not been heard because the rezoning puts 12 story buildings on land that is protected by a conservation easement. To me this is giving land to the highest bidder at the expense of the values of the neighborhood that lives in this area.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jerome Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I strongly oppose the Small Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. Besides violating the conservation easement at the residents tax payers expense - the hidden cost of losing valuable open green space, increased congestion of traffic in the neighborhood by putting 'through streets' of 38th and Dahlia Street (which speeds regularly top 50 mph on Dahlia and include many accidents at the corner of 38th and Dahlia), broken promises and lack of safe spaces to recreate and exercise.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Martha Grosskopf	10/5/2022	I strongly oppose the Small Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. Besides violating the conservation easement at the residents tax payers expense - the hidden cost of losing valuable open green space, increased congestion of traffic in the neighborhood by putting 'through streets' of 38th and Dahlia Street (which speeds regularly top 50 mph on Dahlia and include many accidents at the corner of 38th and Dahlia), broken promises and lack of safe spaces to recreate and exercise. I often walk in the park since it is close to my house and enjoy the quiet location away from the traffic, the trees, the breeze and the green space. I fear the encroachment of more vehicles, more noise, and more dogs that destroys the concept of the open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William R Dresser	10/5/2022	I am strongly opposed to. This area should remain an open space for the people of Denver. I am very disappointed that the city has spent tax dollars to oppose what the people have already voted for!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	William R Dresser	10/5/2022	I am strongly opposed to this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Louis Plachowski	10/5/2022	strong opposition. We should not be spending taxpayer monies and time on an issue that has not yet been decided. There is a conservation easement in place and until the people of Denver have made their choice the advancement of a zoning change is a waste of resources. Has the developer been given a go ahead?

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	<p>I strongly oppose both the small area plan and rezoning proposal for the former Park Hill Golf Course. George Washington Clayton died in 1899 having amassed a large real estate portfolio becoming Denver's biggest single property owner, investing in downtown real estate and also in the edges of Denver of the time including Capitol Hill, City Park, Clayton, Park Hill, University Hills and what would become Stapleton Airport and the Denver County Jail near Smith Road and Havana Street. He bequeathed his portfolio to fund a school for orphan boys and specified that the Park Hill Golf Course land remain agricultural for future generations. He entrusted the City of Denver, as original trustee of his estate, with the responsibility of securing and upholding his vision. Agricultural land use categories include: (1) irrigated cropland; (2) dry cropland; (3) improved pastureland; (4) native pastureland; (5) orchard; (6) wasteland; (7) timber production; (8) wildlife management; and (9) other categories of land that are typical in the area. The people of Denver embraced Clayton's desire and the city of Denver codified that desire by zoning the property as « open space » and placing a conservation easement paid for by its citizens on it. The citizens of Denver reaffirmed the desire for open space with the passage of Ballot Initiative 301 in 2021. This is the prevailing vision. It is the responsibility of the City of Denver as grantee of the easement to ensure that the property be maintained as open space. The assistance provided by the city to the owner of the property to change the use of the property to a non agricultural/open space and development use shirks and runs counter to its stewardship responsibility and contractual promise to the public to protect the property for conservation. "Open Space is land that is not intensively developed for residential, commercial, industrial or institutional use. It serves many purposes, whether it is publicly or privately owned. It includes agricultural and forest land, undeveloped shorelines, undeveloped scenic lands, public parks and preserves." "The conservation easement is a recognized "land protection mechanism" under both federal and state law. Every conservation easement is written to address the individual needs and desires of the landowner and the property, while meeting the requirement to acknowledge and protect its "conservation purposes," It is a recorded legal document between a landowner and a qualified conservation organization (a city or land trust) that identifies the important conservation values on the property and permanently protects those values by restricting development, subdivision and other non-compatible uses of the property. The land remains in private ownership, but the easement is a perpetual restriction on the property. The land can be sold or transferred, but always subject to the terms of the conservation easement. The grantee of the conservation easement, a land trust (or in this case the City and County of Denver,) perpetually holds the development rights in the conservation easement for the limited purpose of ensuring that they are forever terminated and extinguished and may not be used by the Grantee (the City), the Grantor (Westside) or any other party. The land trust is legally obligated to enforce the terms of the conservation easement. Stewardship of the easement requires annual monitoring of the property by the land trust to record natural or man-made changes to the property, document the land use and management, note possible violations of the terms of the easement, and interact with the easement donors — exchanging ideas, answering questions, discussing the landowner's vision of the future for the property.</p>
Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	<p>A property qualified for conservation purposes must include one or more of the following Conservation Values that will provide a benefit to the public: Agricultural or scenic open space Natural habitat of fish, wildlife or plants Land for outdoor recreation and/or education Historically important land and/or structures" North Denver, arguably more than any other part of the city, has the greatest need of any where else in the city for a large expanse of open space, at a minimum the full 155 acres of PHGC (same size as Washington Park) to combat and mitigate the extensive pollution caused by nearby industrial and transportation sources of pollution - Cherokee Power Plant, Metro Wastewater, Purina, Suncor, I-70, to name a few. Historically a sacrifice area adjacent zip code 80216 continues to be considered to be one of the most polluted zip codes in the country and under Superfund review and/or remediation by the EPA and Colorado Public Health and Environment. Locating buildings on this tract of land will only add to the pollution load in the area and destroy nature's way of combating it. "The concept of carbon pollution is normally associated with the transportation sector. When air pollution is mentioned, we tend to imagine a large number of vehicles stuck in traffic, releasing emissions into the atmosphere. However, buildings actually have a higher environmental footprint than transportation, although it is less evident. Buildings produce pollution both directly and indirectly, representing 39% of carbon dioxide emissions according to the US Green Building Council. Transportation is in second place with 33% of emissions, and industrial activity is in third place at 29%." Do we really want to impose more environmental injustice on the community living in north park hill and surrounding areas by installing buildings on an open space that can naturally clean the air and water, add oxygen, and cool the surrounding area? Denver's own plans as articulated in Game Plan for a Healthy City, Tree Canopy inventories, Climate, Sustainability, and Public Health studies provide visions that are other than the dense development proposed by Westside on this land. The Trust for Public Land studies show that Denver is deficient in open space as compared to other cities according to their criteria. There are alternative locations for housing but none of this size for open space. The larger the open space the greater the environmental benefit. The prevailing vision is for Denver and particularly northeast Park Hill and north Denver to have more, not less, open space and for housing, also needed, to be located in already developed areas and possibly underutilized areas, not green space. Industrial properties, paved parking lots, defunct motels, and office buildings are just some of the properties that can be redeveloped or repurposed for housing. Preserving the entire 155 acre parcel for conservation purposes is the prevailing vision. I strongly disagree with the vision presented by Westside and the City to develop portions of the Park Hill Golf Course for housing and retail. It is critical that the entire parcel remain open space for protection of biodiversity and the health and quality of life Denver residents.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	<p>It is my understanding George Washington Clayton wanted his land to remain agricultural and entrusted the City of Denver to keep it so. Denver did not and instead used Clayton's estate for its own benefit. The probate court discovered and relieved the city of its executor duties. Nonetheless the city has found other ways to obtain Clayton's assets:1. Use of its condemnation authority to obtain 90 acres of Park Hill Golf Course for a detention basin2. Use of its power to rezone to change the classification of the golf course from open space subject to a perpetual conservation easement (current zoning) to privately owned open space unrestricted and potentially available for other uses subject to planning (proposed zoning)3. Use of its planning authority to conduct a sham visioning process for the future of Park Hill Golf Course ignoring/violating the following:a. George Clayton's wishes,b. current zoning,c. taxpayer purchase of a conservation easement,d. opposition by stakeholders to the conclusions drawn by consultants in the visioning process, and,e. environmental considerations (heat island, air and water quality , wildlife habitat, need for parkland, quality of life, psycho-sociological impacts of nature deficit, health, etc.)</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jacqui Lansing	10/6/2022	<p>Denver was once considered a city in a park. It now has less than 8% of its land designated as park land, much less than comparably sized cities which have designated over 20% of their lands for parks. The additional concrete called for in Blueprint Denver requires mitigation with offsetting green space. Park Hill Golf Course is one of the few large open spaces left in the city which could be designated a city park. If we want a livable city we must have green space, responsible stewardship of our land, and an enlightened fox guarding the hen house. Open space vs housing is a false choice. Denver needs both housing and open space. Housing can be built in a variety of locations - on parking and industrial lots and can be provided vertically. Open green space with trees is in limited supply and housing is being built all over Denver particularly in the north of the city. The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation. The most livable cities are defined by their large parks and open space. They are deemed the lungs and souls of cities, providing oxygen, cleaning the air and water, and providing scenic beauty. To many they are revered as God's creation not man's. They are grounds where plants and animals, including humans, thrive and play. The virtues of natural places in feeding the soul have been extolled by artists of all types - poets, writers, painters - since time immemorial - Henry David Thoreau, Frederick Law Olmsted, Robert Frost, Emily Dickinson, Jean Jacques Rousseau, to name a few. Wealth has been defined by the size of land preserved. Noblemen have had the privilege of hunting and playing on large estates. Is it fair that the less fortunate are relegated to tiny homes and/or apartment/condo storage units and small concrete pocket parks? Denver does not even come close to other major cities in the US with respect to open space set asides in close proximity to its residents. Furthermore it is intensifying development of every available green space in every neighborhood.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	David Engelken	10/7/2022	<p>Our open space at Denver is already being swallowed. The manipulation with zoning attempts to subvert the legal status of Park Hill Golf Course threaten one more precious and wonderful piece of open land and sky in our besieged and under-park-landed city. Please, CDP and City Council, preserve this land from in-fill development as the existing contracts, zoning laws and covenants that govern it require.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jean Socolofsky	10/7/2022	<p>Please honor the citizens of Denver as their representatives. They voted in a fair and open election, and overwhelmingly in favor of leaving this area as an Open Space. Please focus on the much needed redevelopment of the existing housing and buildings just a few blocks away to fulfill stated needs. Thank you.</p>

Online Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for the Park Hill Golf Course) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. (please see the Nov 2021 voter results for Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively)2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law (violating the statues which govern conservation easements) and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer (Westside Partners).A legitimate question from taxpaying voters such as myself: Why is the City and County of Denver not promoting legal visions for this property such as those presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/">https://yesopenspace.org/</a> ? Take a look at the outstanding proposed park image presented here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a> . Were the City to present these images (for an intact, 155-acre park), alongside the "visions" presented by the developer, then the process of voting on any change to the conservation easement would actually be legitimate. As it stands to-date, the CPD's "plans" are a joke to this voter, neighbor and taxpayer, as they ignore the presence of the \$2 million conservation easement for this property.
Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	10/7/2022	The CPD planning process is a sham and it's irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land: Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers? CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space. Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DeWWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	10/7/2022	CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase—despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. 1 CPD's documents establish that its Executive Director and her staff consider Westside—not Denver's citizens and taxpayers—to be CPD's "client" in this planning process. 2 Despite Westside's expensive opposition campaign where it spent at least \$636,000, Ballot Initiative 301 carried nearly 300 precincts and only narrowly lost in 7 precincts. In fact, despite Westside claiming to speak for "local voices," the vote in precincts surrounding the PHGC land was even more emphatic—winning by 68% to 32%.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easementIt would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!Approval would result in the City andndits taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Online Comment Form	Ed and Nancy widmann	10/8/2022	We are very disappointed that the plan is not to reopen and refresh the golf course.This course has history that should not be ignored. It was an early course where many residents learned to golf.It also had many black members many of which were Denver leaders , such as judges etc.We believe that if this is developed there should only be single family homes, which is keeping with the Park Hill neighborhood.
Online Comment Form	Alexandra Lansing	10/8/2022	I strongly oppose to any development on the Park Hill Golf Course land that is protected by a conservation easement. The community has not received a fair process of community involvement and freedom of speech. I have attended multiple "visioning meetings" and was told that my views about preservation and conservation were not going to be addressed. It was apparent that not all community voices were welcome in the so called "community visioning process."
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Gloria Kochan	10/9/2022	I don't want 12 story buildings here in our single family/duplex neighborhood. 12 STORIES IS HUGE. Even if it is far northwest. What happened to the referendum we voted on that said we had to have a citywide vote to lift the easement? Without that you are going against the will of voters. You are IGNORING the will of the voters. What happened to the center for African American business center the developer promised in the beginning of the process? Most neighbors want all open space. You can see the flame from Suncor and the 170 from the golf course we need pollution mitigation. And we are low income and can't take the worsening of the heat by paving. I can feel the cool from the grass at sunset even on the hottest days. Open space open space open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Carol Ann Chambers	10/9/2022	I am opposed to the rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course. Rezoning would be illegal and presumptive that the City and the Board chooses to ignore Denver voters regarding a conservation easement. I have followed the process to create the PHGC area plan and it was based on the conservation easement being lifted before a vote was taken. The PHGC area plan didn't include drawings on the surrounding neighborhoods and areas of development during the process and discussion. I consider this exclusion as not meeting full disclosure during discussions and process.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alan Dresser	10/9/2022	I am strongly opposed to rezoning this property. The entire 170 acres should remain open space. Denver has enough development and not enough parkland!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alice Applebaum	10/9/2022	Strongly opposed. These developers do not do what they say they will do. Once our green space is gone there is no way to get it back. Denver is known for good parks! Shouldn't EVERYONE have access to parks?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alice Applebaum	10/9/2022	Strongly opposed! We need green space for quality of life in our city. Once it's gone we can't get it back. These developers are known for bait and switch promises. Please do not let Them develop the golf course.

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log**

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Taylor Richards	10/9/2022	I am strongly opposed
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mary Lou Clark	10/10/2022	It is totally ridiculous to approve rezoning while a conservation easement is in place. We all know our crooked mayor (who everyone hates) wants to get his grubby little hands on this property for his developer buddy. Last November the voters thwarted his plan to dismiss the easement but he keeps trying. So...is he coercing the planning board to get this property rezoned offering some sort of compensation? I wouldn't put it past him as he's such a snake! I think you all are inviting a lawsuit if you try to do this! These same comments apply to: PARK HILL GOLF COURSE SMALL AREA PLAN! So...STRONG OPPOSITION TO THESE PLANS!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Laurel Mohr	10/10/2022	There is a conservation easement on this land. The people of Denver have strongly supported this easement. The Northeast Park Hill neighborhood has strongly supported this. We do not want development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Judith Cohen	10/10/2022	I do not understand why the City and the Planning Department continue to spend time and money on this plan when the citizens of Denver have clearly said they want open space and not development and the property cannot be developed unless the conservation easement is lifted.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Todd Nicotra	10/10/2022	I think this plan makes great sense and will encourage smart growth for the neighborhood and the City of Denver. 100 acres of parks, mixed income housing, and commercial development seem like a much better use of urban land than a golf course. As a resident of Denver, I fully support this plan.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Priscilla Stiefler	10/10/2022	We, Denver voters, strongly oppose Mayor Hancock's alliance with his "client" to develop the City Park Golf Course into something other than using it as open space. The conservation easement is legally binding and the City's attempts to overturn it are not welcomed by 63% of us who voted. DO NOT DEVELOP THIS PROPERTY ACCORDING TO THE CITY'S CURRENT PLAN!!
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Nick Johnson	10/10/2022	I am very against this plan! There is no guarantee the developer will follow through on their proposals. It also likely increases traffic substantially in the area. Plus, it will concentrate affordable housing in this area. There is already a good deal of affordable housing in this area. This will create a pocket of wealth discrepancy in the city. We really need to maintain our green space. The smog and construction in this city in out of hand. We should strive to maintain some nature and trees and a place where people can just enjoy being outside.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Susan Klann	10/10/2022	I want this land preserved as open space, not developed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kathleen Wells	10/10/2022	There is not a good reason to build 12-story buildings on land that is protected by a conservation easement. There are no circumstances that justify abrogating the easement. If this were to occur, one would think all such easements would be at risk.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	T Goldhamer	10/10/2022	This land is encumbered by a conservation easement bought and paid for by taxpayers of the City and County of Denver. The City must protect the conservation purposes of the easement and not cooperate in any way with allowing uses other than open space, recreation and scenic uses. If the property owner wants to use the property for other than a golf course the City and the owner could come to agreement on other uses that still protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement and work to get any necessary court and voter approval. Such uses may not be as profitable for the property owner. This developer bought the property knowing about the easement but gambling that the city would go along with a profitable development proposal. The City has an obligation to uphold the conservation easement to protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement. The property owner's plans and promises are enticing to some in the community but they are no guarantees and come with the burden of a Metropolitan District with substantial costs, loss of irreplaceable open space and vistas, and increased congestion and traffic. The development ideas elicited from the community should be facilitated on the surrounding undeveloped or underdeveloped land and the Park Hill Gold Course Land should be preserved as open. Please rethink this draft plan. Work toward meeting objectives that the plan elicited on other land in the area.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	10/10/2022	I am writing in support of Denver Audubon's assessment of Denver, and its developers, planning process for the Park Hill Golf Course open space. In addition to adding value for businesses, tax income, and low-income housing that may advance the public's interest and enjoyment of the park at the perimeter, there are many options for use on nearby industrial space as an alternative. Why not preserve the already precious protected space we have left? As internationally agreed at the recent Denver-based Greater and Greener urban parks conference, there is a clear path forward for developing open park space that limits gentrification and provides for healthy and smart urban land use. * OPEN SPACE PER RESIDENT. Northeast Park Hill is an underserved community in need of walkable access to a park. Increasing the 91 acres now available to the surrounding communities by the entire 130 acres available at the PHGC would still only bring these communities up to just over one-third of the acreage available to the communities of Berkeley, Gateway-Green Valley Ranch and Washington Park. Denver formerly had one of the highest ratios of open space per resident – we were a national leader in that field. Now, with only 170 sq. ft. per person, Denver ranks 12 out of 15 of the nation's largest cities.* LOSS OF WILDERNESS HABITAT. The Denver area is a part of a principal route of the Central Migration Flyway used by millions of migrating birds in spring and fall. The widespread loss of habitat is the biggest driver of bird population declines. Audubon considers 113 species using this Flyway to be highly vulnerable to changes from human activity. Preserving large intact areas of habitat is crucial to the survival of North American bird species. Habitat size matters to migrating bird species. Loss of Denver as a stop-over habitat constitutes a serious threat to species survival. * VALUE TO RESIDENTS. Preserving a single, uninterrupted area of open space for the regional community has important benefits, albeit different from any single commercial advantage from urban development. Parks, research shows, can advance the community's objectives to help children develop physically, intellectually, psychologically and socially. * ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE. Improving the overall quality of Denver's urban tree canopy to add shade that reduces the heat island effect of streets, parking lots and buildings, traps and removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and cleanses airborne pollutants from the air we breathe. I wholeheartedly agree with Denver Audubon's recommendation: "At least 90% of the Park Hill Golf Course should be retained as open space, as wild and natural as possible, using native plants for any necessary revegetation. Well-planned development around the area's periphery can create opportunities for "buy-in" by adjacent neighborhoods that would support a sense of stewardship and conserve area resources."A personal view. I've volunteered for the city of Denver and the state of Colorado as a community representative for about 40 years with a renewed focus on open space and wildlife support in our dense urban areas. Most of it has been in support of Denver City Park as one such important space. I believe thriving urban wildlife habitats (particularly for birds) are a measure of our own survivability as a community. Denver Audubon has done a thoroughly researched assessment of the developer's plan for this large portion of the city's urban space. Their assessment is worthy of further, pre-decisional discussion.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	MARIA FLORA	10/10/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement for recreation and open space. Under the Colorado Conservation Easement Statutes, that conservation easement cannot be terminated without a court finding that due to changed circumstances, the purposes of the conservation easement cannot be fulfilled. That is an impossible standard, for a number of reasons. The conservation easement protects the land from development, so why are we considering a zoning change and small area plan while the conservation easement is in place. And Denver voters are unlikely to vote to terminate the conservation easement to promote a private development. The landslide vote in favor of Initiative 301 in the fall of 2021 shows that the citizens of Denver value this greenspace and see the importance of it for the next seven generations, even if the administration does not. The immediate neighbors to this land do not want it developed, but want it to remain 100% open space. Take a look at the Greater Park Hill 2019 survey (77% want 100% open space) and the precinct-by-precinct vote on Initiative 301 before you believe Westside that the neighborhood wants this property developed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Muhammad Khan	10/10/2022	My concern is with Dahila St being a through street will let heavy traffic through the residential neighborhood. Signs and barricades don't really stop a motivated driver. This is also not in line with what the Denver residents expressed with the park street closures during 2020. I guess if you put a roundabout that'll deter plenty of drivers. The other shortcoming that I see is there's no right-of-way being requested on Colorado Blvd for the future BRT. I get the lofty goal of converting existing lanes of Colorado Blvd to BRT but personally, I would rather earmark the land now than try to figure out in the future where the land will be coming from.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Steve Good	10/10/2022	Outrageous that the City is proceeding with a plan to overturn a conservation easement that the City itself put in place, and that Denver voters overwhelmingly endorsed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Vanessa Glass	10/11/2022	As a neighbor in the Clayton neighborhood, I am writing in support of the proposed Park Hill Golf Course development and the residents of North East Park Hill who have expressed a need for affordable housing, healthy food options, commerce, and economic opportunities. I believe the proposed plan addresses the concerns that have been raised and the 100 acre park is sufficient to protect open space and provide opportunities for the community and youth. I ask that you give greater weight to the Community Voice Report that reflects the needs and desires of the residents in the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the Golf Course recognizing that the avenues to provide comment so far have been biased against the local residents given the current demographics and historical disenfranchisement of these voices.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Maria T	10/11/2022	Strong opposition Keep Open Space
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Penfield Tate	10/11/2022	<p>Penfield Tate's Comments to the Planning Board offered in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application I am a long time Colorado and Denver resident and have lived in Park Hill since 1984. I am a practicing attorney with an emphasis in public finance and municipal law, among other things. In my practice I have represented the City and its agencies on a number of public project financings over the years. I am a member of Save Open Space Denver ("SOS") and was a member of the successful effort to pass Initiative 301 promoted by Yes for Parks and Open Space this past November. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan ("Small Area Plan") and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application ("Zone Map Amendment"). Regrettably, CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development aspirations of its real estate developer "client." CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of the developer's plans.</p> <p>After Westside purchased the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land in July 2019 subject to the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the City administration began working with Westside on plans to eliminate the City-owned conservation easement and open the land to construction of residential and commercial buildings. It also granted the developer a three year window during which it would not enforce the requirements of the conservation easement. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." CPD's "Steering Committee" was substantially composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. This was done over the objection of members of the "Steering Committee" who were not shown a draft of the "prevailing vision" report before the City released and promoted it to the public. In early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal Small Area Plan. At this time, the City also dismissed SOS from the "Steering Committee" because it did not support the City's prevailing vision of development of the site. Principal Rationale for Opposing Approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application: My principal rationale for opposing approval of CPD's Small Area Plan and the developer's Zone Map Amendment Application is: (1) they violate the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement; (2) they violate state law because there has been no court order issued pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute allowing termination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the conservation easement; and, (3) their approval would result in the City and Denver taxpayers making a multi-million dollar gift to Westside. Mistakes in CPD's Planning Process: CPD's planning process has been laden with mistakes in many ways including the following: • Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers the developer to be its "client" —not Denver citizens and taxpayers?</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Penfield Tate (cont.)	10/11/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During its planning process, CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. Instead, CPD has only posted on its website and shared with the Steering Committee and the Planning Board in its October 5, 2022 "Informational Item—Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan" FAQs prepared by the City Attorney regarding the conservation easement. Proponents of preserving the conservation easement for its open space and recreational conservation purposes disagree with the City Attorney's opinion that if the conservation easement is preserved the land must always be operated as a golf course. In summary, we maintain the is the true meaning of the conservation easement, which should be preserved: o A conservation easement is an interest in real property that is defined and governed by Colorado statutory law. A conservation easement, by legal definition, imposes limits on the use of land to maintain it, among other things, "predominantly in a natural, scenic or open condition, or for wildlife habitat...or recreational...or other use or condition consistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity." While a variety of land uses are allowed, these uses must be consistent with this statutory definition and the specific "conservation purposes" described in the conservation easement document. o The "conservation purposes" of the PHGC land conservation easement are to maintain the land's "scenic and open condition" and to preserve the land "for recreational use." The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation. o Therefore, if the developer and the City choose not to continue golf course operations on the PHGC land, they could modify the conservation easement's "permitted uses" as long as any new uses are consistent with the easement's open space and recreational "conservation purposes." Such a modification would not trigger the Colorado statutory requirement for securing a court order related to conservation easement termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements. • CPD has been overreaching by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. This process should have been done in context. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where Save Open Space Denver has identified over thirty-six acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space. • Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. The developer's proposed "gift" of an 80-100 acre park is not gift – it is the confiscation of a 155 acre conservation easement owned by the City for its people. • CPD has wholly ignored meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space.</li> </ul>



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Penfield Tate (cont.)</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>• While relying on its invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes, CPD has ignored the fact the overwhelming majority of people who have engaged on the issue have supported preservation of the conservation easement. CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. CPD has ignored the significance of the November 2021 election where voters in precincts surrounding the PHGC land and citywide voted by a 68% margin to provide extra protections for the PHGC conservation easement by mandating a citywide vote before the conservation easement could be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned and before any residential or commercial buildings could be constructed on the PHGC land. CPD has ignored the strong written and oral public comments provided in the "Public Comment" portion of the "Steering Committee" meetings and on CPD's "Comments submitted through general comment" website form supporting preserving the conservation easement in accordance with its open space and recreational conservation purposes. The overwhelming majority of commentators have opposed development and supported preserving the conservation easement. CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside must utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that impose upon property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. CPD has even ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Penfield Tate (cont.)</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is likely now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a substantial majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in the Small Area Plan phase— despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented Save Open Space Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" and removed SOS. Most significantly, CPD has wastefully put the cart before the horse conducting a Small Area Plan process now. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. Why approve a Small Area Plan and Zone Map Amendment before a court has determined under state law that either is allowed?</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Mary Ellen Garrett</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>What are the options for the Park Hill Golf Course at this point? As a Park Hill resident, who also lived here as a child and young adult, I think city leaders are blowing a fantastic opportunity to improve and maintain this site as a park. Can that still be considered? As we along with much of the world swelter in record heat, the importance of trees, open space, and parkland to urban community health is vital. Affordable housing is also a huge need in Denver; the project envisioned by Westside Development for PHGC would be a drop in the bucket of this need, while forever foreclosing the entire site remaining a park. It's not clear why the city didn't purchase this site from the previous owner, but is this an option now? Clearly Westside didn't purchase it to keep it as open space, in spite of the conservation easement – paid for with our tax dollars – that's in effect for this land. They and city planners have steamrolled a planning process promoting Westside's development vision, which will require the conservation easement to be revoked in order to build. Public input into this plan has been carefully staged; public meetings I attended were a frustrating farce. It's been very sad, and I think questionable, to see city staff used at these meetings to further the developers' agenda. Neighbors have drafted a comprehensive park proposal. What's needed for city leaders to give this serious consideration? Denver residents have made their preferences clear: a 2019 Greater Park Hill Community-commissioned survey found a large majority of the neighborhood — 77 percent — prefers the property "remain entirely some kind of green space/park or golf course." And last year's city-wide election results on proposals 301 and 302 show a very strong preference for what Denverites want to see happen at this site: preserving it as open space! What can be done at this point to honor the wishes of the majority of Denver residents regarding the future of the Park Hill Golf Course?</p>
<p>PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Mary Ellen Garrett</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>I'm upset that this planning process did not invite public input on a full range of conservation options. It has only presented development proposals from the developer. I think this invalidates the results of the public comments you've gathered. The whole process has been framed by Westside. City staff have been co-opted, and the public -- which strongly supports keeping this whole site as open space/parkland -- has been invited to give opinions on a very limited range of alternatives. Revoking the conservation easement is barely mentioned in the current plans or at meetings I've attended. Didn't we as taxpayers pay several million dollars to keep this land from being developed? My main concerns: the planning process is a sham, to promote the developer's vision, and should go back to the drawing board and solicit input on a full range of conservation v. development ideas. Denver residents have strongly voted in favor of conservation for this site. How have those votes been factored into the current planning process? What about the conservation easement? How has your planning team dealt with the comprehensive park plan that Park Hill neighbors have proposed, as featured on the cover of the August 2022 Greater Park Hill newspaper? I heard some belittling comments about this proposal by the developer. I'm requesting that city staff take it seriously and include it in the information that is being presented for public comment. Thank you.</p>

<b>Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log</b>			
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Steve Ryder	10/11/2022	<p>Denver Field Ornithologists is an all-volunteer, non-profit organization founded in 1935 with a current membership of 600 individuals and families. Our mission is to promote interest in the study and preservation of birds and their habitats. In recent years our members have expressed a keen interest in conserving bird and bird-associated habitat statewide, with a particular focus being the Denver Metropolitan Area. COMMENTS REGARDING THE ZONE MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION The entire property is currently zoned by the City as OS-B, which accommodates privately owned active recreation. (Re-Zoning App, pp. 28-32) The proposed zoning keeps less than one-half of the property in the OS-A District. This is problematic for the following reasons: a) The intent of the current zoning is to allow a private golf course, which most agree is less desirable than a more broadly-considered open space and park system. But this is not merely a zoning designation, its restrictions are in the form of a conservation easement that anticipates the property NOT being developed. b) Any amendment to the conservation easement should either be neutral, meaning it remains entirely a zone for recreation and open space, or strengthened to promote connecting people to nature via a passive Open Space designation. c) Regrettably, the proposed zoning essentially extinguishes much of the intent of the current zoning by requiring an urban, development-centered landscape over about one-half of the property. This is obviously contrary to the intent of the conservation easement. Of particular concern is "The Project" statements (p. 31) which provide clear evidence that there is little to no interest in providing the public a viable open space area that allows the experience of nature in the City: a) Out of the 155 currently protected acres, only 100 acres would be designated as parks and open space; and a majority of these 100 acres would be a formal city park (as opposed to open space more conducive to experiencing nature in its more ecologically productive state); b) The actual "Open Space" in the re-zoning proposal could in reality be the OS-A District (~80 acres) minus the proposed city park acreage, leaving actual Open Space to as small as 25-30 acres – a planned afterthought and an incredible wasted opportunity. The low importance of the environment in the Comprehensive Plan Goals reinforces our view of the City's afterthought approach to environmental resilience (pp 38-39). It is argued that the re-zoning proposal will "greatly advance" water conservation goals. Not so. The proposed city park will use similar water amounts than used by the golf course, and the open space will require similar amounts of water for a few years for the vegetation to become established. The remainder of the property will likely use huge amounts of water due to its planned highly developed structure. Per capita water use is a poor measure of water conservation, unless one starts from a baseline, in this case a former golf course. In summary, the re-zoning proposal violates the intent of the current property's zoning designation (including its open space intent), and will result in a considerable loss of urban wildlife habitat, contrary to the City's stated goals (see Area Plan below). Finally, the amending of the existing conservation easement (to allow public use of Open Space and parks) must take place prior to the adoption of this proposal, which presumes the easement's wholesale amendment or extinction. This proposed arbitrary extinguishment of a conservation easement raises troubling concerns by setting a precedent in the practice of land conservation that easement-protected lands can be viewed as land waiting to be developed. Amendment of this easement must maintain its context and intent – the current proposal is unapologetically development oriented, with passive recreation and open space being a mere afterthought. COMMENTS REGARDING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE SMALL AREA PLAN The Comprehensive Plan 2040 contains six "vision elements" that form its base. The fifth element states: In 2040, Denver is a thriving, sustainable city connected to nature and resilient to climate change." While high-minded and aspirational, the current re-zoning and comprehensive plan thinking would result in an embarrassing lost opportunity to actually connect people to nature, if the Park Hill GC site were planned accordingly. You cannot create "open space" and "nature" out of 5-10 story buildings, a city park and a remaining snippet of open space.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Edward J. Shalkey Jr.	10/11/2022	I am strongly opposed to making any changes whatsoever to the existing OS-B zoning except for changing zoning to OS-B in the event the property ever becomes publicly owned. The proposed additional uses will forever preclude the entire property from remaining open space in its entirety.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Edward J. Shalkey Jr.	10/11/2022	The Area plan ignores the requirements of the Conservation Easement which would preserve the entire property as open space. Developing significant portions of this property with uses allowable in the zoning change application will permanently remove a large tract of open space from the city's standard inventory. More open space is required for the current and future long-term health of a growing city. The Area plan proposes residential and commercial development in reaction to perceived short term needs such as streets, parking, housing and commercial development, with only a token, modest sized, loosely defined recreation area. This is a very short-sighted plan to enable the rescue of an aggressive developer's investment plans in the face of the recent city-wide vote to preserve ALL OF the Park Hill Golf Course open space.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT	10/11/2022	Statement in Opposition to the Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan 1. The Department of Community Planning and Development used a flawed approach to find a "prevailing vision" that favors residential and commercial development on the former PHGC. In my opinion, the approach taken by the Department of Community Planning and Development to conclude that "the prevailing vision" of the community considers it appropriate to preserve only approximately one half of the total acreage of the former PHGC for open space and recreation was biased and unreliable. The methods supported by the City to inquire about the "vision" of the people of Denver never offered residents the option to endorse a plan that would require the entire 155 acres of the former PHGC to be utilized for recreation and open space. In actuality, as evidenced by their votes in favor of Measure 301 and against Measure 302 in November 2021, Denver voters overall and the Park Hill neighbor in particular decisively rejected the stated position of the Westside developers to favor some residential and commercial development. The survey cited by the City and Westside as a basis to claim that the prevailing vision of residents living within one mile of the former PHGC was to favor "mixed-use" was biased for several important reasons. First, the initial and main question on the survey asked respondents to choose between use of the land exclusively as a golf course, or as a mixed-use site with residential development and park land. This dichotomous choice was by design biased to favor endorsement of mixed use. A fair and unbiased survey of opinion would have presented more options, including not only mixed use, but also full residential and/or commercial development, and full preservation as parkland and open space. Second, there was no demonstration that the survey in fact reached a representative sample of the intended audience, nor that the number of responses received were statistically adequate to reflect the targeted community. Third, there was no valid reason to restrict the survey to residential addresses within one mile of the site. These biases, particularly the limited choice of options, was particularly objectionable in view of the City's knowledge that an active grass roots movement expressed vocal support for full preservation of the former PHGC as open space or parkland. The process undertaken by the City to promote a plan that would devote approximately half of the former PHGC for commercial and residential development was performed without a scientifically valid environmental and public health impact analysis intended to impartially present the costs and benefits of various options, including preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. This is in contravention to best practices for consideration of major development projects under consideration by a public entity such as the City and County of Denver. For example, the relative impact of "mixed use" versus full conservation as parkland and open space on factors such as urban heat island effects, air pollution from traffic, access to open space and parkland for recreation and physical exercise was never impartially and scientifically assessed.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	2. Preservation of the former PHGC entirely as parkland and open space would address substantial environmental and public health needs of Denver. Based upon peer-reviewed research, and my experience as a physician and academic specializing in environmental health and public health, it is my opinion that environmental and public health factors strongly favor preservation of the entire PHGC site as open space and parkland. Consider the following: 1. Between 2010 and 2019, Denver was the country's fifth fastest growing large city. [https://wallethub.com/edu/fastest-growing-cities/7010]. Growth has come with an increased number of cars, roads, parking lots, shopping plazas and other buildings in our community. In fact, nearly half the land in Denver's city limits is paved or built over. [https://www.denverpost.com/2019/01/13/denver-green-space-urban-density/] At the same time, the percentage of City land devoted to open space and parkland has fallen behind that of most other cities. With only 5% of its land used for parks and recreation, Denver has fallen from 13th place in 2012 to 18th place in the 2021 Trust for Public Land Park Score for America's 100 largest cities. In comparison, the percentages of land used for parks and recreation in some other cities are: Washington, D.C.—21%; New York City—16%; San Francisco—21%; San Diego—21%; Portland, Oregon—14%; Boston—19%; Minneapolis—10%; Los Angeles—13%; Seattle—11% and Chicago—9%. According to the Trust for Public Lands, the 2021 national median percentage of land used for parks and recreation in America's 100 largest cities was 15%. [https://www.tpl.org/parkscore]. Use of the former PHGC entirely as parkland would substantially strengthen the park system of our increasingly densified and developed city. The neighborhoods that include and generally abut the PHGC land south of I-70 are the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood that is east of Colorado Boulevard, and the Elyria-Swansea, Clayton, and Cole neighborhoods that are west of Colorado Boulevard. These neighborhoods have substantial communities of color. The percentage of non-white residents in each neighborhood are as follows: Northeast Park Hill: 78.3%; Elyria-Swansea: 87.54%; Clayton: 67.1%, and Cole: 66.2%. [see https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/]. Many residents of these neighborhoods have limited income. For example, a recent assessment found the median household income for Northeast Park Hill was \$37,501. [https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/Colorado/Denver/Northeast-Park-Hill/Household-Income]. These neighborhoods, which are close to the I-70 corridor and industrial sites, are among the most polluted neighborhoods in Denver. For example, the 80216 zip code, the area in which the Elyria Swansea neighborhood lies, in 2017 had the highest environmental hazard rating of any zip code in the United States. [https://www.attomdata.com/news/risk/2017-environmental-hazard-housing-risk-index/].

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	<p>These neighborhoods now have a pressing need for open space and trees. For example, the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood ranks 473 out of 483 Denver census blocks in the Tree Equity Score created by the national conservation organization, American Forests. Only two percent of the land in this neighborhood has a tree canopy cover, which compares poorly with the 24% tree canopy cover that the organization American Forests considers optimal. The Tree Equity Scores and tree canopy cover numbers for the other three neighborhoods in the vicinity are comparable to the deficient Northeast Park Hill neighborhood numbers. [<a href="https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222">https://www.treeequityscore.org/map/#11/39.7136/-104.9222</a>] Protection of the PHGC land conservation easement would protect the existing tree canopy and increase equity of access to open space for low-income communities of color. Because of the relative lack of open space and tree cover in the four neighborhoods generally abutting the PHGC land and south of I-70, the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment has given two of them (Northeast Park Hill and Swansea-Elyria) a rating of "High", the most severe rating, and the other two (Clayton and Cole) a "Medium-High" rating on the 2021 Neighborhood Heat Vulnerability Index. [<a href="https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#c-13201793">https://dashboards.mysidewalk.com/denver-health-assessment/healthy-environments#c-13201793</a>]. Commercial and residential development of the PHGC land, combined with increasing air temperatures associated with climate change, would contribute to the development of "heat islands" which, in turn, would threaten the health and well-being of those living and working in these neighborhoods. Urban heat islands are associated with heat exhaustion, heat stroke, heat-related respiratory problems, and death. Conversely, trees and vegetation play key roles in directly countering urban heat islands and the negative health effects with which they are associated. [<a href="https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands">https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands</a>; <a href="https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts">https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/heat-island-impacts</a>]. The City's eventual acquisition of the PHGC land for a designated park would offer the opportunity for the City to augment the land's critical tree canopy thereby reducing heat island issues. 3. Preservation of the entirety of the former PHGC as parkland and open space is the only option that fulfills the City of Denver's stated goals for climate action. In November 2020, the Denver voters overwhelmingly approved Measure 2A, the Climate Protection Fund, which was referred to the ballot by the City Council on the recommendation of the Climate Action Task Force. According to the November 2021 report issued by the Office of Climate Action, Sustainability and Resiliency entitled, "Climate Protection Fund Five Year Plan": "In addition to strategies that directly eliminate emissions, Denver will pursue nature-based solutions to sequester carbon, including preservation of shortgrass prairie, preservation and expansion of the urban tree canopy, and preservation and maintenance of forests in the Denver Mountain Parks" [emphasis added] (see report page 15). Maintaining the former PHGC as verdant open space and parkland, supplemented by additional planting of trees, would be the course of action most supportive of this goal. In addition, the report specifically cites the importance of environmental justice concerns as part of Denver's climate action. As a metric to address climate equity, the report identified "Reduction in disparities in pollution and climate-related vulnerability between communities in Denver" (see report page 37). As noted earlier, the fact that the Denver neighborhoods adjacent to the former PHGC now experience the highest heat vulnerability index and have the lowest tree canopy cover, argues strongly in favor of preserving the site entirely for parkland and open space. City of Denver Forester Mike Swanson acknowledged this when he told the Denver Post "Yes, Denver needs more trees. And we need to stop pouring concrete." [Denver Post, January 3, 2021, <a href="https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/03/denver-tree-planting-greenspace-heat-islands/">https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/03/denver-tree-planting-greenspace-heat-islands/</a>].</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Michael J. Kosnett, MD MPH FACMT (cont)	10/11/2022	<p>The former PHGC tract, on which the City and County of Denver holds a conservation easement, represents an irreplaceable opportunity for Denver to utilize parkland to promote the health and well-being of city residents. There are ample opportunities for commercial and residential development to be pursued at alternative locations. Respectfully submitted, Michael J. Kosnett, MD, MPH, FACMT Associate Adjunct Professor Colorado School of Public Health* 2099 Ivy Street Denver, CO 80207 (Affiliation noted for identification purposes only. This is not an institutional statement.)</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Alex Yukhananov	10/11/2022	<p>I think going for a market driven approach is the wrong way forward and we will regret going forward with this plan. The community needs high-quality public housing, not market driven and poorly subsidized units. With this plot of land, we can significantly alleviate the housing crisis in Denver, however, this proposal will not do that. If we are building half-a-million dollar units, we aren't solving the crisis, we are making it worse. I propose that the city intervene and prevent development until there is a more concise plan that is housing and people focused as opposed to market driven. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Hadley Peterson	10/13/2022	<p>The 303 ArtWay acknowledges that aligning through the Golf Course property will increase safety and mobility options since DOTI is not pursuing intersection rebuilds in a timely manner along Colorado. This project continues to be UNFUNDED by the City and County of Denver after 7 years of advocacy and design work with the Northeast Park Hill community. By leveraging the Golf Course development, this community can be proactive about their future.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jason Schaefer	10/13/2022	<p>I have been following the Park Hills Golf Course saga closely and dove into the the information and arguments put forth by those proposing to redevelop the golf course and those who want to have it function as open space. While both sides make valid points, the proposal to develop the golf course into a mixed-use development is a more holistic and comprehensive approach that meets the moment while addressing many challenges and needs in our city. Ultimately, the open space concept is too narrowly focused, feels very NIMBY/exclusionary, and doesn't address top priorities like housing. The proposal to redevelop strikes the right balance. It provides much-needed housing while still providing a significant green space that will benefit the surrounding neighborhoods and community at large. Better still, it is located near transit. This is critical from both a climate and equity standpoint. We need to provide more housing options near transit. The Colorado A-line station is underserved from a housing standpoint. Not taking this opportunity to add more housing units while we're in the midst of housing affordability and climate crises' would be downright negligent.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jenna Katsaros	10/13/2022	<p>Please do not take away green space from an already deficient area. Development of parks, trails, outdoor spaces/fields, natural areas will compliment this area full of multi-family units (read = no backyards!) and honor the intent of the easement. I am frustrated to see this project continue to be pushed as "helping" people in that underserved area. They are underserved in parks and green space! Future development can be focused - and will be focused - near the light rail station at 40th &amp; Colorado. Where are the plans showing that development project? The city continues to lack transparency. This is only favorable to special interest groups, most of whom helped get Hancock elected. The favoritism and pushing this down NE park hill throats under the guise of "equity" is disappointing and short-sighted. Shame on Hancock for making these promises and shame on the Committee for allowing it to move forward.</p>
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	John Brink	10/13/2022	<p>The Park Hill Golf Course Area plan is fatally flawed because it is inconsistent with the conservation easement purchased for the public's use and enjoyment in 1997 with Denver taxpayer funds. Attempting to undo that easement, is contrary to Colorado law, the overwhelming public support for Ballot Measure 301 and the provisions of the easement itself. Westside Investment Partners surely knew about the 1997 easement in 2019, when it paid just \$3.55 per square foot for the land. That's about one percent of the price other developers are paying for developable property in Denver these days. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend that the City purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space. Instead of following the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the City has worked at cross-purposes with those recommendations. Indeed, City documents explicitly state that its Community Planning and Development bureaucracy considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its "client" in the Westside Investment Partners-driven planning process for the land. From its very outset, the City's "community engagement" process has been designed only to ratify what the developer wants and only to heed the pro-development voices it wants to hear. The 1997 perpetual conservation easement should be the default condition in any plan for the area. However, CPD's process presumes development and largely ignores the easement. To CPD and the vetted pro-development supporters on its Steering Committee, the only possible outcome of the planning and community participation process is development, irrespective of concerns about the impacts of developing the land, the loss of open space and future parkland and the land use changes already underway in the vicinity of the Park Hill Golf Course. CPD falsely claims that the community supports development of the land. This ignores surveys showing that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former golf course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Furthermore, it ignores the overwhelming support of open space by voters last November via their approval of Ballot Measure 301 and the resounding defeat of Ballot Measure 302, the City and Westside's attempt to make it easier to remove the conservation easement and destroy any chance of creating a full-scale park for all of Denver's citizens. The CPD process is unwaveringly biased against considering or even acknowledging nearby land development activities and opportunities that would meet many of the "needs" and provide many of the "benefits" that Westside promises would arise from developing Park Hill Golf Course. Likewise, the CPD process assiduously ignores any adverse fiscal or environmental impacts of developing Park Hill Golf Course. There are better ways to meet Denver's needs for more affordable housing and the other alleged benefits touted in the Draft Area Plan for Park Hill Golf Course. The City's expenditure of resources to benefit of Westside Investment Partners has been a colossal waste of tax dollars. Those tax dollars and funds from the 2019 bond measure to acquire more parkland would be better spent on implementing the Save Open Space Denver vision for a regional park at the Park Hill Golf Course property (See <a href="https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b">https://issuu.com/greaterparkhillnews/docs/gphn_august_issuu_d09761115cc04b</a>.) My family and I remain unalterably opposed to this corrupt boondoggle.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kelvin kreymborg	10/14/2022	Why can't we ever get real numbers in any of these plans? Real numbers like anticipated population to live here? How many units will be affordable or semi affordable that they plan to build? Even if it works out as a unit break down like of every X# number of units# y and #z will be built. Same with open space and # of trees to be planted also amount of impervious areas? We always get these concerns addressed in generalities. Somehow I think the city & developer has to have an algorithm or formula they can plug these concerns into and pretty much have the answer already. We deserve that info.. we also need to know how the developer will be held accountable to these commitments.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mary Ellen Garrett	10/14/2022	I'm very discouraged by the planning process and draft plan for this important site. Meetings I attended consisted of displays spread around rooms, with staffers at each display, who we could chat with. Nothing was recorded or tabulated. The effect was to completely diffuse and dilute public concerns and comments. This whole process has been an exercise to justify the developer's plans for this incredible neighborhood asset. I oppose the rezoning request. The city should start over with a planning process that asks neighbors about the full range of conservation v. development options. Yes, only a small % want the area to continue to be a golf course, but a very high % want it to be a park and open space! The neighborhood plan for a comprehensive park needs to be shown as an alternative in this process and rezoning request.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Deryk Standerling	10/14/2022	I do not support moving forward with development of the park hill golf course. I live in northeast park hill and every survey where input has been requested, there has never been an option to make this a park or keep the property as it is. The process has been biased towards the developer. Let a 3rd party non biased firm actually ask the community what we want without guiding us to various housing and business options before moving forward with plans that meet the developers needs. If the community actually has a chance to voice all of our desires for this space without being led to a specific outcome, I would be happy to support whatever is decided.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jeff Bailey	10/17/2022	I am in favor of the developer's plan, as Denver sorely needs many thousands of housing units of all types and prices. This parcel being near public transit is another big plus. The park is also nice. I hope the city officials here do not cave to NIMBY pressures. Housing unit growth needs to match pop/job growth and there is much catching up to do.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jason	10/17/2022	Why are you moving forward with this plan considering that the voters were clear in their support of keeping the conservation easement in order to maintain the old golf course as a park/open space?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jeanne Robb	10/18/2022	In the 1989 bond issue Denver voters voted to put \$ 2 million towards the purchase of Park Hill Golf Course. I think the hope had been to buy the property, but instead a conservation easement was placed on the property. A conservation easement is a tool requiring public trust. Keeping the faith with voters should be one of the highest values of any government official. We have missed the opportunity to do so in two bond issues that have been presented to voters since Clayton raised the idea of selling the property in 2016. During this time, I have leaned heavily to preserving the entire open space on this site. Sadly, that is not the issue before Planning Board at this time. Small Area Plan I understand that this plan was prepared as a reference if City Council refers the easement question to the voters. So I will comment on the plan as follows: 1. Neither the plan nor the accompanying staff report acknowledges the 1989 bond issue vote. Citizens paid additional property tax for this easement. The plan should state that the public voted to tax themselves for this conservation easement. 2. The plan recommends a 70 - 80 acre regional park (about the size of Cheesman). I agree that the regional detention area should not count as park acreage. That is clear in the stormwater/infrastructure section, but it should also be clarified in Q1, D, p.33. 3. The "Parks First" drawings of the connection(s) to green space along Colorado Blvd in the "Planning Overview" (2.3.1) section are substantially different and significantly more desirable, than the drawing used in the "Quality of Life" Open Space Framework on p.33 and the "Mobility" (3.4) section. Could there be alternate drawings in the Open Space Framework section that more closely match the "Parks First" concept? 4. While the plan mentions affordable housing for families, I'd like to see it emphasized. Large Development Review While not listed on your agenda, I understand the LDR process is underway, even before the Small Area Plan has been approved. That seems precipitous. The principles of this plan must be strongly and faithfully applied in the LDR. Drawings I have seen from Westside are disappointing in light of the plan's "Western Gateway" principle. Also, please be sure that they are providing 80 acres for a regional park, not including the 20 or 25 acres of drainage detention. Even if the city attorney's opinion is that the property can only be a golf course, and thus, the easement must be removed even for a park, others see an easement as something you hold in public trust, not to be easily abandoned in spirit. Voters will not want to release the easement without a plan with substantial guaranteed open space. The amount of open space will be the most important factor in any vote. The Small Area Plan and the conforming LDR must convince voter that this will happen. Rezoning I do NOT support rezoning at this juncture. I get that the City may be trying to be as clear as possible before the vote, but rezoning open space seems like a done deal. I feel that rezoning before the vote on removing the easement betrays the public trust. While having plans in place could inform voters, a zoning prior to the removal of the easement will confuse them. If you need to guarantee a certain amount of open space, that could be stated in the ballot issue. Metropolitan District Again, this is not on your agenda, but I have read a district is in the works. As above, the timing seems wrong. But if this moves forward in the future, the district taxes should not be a burden to the affordable owners. In conclusion, I am distressed by how quickly all pieces of this project are moving forward before the public can vote on whether to remove the conservation easement.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kristen Anderson	10/18/2022	I'm writing to share my strong objections to the proposed rezoning of this property. Denver voters voted to protect this land through a conservation easement and paid for that easement because we wanted to see this large property preserved as open space. As Denver has continued to get more and more developed, large tracts of land like this become even more important to give residents places to recreate, access nature and the mountain views that make our city famous, as well as to preserve places that help reduce air pollution and reduce the heat island effect that has become more and more dramatic in recent years. Northeast Park Hill was identified in a recent study as being one of the worst areas of the city for the heat island effect, because we have so much pavement and so little tree cover. If we don't keep this property open space, that will become significantly worse. In this neighborhood, we live every day with significant air pollution from all the traffic along I-70 and Colorado Boulevard, as well as from the truck traffic to the industrial area north of us. We also get the pet food-processing smell from the Purina plant on a regular basis. The natural open space on the golf course property, with its mature trees, helps ameliorate those effects. If the city truly believes in health equity for all its residents, we need to do what we can to protect the things that help make up for the extra environmental health risks that residents in neighborhoods with higher pollution live with every day. Protecting this land as open space and continuing its existing zoning is a crucial step to do that in this neighborhood. Furthermore, a number of the claims in this application are disingenuous. First, the applicant mischaracterizes the existing easement as only allowing the property to be operated as a golf course that only few people can benefit from, but the easement specifically mentions recreation. Former Mayor Webb has said it was clear when it was written and approved by voters that the intention was to keep the land open space for recreation, which could be interpreted more broadly. Second, the public outreach section completely ignores significant objections to developing this property, registered at every stage of this proposal's public comment opportunities by both those of us who live within blocks of this property (as I do) and other city residents who voted for and helped fund the purchase of the conservation easement. Finally, the applicant also significantly exaggerates the amount of open space that would actually be publicly accessible for recreation under this proposal. A large portion of the proposed "park" is actually a stormwater detention area that is not publicly accessible for recreation. And about 20 other acres of their open space total would just be green spaces in front of buildings, not a large park that anyone can use for recreation. Denver's long-term plans include becoming a more sustainable and climate-resilient city. Honoring the will of voters and taxpayers through preserving the open space designation for this space will help us achieve that. It will reduce the heat island effect, help ameliorate pollution, by retaining mature trees, can help prevent flooding like we recently experienced by keeping more un paved land, supports residents' health by providing a large place for outdoor recreation in a very built-up area, and protects wildlife habitat in the city (foxes were regularly seen on the land this summer). Please support our health and help boost Denver's image and reality as an environmental and livable city by keeping the current zoning designation for this property. All of the other needs identified for this neighborhood through this planning process can happen on other parcels that are already zoned for development. Thank you.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Brian Loma	10/19/2022	Think the voters spoke in 2021 when we voted to protect open space. Also, I think that Norm is a Scammer. He committed to financially supporting our group that provided services for the 2022 5 Points Jazz Festival. He never provided the financial support he committed to. My friends wanted to work with Norm to provide a local food bank utilizing the Park Hill Golf Course clubhouse. They are now suing Norm and his group. This proposal was not what the citizens asked for and I as a resident of Skyland Neighborhood call for a no vote on his proposal.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Kristen	10/19/2022	Grocery store should be of most importance. Would be great for this neighborhood to have not only solid food options, but local shops and restaurants to build the economy. Right now there are homeless encampments and people trashing vehicles all around, so my one question would be if the housing units are all affordable/ community housing or if there are also traditional style homes being built? What percentage of the build are to be for affordable versus for the community shelters? I am happy for us to give back to peoples in need, however with the multiples shelters (4 I am aware of) and community housing surrounding this area... I am concerned as to why it seems the only location for these low income/ shelters are only in Clayton and Park Hill? Is this something happening in other zones too? Just concerned we are structuring Clayton and park hill into a low income zone. Rather than building a more inclusive area for all incomes. There are hardly any food options, no retail, and no grocery stores... hoping we can make the community better, safer, and bring outside neighborhood visitors to this area.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Barry Rosenberg	10/19/2022	I live in Park Hill and am interested in what happens at the former golf course. I like the idea of affordable housing and would like to know what percentage of the homes will actually be affordable and what is considered to be affordable. I think, if developed, it would be great if all the homes had geothermal heat, solar energy (preferably a solar farm, electric appliances and 220 wiring (for electric cars). I would hope no or very, very few trees will be cut down, if developed
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Barry Rosenberg	10/19/2022	responded earlier. I think thousands of seedling should be planted on non residential areas. School children in Denver can plant seedlings and see them grow, like they will. Seattle has an amazing arboretum and, while City Park is an arboretum many of the trees are not native to our area. I would suggest contact the Park People, a non-profit in Denver for advice and where and what to plant.. see theparkpeople.org
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jesse Parris	10/19/2022	I want to know exactly how many affordable units 0-30% AMI are proposed to be on this property?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Jorge G.	10/23/2022	Could you explain how it is legally possible to propose zoning changes when the Conservation Easement remains in place? Doesn't that have to be lifted first before anything of this sort could be seriously considered?
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Chelsea	11/28/2022	Has the committee modeled viewshed impacts of the height of 8 and 10 story buildings? The people who about the park will have their Mountain View's obscured by this height of development.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Scott Strohmeier	11/28/2022	I am adamantly opposed to any development of the park hill area. we've voted TWICE to negate any development, and now we're going to have to vote again? Criminal.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Mark Obmascik	11/28/2022	No means no. Time for the mayor to listen to voters, not campaign contributors. Taxpayers own the conservation easement to the Park Hill Golf Course -- it's not up to a lame duck administration to give away to developers what taxpayers have bought. A no vote by voters means no City Hall override of the conservation easement.
PHGC Webpage Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	11/28/2022	The citizens of Denver very emphatically VOTED to keep the Park Hill Golf Course UNDEVELOPED. It is incomprehensible why the city, working hand-in-glove with Westside Development, has interpreted that vote as having never happened, and instead coming up with some half-cocked "prevailing vision" for developing the property -- and enriching Westside many, many times over. As a lifelong Denver resident, I am strongly opposed to re-zoning, re-developing, "prevailing" or whatever else the developers want to call this.
Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	Written Comments to the Planning Board from Woody Garnsey in Opposition to Approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application [October 22, 2022] I am a Denver native, a 51-year resident of Park Hill, and a retired attorney. I submit these comments to the Planning Board in opposition to approval of (1) CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and (2) Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application. CPD's Small Area Plan process had a predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans. Starting soon after Westside purchased the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the City administration began working with Westside on plans to break the City-owned conservation easement and open the land to construction of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." CPD's "Steering Committee" was substantially composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal Small Area Plan. Overarching Basis for Opposing Approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application: My overarching basis for opposing approval of CPD's Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan and Westside's Zone Map Amendment Application is: (1) they violate the perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement; (2) they are illegal because there has been no court order issued pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute allowing termination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the conservation easement; and (3) their approval would result in the City and Denver taxpayers making a multi-million dollar gift to Westside. The Fatal Flaws of CPD's Planning Process: CPD's planning process has been fatally flawed in many ways including the following:• Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its "client"—not Denver citizens and taxpayers?
Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	o A conservation easement is an interest in real property that is defined and governed by Colorado statutory law. A conservation easement, by legal definition, imposes limits on the use of land to maintain it, among other things, "predominantly in a natural, scenic or open condition, or for wildlife habitat...or recreational...or other use or condition consistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity." While a variety of land uses may be allowed, these uses must be consistent with this statutory definition and the specific "conservation purposes" described in the conservation easement document. o The "conservation purposes" of the PHGC land conservation easement are to maintain the land's "scenic and open condition" and to preserve the land "for recreational use." The "permitted uses" listed in the easement – golf course, tennis courts and ball fields – can be changed, but any new use must be consistent with the "conservation purposes" of open space and recreation. o Therefore, if Westside chooses not to continue golf course operations on the PHGC land, it and the City could modify the conservation easement's "permitted uses" as long as any new uses would be consistent with the easement's open space and recreational "conservation purposes." Such a modification would not trigger the Colorado statutory requirement for securing a court order related to conservation easement termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements. • CPD has committed "planning malpractice" by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where Save Open Space Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.



Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	<p>o CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course.</p> <p>o CPD has ignored the significance of the November 2021 election where voters in precincts surrounding the PHGC land and citywide voted by a 2-to-1 margin to provide extra protections for the PHGC conservation easement by mandating a citywide vote before the conservation easement could be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned and before any residential or commercial buildings could be constructed on the PHGC land. CPD has failed to give appropriate consideration to the strong written and oral public comments provided in the "Public Comment" portion of the "Steering Committee" meetings and on CPD's "Comments submitted through general comment" website form supporting preserving the conservation easement in accordance with its open space and recreational conservation purposes. The overwhelming majority of commentators have opposed development and supported preserving the conservation easement. • CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. • CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. • CPD has failed to complete a meaningful study regarding the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. Instead, CPD has only prepared a superficial 1-page document titled "Concept-level Traffic Analysis" that it has posted on its website. • CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. • While relying on its invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes, CPD has ignored the fact the overwhelming majority of people who have engaged on the issue have supported preservation of the conservation easement.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	10/2/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed. • Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. • During its planning process, CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development. Instead, CPD has only posted on its website and shared with the "Steering Committee" and the Planning Board in its October 5, 2022 "Informational Item—Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan" FAQs prepared by the City Attorney regarding the conservation easement. Proponents of preserving the conservation easement for its open space and recreational conservation purposes disagree with the City Attorney's opinion that if the conservation easement is preserved the land must always be operated as a golf course. In summary, here is the opinion of the conservation easement preservation proponents:</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. • CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). • CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a substantial majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in the Small Area Plan phase—despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented Save Open Space Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. • CPD has wastefully put the cart before the horse conducting a Small Area Plan process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> </ul>
Planning Board Comment Form	Amy Harris	10/3/2022	<p>It is absolutely unbelievable to me that there would even be consideration of rezoning the Park Hill Golf Course Land while it is firmly protected from development by a publicly held conservation easement. Obviously, this rezoning cannot be approved. Further, there is simply no chance that the conservation easement will be lifted to allow for development of 12-story apartment buildings. Perhaps the greatest of several barriers is the will of the People of Denver, who must approve such development plans in a citywide vote. If we look to the performance of Initiative 301, we see that over 60% of voters supported 301 and opposed 302. The number was closer to 70% in the neighborhoods nearest to the golf course land. We have spoken up time and time again to ask that these development plans are halted and instead this land is purchased by the City with 2A funds and built into a regional park with public amenities. We will never stop fighting. Please listen to us. And at the very least, please take the reasonable route in considering this rezoning - if it is currently impossible to build on the land, why on earth would you support rezoning to support development? It makes NO sense.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Amy Harris	10/3/2022	<p>From the very beginning, the Small Area Plan process has been fraught with deceit and manipulation. It is obvious that when Westside bought this land in 2019, they had a plan in place for how the land would be developed to ensure that they could profit mightily from it. Westside calculated that it could buy off the Mayor and City Council and create fake nonprofits claiming to support development because it will benefit our community. What they did not count on was the power of the people! We, who LIVE HERE, do not support development on protected land. We DO NOT support bringing thousands of additional residents to our neighborhood which has already been severely underserved for decades in terms of access to parks and open space, clean air, and clean water. We all have lead in our water and yet there is only a slow crawl of effort to amend that, and instead we are mailed water filtering pitchers. We live in one of the most polluted areas IN THE NATION due to the nearby oil refinery, dog food factory, and toxins spewed into our air by traffic on Colorado Blvd and I-70. Our tree canopy is practically nonexistent and it makes our neighborhood unbearably hot in the summer due to the heat island effect. And it's not to say that we won't do our part in regards to housing - we have welcomed the Delwest affordable housing project that will bring another 750 folks into our neighborhood, and we welcome the new housing that the Urban Land Conservancy has planned for 40th &amp; Colorado Blvd. But we draw the line at taking away the only potential for our park-starved community to finally have proper access to open space and desperately needed playing fields and other amenities for children. The LAST place that housing should be built on is on protected land! We DO NOT want to see the grass and trees turned into concrete and metal. There is another way! There are other places to build housing in this city, and it is already happening! What will you be prouder of in 50 years - that you protected precious and rapidly dwindling open space in a dense city, or that you gave that land to a wealthy developer so they could construct 12-story buildings and block our mountain views while pocketing millions in profit? Please listen to us, the people who live here. We do not want this. We want and deserve to have the ENTIRE land continue to be protected and converted into 100% public use as a park with associated amenities.</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Roberta Marks	10/3/2022	<p>Our community has stated repeatedly that we do not want high rise buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement! It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Roberta Marks	10/3/2022	<p>Our community has stated repeatedly that we do not want high rise buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Aaron Gottlieb	10/3/2022	<p>Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside</p>
Planning Board Comment Form	Aaron Gottlieb	10/3/2022	<p>Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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

Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine Swan	10/3/2022	There is a conservation easement, paid for by city taxpayers, protecting the land from development. It makes no sense at all to move forward with consideration of a plan to develop the land under the circumstances. Further, the plan is disingenuous, as it is based on solicitation only of plans that presuppose development of the land. The city and developer have yet to present a plan that provides for the land to be used solely recreation, park, or open space, consistent with the conservation easement. It seems this is by design, as the city and its "client" do not want to address the reality that the majority of the citizens of this city are not interested in gifting valuable development rights to the developer nor in seeing the open space that we paid to protect developed. We do not want to see ANY development on the site. It should be used for desperately-needed park space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Peggy Hammond	10/3/2022	This is the last large swath of green/open space in Denver. Westside Development knew there was an easement - in perpetuity - when they purchased this land. The City continues to work with Westside on development plans, despite the voters saying clearly they want this land to remain open space. Virtually ALL of the land around the gold course is or will be developed - densely. We need open green space. Once it's gone it is gone forever. <b>STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PROJECT.</b>
Planning Board Comment Form	Peggy Hammond	10/3/2022	Do not want development on land that is protected by a conservation easement - how many times do the voters need to tell you guys this? We want open space - once open space is gone, it is gone forever. There are plenty of other parcels of land to build on - to attempt to build on the last large swath of open space - with a conservation easement on it - is pure greed by Westside Development - a company that KNEW there was a conservation easement and assumed they could buy their way into developing no matter what the people of Denver want. The so-called "survey" was biased - I know because the only options for answers were what the developers wanted - there was no option for keep this as open space. Westside should not be allowed to bully their way into overturning the wishes of voters - and the City and City's Planning Dept should not be wasting time and money on helping Westside to do this.
Planning Board Comment Form	Bryan Saunders	10/3/2022	There should be ZERO development at this site based on the conservancy status as well as the desperate need to keep Denver a greener place to live. This property is a once in a generation opportunity to provide open space, recreation, and supporting community needs to an area that needs and demands better government response for a greener, cleaner and more vibrant community. There are plenty, more than plenty, of business and residential development spaces near this special space. As a long time resident of Denver and the Park Hill area, we are fortunate to have access to some parks but how do you even consider not taking advantage to make this park a new GEM of the city. Denver supposedly, prides itself on green space but development seems to have taken over any chance that our city can maintain its standing as a place of recreation, kid friendly, family friendly and neighborhood friendly without consistency in looking forward. One of my sons plays soccer, and for the last two weekends we had to drive to Aurora and Castle Rock because there are not enough fields in Denver. That is not ok. That is not the Denver I know and love. We can do better and this space and this opportunity is just one example of how we can be progressive, green, and say to developers you have your options but THIS is not one of them.
Planning Board Comment Form	Pete Meinig	10/3/2022	I sat through the entire presentation on September 7th. I was skeptical that the rezoning was little more than a land grab for greedy developers and crooked politicians. Now I am quite certain. Four rich white guys sent their one Asian partner to speak to an audience that was by and large vehemently opposed to the project, and talked about things like improving the North Park Hill community and "being green". This project would add THOUSANDS of cars to an already overburdened Colorado Blvd, and sandwich a poorer neighborhood between the Stapleton neighborhood (or whatever they are calling it now) and this new monstrosity, which would almost certainly accelerate the gentrification of that largely black neighborhood. This isn't about helping that community, social justice, being green, or any of those feel-good liberal talking points. It's only about one thing - making a few people a lot of money. They are scumbags for trying it in the first place, and the deceptive bills that try to sneak in the rezoning only prove that the politicians are complicit in their scumbaggery.
Planning Board Comment Form	Douglas Tweed	10/3/2022	A vote in last November's election was overwhelmingly to keep this property as Open Space
Planning Board Comment Form	Constance Mortell	10/3/2022	How can the city of Denver want to decrease the amount of open space per resident in this city, when we have less open space than NYC and Washington, DC - this administration is not remotely interested in saving and paying honor to the natural environment most move here for - but can only think of the bottom line and more money for themselves, via the real estate developers they keep supporting in the face of massive air pollution here, traffic grid-lock and huge numbers of homeless, and they just want to keep concreting over more and more and more open space. Total violation of what they are supposed to do for residents!
Planning Board Comment Form	Winston Downs Community Association	10/3/2022	Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement. -CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. -CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space. -CPD's survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course. -CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds. CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens. -CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned "Environmental, Parks, Open Space & Recreation Technical Assessment" dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods "are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita" and that—in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.
Planning Board Comment Form	Winston Downs Community Association	10/3/2022	CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund. -CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights). -CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this "area plan" phase— despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement "Steering Committee" member—CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed "Steering Committee" member who needed to resign. -CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an "area plan" process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become "impossible" to continue fulfilling the easement's open space and recreational conservation purposes. -Denver's drive for density opposes its claim to support climate control. For every person claimed to move here, there is a person moving away because Denver does away with parks, open space and areas for recreation. -Park Hill location needs open space in this community - not more buildings, heat islands and added traffic due to Denver's total lack of transit planning
Planning Board Comment Form	Elaine Granata	10/3/2022	There is a conservation easement to keep this land open space. Until the easement issue is resolved any rezoning is premature. I also believe we should not be paving over land. Housing and development are best applied to land that is already covered in concrete/buildings. Denver, and especially northeast Denver, is behind in having parks— parks soak up CO2, cool the neighborhood, buffer noise from I-70 and Colorado Blvd. The Parks and Recreation Advisory board recommended that the city buy this property for a park-- that recommendation should be given serious consideration.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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



Planning Board Comment Form	Benjamin Carter	10/6/2022	Denver has significantly lower green area than comparable cities, and a noticeable heat island effect. Climate change seems to be worsening this effect, and the pollution struggles of the region complicate outdoor spaces even further. As these challenges and other strike our community, we need to take steps to preserve our resources for today and for tomorrow. In looking around and participating in several reviews, it has become apparent that this area has several new housing projects already in development, some practically adjacent. During the Park Hill Golf Course development reviews I participated with, the organizers acknowledged that neighboring developments and other resources were not necessarily taken into account. Additionally, during these reviews, there was a noticeable favoring of development coming from the organizers and facilitators, most easily witnessed when reviewing development options presented to the community, few or none of which offered 100% open space options. This is inherently problematic as it violates the use restrictions, and begins to highlight that this effort to develop the property seems to be a commercially driven effort, rather than a civic-minded one. In looking for alternatives near the neighborhood, one can readily witness that there are underutilized industrial and commercial areas that might be suitable for rezoning and revitalization as either residential or commercial use - or both, to enhance neighborhoods and add services. If the neighborhood between the Smith Rd and M.L.K. Jr Blvd, and between Quebec and Commercial, were able to take advantage of such revitalization along that north side, it might boost home values and incomes of the residents, ensure ready access to open space for all size needs on three out of four sides, and drive external investment into desirable new local businesses, all with the security of Denver Police District 2 right next door, and valuable RTD light rail access at either end.
Planning Board Comment Form	Benjamin Carter	10/6/2022	Imagine if Park Hill someday had a boardwalk along the tracks instead of a sidewalk, you could walk to work, and your kids could play safely in a nearby park after school! What a special place to live that would be! The City of Denver acquired this easement's set of use restrictions in 1997, paying \$2M as an investment on behalf of it's citizens to ensure that a real property interest was established to preserve the area as open space, whether that benefit be direct (i.e. a city-owned park) or indirect (i.e. golf course). We have seen the continuation of this civic interest over the years as our elected officials have continued their duties as public trustees to see that despite property ownership changes, the use restrictions were properly preserved. Anyone seeking to despoil that investment and land for the sake of new construction property development seems to be clearly driving an effort to violate the fiduciary and civic trust of Denver citizens, landowners, and other stakeholders, which our elected officials are charged with defending. Building new housing on this property would further exacerbate the problem that this easement was acquired to defend against, and potential new residents (especially if they are families with children) will only intensify the need for more open space. It is a short term solution for a long term opportunity. I vehemently feel that efforts to develop this area are misguided. We should preserve this space as close to 100% greenery + support services as possible. To do otherwise violates the spirit, intention, and literal text promised by the Park Hill Golf Course Conservation Easement and use restrictions, as well as the needs of our community. We should not allow the enrichment of Westside developers or any other organization, incidental or intentional, at the cost of the open space intentionally preserved in an easement, particularly when Denver already has so little. George Clayton would not approve.
Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/7/2022	A question came up at the Oct. 5 PHGC informational briefing concerning the conservation easement and its mandatory use as a golf course. While City Attorney McGrath was correct that as currently written, golf is the prescribed primary use for the property, that is not the whole story. What he failed to note is that the conservation easement can be modified to remove the golf use restriction without weakening or terminating the underlying conservation easement. CPD admitted that is the case in answer to two questions in their published Q&A following the March 25, 2021 Public Meeting (see questions 15 and 19 in the attached document). The only criteria that the modification needs to meet is that it does not violate the conservation purposes of open space and recreation. The reason the golf use is mentioned so prominently is that in 1997 when the easement was written, the land had been a golf course for more than 65 years, and it is likely that no one contemplated at that time that it would be used for anything else. So naturally, the language would reflect that reality. Unfortunately, CPD has chosen on their description of the steering committee proceedings to deceptively assert that their goal, if voters approve, is to "Update" the conservation easement, implying that it can be modified to allow commercial and residential development. Besides, does anyone think the city respects the mandatory golf use requirement? Has anyone seen a duffer plying the course in the last 3 years? Of course not. With a wave of the hand, the city granted Westside the ability to ignore that requirement since 2019. That 3 year timeout is set to expire in one month. Has Westside or the city made any move to reinstate golf use starting next month? Of course not. The golf use exemption will continue indefinitely (or at least July 2023). Is there any expectation that if voters reject the city gifting to the developer our development rights that are worth approximately \$60 million that Westside will decide to get into the golf operations business? Hardly. Nevertheless, the city and Westside have repeatedly used the "threat" that if citizens don't allow development, then they will be stuck with a golf course. On the contrary, the city would be the natural buyer of the property, with the ability to determine whether a full-scale park or golf is the best use as high density development next to, surrounding and across 40th Avenue and Colorado Blvd Train station proceeds. Will those future residents have to compete with 10,000 new residents Westside envisions settling on the reduced scale park?
Planning Board Comment Form	Wayne C Olsen	10/7/2022	The golf course needs to kept as a open space/park. There is enough development in the front range. Take this opportunity to keep something green! Besides the fact that we the taxpayers have already paid 2 million for the rights.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Morris	10/7/2022	The people of Denver have expressed their support of the Easement when it was passed by the Webb Administration and when two submitted alteration proposals were submitted to city-wide vote regarding the project. If the planning board is a representative of the people, you have no alternative to rejecting the proposed zoning change. If you are supporters off the developer, you will have as much influence as I do which is non-existent as long as any of you sit on the Planning Board. This is a democracy. Fail to respect the people's expressed opinions at your own risk. If you fail to follow the people's opinions the next mayor would be correct to return you to the world you inhabited before your appointments. Trump might ignore the voters. Side with his people and you will end your influence on the future of Denver.
Planning Board Comment Form	Heidi Huisjen	10/7/2022	Our Southeast Denver community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I drive past this intersection everyday. We the citizens of Denver are seeing too much development of open spaces. Yes, we need housing, but it needs to be thoughtfully planned and not haphazardly plopped on land designated at open space. In 10 years, we're going to look back on the rapid development and wonder why we allowed so many poor decisions. Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside. Let's not keep giving developers the benefits and open space that makes Denver a beautiful town! Our fair city deserves to keep open space for the enjoyment of our citizens.
Planning Board Comment Form	Harry G Doby	10/7/2022	Unfortunately the "inclusive community process" is riddled with fatal flaws. The Steering Committee was dominated by friends of the mayor who were not required to disclose any financial ties or conflicts of interest, thus ensuring a favorable outcome. Even though the committee was unable to come to a consensus, nevertheless a "Prevailing Vision" was somehow divined, ignoring the main product of this process will be expensive for-sale units with high property taxes burdening the buyers due to the necessity of a metro tax district, the conservation easement's prohibition of development, the fact that high density development is already approved next door, with an addition 34 developer-owned properties surrounding the 40th and Colorado Train station just waiting to be redeveloped. This sham process was mandated to ignore all external factors other than that of this single, irreplaceable urban green space with no development rights. The community survey that purports to represent the local community's input was an ethically-challenged push poll that feared to ask if the community wanted the conservation easement and green space preserved. Instead it only gave the option of a golf course or "something else", which of course the city then used to falsely claim to be development. Failing to even mention the conservation easement or giving the option of 100% preservation placed a heavy thumb on the scales, and flies in the face of the statistically valid survey commissioned by the Greater Park Hill Community RNO that dared ask the question of 100% preservation, resulting in a 77% positive response from the community. The fact that in addition, 68% of NE Park Hill residents (over and above the entire city's landslide 63% vote) voted FOR strengthening the protections of the conservation easement in November of 2021 election further destroys the myth of local support for development. Finally, the Community Navigator process was flawed in that the organization's leader in a 2020 letter to City Council essentially accused the proponents of preserving this land for a park or open space as being wealthy, privileged racists. Then he was awarded the contract to find support for development in a carefully limited interview scheme. At each stage, the outcome was heavily weighted to achieve a predetermined outcome that the mayor has wanted for many years.
Planning Board Comment Form	Heidi Huisjen	10/7/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. I drive by this golf course everyday and have always appreciated the open space that it brings to the neighborhood surrounding it. We need to stop letting developers make plans that are focused on high density housing. And less on creating open and thoughtful spaces for our citizens. Enough! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside. I would ask these planners involved in reviewing the materials for this project to start rethinking how the city approaches development and open space. Otherwise, 10 years down the line, we will have regrets.
Planning Board Comment Form	Scott Holder	10/7/2022	What part of "perpetual easement" don't y'all get? This is a criminal giveaway to Westside. Denver voters have repeatedly said they want this preserved as open space.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Scott Holder	10/7/2022	Again, what part of "perpetual easement" don't you get? Preserve this as open space the way Denver voters have overwhelmingly and consistently stated over the years instead of a criminal giveaway to Westside.
Planning Board Comment Form	Annie Pratt	10/7/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! This land was purchased under a conservation easement, which the city paid for, and voters overwhelmingly voted to retain. Developer profits should need to stop being the primary objectives in this town.
Planning Board Comment Form	Shiloy Sanders	10/7/2022	Denver needs more open space and green areas to decrease smog and prevent overcrowding. The Park Hill golf course area is protected by a conservation easement and has beautiful well established trees and acres of grassy hills. It would be an abomination to rezone this area and allow high rise buildings. Colorado Boulevard is already a high traffic area and does not need more congestion added to it. Open spaces and more parks are what is needed and vital to keep North Denver from becoming a concrete jungle. Thank you for protecting Denver's open spaces and upholding this conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jean Socolofsky	10/7/2022	and then to have that power of the people's vote in a fair open election, denied, is against democracy and the rights of the citizens. The area is needed for more open spaces for the health and well being for the surrounding community, which is in the greatest need of such space, due to, i.e. Suncor, I-70, density. All Denver suffers. Please focus on existing neglected areas nearby to fulfill your goals. Our City government needs to support all the facts stated above.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for this property) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement (see voter response to Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively).2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer, against the wishes of the majority of Denver tax payers and voters. My question to the City of Denver: Why are taxpayer dollars not being used to consider and promote a vision for this property such as the "Imagining a Great Park" images presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/">https://yesopenspace.org/</a> ? (Please see attached images). You can also see this potential vision here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a>
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Fahres	10/7/2022	The rezoning application and Small Area Plan (for the Park Hill Golf Course) should NOT be approved because:1.) Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. (please see the Nov 2021 voter results for Initiated Ordinance(s) 301 and 302, respectively)2.) It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space!3.) Any approval would result in the City and its taxpayers risking breaking the law (violating the statutes which govern conservation easements) and making a multi-million gift to a for-profit developer (Westside Partners). A legitimate question from taxpaying voters such as myself: Why is the City and County of Denver not promoting legal visions for this property such as those presented by <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/">https://yesopenspace.org/</a> ? Take a look at the outstanding proposed park image presented here: <a href="https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg">https://yesopenspace.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/proposed-park-map.jpg</a> . Were the City to present these images (for an intact, 155-acre park), alongside the "visions" presented by the developer, then the process of voting on any change to the conservation easement would actually be legitimate. As it stands to-date, the CPD's "plans" are a joke to this voter, neighbor and taxpayer, as they ignore the presence of the \$2 million conservation easement for this property.
Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine S Matheny Dresser	10/7/2022	This property is under a conservation easement paid for by the taxpayers of Denver ... I did not hear in any of the presentation an appraisal of how much the conservation easement is worth today and how either Clayton or Westside will be compensating Denver citizens. It is premature to talk about rezoning prior to going before a state court to have the easement removed. There are so few parcels of open land in Denver; to pave this one over, in an area that between lack of trees, concrete, and stalled traffic, is already a heat island would shortsighted and tragic.
Planning Board Comment Form	Katherine S Matheny Dresser	10/7/2022	I have been to two informational meetings at the Park Hill Golf Course Club House and one online visioning meeting ... I think I am well versed in the issues concerning rezoning and the Small Area Plan. I, like a majority of Denver voters, supported ballot measure 301 and opposed 302. Denver needs more green space, not less. Not only do the voters of Denver need to approve the removal of the easement, but also the state must approve removal. What the city is doing here is premature.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Koppel	10/7/2022	The city paid for an easement on this property for a reason. Green space is important. There is plenty of area in the vicinity that can support a similar multiuse project. I would support it anywhere that is already developed (paved). Developers bought this land knowing there was an easement. The city should stand firm and show them that we value our green space.
Planning Board Comment Form	Caroline Schomp	10/7/2022	As the last large tract of open space we should not develop PHGC. there are still other options for development including affordable housing and a grocery store
Planning Board Comment Form	Michele Swenson	10/7/2022	The people in the area of the Park Hill Golf Course have expressed strong support for maintaining (not breaking) the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement, and for maintaining the Park Hill Golf Course as Open Space, NOT building residential and commercial construction. The planning and development process conceived and implemented by Community Planning and Development Department (CPD) advances the predetermined outcome of support for the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. It does not comport with the will of the people. Honor the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement, paid for by the people of Denver. Dedicate the area to park open space, as the majority of people have called for.
Planning Board Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	DEN needs more open space, not more crummy infill.
Planning Board Comment Form	Melissa Baldrige	10/8/2022	Our community has stated over and over again that we do not want 12-story buildings built on land that is protected by a conservation easement. It would be ridiculous to approve rezoning allowing development while the conservation easement is in place - and it will stay in place because Denver voters value open space! Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Morris Askenazi	10/8/2022	We need open space in Denver!
Planning Board Comment Form	Brian Kelly	10/8/2022	Westside is jumping the gun on this application. How arrogant and cocky of them. This rezoning should not be up for any debate until and only IF, in a general election, Denver citizens decide to negate the conservation easement which, by all measures, they will not do.
Planning Board Comment Form	Brian Kelly	10/8/2022	There is absolutely no reason for the citizens of Denver to give away this asset. Why are my local government officials trying to give a multi-million dollar gift to a private developer? This reeks of corruption.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Pratt	10/8/2022	I do not support giving away property we, the tax payers of Denver, paid for to keep as an open space in perpetuity. That's just ridiculous, but further, this sham of a deal has not been above board, has not moved forward in any kind of good faith, and should not be supported. If we are to transform this property it should be done without the involvement of the current property owners. They do not represent Denver, they do not represent the neighborhood, they are clearly in it for their own profit and nothing else.
Planning Board Comment Form	David Pratt	10/8/2022	See my comments regarding the rezoning and to further add, just no. I cannot support this plan or the developers behind it. The city should be ashamed of itself for not supporting our residents over these profiteers. We have too many issues on the ballot that are not in the people's best interests. It's sad to see this here in Denver.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Wendy Harring	10/8/2022	I cannot fathom why the City is wasting its resources (which we taxpayers fund) on even considering Westside's rezoning application and Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course property. This is totally premature and inappropriate. The property is subject to a perpetual conservation easement paid for by the taxpayers. The conservation easement requires that the property be used as open space and for recreational purposes. The City and Westside consistently and on an ongoing basis continue to ignore the conservation easement and push for development of the property. Their actions led to Initiated Ordinance 301 (requiring voter approval for development on city park lands or lands subject to a conservation easement) which passed by an overwhelming majority and Westside's Initiated Ordinance 302 (an attempt to redefine "conservation easement" to exclude the Park Hill Golf Course) which lost by an overwhelming majority. Yet the City completely disregards the will of its residents/taxpayers. The City's actions make no sense and makes one wonder if the Mayor and others are indeed in the pockets of the developer. C.R.S. Section 38-30.5-107, a Colorado state statute, provides that, in order for a conservation easement to be terminated, a court with jurisdiction must find that conditions have changed making it impossible to fulfill ANY of the purposes for which a conservation easement was created. I submit to you that no court could ever make this finding. If anything, Denver's significant growth, climate change, drought, and the like have substantially increased the need to preserve what little open space remains in the City. Those are the changed circumstances, all increasing the need to save the Park Hill Golf Course from any development. The other City parks are overcrowded as is. If the Park Hill Golf Course is developed the opportunity to preserve the land as open space is gone forever. Lastly, my understanding is that Westside paid \$20 million or so for the 155-acre Golf Course. Recently, the 8-acre VA Hospital in Denver (and not far from the Golf Course) sold for \$41 million or over \$5 million per acre. If the City approves development of the Golf Course, the City will be making a HUGE financial gift worth millions of dollars to Westside and receiving nothing in return. This is ludicrous and completely unacceptable.
Planning Board Comment Form	Eileen Nuanes	10/8/2022	Since the beginning of this attempt to turn the Park Hill golf course into a development by Westside the opinion of those of us who helped pay for the open space easement with our taxes has been ignored. Despite a loss in a city wide election to vacate the open space requirement Westside and the Denver Planning Department have pushed ahead with their plans for this unwanted and unhealthy development. The lack of open green space in this and surrounding neighborhoods is a glaring failure and reminder that this neighborhood historically has never received the financial support for amenities that other neighborhoods, like Washington Park, Congress Park, or Cheesman Park have been gifted. Westside Development is just the latest attempt to take away a benefit from lower income neighborhoods by placing 400 apartments next to an industrial area and calling it "affordable housing". The open space designation was to meant to provide a place where people, can have recreation, a place to enjoy the out of doors, enjoy greenery, see wildlife and bring a sense of community to this neighborhood. This is why Denver spent two million dollars to ensure that this would remain open space. This neighborhood and the people of Park Hill and Denver will benefit more from less concrete, less asphalt, less congestion, less noise, less air pollution for years to come if this rezoning is denied. Please do not rezone this area for development and instead provide this neighborhood with a park for soccer games, for picnics, for concerts, for sunset walks, for children's laughter at a playground, things which make a neighborhood a place people want to be in a community you can help build. The saying is "if you build it, they will come". A park is a great way to begin.
Planning Board Comment Form	Keara Watson	10/8/2022	It's short sighted for the city to allow the Westside development company to take away an open space. I attended the community meeting on September 7th and quickly read between the lines of what the developers were saying. They showed us lovely plans and told us that they could put in open space and affordable housing but they were not genuine. The housing groups and Parks and Rec department representatives were only speaking about what could be, not what is guaranteed in a legally binding contract. Once the land is rezoned, Westside can do whatever they want with it, to their benefit and not the citizen's benefit. Also, they were rather rude and dismissive of peoples questions. I don't know why the city of Denver wants to work with Westside so much and why the PHGC is the only land they are considering. Is there someone working for the city that has a vested interest in Westside? There are other rundown areas that could use redevelopment instead. If Westside Development donates 2/3 of the property to the Parks department and actually is legally bound to do what they showed us in the presentation on September 7th, then I'd reconsider supporting them. No one reads these comments anyway. It's not as if our vote mattered. Thanks, Keara
Planning Board Comment Form	Alexandra Lansing	10/8/2022	The property is already zoned as open space. There is a conservation easement on the deed that further protects that open space in perpetuity. FOREVER. Rezoning would be a violation of that conservation easement, for anything other than open space. Therefore, it is a breach of contract. It is not consistent with the Game Plan for A Healthy City, approved by City Council on May 21, 2019. Rezoning is not consistent with city, state, and national climate change goals. Trees reduce the heat island effect, and yet we are cutting trees down right and left throughout the city as we build bigger homes and densify. Science shows that trees and green space are necessary for public health. They mitigate pollution and provide oxygen for us to live. People are suffering from Nature Deficit Disorder, Asthma, Cancer, and other health issues frequently associated with lack of green space. There are not any circumstances that justify rezoning Park Hill Golf Course. Denver hosted the International City Parks Alliance Greater and Greener conference in 2019 as an exemplary city for parks and green space, yet we are depleting every little bit of open space, challenging even a participatory stand in an alliance as such. According to the Trust for Public Land Study, most large cities have over 20 percent of park space, and Denver has only 8 to 9 percent of parks. Denver is significantly below. This is a problem!
Planning Board Comment Form	Lacey Jennings	10/9/2022	We do not want/need 12 story buildings on a designated conservation easement. This is counter to the purpose of the conservation easement and Denver taxpayer preferences who want the conservation easement maintained.
Planning Board Comment Form	Maggie Price	10/9/2022	CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land. CPD hand-picked the "Steering Committee" to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. One member of the current planning board was part of the Steering Committee CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development
Planning Board Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	10/9/2022	68% of the neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement in the Nov 2021 election. Hundreds of residential units either adjacent or close to the proposed PHGC development are already in the pipeline to be built. Among US cities Denver isn't even among the top 50 in "green space per capita" now even without the PHGC development. The Denver Planning Board shouldn't appear to be pro-development and should uphold the PERPETUAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT!
Planning Board Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	10/9/2022	68% of the neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC voted FOR protecting the conservation easement. Hundreds of residential units either adjacent or close to the PHGC are already in the development pipeline. Denver isn't ranked even in the top 50 US cities for per capita green space, and has declined from 9.5 acres per capita in 2002 to 8.9 now. The Denver Planning Board shouldn't appear pro-development and should vote to respect the "PERPETUAL conservation easement

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Mary T Bernuth aka Terry Bernuth	10/9/2022	I continue to be shocked that so many city resources are being used for this proposed rezoning project when the land is under a conservation easement that the city paid the Clayton Foundation 24million dollars for. I understand that only the district court can modify or remove the easement currently on the subject property. The current easement is not ideal in that it limits the uses of the property. However, if proposed uses still maintained the property as green space my guess is that the district court would find that a reasonable use and make a change to the current easement so it can be used for other purposed than a golf course. I worked for the Clayton Trust, later called the Clayton Foundation in the 1980's. The assets of the trust and the income from the golf course were dedicated to the education and care of young ("white" language later changed by court order) boys who were orphaned in the early 20th century when the trust was created by Mr. George W. Clayton, the benefactor. At the time the trust was created, the golf course was a farm that provided food and dairy for the boys. Only much later did it become a public golf course. The Clayton College, as it was known, evolved with the times and became a residential treatment facility for boys licensed by the State of Colorado. When the Clayton Foundation was created in the 1980's, the board wanted to expand the educational mission of the foundation rather than the treatment mission it had evolved into. A district court order modified the trust agreement to allow that change and the golf course income continued to support the educational mission until it was closed. In my view, the last decade of unrestricted growth in Denver has eaten up almost all the green space that was available in the city outside of the parks. We now know how important those green spaces and trees are important to the health of the residents of the city. Housing is important but Denver needs to slow its growth so it can begin to make the changes necessary to have clean air for our current citizens. Keeping the Park Hill golf course green would be a huge step forward to doing that. I believe the property could be developed into an organic farming operation and tree farm that would provide apprenticeships for members of the Denver community to learn how to sustainably grow food for their neighbors and their family. The tree farm could help clean Denver's air and there might still be enough land for a park for families to enjoy.
Planning Board Comment Form	Gary Martyn	10/9/2022	Denver voters approved money to buy the Park Hill Golf Course. When that could not be accomplished, the city bought a permanent conservation easement to prevent development of the property. Denver voters did not ask the city to change course and develop this property. A private developer is trying to do this and negate what Denver voters actually voted to do. This is just wrong. The city using it's planning department to help this is also wrong. Rezoning of this property should not even be considered unless the conservation easement is somehow lifted. This whole process has been driven by a developer, not the people who hold the development rights. Please respect the citizens of Denver and do not go forward with a rezoning process. Is it even legal to do this?
Planning Board Comment Form	Gary Martyn	10/9/2022	The fine people of Denver who voted to provide the funds for preserving Park Hill Golf Course have not changed their minds and decided to develop this property. Rather, a private developer with assistance from the city is doing this. When Denver voters provided monies for the golf course property, they were buying a permanent asset for the city. That has not changed. The developer found a possible course to, in essence, invalidate that election. This is wrong, and the city should not be assisting in this effort. The small area plan should not even be considered, as Denver voters bought a perpetual conservation easement for this property. Please do the right thing for the people of Denver and reject any plan for development of the Park Hill Golf Course.
Planning Board Comment Form	Edwin L. Bell	10/9/2022	After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christine Dea Dea	10/9/2022	This attempt to revise the status of the land is ILLEGAL and not what previous widespread voting supports. No PR effort waged on the public or the political/financial push of City officials can change this. \$40,000,000 yearly is set aside for park acquisition so there is City money for a new open space. It is NOT an impossibility for the land to be maintained as open space and the thinking public knows that.
Planning Board Comment Form	Christine G Dea	10/9/2022	This is open space area. It is not zoned for 12 story apartments and the voters have SPECIFICALLY AND IN WIDESPREAD VOTING STATED THEIR DESIRE FOR OPEN SPACE. And, there is a conservation easement in place WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW THIS DEVELOPMENT. Read the law. Trying to overcome the law by pressuring City Council and others in power negates the power of the people.
Planning Board Comment Form	Timothy Dea	10/9/2022	This is an atrocity. The LAW is clear. Yet the Westside development interest is trying to shove their might down our throats. Hancock and Happy are choosing to listen to Westside and not the people nor the law. Excuse me, this is a permanent easement, meaning in perpetuity. What do you not understand. I think you totally understand, yet ally yourselves with money and power over "WE, THE PEOPLE." Oh, and then there is the LAW.
Planning Board Comment Form	Timothy P Dea	10/9/2022	Your small are plan is ILLEGAL. Before you slick your way into your plan, why don't you listen to what we have told you in our vote. While you continue to attempt your seduction of open space, we will resist. Open space is precious to those of us who are born and raised in Colorado, Denver, and specifically Park Hill. We continue to see the politicians, such as Hancock and Happy, be seduced, knowing it is a mutual benefit to Westside and Hancock and Happy. This is called a power over move which attempts to use power for ill, or for development over precious open space, WE WILL NOT SIT STILL. I WILL BE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING AND WILL VOICE MY OPINION in the open, public forum
Planning Board Comment Form	Taylor Richards	10/9/2022	Approval would result in the City and its taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside
Planning Board Comment Form	Laurel Mohr	10/10/2022	Your statement - "to best reflect the results of our community outreach, we have shaped this rezoning proposal to balance the neighborhoods support for a mix of development as well as parks and open space". Truth- The community voted 2/3 to 1/3 AGAINST development. The community overwhelmingly wants this land to remain open space. The community does not want 12 story buildings. It wants parks and open space. This proposal has completely ignored the fact that there is a conservation easement protecting the entire space .
Planning Board Comment Form	Dean DiGiulio	10/10/2022	As a long time central Denver resident who currently lives and has raised kids in central Denver, parks and open space are very important to my family. I would like to please ask that you keep this land in the public domain as a park and/or open space. There's plenty of existing private land for development, this I know, as a developer. Thanks, Dean
Planning Board Comment Form	Judith Cohen	10/10/2022	I do not understand why the City and the Planning Department continue to develop plans for this project when the citizens of Denver have clearly indicted with their votes that they do not want development of the Park Hill Golf Course and that the property cannot be developed under the current conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Gayle Larrance	10/10/2022	Too bad Mayor Hancock and the city choose to ignore the vote of the people!. Defeating commercial developers of the Park Hill golf course.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

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



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Comment Form	Greg Sorensen	10/10/2022	Westside is requesting a rezoning for property that has a conservation easement on it to protect it in perpetuity as open space. This request to rezone the property is illegitimate because the property cannot be redeveloped without a vote of the citizens of Denver and court judgement, and that has not happened. So it is premature to request a rezoning. Maintaining this 155 acres as open space is critical to help Denver address its shortage of parks. There can be no better use of this land than as open space, which will provide mental and physical health benefits for hundreds of years. There are nearby parcels that can be used for housing and commercial development. If this land is lost to development, it will never--ever--provide the open space that Denver so critically needs.
Planning Board Comment Form	T Goldhamer	10/10/2022	This land is encumbered by a conservation easement bought and paid for by taxpayers of the City and County of Denver. The City must protect the conservation purposes of the easement and not cooperate in any way with allowing uses other than open space, recreation and scenic uses. If the property owner wants to use the property for other than a golf course the City and the owner could come to agreement on other uses that still protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement and work to get any necessary court and voter approval. Such uses may not be as profitable for the property owner. This developer bought the property knowing about the easement but gambling that the city would go along with a profitable development proposal. The City has an obligation to uphold the conservation easement to protect the open space, recreation and scenic purposes of the easement. The property owner's plans and promises are enticing to some in the community but they are no guarantees and come with the burden of a Metropolitan District with substantial costs, loss of irreplaceable open space and vistas, and increased congestion and traffic. The development ideas elicited from the community should be facilitated on the surrounding undeveloped or underdeveloped land and the Park Hill Gold Course Land should be preserved as open. Please do not approve this rezoning request.
Planning Board Comment Form	Greg Sorensen	10/10/2022	This small area plan should not be approved. I do not understand why Denver is even developing this plan and acquiescing to the development of open space, something that Denver so desperately needs. How much money has the city of Denver spent on this sham process that does not take into consideration how critical open space is the mental and health and well-being of Denver residents, regardless of where they live? The Park Hill Golf Course sits in the middle of a highly developed area, with I 70 to the north and Colorado Blvd to the west; there are many nearby parcels to the west that can be developed for housing and commercial facilities, but no large parcels of open space. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to preserve open space and make it available to all Denver residents. Denver used to be known for its parks, but CPD and its development-oriented plans are squandering this opportunity, and who knows for what. This is an illegitimate planning process that is being done before a vote by Denver citizens whether to allow this area to be developed. Shame on CPD and the Hancock administration for being at the beck and call of Westside to develop a small area plan that only includes this 155-acre area, but not the surrounding neighborhoods. If "affordable housing" were developed on this property, it would not be affordable after the creation of metropolitan districts to finance infrastructure development. This entire plan is a travesty and must not be approved.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tracey MacDermott	10/10/2022	I am opposing both Westside's rezoning application and the proposed Park Hill Golf course Small Area Plan. The city should not waste anymore of our city taxes to help support a developer. The Park Hill Neighborhood Survey conducted by NRC clearly shows that the neighbors in North and Northeast Park Hill do not want this land developed. Ballot initiative 301 also clearly shows the will of the people. We are in a climate crisis with Denver rating number 3 in the heat island effect as well as lacking in Park space. There is a conversation easement in place. Don't buy the developers non-sense argument that the land can only be a golf course. This is a blatant attempt to get cheap land for even cheaper development.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alex walsh	10/10/2022	This land has a conservation easement on it that restricts use. There is no way this should be rezoned as it would be a violation of the conservation easement.
Planning Board Comment Form	Alex walsh	10/10/2022	This plan cannot move forward as there is a conservation easement on the land that restricts use as well as a city ordinance that requires a vote of the people before amending the easement. Stop wasting time and tax dollars undermining this process.
Planning Board Comment Form	Tom Korson	10/10/2022	As to the Park Hill Golf Course, it is very important to preserve open space in a city (Denver) experiencing rapid growth. I would prefer that that golf course be kept as is or converted into a park. Only very limited building should be permitted. Thank you
Planning Board Comment Form	Jay Morse	10/11/2022	The City of Denver has made a long standing commitment of maintaining, keeping and adding open space for parks. With so much hardscape and development in the city we need to keep that last of this large open space. Yes, it's important to have housing for people and to have green space for people to recreate, rest, and enjoy. There's plenty of opportunity to have dense housing surrounding this area. By keeping this area as open space for a park, the value of living in the area is immense. We have beautiful parks in Denver and we need this greenspace to thrive and live up to our high standards of being a healthy population. Also, this space is protected by a conservation easement. Let's respect that decision.
Planning Board Comment Form	Jay Morse	10/11/2022	The City of Denver has made a long standing commitment of maintaining, keeping and adding open space for parks. With so much hardscape and development in the city we need to keep that last of this large open space. Yes, it's important to have housing for people and to have green space for people to recreate, rest, and enjoy. There's plenty of opportunity to have dense housing surrounding this area. By keeping this area as open space for a park, the value of living in the area is immense. We have beautiful parks in Denver and we need this greenspace to thrive and live up to our high standards of being a healthy population. Also, this space is protected by a conservation easement. Let's respect that decision.
Planning Board Comment Form	Georgia McCracken Garnsey	10/11/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement that prohibits development. It is also protected by a state statute that requires anyone who wants to develop the property to show a Judge how it is "impossible" to maintain the area as open and recreational space. Nothing has changed. The conservation easement is in place. The State Statue is still in place. It is currently ILLEGAL to develop on the Park Hill Golf Course land. All the taxpayer money that has gone into the city and Westside's process to try and ram development through on land that the community at large does not want to see developed is a terrible and disgraceful waste. The city of Denver is not working on behalf of its tax paying citizens they have vowed to serve. This administration and the Planning Department are working on behalf of Westside Investment. If the conservation easement were lifted they would have succeeded in gifting Westside Investment Partners at least \$60 million. The environmental impact to this already concretized and highly polluted and trafficked area of Denver is incalculable.
Planning Board Comment Form	Georgia McCracken Garnsey	10/11/2022	The community does not want dense development, twelve story buildings, and massive amounts of concrete on the Park Hill Golf Course land. The community voted overwhelmingly to maintain the land as open space for recreational purposes in an area that is already undergoing dense development - including affordable housing - all around it. The city and Westside have conducted a sham Steering Committee Process where the committee is stacked with pro-development people and the words "conservation easement" were not allowed to be uttered. The city and Westside have conducted sham Push Surveys and other sham mechanisms to show community support for development and that is a sham, too. At a recent board meeting of the Northeast Denver Coalition most of the neighbors who showed up to speak about the PHGC land were adamant that they wanted the land to remain as open space and a possible regional park. It is also ILLEGAL to develop on the PHGC land. The land is protected by a Perpetual Conservation Easement and a State Statute, yet the city has spent upwards of \$250 million to push through rezoning and a small area plan that it would be ILLEGAL to implement. Sham upon sham upon sham. This administration and everyone who participated in and promoted all these sham processes are tainted forever. You have not served but manipulated and betrayed the tax paying citizens you vowed to serve. Disgraceful and it won't be forgotten.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

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

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

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

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

<p>Planning Board Comment Form</p>	<p>Shanta Harrison-Sullivan</p>	<p>10/19/2022</p>	<p>Good afternoon,I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Park Hill Golf Course land. I am a life-long resident of Northeast Park Hill, and live about two minutes away from Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC). I have admired the grounds for many years, and attended many events at the clubhouse. Having lived in Park Hill my entire life, the scenery as I drive down 35th Avenue from my home to Colorado Boulevard, is familiar. It's relaxing. It's home. The vast landscape of trees and greenery creates a sense of tranquility and nostalgia that no longer exists in other areas of the neighborhood. It is the perfect location for a regional park, and will be a welcome reprieve for all when the surrounding areas are developed, traffic increases, and the heat island effect begins to rise. The last thing we need on this land is 5-12 story buildings – the majority of which will contain more market rate housing.Park Hill is most definitely in need of TRULY affordable housing, a grocery store, and other essential amenities. We have yet to see a comprehensive study of other areas in and around the PHGC site that could accommodate these needs. The PHGC, surrounded by five different neighborhoods, has become a magnet for those craving fresh air and open space. A growing number of residents are taking advantage of the natural landscapes and walking paths that the land offers. The land is already being used as parkland. I'll say that again for the folks in the back...THE PEOPLE are already using this beautiful open space as PARKLAND – walking, biking, exercising, etc. All that's missing are the swing sets and benches. The people have unofficially spoken. It's time to make it official and, designate the PHGC as a public park, open and accessible to all!</p>
<p>Planning Board Comment Form</p>	<p>Shane Sutherland</p>	<p>10/18/2022</p>	<p>I am writing to inform you that on October 6, 2022, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., (GPHC) voted 16-0 approving the attached resolution. This resolution entitled "RESOLUTION OPPOSING WESTSIDE INVESTMENT PARTNERS' AREA PLAN AND REZONING REQUEST FOR THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND" is in opposition to the proposed rezoning of Park Hill Golf Course.The GPHC is a Registered Neighborhood Organization with the City and County of Denver. Park Hill Golf Course is entirely inside the boundaries of GPHC.Shane Sutherland, Chair Greater Park Hill Community Inc. RESOLUTION OPPOSING WESTSIDE INVESTMENT PARTNERS' AREA PLAN AND REZONING REQUEST FOR THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LAND At a meeting of the Board of Governors of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. on October 6, 2022, the following resolution passed:WHEREAS, with Denver's significantly increased density and population and the adverse impacts of climate change,Denver has a critical need to protect and enhance its parks and open space for the health and well-being of its residents;WHEREAS, Denver's parks and open space have failed to keep up with its increased density and population;WHEREAS, Colorado conservation easements are created for the purpose, among other things, of maintaining land predominately in a natural, scenic, or open condition or for wildlife habitat or for recreational or other useconsistent with the protection of open land, environmental quality or life-sustaining ecological diversity;WHEREAS, the City owns a perpetual open space Conservation Easement purchased in 1997 for \$2 million whichprotects the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course land from development (the "Conservation Easement");WHEREAS, Westside Investment Partners ("Westside") purchased the Park Hill Golf Course land in July 2019 subjectto the Conservation Easement and has declared its desire to cancel the Conservation Easement and develop thePark Hill Golf Course land;WHEREAS, the Community Planning and Development Department has prepared a "Park Hill Golf Course SmallArea Plan" ("Area Plan") and Westside has filed a "Zone Map Amendment Application" [Case No. 20221-00158]("Westside's Rezoning Application") requesting to rezone the Park Hill Golf Course land from the existing OS-B OpenSpace Recreation District to multiple different mixed use zone districts in order to facilitate development on the western half of the site.;WHEREAS, the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application involve building high-density commercial andresidential buildings up to 12 stories high on at least 55 acres along Colorado Boulevard, adding as many as 4,300residential units and 10,000 new residents, doubling the population of Northeast Park Hill, and making Dahlia ahigh traffic through street connecting Smith Road to 35th Avenue;WHEREAS, the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application will be on the October 19, 2022 Denver PlanningBoard agenda;WHEREAS, the Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. (GPHC) Board of Governors has consistently supported the Conservation Easement by passing the following Resolutions:April 2018: RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE LANDAugust 2020: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REFERRED CHARTER AMENDMENT; LET DENVER VOTE;OPEN SPACE PRESERVATIONJuly 2019: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRESERVING THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE PERPETUALOPEN SPACE CONSERVATION EASEMENTSeptember 2021: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INITIATED ORDINANCE 301 AND IN OPPOSITION TOINITIATED ORDINANCE 302WHEREAS, in October 2019, GPHC commissioned a formal statistically valid neighborhood-wide survey conductedby the National Research Center, the results of which showed that, regarding terminating or modifying theConservation Easement and changing the zoning for the Park Hill Golf Course land, three-quarters of respondentspreferred the land remain entirely some kind of green space/park or golf course;WHEREAS, the approval of the Area Plan and Westside's Rezoning Application would violate the Conservation Easementand the Colorado Conservation Easement statute (C.R.S. § 38-30.5-107) unless a court order is first obtained allowingtermination, release, extinguishment, or abandonment of the Conservation Easement, and would result in the City andits taxpayers making a multi-million gift to Westside;NOW THEREFORE, Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. respectfully urges the members of the Denver Planning Boardand the Denver City Council to vote against the "Park Hill Golf Course Small Area Plan" and Westside's "Zone MapAmendment Application" [Case No. 20221-00158].Approved: October 6, 2022</p>
<p>Planning Board Online Comment Form</p>	<p>Mimi Madrid</p>	<p>10/19/2022</p>	<p>My name is Mimi Madrid, I reside in Swansea at 4334 Elizabeth Street.I urge committee to VOTE NO on the rezoning request and the small area plan.Over the years, I've witnessed how landowners, investors and developers gentrify neighborhoods and displace poor and working families who are predominately families of color. It's done in a strategic manner - where community organizations are called in to create resident trust, nurture city buy-in, and ends in eventual displacement of most of the original residents.When Sisters of Color United for Education, a trusted long-standing community organization, called on residents and community members to help nurture the Park Hill Golf Course clubhouse back to life we answered with a renewed sense of faith in Westside Investment Partners and the Holleran Group. They must be different!Sisters of Color remodeled the clubhouse and made it suitable and safe for community members to access the building. Along with many others, I witnessed the years of decay, underdevelopment of the building - even saw rat carcasses behind kitchen stoves. As soon as the building was ready for community programs the issues began.Right before the vote in November, Westside and Holleran fell back on their lease agreement with Sisters of Color. Westside and Holleran Group has recently offered a settlement of \$173,000 for the remodel BUT to be paid out in a span of several years AND to be claimed as a charitable contribution. Their offer is disrespectful - it puts undue burden on Sisters and is asking for undeserving tax benefits for their bad actions. Sisters have decided to sue.I do believe our community needs affordable housing, accessibility to healthy food, and economic opportunities.However, I believe Westside and Holleran Group have acted in bad-faith with community partners and this behavior will continue decades into a project of this magnitude. Community Agreements they make at-large will not be held and their actions show they will be broken.They will benefit themselves long-term and not the most underserved residents in our community.You can read the full lawsuit online in the Westword publication titled: Sisters of Color Suing Park Hill Golf Course Developers Over Clubhouse Dispute.I urge you to VOTE NO.</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Monica Smith-Acuña, P5YD</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>Dear Planning Board,As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP.Sincerely,Monica Smith Acuna1258 S Williams St Denver CO 80210</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Emily Tracy</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Emily Tracy1407 E. 10th Ave. #11Denver CO 80218</p>



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

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

<b>Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log</b>			
Planning Board Email	Matt Wagner	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Matt Wagner 2936 Emporia Street Denver 80238
Planning Board Email	Anita West-Berry	10/10/2022	Dear Planning Board,I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rentals and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. We need to create fair, environmentally, sustainable, and healthy communities for families, youth, and seniors. We need to ensure that Black and Indigenous People of Color(BIPOC) have easy access to transportation, parks and recreation, good jobs, healthy foods, and medical care. We can start by giving voice to the issue and then put action to words. I think it’s important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Anita West-Berry 4027 E 30th Ave Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Nick Massie	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.
Planning Board Email	Leslie J. Berry, Jr.	10/10/2022	I am a third generation native and resident of the City and County of Denver. My grandfather, Dr. Clarence F. Holmes, Jr, was born in 1892, was the 2nd African American dentist in Denver, and founded the NAACP chapter in Denver. To say I have a “dog in this hunt” is an understatement. I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help get us arrive at this point. The process has been Open, Transparent to the public, and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP.Sincerely, Leslie J. Berry, Jr.4027 E. 30th AveDenver, CO 80207(303) 862-1726
Planning Board Email	Sara O’Keefe	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,Sara O’Keefe2432 N Washington St Denver, 80205
Planning Board Email	Bryan-David Blakely	10/13/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Bryan-David Blakely 510 Grape St, Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	John DeLuca	10/13/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, John DeLuca 2645 W. 25th Ave Denver, CO 80211

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log**

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Keely C. Downs	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). We need more housing units and an old golf course is a great opportunity to use the land for a better purpose. This is a great area for housing units and the Small Area Plan looks really great as well. As a Denver resident who loves the City of Denver, I am strongly in support of this plan to create more than 2500 new homes. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Keely Downs 1940 S. Milwaukee Street, Denver, CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Eric Hecox	10/7/2022	I write in support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158) as Denver has a desperate need for additional housing as well as publicly accessible parks. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. Our community also needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Eric Hecox 1651 North Monaco Parkway Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Karolette Greene	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Karolette Greene 2395 Clermont Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Kyle Bassett	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Kyle Bassett 15449 West Baltic Ave, Lakewood CO 80228
Planning Board Email	John Victor	10/7/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. John Victor, GS Mobile Home Communities/Highline, Inc. 2100 E. Cofax Blvd. Denver, CO 80206
Planning Board Email	Brian Chen	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Brian Chen 255 Ash Street Denver 80220

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

Planning Board Email	William Ray	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. William Ray, 1782 Locust Street Denver CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Lisa J. Wingrove	10/8/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Lisa J Wingrove 2310 Elm Street Denver CO 80207
Planning Board Email	James J. Peros Pamela A. Peros	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. James J. Peros Pamela A. Peros 3855 S. Niagara Way Denver, Colorado 80237
Planning Board Email	Mina Ishida Goldst	10/8/2022	I support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). My neighborhood, Park Hill, and in reality all neighborhoods, need more opportunities to build generational wealth. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Over the last few years, my family and I have known many people who have moved out of Park Hill in search of more affordable housing options in places outside the city like Aurora and Houston. Park Hill just doesn't have enough of the smaller, varietal homes that suit various financial and life needs of families and individuals. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. This area will become a thriving economic center for my neighborhood, and I wholeheartedly support that. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Mina Ishida Goldstein 1569 Eudora St. Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Lisa Williams	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Lisa Williams, 1201 Galapago St, Denver, CO 80204
Planning Board Email	Anonymous	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log			
Planning Board Email	Barbara Hill	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Barbara Hill 5789 S Danube Circle Aurora, CO 80015
Planning Board Email	Uta Greene	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Uta Greene 2825 S Cherry Way Denver, CO 80222
Planning Board Email	Andrew Feinstein	10/9/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Andrew
Planning Board Email	Erik Anderson	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Erik Anderson 650 Locust Street Denver CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Elizabeth J. Peros	10/9/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct and unused golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. The Park Hill Golf Course should be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. Specifically, more than 2,500 new homes can be built on the site, and at least 25% of those homes will be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of affordable housing options, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. In addition to housing, the community has articulated its desire for parks on this site. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. This is a perfect location to add in the community's preferences for parks and housing. The development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates parks and open space and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I cannot think of a worse use for the site. I am especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. I can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Please approve the plan and the rezoning. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Elizabeth J. Peros 3554 S. Hudson Street Denver, CO 80237
Planning Board Email	Tyler Downs	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Tyler Downs Wazee Partners, LLC 44 Cook Street, Suite 400 Denver, CO 80206

<b>Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log</b>			
Planning Board Email	Christopher Banks	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Christopher Banks 2459 S Kittredge Way Aurora, CO. 80013
Planning Board Email	Stacey Cha	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that the Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Stacey Cha 999 S Logan St. #230 Denver, CO 80209
Planning Board Email	Churchill Bunn	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Thank you, Churchill Bunn 474 S. Williams Street Denver, CO 80209
Planning Board Email	Jody Beck, PhD	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). I have spent the last two decades studying the issues of equity and justice in cities, much of that centered around how land use and access to resources impacts our citizens. The current use of this site as a golf course does not address the current needs of our cities, and neither does maintaining the entire site as open space. The citizens of our city desperately need affordable housing which the proposal in the Small Area Plan offers. The plan’s proposal to make 25% of the housing on site permanently affordable is not only evidence of the good faith of the development team to address the needs of our citizens, but much needed in Denver. Open space is good, but high-quality open space that is rich with activity and accessible to homes is better. The current golf course use, and reserving the entire site as mere grass open space, is not only failing to provide a high quality open space for the city but it is grossly wasteful in terms of water and the need to use heavy loads of fertilizer and pesticides. The proposal would give the citizens of Denver a truly usable, high-quality, and accessible space of over 100 acres. This is a great improvement to our city. Lastly, the planning board can only approve this plan if it cares about equity. The plan provides for incubator and retail space that nearby residents can use to start building generational wealth – something that has been denied many of our citizens because of their race and background. I have also followed the politics of this site for many years. There are several very loud voices who do not live in the neighborhood and have funding and roots elsewhere that are arguing for keeping the site as a golf course – without any logical argument and certainly without any concern for equity and justice. It is clear to me that most of the people who should be making this decision – those who would be benefited from a redevelopment of the site – want more affordable housing, accessible retail and especially grocery stores, places to grow businesses and other enterprises, and safe high-quality open space. I reiterate that I am in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course along with the rezoning application. I am happy to answer any questions you may have in this regard. Cheers, Jody Beck, PhD Associate Professor, Landscape Architecture University of Colorado Denver
Planning Board Email	Sylvia Lambe	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood’s food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and open up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Sylvia Lambe 3751 S Hillcrest Drive, Denver, CO 80237
Planning Board Email	John DeLuca	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, John DeLuca 2645 W. 25th Ave Denver, CO 80211
Planning Board Email	Kelsy and Edwin Bell, Jr.	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022i-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It’s important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Kelsy and Edwin Bell, Jr. 4206 Madison Denver, Colorado 80216



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Sevinay Yese Kovats</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>My name is Sevinay Yese Kovats, I am CO Licensed architect practicing and living in Denver. I am writing in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Sevinay Yese Kovats 7700 E 29th Avenue Unit 401, Denver CO 80010</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Barb Frommell</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>I am a Park Hill resident, and I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Barb Frommell 4035 E 18th Avenue Denver, CO 80220</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Casey A. Grosscope</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,Casey A. Grosscope</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Olivia Fortunato</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford.This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units.I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to.Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Best, Olivia Fortunato</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Kerri R. Fields</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Kerri R. Fields9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203Aurora80247</p>
<p>Planning Board Email</p>	<p>Kerri R. Fields</p>	<p>10/10/2022</p>	<p>As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP.Sincerely,Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203 Aurora 80247</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203Aurora80247
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following:•Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site•A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood•Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians•Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Kerri R. Field 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203Aurora 80247
Planning Board Email	Rodney D Bell	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Rodney D Bell 2496 Champa Street Denver, CO 80205
Planning Board Email	Kerri R. Fields	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Kerri R. Fields 9855 E Louisiana Dr. Apt 10-203Aurora80247
Planning Board Email	Jason Kaplan	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely Jason Kaplan 4130 Montview Blvd Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Morgan Ryan	10/10/2022	As a longtime resident of the City of Denver, I am writing this letter in support of the approval of the Small Area Plan and the Rezoning Application for the Park Hill Golf Course Redevelopment. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. This rezoning application and the proposed zone districts are firmly in line with the draft Small Area Plan. The draft SAP calls for a mixed-use development and 100 acres of open space, both of which would be accomplished through this proposed rezoning and accompanying Development Agreement. More importantly, the SAP encourages a balance between open space and housing in a way that can truly benefit all of Northeast Denver. We support the process and the plan and respectfully request the approval of the SAP. Sincerely, Morgan Ryan 1028 Tamarac St. Denver, CO 80230
Planning Board Email	David Pietsch, III	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, David Pietsch, III 2343 S Clayton St. Denver, CO 80210

**Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log**

Planning Board Email	Ryan O'Brien	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Ryan O'Brien 650 Dexter Street, Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Tim Kovats, aia, LEED AP	10/10/2022	My name is Tim Kovats, I am a local architect and twenty-plus year resident of Denver. I am writing in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to.</li> </ul> Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, timothy kovats, aia / leed ap / project architect
Planning Board Email	Eric Lazzari	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Eric Lazzari 1144 S Monroe St Denver CO 80210
Planning Board Email	Greg Ryan	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Greg Ryan 1028 Tamarac St. Denver, CO 80230</li> </ul>
Planning Board Email	Jason Kleinhelter	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely, Jason Kleinhelter 2615 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207</li> </ul>
Planning Board Email	Brooke Hickerson	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely, Brooke Hickerson 2645 E 2nd Avenue, Suite 200 Denver, CO, 80206</li> </ul>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Alyssa Bryant	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Alyssa Bryant Aurora, CO 80014
Planning Board Email	Allen Aaron Lampert	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. While I'm not currently a Denver resident, I lived in Denver for 10 years between 1998 and 2008 and do a lot of business in the city and county in the commercial real estate arena. Sincerely, Allen Aaron Lampert 16155 W. Bayaud Drive Golden, CO 80401
Planning Board Email	Mark S. Marshall	10/10/2022	As a Park Hill resident, I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood needs more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Mark S. Marshall 2572 Elms Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Joe DelZotto	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). As the owner of over 300 units to the northwest corner of the golf course, the community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. I commend the City and the community stakeholders who have participated in nearly two years of discussions to help us arrive at this point. The process has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. 100 acres of park and open space, the opportunity to add a significant amount of permanently affordable housing, better access to public transportation, and the potential to address the neighborhood's lack of a grocery store are all reasons to approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Joe DelZotto 355 S Madison St #326, Denver, CO, 80209
Planning Board Email	Peter Eklund	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Peter Eklund 5410 E 6th Avenue Parkway Denver, CO 80220
Planning Board Email	Evan Smith-Acuna	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Evan Smith-Acuna 1870 Vine St #103 Denver, CO 80206
Planning Board Email	Kevin Cosgrove	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Kevin Cosgrove

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Brian Hommertzhem	10/10/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD’s A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I’m impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following:•Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site•A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood•Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes & pedestrians•Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets.Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Brian Hommertzhem 2053 Krameria St. Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Rob Thomas	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely, Rob Thomas 20377 e 49th ave denver,CO 80249
Planning Board Email	Glenn P Greene	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it’s important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. Sincerely,Glenn P Greene 8080 E Dartmouth Ave #38Denver, CO80231
Planning Board Email	Mark Howard	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site.After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That’s enough land to create the City’s 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I’m especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it’s intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Mark Howard 4624 Raleigh Street Denver, CO 80212
Planning Board Email	Will Wagenlander	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). Denver is facing the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased more than 45% in twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. I want a City where all can afford to live, including my children when it’s time for them to find their own home. We need housing for everyone. Not a passive park space that only serves a select few. Why can’t we have both needed housing and needed parks at Park Hill Golf Course? This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It’s worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City’s new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. It’s critical that the Planning Board recognizes how helpful the public process has been. Two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely Will Wagenlander 10857 East 26th Ave. Denver, CO 80238
Planning Board Email	Christopher Levy	10/11/2022	I am asking that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022I-00158). After a months-long public process, the community has made clear that there is no longer a need for a golf course at this location and wants something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community made clear that this is not a choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing.Denver has changed and so have the needs of its residents. The development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. As a resident of Park Hill, this is the type of activation that makes me excited to be a young person living on this side of the city.Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course, and as someone who frequently enjoys the newly renovated City Park course just down the street, I can’t think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park, new housing, and the opportunity for activation. Your support of the applicant’s proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely,Christopher Levy 2315 Elm Street Denver, CO 80207

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Cameron Greene	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has brought us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and the community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is an excellent demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted.Sincerely,Cameron Greene 2100 Welton st #1016 Denver, CO 80205
Planning Board Email	Matt Wagner	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Matt Wagner 2936 Emporia Street Denver 80238
Planning Board Email	Rhoda Pilmer	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Rhoda Pilmer 2283 Locust Street Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Matt Brady	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of the community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on the community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to the community to live, work, and play. Upholding the commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that the community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely,Matt Brady 1560 W Nevada Pl Denver, CO 80223
Planning Board Email	Sanai Fennell	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors.Sincerely,Sanai Fennell3464 E. 31st Ave. Denver, CO 80205Owner of3581 Olive St. Denver, CO 80207
Planning Board Email	Rachel Feinberg	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me:•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project.Sincerely,Rachel Feinberg2690 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207



Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Planning Board Email	Dilpreet Jammu	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Dilpreet Jammu 12762 Ironstone Way #303 Parker CO 80134
Planning Board Email	Jamira T. Jones	10/10/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years trying to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Jamira T Jones 1119 Detroit St Denver CO 80206
Planning Board Email	Stephen Fagan	10/11/2022	I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Stephen Fagan 3728 Jason St Denver, CO 80211
Planning Board Email	Jice Johnson	10/11/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Jice Johnson 1031 33rd St., Denver, CO 80205
Planning Board Email	Jackie Curry	10/12/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work, and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors, and opens up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Jackie Curry 755 South Dexter St Apt 125 Denver, CO 80246
Planning Board Email	Darren Boyd	10/12/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Sincerely, Darren Boyd 3319 Columbine St Denver, CO 80205

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

<p>Email to Planning Board</p>	<p>Rachel Feinberg</p>	<p>10/15/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: •New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy •Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping •Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity •The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver) I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project Sincerely, Rachel Feinberg 2690 Forest Street Denver, CO 80207</p>
<p>Email to Planning Board</p>	<p>Catherine Compitello</p>	<p>10/11/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Thank you for considering this important perspective. Catherine</p>
<p>Email to Planning Board</p>	<p>Greg Holm</p>	<p>10/17/2022</p>	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45% in the last twelve months, and starter homes are practically non-existent. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units, and each of us knows someone who has been impacted by the lack of housing that people can afford. This proposal would convert the defunct golf course – which can only be used as a golf course under the conservation easement – into much-needed affordable and workforce housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25% of those homes would be permanently affordable. It's worth noting that the on-site affordable housing would be more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements. I am also impressed that the developer has committed to creating hundreds of rental and for-sale permanently affordable homes, including family-sized and deeply affordable units. The most successful and popular parks in the City of Denver – City Park, Crestmoor Park, Cheesman Park, Washington Park and others, thrive because they are surrounded on all sides by residential development that has direct access to the parks. Parks need people with easy access and residential development directly adjacent to parks is what makes parks thrive. This project's residential units will provide that missing element to the Park Hill Golf Club site. In contrast, Park Hill Golf Club is bounded on the: •West by Colorado Blvd., a six lane arterial street that is a major barrier to potential users on the west side of Colorado Blvd., •East by older industrial buildings on 75% of the frontage and by existing single family homes on 25% •North by Smith Road, another arterial street, as well as by the Union Pacific Railroad. North of Smith Road and the UP tracks are again older industrial buildings and there is multi-family development on about 30% of the frontage on the S. side of Smith Road. •South by existing single family development. The applicant's proposal will provide the additional residential density needed so that the 100 acres of parks the applicant proposes can thrive like the other great parks in Denver. In addition, the applicant will be funding the construction of the parks and the residential development they propose will generate substantial property tax revenue to make the City of Denver more fiscally sustainable and will provide additional funding for schools in the immediate vicinity of the project. The opponents claim to be in support of park uses, however the site plans on the Yes for Parks and Open Space website omit the surrounding context outlined above, which demonstrates that, without additional residential development, would likely result in a park without the users needed for the park to thrive. The opponents also offer no solutions for funding the design and construction of the park they suggest, and they are disingenuous when they suggest a park when the conservation easement they insist be preserved only permits an 18 hole golf course. While one can only guess at their motivations, their mention of the group's support of single family only zoning suggests that they support only the most expensive housing type, which historically has been used as a tool to exclude people with lower incomes, which includes many people in the BIPOC community. The opposition offers only that, opposition, and no positive vision of how this site can be utilized to address Denver's housing crisis. I think it's important that Planning Board also recognizes how helpful the public process has been in bringing us to this point. Nearly two years of discussions between the City and community have resulted in a process that has been transparent to the public and accountable to the community, and is a great demonstration that the SAP process can work the way it was intended to. Our community urgently needs both parks and homes. This proposal does that, and so much more. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications as submitted. Greg Holm 1325 S. Downing St. Denver, CO 80210</p>
<p>Email to Planning Board</p>	<p>Sarah McGregor</p>	<p>10/15/2022</p>	<p>I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – we want both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis, and the City has invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park and much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. Those who oppose the plan are essentially supporting a privately owned golf course and I can't think of a worse use for the site. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have a new park and new housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Sarah McGregor 2886 Emporia Denver 80238</p>
<p>Email to Planning Board</p>	<p>Shawn Lindabury</p>	<p>10/16/2022</p>	<p>I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #2022-00158). Because transportation accounts for nearly one-third of carbon emissions in Colorado, I support this project because it recognizes the importance of building new parks and housing near mass transit. The proposed mixed-use project at Park Hill is demonstrating best practices in land use too – the last thing we need at the intersection of RTD's A-Line and the planned Bus Rapid Transit on Colorado Boulevard is a golf course. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. Some of the elements of this project that I really like include the following: •Miles of new trails and multi-use paths through the site •A very cool partnership with 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, which will carry people to and from the site while also centering on the rich history and culture of the neighborhood •Safer infrastructure for cars, bikes &amp; pedestrians •Improved intersections to promote connectivity I especially like that the new regional park is not surrounded by busy streets. Unlike other city parks that have major corridors as their perimeters, the entire western edge of the parkland will be folded into the community development. Sincerely, Shawn Lindabury 3635 Akron St Denver, CO 80238</p>

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Email to Planning Board	Michael Niyompong	10/16/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). The Park Hill neighborhood is in need of more opportunities to build generational wealth and offset the displacement of our community. The lack of attainable housing – especially home-ownership opportunities – has had a real impact on our community. Instead of a defunct and unused golf course, I want this area to be transformed into something that can provide multiple opportunities to our community to live, work and play. Upholding our commitments to improving equity and inclusion begin with attainable housing. And by creating hundreds of new rental and for-sale homes that our community members can afford, this project represents a big step forward in meeting these goals. The plan also creates new opportunities for local entrepreneurs, especially women- and BIPOC-owned businesses through commercial space and affordable incubator spaces. Local businesses are critical components to a thriving community, and I like how the commercial space is connected to the community and the new park. Most importantly, this proposal emphasizes community health and safety. This project recognizes the need to create walkable communities with healthy food options and local retail, and overcoming the neighborhood's food desert is a huge community priority. Well-lit paths and the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail will create new opportunities to be outdoors and open up miles of new accessible trails and connectors. Sincerely, Michael Niyompong 2545 S. Sherman St. Denver, CO 80210
Email to Planners	Rodger Hara	10/18/2022	I am a Denver resident and have been involved in affordable housing finance and development for 50 years. I have worked for HUD at the local and national levels, for CHFA, DHA and a variety of private sector clients during that time. Since 2008, I have been an independent consultant for developers, housing authorities, HUD, CHFA, DOH, etc. This is to express my support for the proposed work at Park Hill by Westside, as I think it is an appropriate and necessary use. I have no relationship with Westside or anyone connected with the project and am expressing my support as a resident of Denver and advocate for good land use. Best, Rodger Hara 4255 S. Olive St., Unit 13 Denver 80237
Email to Planning Board	Bill James	10/18/2022	Some of you know me as a former Director at RTD and a long-time commercial and residential real estate appraiser with specialties in transportation-oriented development and affordable housing. I write to ask that you approve the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). I welcome the gift from the YIMBY group of some of the language in this memo. Many years ago I advanced my feeble ability as a golfer by frequently playing at Park Hill Golf Course. More recently I appraised the property and watched it grow to serve the storm-water detention needs of the surrounding area. So I am very familiar with this asset of the city and want to ensure it will serve the city well in the future. With that background, I have watched closely the evolving controversy about redevelopment of the golf course land. After an extensive public process, the community has made clear that it wants to transform the defunct golf course into something that can meet their priorities on a more urgent basis. Most importantly, the community has rejected a false choice between keeping this land as all parks or building new housing – the community needs both parks and housing. It's important to acknowledge that Denver has changed a lot since the easement was put in place 25 years ago. We are in the middle of a housing crisis. The City and RTD have invested billions of dollars in our rail transit infrastructure which with a station nearby can serve the community at Park Hill. We need to honor that investment as well, and the development application puts forth a balanced solution that creates a huge new park, much needed housing and retail for the local neighborhood. As a student of land use, I think the former golf course can well serve all of those needs. Please approve the plan and the rezoning so we can have new housing and a new park and retail to serve the new and existing housing. Your support of the applicant's proposal will bring us one step closer to a better reuse of this site. Sincerely, Bill William M. James MAI CCIM MBA
Email	Ruth and Stephen Rohs	10/19/2022	I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Our community needs new parks and open spaces. Under the current conservation easement at Park Hill Golf Course, the land can only ever be an 18-hole golf course and driving range. Considering that the old golf course used more than 106 million gallons of water every year, along with tons of fertilizers and pesticides, the community has made clear that there are better uses for this site. After more than 20 months of a comprehensive public process, the community has articulated its priorities for both parks AND homes on this site, instead of a defunct golf course. More than 100 acres, or two-thirds of this site, will be dedicated for new public parks and open spaces. That's enough land to create the City's 11th Regional Park, and new places to enjoy for both the community and all of Denver. For people who love parks, and want more of them, this proposal has lots of great details that appeal to me: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•New publicly accessible outdoor and indoor recreational facilities that everyone can enjoy</li> <li>•Removing water-intensive grass will be replaced with more trees and native drought-tolerant plant palettes and landscaping</li> <li>•Increased biodiversity, pollinator habitats and activity</li> <li>•The developer would contribute more than \$20 million toward park improvements (in addition to the donation of land to the City of Denver)</li> </ul> I'm especially grateful to the City staff and the community members who have helped ensure that the entire public process has been transparent and accountable. We have spent more than two years to understand the best possible uses of this site, and we can confidently say that the public process has worked the way it's intended to. Our community has a huge shortage of housing, and this is a perfect location to add in both parks AND homes. Please approve this project. Sincerely, Ruth and Stephen Rohs 4059 S Niagara Way Denver, CO 80237
Email to Planning Board	Kristen Andersen (part 1)	10/19/2022	I live right next to the Park Hill Golf Course property and want to submit these comments on the proposed zoning change for the Park Hill Golf Course property but cannot attend your meeting today. Please take them into consideration when you evaluate the zoning change proposal and vote to keep this parcel zoned open space. As long as there is a city-owned conservation easement on the land, the city's zoning should support that use. These comments were also submitted through the link in the email that was sent out about this meeting, but I could not tell if that went to you on the planning board or not. So here they are again, to make sure you receive them. Please forgive any duplication. I'm writing to share my strong objections to the proposed rezoning of this property. Denver voters voted to protect this land through a conservation easement and paid for that easement because we wanted to see this large property preserved as open space. As Denver has continued to get more and more developed, large tracts of land like this become even more important to give residents places to recreate, access nature and the mountain views that make our city famous, as well as to preserve places that help reduce air pollution and reduce the heat island effect that has become more and more dramatic in recent years. Northeast Park Hill was identified in a recent study as being one of the worst areas of the city for the urban heat island effect, because we have so much pavement and so little tree cover. We must keep this large property with mature trees open space to prevent that from becoming worse. In this neighborhood, we live every day with significant air pollution from all the traffic along I-70 and Colorado Boulevard, as well as from the truck traffic to the industrial area north of us. We also get the pet food-processing smell from the Purina plant on a regular basis. The natural open space on the golf course property, with its mature trees, helps ameliorate those effects. If the city truly believes in health equity for all its residents, we need to do what we can to protect the things that help make up for the extra environmental health risks that residents in neighborhoods with higher pollution live with every day. Protecting this land as open space and continuing its existing zoning is a crucial step to do that in this neighborhood.

Park Hill Golf Course - Comment Log

12/8/2022

Email to Planning Board	Kristen Andersen (part 2)	10/19/2022	<p>Furthermore, a number of the claims in this application are disingenuous. First, the applicant mischaracterizes the existing easement as only allowing the property to be operated as a golf course that only few people can benefit from, but the easement specifically mentions recreations. Former Mayor Webb has said it was clear when it was written and approved by voters that the intention was to keep the land open space for recreation, which could be interpreted more broadly. Second, the public outreach section completely ignores significant objections to developing this property, registered at every stage of this proposal's public comment opportunities by both those of us who live within blocks of this property (as I do) and other city residents who voted for and helped fund the purchase of the conservation easement. Finally, the applicant also significantly exaggerates the amount of open space that would actually be publicly accessible for recreation under this proposal. A large portion of the proposed "park" is actually a stormwater detention area that is not publicly accessible for recreation. And about 20 other acres of their open space total would just be green spaces in front of buildings, not a large park that anyone can use for recreation. Denver's long-term plans include becoming a more sustainable and climate-resilient city. Honoring the will of voters and taxpayers through preserving the open space designation for this space will help us achieve that. It will reduce the heat island effect, help ameliorate pollution, by retaining mature trees, can help prevent flooding like we recently experienced by keeping more unpaved land, supports residents' health by providing a large place for outdoor recreation in a very built-up area, and protects wildlife habitats in the city (foxes were regularly seen on the land this summer). Please support and help boost Denver's image and reality as an environmental and livable city by keeping the current zoning designation for this property. All of the other very important needs identified for this neighborhood through this planning process can happen on other parcels that are already zoned for development.</p>
Email	Carol Friesen	10/19/2022	<p>I am writing in support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). I have enjoyed using the Park Hill golf course in the past, but I believe that this is a far better use of the land. Given the opportunity to create much-needed affordable housing, and given its proximity to major transit corridors, the RTD A Line and the proposed Bus Rapid Transit line on Colorado Blvd, it would be a sorry waste to use the land for any other purpose. I have seen a presentation of the plan and am quite impressed by how thoroughly the planners have taken into account important considerations like helping to fill schools in the surrounding area, creating a community retail hub including a neighborhood grocery store, and making businesses truly accessible for bikes and pedestrians. I'm impressed that this project is taking mobility and transit solutions so seriously. My family and I moved to the Central Park infill development in its early days, back in 2004. It was supposed to be a pedestrian and transit oriented development, but because I became a non-driver due to disability, we had to move to where transit was truly accessible. This development is infinitely better planned to accommodate and even encourage non-driving, as the park is not surrounded by busy streets. With climate change bearing down on us, this is truly the direction that Denver needs to go as a city. Sincerely, Carol Friesen 25 Downing Street Apartment 2-405 Denver, CO 80218</p>
Email	Keo Frazier	12/1/2022	<p>I write in strong support of the Small Area Plan for the Park Hill Golf Course (4141 E 35th Avenue), as well as the Rezoning Application (4141 E 35th Avenue, Case #20221-00158). Along with our Nation, Denver is facing one of the worst housing crises in our history. Rents have increased by more than 45 percent in the last twelve months and new homes are sparse. Our community faces a shortage of more than 50,000 affordable units. The scarcity of affordable housing is impacting all of us in so many ways. This proposal would convert the current mandatory golf course (only able to be used as a golf course under the conservation easement) into much-needed affordable and middle income housing. More than 2,500 new homes could be created on this site, and at least 25 percent of those homes would be permanently affordable. With this plan, the on-site affordable housing would more than double the City's new affordable housing requirements, including family-sized and for-sale and permanently affordable prices. The public process has been informative, equitable and inclusive, resulting in two years of discussions between the City and community. This is the level of transparency and open dialogue we need to demonstrate accountability for the people of Denver. Our Denver neighborhoods need holistic community spaces with parks, food, amenities and (most importantly) affordable homes. Please approve the SAP and Rezoning Applications for Park Hill Golf Course.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Development Agreement  
and Land Exchange Agreement  
Key Terms Summary**

**December 6, 2022**

**General Summary**

The Park Hill Golf Course Development Agreement and Land Exchange Agreement is a binding agreement between the City and the Developer that governs the terms and conditions of the proposed redevelopment of Park Hill Golf Course. The Agreement must be approved by City Council and executed by the City and the Landowner. The Agreement addresses matters relating to the buildout of the Project, such as the conveyance of parks and other properties to the City, the Developer's participation in design and construction of park and other public improvements, the Developer's affordable housing commitments, and the terms and conditions relating to the extinguishment of the use restriction.

The following are the principal terms and conditions of the Agreement:

- **Use Restriction/Conservation Easement Removal**
  - Requires conducting municipal election pursuant to Initiative 301 in order to permit removal of the existing conservation easement.
  - Following the City's certification of election results approving the removal of the conservation easement, the Agreement requires: (1) the Landowner to convey the entire 155-acre Golf Course Land to the City, (2) the City to re-convey the 75-acre Project site back to the Landowner, and (3) the City to retain the 80-acre future Regional Park property.
  - The Landowner's conveyance of the Golf Course Land to the City will have the legal effect of automatically extinguishing the conservation easement, as contemplated under the Conservation Easement Statute, as to the entire 155-acre Golf Course Land.
  - Subsequent land conveyances to the City and public access easements will expand park and open space land within the Golf Course Land to a minimum of 100 acres.
  - If the voters reject removal of the conservation easement, the Landowner will be required to file an application to rezone the Golf Course Land back to the Open Space B (OS-B) designation, to allow for the Golf Course Land to continue as a golf course use under the terms of the conservation easement.
- **Vested Property Rights**
  - Establishes vested property rights for a term of 15 years in the following matters under the Denver Zoning Code:

- ◆ Zone District Intent Statements for G-RX-5, C-MX-5, C-MX-8, C-MX-12, C-MS-5 and DO-8 overlay districts.
  - ◆ Building Form Intent Statements for Town House, Shopfront, and General building forms.
  - ◆ Building heights
  - ◆ Building setbacks
  - ◆ Permitted uses and parking standards
- **Zoning and Development Standards**
    - Establishes zone districts as described in the Rezoning application.
    - Requires imposition of design covenants and standards, and establishment of a design review board, prior to the first SDP approval within the Project.
- **Districts**
    - Contemplates formation of five new metropolitan districts to finance, construct, operate, and maintain Public Improvements.
    - Contemplates amendment of the Agreement to include Districts as parties to the Agreement.
- **Conveyances and Dedications**
    - Parks and Open Space
      - ◆ Requires 100 acres of parks and open space, including lands conveyed to the City in the initial land transfer, lands that will be subsequently conveyed to the City, and open space lands that will be privately-owned but subject to an easement for public access.
      - ◆ Requires the Landowner to convey 80 acres upfront, and approximately 14.5 additional acres, to the City for parks and open space purposes.
      - ◆ Requires the Landowner to grant an easement for public access over approximately 5.5 acres to satisfy the private open space requirements of Section 10.8 of the DZC.
      - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to design, construct, and complete the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail, and, where the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail is located on private property, to convey the underlying property and improvements to the City upon completion.



- ◆ Requires the Master Developer to provide up to \$500,000 for initial maintenance of lands conveyed to the City.
- Transportation
  - ◆ Requires the Landowner to convey internal streets to the City, or, if DOTI has determined that it is in the City’s interest, to a metropolitan district
  - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to convey land for intersection improvements at 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard and 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard.
- Utilities
  - ◆ Acknowledges that an existing water line easement along the alignment of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue is likely to be relocated to an alignment along 37<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- **Public Improvements**
  - Parks and Open Space
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to provide \$500,000 to fund early maintenance of the land transferred to the city
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to pay up to \$2,500,000 in matching funds to support the master planning and design of the Regional Park Improvements.
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to pay \$17,000,000 for the construction and installation of Eligible Park Improvements, potentially including (i) mass grading; (ii) landscaping; (iii) irrigation system improvements; (iv) parking; (v) a splash pad; (vi) a regional playground; (vii) two (2) multi-use fields; (viii) public restrooms; (x) a pet park or pet relief area; (xi) the 303 ArtWay Heritage Trail; and (xii) other Regional Park Improvements.
  - Transportation
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to realign the intersection of 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Albion Way into a three-way intersection.
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to make intersection and safety improvements at 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard and 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colorado Boulevard.
    - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to provide up to \$4,200,000 to support the City’s construction of an extension of Dahlia Street between 38<sup>th</sup> and 39<sup>th</sup> avenue, which will serve the Regional Park.

- **Affordable Housing**
  - Establishes a high-impact development compliance plan under the City’s new Mandatory Affordable Housing (“MAH”) ordinance.
  - The Landowner waives the right to any height increases under the MAH ordinance.
  - Minimum Numbers of Income-Restricted Units (“IRUs”)
    - ◆ Requires at least 25% of all Units within the Project to be IRUs.
    - ◆ Requires a minimum of 300 for-sale IRUs, of which no fewer than 200 must be two- or more bedroom units and no fewer than 100 more must be three or more bedroom units.
    - ◆ Requires no fewer than 40 permanently supportive housing IRUs, These IRUs will be affordable to households earning 0-30% of AMI
    - ◆ Requires no fewer than 60 Senior IRUs. The effective average affordability level of these IRUs will be no greater than 50% of AMI.
    - ◆ Requires a “family IRU” Affordable Development containing no fewer than 150 IRUs, of which at least 50% must be two- or more bedroom Units. The effective average affordability level of these IRUs will be no greater than 55% of AMI.
  - Affordability Levels
    - ◆ Requires that for-sale IRUs be income-restricted to households earning equal to or less than 120% of AMI, with an effective average affordability level no greater than 100% of AMI. 15% of the for-sale IRUs must serve lower AMI levels. Those units will be income-restricted to households earning equal to or less than 100% of AMI, with an effective average affordability level no greater than 90% of AMI.
    - ◆ Requires that for-rent IRUs be income-restricted to households earning equal to or less than 80% of AMI, with an effective average affordability level no greater than 60% of AMI.
  - Control Period
    - ◆ Permanently supportive housing IRUs and for-sale IRUs will be permanently income restricted.
    - ◆ For-rent IRUs will be income restricted for a period of at least 99 years.
  - A number of IRUs equal to 5% of the total number of market-rate Units will be located within mixed-income Developments.

- The City’s recently-adopted Prioritization Ordinance applies to all IRUs within the Project except permanent supportive housing IRUs (the City’s Prioritization Ordinance also does not apply to permanent supportive housing IRUs).
- Affordable Developments in which more than 50% of the Units are for-rent IRUs and affordable to households earning 80% of AMI or less, or in which more than 50% of the Units are for-sale IRUs and affordable to households earning an effective average of 90% of AMI or less will not be subject to a debt mill levy associated with a metropolitan district.
- Compliance and Enforcement
  - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to submit an Annual Compliance Plan containing the following information: (a) the number of current and anticipated Units within the Project; (b) the number of current and anticipated rental and for-sale IRUs within the Project; (c) the number of current and anticipated bedrooms located within Units within the Project; (d) the number of current and anticipated bedrooms located within IRUs within the Project; (e) the current and anticipated affordability levels of completed and planned IRUs; (f) the current and anticipated number of IRUs located within Senior Developments, family IRU Affordable Developments, and PSH Developments; (g) the current and anticipated number of Priority IRUs, including the current and anticipated occupancy of such Priority IRUs.
  - ◆ Requires the Master Developer to submit a Compliance Deadline Report once every four years demonstrating the Project’s conformance to the Plan.
  - ◆ Enables City to deny approval of any SDP that is inconsistent with the Annual Compliance Plan and/or to deny issuance of permits or certificates of occupancy if Project is out of compliance as of a Compliance Deadline.

BY AUTHORITY

ORDINANCE NO. 718

COUNCIL BILL NO. 708

SERIES OF 1997

COMMITTEE OF REFERENCE:

PUBLIC AMENITIES

A BILL

**FOR AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE ACQUISITION OF A CONSERVATION EASEMENT IN THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE FROM THE CLAYTON FOUNDATION.**

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Conservation Easement transferring a property interest in the Park Hill Golf Course from the Clayton Foundation to the City and County of Denver cannot be executed by the proper officials of the City and County of Denver until after approval action by the Council of the City; and

**WHEREAS**, the City has duly reviewed the proposed Conservation Easement and determined it to be in the best interest of the City to enter said Conservation Easement;

**NOW, THEREFORE,  
BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER:**

**Section 1.** That the proposed Conservation Easement for the Park Hill Golf Course, in the words and figures contained and set forth in that form of said Conservation Easement, and filed in the office of the Clerk and Recorder, Ex-Officio Clerk of the City and County of Denver on the 8th day of October, 1997, City Clerk's Filing No. 97-926, is hereby approved and authorized for execution by the Mayor and other proper officials of the City and County of Denver.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL

October 20

Cathy Reynolds


- PRESIDENT

APPROVED: Will E. Schuff

- MAYOR Oct. 21

ATTEST: Gregory E. B. ...

- CLERK AND RECORDER,  
EX-OFFICIO CLERK OF THE  
CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER



PUBLISHED IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS Oct. 17, 1997 Oct. 24, 1997

PREPARED BY: PATRICK A. WHEELER, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY 10/6/97

REVIEWED BY: [Signature] - CITY ATTORNEY 1995 1997

SPONSORED BY COUNCIL MEMBER(S) \_\_\_\_\_

97030002