

Re: Rezoning Application for 2400 S University St from G-MX-3 to G-RX-5

[Type text]

April 20, 2014

To the Denver City Council:

We are concerned citizens and immediate neighbors of the above referenced block, residing across the alley at 2477 S. Josephine St. We have been property owners and taxpayers in the University Park neighborhood continuously for the past 42 years.

We'd like to begin by stating that as neighbors, **we welcome the development of this parcel as currently zoned**. We are confident that such redevelopment under G-MX-3 will, indeed, add some vibrancy to the area.

However, we are extremely concerned at the prospect of the additional two stories, 236 residential units and 25' of height being considered and entreat the City Council to deny this request.

The ratification of a new Zoning Code for our great city in 2010 was undertaken following considerable research, community input and deliberation over a 5-year period. That Zoning Code, adopted *less than four years ago following extensive study*, zoned the block in question G-MX-3.

While there are taller buildings than the one being proposed just one block south on University, it is exactly this type of *out-of-context development* that led to undertaking the vast and broad five-year effort that resulted in the 2010 Zoning Code. All of these buildings were erected sometime in the 1960s and are ***not in keeping with the neighborhood context***. The fact that there are newer 5-story and taller buildings on University and Evans is of no argument ***as these were there when the present zoning was adopted in 2010. (See attached application comments section.)***

Assuming a commercial ground level with housing above, **the difference between 3 and 5 stories essentially doubles the density of occupancy/living space/units** on this parcel. The present zoning of G-MX-3 has a maximum height of 45', while the zoning change would increase maximum height to 70' tall, ***an increase of 55%***.

We ask City Council to review this rezoning request based not on what is ***currently on the block, but rather on the current zoning for this block***. It is incumbent upon the City Council to consider what current zoning allows in relation to the area vs. the current eyesore and instability of the current property condition.

At the Denver Planning Board meeting in March, the only "justifiable circumstances" articulated were a) changing economics, and b) the assemblage of the full parcel by a single owner. The citation of these as "justifiable circumstances" for rezoning is troubling. This infers that property acquisition is sufficient argument to support a favorable rezoning request. Further, changing economics is also a capricious argument, since *economics are always changing*. Further, University Park is considered a ***stable neighborhood***. So in regard to justifiable circumstances I'd like City Council to consider, "What has changed since 2010?"

Re: Rezoning Application for 2400 S University St from G-MX-3 to G-RX-5

[Type text]

April 20, 2014

Residents and citizen taxpayers in *stable areas* of the city should be able to rely on the wisdom, thought and predictability of our zoning code. In the application, the statement is made that the current zoning was put in place as a “holding zone” until the full parcel could be assembled. Is no one questioning that statement? Is that really all the 2010 Zoning Code is for areas that are not yet developed to their maximum allowable context? Again, we support redevelopment of this block, which **the applicant (and 40-year property owner) has accurately described as “stagnant with vacancies, vandalism and (is) a general eyesore to the neighborhood.”**

We have serious concerns with added traffic and street parking and resulting safety issues from the proposed four stories of residential units. The architect's current proposal* includes 236 residential units and 390 parking spaces with primary parking access off our alley via Harvard, (which is already congested, over-parked, and suffers from significant and hazardous snow and ice buildup during the winter months due to lack of sun). Please note that there is no left turn onto Harvard off southbound University, which will create several disruptive traffic patterns into the area immediately east of the property.

***Presented at a neighborhood meeting on February 20.**

Additionally, we are very concerned about the planned access to underground parking via a ramp from the alley positioned right across from our driveway and garage. Current zoning of G-MX-3 would limit the residential stories to two, or half the units contemplated in the proposed plan, which is imminently more reasonable.

It should be noted that the opposite side of the street is zoned C-MX-5. Thoughtful city planning and zoning looks at an area, not just a block. I believe that is exactly how the 2010 zoning effort was undertaken, which resulted in the G-MX-3 designation. It is incumbent upon City Council to consider not just the east side of the 2400 S. University block, but also the surrounding area to the east which is entirely composed of single family dwellings, as well as the zoning on the west side of the street. Current congestion on this block of University and the lack of room for any added traffic lanes, makes the thought of a “canyon” of traffic between 70’ high buildings on both sides of the block a nightmare.

At the end of this letter are just a few items from the application and our thoughts/responses for your consideration.

We implore you to consider the rights of those of us who are truly neighbors to this property, and who have already made a significant investment in our properties and neighborhood. The deleterious impact to our property values and the nature and landscape of our block, as well as the negative impact on our neighborhood is real.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Harrington and Mark Westlund
2477 S. Josephine St.

REZONING APPLICATION - POINTS AND RESPONSES

The following are just a handful of references from the application and our responses to the same.

1. APPLICATION - p. 9

“Within Areas of Stability there may be places such as **stagnant commercial centers** where **reinvestment would be desirable** to make the area an asset to and supportive of the surrounding neighborhood. **Page 23** (*The existing commercial center is stagnant with vacancies, vandalism and a general eyesore to the neighborhood. Redevelopment is now possible due to the assemblage of the middle portion of the block making a unified development possible.*)”

Response:

The existing properties (with the exception of 2460 and the DU parcel) have been owned by the same owner for nearly 40 years (as stated earlier in the application), and the fact that the current owner has allowed this block to become a **stagnant commercial center, with vacancies, vandalism and a general eyesore** is a weak argument for the rezoning request.

2. APPLICATION - p. 10

“Blueprint Denver expects an additional 30,000 jobs and 15,000 new housing units in the remaining Areas of Change by 2020. If growth is redirected from the Areas of Stability to the Areas of Change, the model results are positive — **less development intrusion and traffic in the neighborhoods and more redevelopment along corridors** (*Note: the subject site is along the South University Boulevard corridor.*) and near transit stations with little or no increase in traffic. Slight reductions in traffic may even result where land uses are mixed and highly coordinated with transit access. **Page 22** (Development of the subject property, which is along a transit corridor and within a 12 minute walk to the University RTD transit station will meet this objective without intrusion into the University neighborhood).”

Response:

Is University Park considered an area of change? Is DU? Is the block in question? Blueprint Denver suggests redirecting growth to areas of change. UP as a neighborhood is considered an area of stability. The comment that this property development, because of its situation along University (a transit corridor) and near light rail will **meet the objective without intrusion into the neighborhood is false.**

The developer is somehow suggesting (hoping?) that with rezoning to double the density of possible residents will result in less traffic because of mixed land use and

Re: Rezoning Application for 2400 S University St from G-MX-3 to G-RX-5

[Type text]

April 20, 2014

coordinated transit access. Simple math presents the fact that doubling the allowable residential density on this block will double the impact on traffic.

Further, there is no room to widen the 2400 block of South University from its current four lanes. The zoning increase to five rather than three stories (and the implied four rather than two stories of high density residential) will create a significant increase in traffic for the residents of the developed property alone.

Because widening University to add a center turn lane is not possible, residents coming south along University will either turn at one of the short left-turn lanes at Iliff or Warren, or stop traffic flow while executing a left turn at Wesley or at the proposed entrance mid-block off University. There is no left turn presently from University onto Harvard.

Finally, the application erroneously states it is a 12-minute walk to the University transit station from this property. Having made this walk, I would challenge that statement. At best it is a 20 minute walk at an average speed of 3 mph (1.0 mile). See attached information from Google Maps.

3. APPLICATION - p. 11

“Improve roadway safety for all modes of travel and enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of public streets for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders. *(Currently, this is an unattractive block for pedestrians and cyclists. Redevelopment will create an attractive pedestrian environment.)* **Page 9”**

Response:

This development will not enhance convenience, ease or enjoyment of public streets for cyclists or pedestrians. Hit-and-run and auto-pedestrian accidents and deaths are up significantly in Denver over the recent years. The increased density being proposed does not create *any kind of increased convenience, ease or enjoyment, or more importantly safety* for cyclists and pedestrians along University Blvd.

4. APPLICATION - p. 12

“It is significant to note that prior to the 2010 Zoning Code update, the site was zoned B-2 which lacked sufficient development potential to produce the mix of residential or office uses over ground floor shops, services and restaurants that are viewed as desirable by today’s standards. In 2010 the site was rezoned to the existing G-MX-3, *which could be considered a holding zone until an assemblage could take place.* That assemblage occurred this year and now the owner/developer controls the majority of the block in a unified parcel. The current zoning is similar in development potential to the former B-2, which was considered inadequate even prior to the Code update. If approved, the proposed G-RX-5 will be the catalyst for redevelopment for the area providing the amenities expressed in the Plan.”

Response:

With all the research and deliberate thought put into the 2010 Zoning Code, it seems more than a little facetious to suggest decisions made at that time were no more than creating “holding zones”.

This statement is an affront to the considerable effort put into this initiative. Wasn't the 2010 Zoning Code update intended to adopt a desirable, sensible zoning designation? We contend that G-MX-3 **is that desirable, sensible designation.** The statement inferring that now that the entire site has a single owner and should be rezoned from what was merely a “holding zone” is not only questionable, but also infers a capricious lack of predictability in zoning.

5. APPLICATION - (several references)

The application makes several references to the desirability of 1st floor commercial spaces that can be an enhancement to the neighborhood.

Response:

A zoning code change is not needed to have 1st floor commercial space.

6. APPLICATION - p. 15

“The proposed G-RX-5 zone district map amendment is in response to the changed and changing conditions in the University Park area. The numerous developments within the area and the introduction of RTD's light-rail system with stations nearby. The public interest for the citizens of Denver is best served by adoption of this map amendment, which will provide the services, amenities, employment opportunities and residential development necessary for positive planned growth to occur.”

Response:

Development along this corridor has been extensive and has already increased density beyond what is desirable. The Council should note that the light rail plan was well-known and documented at the time of the adoption of the zoning update in 2010 and that is not relevant as a development or change. **The DU light rail station opened in November 2006.**

Developments cited by both the applicant and the Denver Planning Board as arguments FOR adoption of the rezoning, all of which opened prior to the adoption of the 2010 Zoning Code include:

- The Newman Center (opened in 2002)**
- University Lofts (SE corner of University & Evans - opened May 2009)**
- Vista Lofts (opened August 2008)**
- Asbury Green (opened Fall 2009)**



Directions to University of Denver Station
United States
1.0 mi – about 21 mins

Walking directions are in beta.
Use caution – This route may be missing sidewalks or pedestrian paths.

A 2400 S University Blvd, Denver, CO 80210

1. Head north on **S University Blvd** go 351 ft
About 1 min total 351 ft
2. Slight right to stay on **S University Blvd** go 0.6 mi
About 13 mins total 0.7 mi
3. Turn left onto **Buchtel Blvd** go 0.3 mi
About 6 mins total 1.0 mi
4. Turn right at **S High St** go 118 ft
Destination will be on the left total 1.0 mi

B **University of Denver Station**
United States

These directions are for planning purposes only. You may find that construction projects, traffic, weather, or other events may cause conditions to differ from the map results, and you should plan your route accordingly. You must obey all signs or notices regarding your route.

Map data ©2014 Google

Directions weren't right? Please find your route on maps.google.com and click "Report a problem" at the bottom left.

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: 2400 S. University Blvd. - neighbor opposition
Date: Saturday, April 12, 2014 9:40:44 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
Importance: High

From: Adam Loveland [mailto:LOVELAND@citywidebanks.com]
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2014 10:45 AM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: 2400 S. University Blvd. - neighbor opposition
Importance: High

Dear Denver City Council,

My wife and I are residents of Observatory Park and live at 2343 S. Milwaukee St. We oppose the planned development at 2400 S. University simply due to the traffic engineering and lack of reasonable access to the proposed site. Alley access to a large project like will overwhelm an alley not designed for this density or traffic volume. Additionally, the only left-hand turns from southbound University are allowed onto Wesley and not Harvard, likely creating significant back-ups on the already heavily used University Blvd.

We encourage you all to personally visit the site if you have not yet done already. While we feel that development is essential to any great city, it must be done thoughtfully, with safety and traffic considerations seriously considered. This block clearly needs redevelopment, and we want a better project for all stakeholders involved.

Please distribute my letter to all 13 Council members, thank you.

Best regards,
--Adam & Katharine



Adam C. Loveland
Assistant Vice President
1800 Larimer St. Suite 200. Denver, CO 80202
Office: 303-365-3708 Cell: 303-524-0067
Loveland@citywidebanks.com

Member FDIC. NMLS# 886918.

EMAIL DISCLAIMER This transmission, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipients and contains information from Citywide Banks that may be privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by email or telephone immediately and delete the original transmission.

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: 2400 S. University Rezoning
Date: Saturday, May 10, 2014 11:15:41 AM

From: Mark Risch [mailto:rischmg@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 6:25 PM
To: denc - City Council
Subject: 2400 S. University Rezoning

To the Denver City Council:

I am a concerned resident of the Observatory Park neighborhood and I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of 2400 S. University Boulevard. A few years ago, my wife and I purchased a property with close proximity to the proposed redevelopment. At that time, we researched the area zoning to have a better understanding of the potential redevelopment that was likely to occur in the next decade. When we purchased our current home, we based our decision partially on the fact that only 3-story redevelopment would be allowed on the east side of University Boulevard. We concluded that a 3-story redevelopment was consistent with the overall neighborhood and was supported by the University Park Community Council (UPCC).

It appears now that City Council is considering a proposed motion to change the existing zoning to a 5-story structure. This change is not consistent with the desires of the community and the existing zoning code. The existing zoning code was agreed upon by all interested stakeholders with the specific intention to provide predictable, efficient, and widely supported development. The proposed zoning change directly contradicts the 2010 comprehensive zoning update and the 2008 Small Area Plan; both of which had widespread input and support.

I am not opposed to the current zoning as approved (G-MX-3); however, increasing the density will be a significant detriment to our neighborhood. University Boulevard and other local traffic patterns will not appropriately serve the proposed higher density. In addition, with the large increase in units, it is inevitable that parking will become difficult and cause further issues. Finally, additional retail space at this location will only increase vacancy at other nearby struggling retail developments.

Thank you.

Mark Risch
2474 S. Josephine St.

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: A letter for all 13 Denver City Council Members regard Rezone of 2400 S University Block
Date: Monday, April 21, 2014 10:22:17 AM

From: Jim Janicek [mailto:jim@janicekmedia.com]
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 10:05 AM
To: dence - City Council
Cc: DJ Harrington
Subject: A letter for all 13 Denver City Council Members regard Rezone of 2400 S University Block

Dear Members of the City Planning Board and Members of City Council,
I want to make you aware of a significant concern you should be aware of before passing any rezoning in the 2400 S. University Block.
I have lived in University Park Neighborhood for 12 years. I purchased my property in this neighborhood because it is a wonderful place to live, has walkable streets, a great community, and a predictable zoning code.
With the addition of a development of the proposed size, you are creating a tremendous safety hazard that must be considered and addressed with a solution by the developer. We drive on University Blvd every day and at most times witness students crossing University against the lights and outside of crosswalks multiple times per hour. Last year there was a pedestrian death from this very reason. A new building in this area of the size proposed is going to create a huge addition to this problem, especially where there is no major crossing available. I think it's prudent that the developer be required to install either a pedestrian overpass or underpass across university at his development. He should absolutely be responsible for helping offset the traffic and pedestrian risks he is creating. No exception. While we're all grateful for positive redevelopment, one must consider the impact a project this size will have on safety, and that is a key reason zoning codes are set as they are currently. Looking at tax revenue and developer profit is not the whole picture and I challenge you to spend a day watching illegal crossings occur during the regular school days at 9am to 4pm. It's just a matter of time before more lives are taken because of this type growth without proper mediation. I'd hope you would consider your responsibility to this community as a council member and not just vote yes without fully grasping the safety issue.
I believe with the rezoning of most of the block of South University Boulevard, you are changing the integrity of the zoning code, and potentially risking lives. The residents of this neighborhood that purchased their homes believed they could count on those codes to sustain their property values, safety, and parking availability.
Without a required traffic/pedestrian solution to ease the added risk this is going to bring, I oppose this rezoning project and hope that you will as well.
Thank you very much.
Sincerely,
Jim & Kristin Janicek
2535 S Fillmore St
Denver, Co 80210

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Letter for all 13 Council Members RE: 2400 S. University
Date: Friday, May 09, 2014 8:47:53 AM

From: Micah D'Hondt [mailto:micah.dhondt@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 6:13 PM
To: denc - City Council
Subject: Letter for all 13 Council Members RE: 2400 S. University

(Please distribute to ALL 13 council members)

To All 13 Council Members -

I am in the district of Charlie Brown, and a resident of University Park. I have lived in the University/Observatory Park neighborhood since 2006. I am writing in regards to the proposed building for the 2400 block of S. University. I have to say that I am excited for the old, dilapidated buildings to get redeveloped, but I am not excited about the proposed building to this site. It seems as though, all of a sudden, big huge buildings are gobbling up our nice, historic, quaint neighborhood.

We have concerns about this addition to our neighborhood which is already feeling the pinch of other multi-family high rises that have been added recently to our area. Buildings with retail space that still hasn't been occupied...

- The traffic flow on University Blvd, between 1-25 and Yale is already tough to maneuver. This road is often times backed up with countless numbers of cars,

walking traffic and bike traffic. If the 2400 block gets re-developed fully, University will be impassable.

- Our neighbors one a whole are absolutely OK with improvements, but not OVER DEVELOPMENT
- Recent high rises that have been added to our neighborhood are not full in either residential OR commercial offerings.
- The neighbors in this neighborhood bought nice homes and trusted Denver's zoning and are now jumping through hoops to try and protect what they thought was already protected.

Please consider the effects that this project will have on a neighborhood that prides itself on its history, quaintness and "small-town" feel.

Sincerely,

Micah D'Hondt

From: [denc - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Fatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Fan T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Nice neighborhood ?!
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 6:05:24 PM

From: Kim Dozier [mailto:kim@4wallsthatfit.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2014 1:09 PM
To: denc - City Council; Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9
Subject: Nice neighborhood ?!

You have been sent 2 pictures.





This is a what it's like everyday.

I have plenty more pictures of people using the alley behind my home for crack deals, a toilet, sex trade for drugs and so much more. Please let me know if you would like me to send those pictures to you.

I'm sure that the complaints are constant and loud about the new center. My intention is to band together and come up with a solution using examples of what other cities have done that were successful in managing and cleaning up the streets. I have included link for articles below. 1 on the success of NYC and other Seattle. I will continue to research.

Bottom line we need constant police presence. Ball Park, 16th Str. Loitering and littering laws upheld. I have no problem with building a facility to help those who want and need it. I also don't believe that homelessness will end but it can't be OK for it to rule a neighborhood. Any neighborhood. If 8million is going to a building...then it needs to be matched in the streets. WE are truly one of the best cities in the country and obviously progressive since we legalized pot. It can't stop there. Why can't we use the homeless to clean up after themselves and the alleys and streets? If the drug dealers know that they are being squeezed out it will change the whole perspective. I have lived on 22nd and Arapahoe for 8 years...it has never been this bad. I grew up in NY and to see how amazing Time Square is you have to ask yourself...why not Denver too. It's pretty incurable to have a NYC executive comment on how bad they felt our city on 16th street was compared to NYC.

This has to change now. Not when a new building is built..... we have to mean business. There is a reason why programs like Step 13 actually work. Hand up not just a hand out. I realize that homelessness has many mentally ill so some folks...well will remain the street characters that they are....but this is not what I'm taking about. It's the drugs.

So I would love to meet with anyone of you to hear how we can make a difference and I really hope that your not just proposing a building.....

I saw a article that the Mayor is going to get street cleaners, more force etc. When exactly is that starting and who do we call when we need our alleys cleaned because mine is literally full of human waist.

Please understand that your fine citizens are coming together and expecting there to be some big

changes from our city counsel. I hope that we don't have to go to great social media and media lengths to get this done. As stated before....we are not the only city that has been up against this, so we certainly can get the job done.

Love to have to hear the plan and if you need help in finding solutions....we are here and waiting to enjoy our neighborhood. I'd like to be able to walk down 22nd again without being harassed or having to step over things I'd rather not mention.

Thank you, Kim Dozier

http://www.salon.com/2011/11/19/what_really_cleaned_up_new_york/
<http://www.seattleweekly.com/home/947558-129/seattle-cci-says-downtown-street-homeless>

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Fan T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Please deny ReZone Request of 2400 University Ave
Date: Friday, May 09, 2014 3:28:29 PM

From: lgill38@aol.com [mailto:lgill38@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 2:54 PM
To: dence - City Council
Subject: Please deny ReZone Request of 2400 University Ave

Please distribute to all City Council Members. Thank you!

Dear Council Members,

My name is Linda Gill and I live at 2394 S. Josephine St. I am writing to ask you to please deny the rezoning request for 2400 S. University Blvd.

The current zoning is for three stories and is appropriate for that block.

Five stories (70 feet) is too high and too dense for the neighborhood. All of the current high density apartment complexes in University Park on University Blvd. back to other apartment buildings, university buildings, or sorority houses and fraternity houses. The 2400 block of University backs to single family residential homes.

Just four years ago, this area was upzoned from B-2 to G-MX-3. The rezoning at the time took a tremendous amount of energy, time and public outreach on the part of the community and the planning board. To disregard this work is disrespectful to all who were involved, including City Council. The current zoning, G-MX-3 IS form-based, it encourages mixed use development and it exceeds the original allowances of the prior B-2 zoning.

The current owner has been the owner of 3 parcels since 1976. He has not been an active member of the community and has neglected the properties to the point that his own representative has called it "a general eyesore to the neighborhood." This development can certainly be profitable at 3 stories, especially when just factoring in the land value increase since 1976.

In reviewing Mr. Gollick's 22 page Proposed Amendment Summary, I have seen many statements that I find to be misrepresentations, but which are presented as facts. Here are just a few:

-The contextual height study submitted by the developer is not an accurate representation of the *placement* of buildings surrounding the project. Many of the taller buildings depicted as next to and near 2400 S University are closer to Evans and University, which is the hub of DU and University Park, or they are across University and actually on the DU campus or even at 1920 University Blvd, which is over half a mile away and practically next to I-25.

-There *will* be many negative impacts to the neighborhood.

-The walk to the Light Rail is a *22 minute walk and 1.1 miles away*.

-This project will *not* fit the existing context of the neighborhood.

-This project is *not* consistent with the University Park Small Area Plan adopted by you, Denver City Council in 2008.

-The current zoning *is* already form-based.

Just because a proposal is written down and submitted to the Planning Board and City Council, does not make it accurate.

Also, please be aware that this was a very difficult decision for the advisory group on the Planning Board. The Board stated that they saw much merit in the arguments against this rezoning. Increased density won them over (barely), but I am asking you to carefully consider the neighborhood objections and to make your own decision.

Finally, I am also requesting that you do not follow the practice of "courtesy zoning" on this issue. Our

council person is Mr. Charlie Brown and he has been very clear that he supports this project despite the large number of valid neighborhood objections.

Please support us and University Park residents and vote no on the rezoning application of 2400 University Blvd.

Thank you,
Linda Gill
2394 S Josephine St.

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Addition To Homeless Services - Ballpark Neighborhood
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2014 8:31:55 AM

From: Stephen Wilder [mailto:steve@voodoocomedy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2014 12:13 AM
To: kniechatlarge
Cc: Greg Ellis; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Sandoval, Amanda P - City Council Operations; denc - City Council
Subject: Re: Proposed Addition To Homeless Services - Ballpark Neighborhood

Thank you for your response. I appreciate and understand your position. Below please find my feedback to your responses.

- While I concede that the Denver Rescue Mission and related services were in existence in the Ballpark Neighborhood well before the stadium was built, I am confused by your implied assertion that area businesses and residents should just accept and deal with the rampant crime, panhandling, trash, and unrest caused by having such a high concentration of homeless services. It was the city that originally approved plans to build Coors Field twenty years ago, in a neighborhood that they knew would become a hotbed for business and residential development. Are you suggesting that the Denver City Council values homeless people over businesses and residences that pay substantial taxes to be where they are?
- If the walled courtyard is built, will the homeless population be moved onward or arrested if they do not comply and remain inside the courtyard? How will outliers be dealt with? I foresee a repeating situation where the homeless population simply chooses not to go into the courtyard. What actions will the city take if this happens? Are you prepared to drop \$9 million into a solution that doesn't get used?
- Further concentrating the homeless population into the Ballpark Neighborhood will serve to increase the concentration of drug dealers, drug users, and violent street denizens. I have personally been physically assaulted on multiple occasions by individuals drawn to this neighborhood, and I have witnessed countless incidences of drug use, drug transactions, prostitution, assault, and other violent acts. There have been two shootings in the past few months. Is this an environment the City Council wishes to perpetuate, especially in a neighborhood situated along the main artery to Denver? Will the Lawrence Street Community Center allow these violent individuals into the courtyard? What will happen if they refuse to go inside or are not allowed inside?

As of right now, the Denver Post's public poll regarding the Lawrence Street Community Center is 62% in opposition. I am 100% certain there is another solution out there that will provide the needed support without placing additional burden upon the Ballpark Neighborhood. I urge you and the rest of the City Council to explore other solutions, for the betterment of Denver as a whole.

--

Stephen Wilder, Owner & Artistic Director
Voodoo Comedy Playhouse
Phone: 303-900-2123 - Fax: 303-484-2083
steve@voodoocomedy.com - www.voodoocomedy.com
facebook.com/voodoocomedy - twitter.com/voodoocomedy

On Tue, Apr 22, 2014 at 5:04 PM, kniechatlarge <kniechatlarge@denvergov.org> wrote:
Dear Stephen,

Thank you for contacting my office regarding the proposed Lawrence Street Center in partnership with the Denver Rescue Mission. I have been an advocate for improved homeless services throughout my tenure on Council, as well as transitional and permanent affordable housing. I believe the location of the proposed Lawrence Street Center provides a critical service for the health, safety, and life of the individuals seeking other resources in the Ballpark neighborhood. While I understand your concerns about the magnitude and concentration of services in this area, institutions like the Denver Rescue Mission existed long before the stadium itself or the associated commercial and residential development that took off along with the stadium in this area, and it is neither just public policy nor financially practical to expect these long-standing service providers who also own their property to simply relocate.

I do support the Mayor's recent commitment to increasing resources for neighborhood improvements. And I also agree with the concerns that many opponents have raised about simply moving the problem of homelessness out of sight without taking action to solve it. While the courtyard is a more humane and safer environment for men and women to wait for services than the busy streets and sidewalks currently used by the homeless community, and therefore a step in the right direction I strongly support for both the community and the homeless community, the one and only step the city can take to truly end homelessness for an individual or a community is to provide safe housing. That needs to be the next priority, it needs to be funded and advanced more quickly and far more robustly than it has been to date, including with Denver's own dollars. And it will require leadership from all segments of our community. I have and will continue to champion the creation of homes, both transitional with intense services and permanent with on-going services, and I hope that your neighborhood will continue to champion these outcomes as well, even if our reasons for doing so may differ.

Sincerely,

Councilwoman Robin Kniech

From: Stephen Wilder [<mailto:steve@voodoocomedy.com>]
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2014 1:22 PM
To: Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9
Cc: Sandoval, Amanda P - City Council Operations; denc - City Council; gregorydaellis@gmail.com
Subject: Proposed Addition To Homeless Services - Ballpark Neighborhood

Dear Councilwoman Montero,

I am a business owner and proprietor in the Ballpark Neighborhood of Denver and I vehemently oppose the proposal for an additional facility for the homeless in our neighborhood. I request that you use your elected powers of office to oppose the proposal.

The Ballpark Neighborhood already has plenty of services for the homeless, to the point of saturation. Any proposal which would effectively serve to further increase the concentration of homeless people in this area is ill-thought-out and fails to recognize the issues already caused by the concentration of homeless services we already have. Criminal behavior, persistent begging, loitering, etc. already combine to give the Neighborhood a feeling of being unsafe and an undesirable place to live or frequent. To believe that this wouldn't worsen as a result of the current proposal is shortsighted and wrong.

As a business owner in the Ballpark Neighborhood, I have a vested interest in ensuring the area is safe and clean for my customers. I also would like to see the city take a much more active interest in ensuring the same. 22nd Street runs directly through the neighborhood, and that street is *the* main artery into Downtown from the freeway. When out-of-town guests and customers travel into town to visit my theater and many other businesses in the area, they pass directly through the Ballpark Neighborhood, and for many guests who are having their first Denver experience, the lasting impression they get is of a dirty, crime-riddled, unsafe neighborhood, to which they will be very reluctant to return.

In short, I fully understand the need to provide Denver's homeless community with necessary services, and your own place in the chain of facilitating the expansion of these services. However, I cannot support either the location of these proposed services for the reasons already set out, or, the use of so much public money in providing this particular facility ahead of alternative homeless services which would serve as a more effective use of public funds. I do not have all the answers to solve these problems, but I am certain that the Lawrence Street Community Center expansion is not an appropriate answer either.

Please help us save our neighborhood through your leadership.

--

Stephen Wilder, Owner & Artistic Director
Voodoo Comedy Playhouse
Phone: [303-900-2123](tel:303-900-2123) - Fax: [720-442-8203](tel:720-442-8203)
VoodooComedy.com - [Facebook](#) - [Twitter](#)

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed shelter expansion
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 6:05:54 PM

From: Mike Kelly [mailto:mike@cocksclark.com]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:59 PM
To: dence - City Council
Subject: Proposed shelter expansion

Hello, please distribute to all council members, thank you:

I have spent the last 35 years (1979) working one block from the Rescue Mission on Lawrence and Broadway.
Before retiring my father worked the same business here for 35 years going back to 1955. The name of the business is Cocks-Clark Engraving Company (dbaCocksClark Graphics Inc.) and has been at this location consecutively since 1929.
I come from a Catholic, Jesuit, Christian upbringing and I am as sympathetic to the poor as anyone.

Running a business near a shelter would be unimaginable for most people, while all the good that is going on there, it is mirrored with drug peddling and abuse, crime, human defecation on our sidewalks and menacing style of panhandling.
We have often lost business due to a tangent element that surrounds this neighborhood, I am asking that some public discussion may take place before City Counsel votes to award money and to expand and hide this problem.

The homeless people in the ballpark neighborhood need a LASTING helping hand. I don't believe they want to panhandle and deal in drugs and crime. I believe they want a JOB. Why can't we create some jobs with this grant money and put them to work like Franklin Roosevelt did in his New Deal Programs.
Instead of spending money to build walls to hide them from the public. This grant money could be spent doing much more positive things like getting people busy feeling good about themselves.

Instead of expanding in this neighborhood, why not discuss sharing the burden of the homeless situation.
Why is this neighborhood carrying the load after so many years, can we get a break?
What is the logic in having a shelter in such a populated area, is the temptation to panhandle keeping some homeless from boarding

a van and going to a job site where they could be paid for a job.

I am just one business owner, and this is how I feel, I am sure there are many others who's voices should be heard.

Please, allow us to express our feelings about the future of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Mike Kelly
CocksClark Graphics Inc
[303-292-6242](tel:303-292-6242) Office
[303-919-3920](tel:303-919-3920) Mobile
mike@cocksclark.com

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: REZONING 2400 BLOCK OF SOUTH UNIVERSITY - OPPOSITION
Date: Thursday, April 24, 2014 8:49:56 AM

From: nstanesco@aol.com [mailto:nstanesco@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2014 7:34 AM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: REZONING 2400 BLOCK OF SOUTH UNIVERSITY - OPPOSITION

April 24, 2014

TO:
Denver City Council

FROM:
Nancy Stanesco
2476 South Milwaukee Street
Denver, Colorado 80210

RE:
**Rezoning Request to G-RX-5 from G-MX-3
2400 Block of South University Blvd.**

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL 13 COUNCIL MEMBERS

Dear Council Members:

I am writing in opposition to the proposal to rezone the 2400 block of South University to G-RX-5.

I have lived in the 2400 block of South Milwaukee for 30 years. Not the least of the reasons for staying here for three decades are the look and feel of the neighborhood. These would be permanently altered by the creation of an almost-block-long, five-story-high wall of shadows built five blocks to the west of our home. A three-story wall is bad enough, but five stories would be a horrific mark on our neighborhood; it would be over the top – figuratively AND literally.

Other petitions will focus on logistical reasons not to increase the density of the population with this rezoning. I would like to focus on what in the business world is called an INTANGIBLE ASSET. These assets include goodwill. They have value attached to them, and they are recognized and taxed by the Internal Revenue Service. They are real, even though you cannot touch them. The look and feel of our neighborhood is an intangible asset to which I assign significant value, and which impact the joy of “coming home” to each resident of the Observatory Park neighborhood.

A five-story, almost-block-long structure in the 2400 block of South University would destroy intangible value, which every resident of the Observatory Park neighborhood owns, by altering forever the look and feel of our neighborhood.

Please do not permit development of a five-story behemoth structure on the 2400 block of South University. The developer knew what the zoning rules were when he accumulated the property to make

his project possible. Surely he can work within the current zoning rules to create a structure that will serve him well while minimizing the destruction of value for those of us who live near his proposed project.

Thank you for your consideration of this opposition to the rezoning proposal.

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning 2400 Block S University Blvd.
Date: Saturday, April 12, 2014 9:39:44 AM

From: Duane Sjaardema [mailto:dr_sjaar254@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2014 8:05 AM
To: dencc - City Council
Subject: Rezoning 2400 Block S University Blvd.

Please distribute this letter to each Council Member.

Honorable Council Member:

I am a resident of the University Park area. I am concerned about the proposed zoning change for the 2400 block of South University Boulevard that will be considered at your April 28, 2014 Council meeting. South University Boulevard is a narrow street in this block with two lanes of traffic in each direction. There is no turn lane or turn signal at the intersection of Wesley Avenue and University Blvd, which is on the north border of the subject property. Southbound traffic quickly backs up at this intersection if anyone attempts to make a left turn. There is a traffic signal at the Harvard Ave. and University Blvd intersection at the south border of the subject property but there is a left turn restriction at this intersection preventing left turns for the southbound traffic.

My concern is that because of these limitations, traffic for the proposed residential units on the site will flow into the adjoining quiet residential streets resulting in endangerment to children and adults residing in this area. Construction traffic and parking problems may also occur on the adjoining streets. If parking restrictions are imposed for these residential streets it will severely impact guest parking for the residents.

I am aware that traffic studies are currently in progress for the 2400 block of South University. The results of this study may be available at the April Council meeting. I would hope that the problems addressed above will have a suitable resolution as a result of this study and that construction of the changes recommended for South University Blvd. will occur prior to or simultaneous with the construction of the building proposed for this site.

Thank you in advance for your kind attention to this matter.

Duane Sjaardema
1831 S Fillmore St.
Denver, CO 80210-3507

dr_sjaar254@aol.com

303-759-4882

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning of 2400 Block of University
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 2:12:59 PM

From: Jeanne Tubb [mailto:jeanne.tubb@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 2:12 PM
To: dence - City Council
Subject: Rezoning of 2400 Block of University

Please distribute this letter to all 13 council members regarding Rezoning of the S. 2400 Block of University, across from DU. Thank you.

Dear Members of the City Planning Board,

We strenuously object to rezoning this parcel for greater than 3 stories. We purchased and moved into in the area just one year ago after reviewing the zonings and development going on.

This additional request for a total of 5 stories creates good money for the property owners, but problems and costs for the the residents and city, as well as a very inconsistent message regarding **zoning** that considers its impact on neighbors and community.

The additional problems include strong pressure on parking spaces while, at the same time, the city does not allow for parking for more than one hour near this planned structure. And we know the residents will have friends, families & parties. So we will all have deal with the overflow and congestion and sometimes vandalism that results. There will be increased demand on utilities and water and sewer that will not diminish over time. Has this been factored into future planning?

There will be additional enforcement costs associated with noise, activities, congestion, altercations and the average amount of substance abuse that occur in most large groups of people. There needs to be a good ratio of green open space to concreted space for mental health and tranquility.

There are concerns regarding the envelope of shadow cast by the structure, which now creates a larger shadow and adversely affects properties in the shadow envelope from freedom to use solar energy, grow certain gardens and negatively impacts views for several blocks, which are all valuable, tangible assets to each homeowner.

And of course, the sense of a community that is coherent and consistent is a prime reason to buy in Observatory Park versus other areas in Denver.

Perhaps the benefits to the property owner appear to outweigh the interests of current

residents, the consistency of zoning practices and the city balance sheet?

Sincerely,

Jeanne Tubb
2601 S. saint Paul Street
Denver, CO 80210

jeanne.tubb@gmail.com

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Fan T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning request for 2400 S. University Blvd for all 13 members of Denver City Council
Date: Thursday, May 08, 2014 1:33:55 PM

From: janice nelson [mailto:aiab_@me.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 1:33 PM
To: dence - City Council
Cc: DJ Harrington
Subject: Rezoning request for 2400 S. University Blvd for all 13 members of Denver City Council

PLEASE SHARE THIS LETTER WITH ALL 13 MEMBERS OF THE DENVER CITY COUNCIL.

Dear Denver City Council Members,

We are Janice and Brent Nelson who own 2 residential properties in the University/Observatory Park neighborhood and reside at 2451 South Saint Paul St. We are writing to express our **opposition** to the **zone change request for the east side of the 2400 block of South University Blvd.**

We have been property owners in the neighborhood since 1974 and have seen many changes within the neighborhood and area since that time. There has been a multitude of zone change requests over the years, with most requests being for residential properties. Some requests were reasonable and understandable, while others were simply to get as much out of a property as possible for financial gain without regard for how it would negatively impact the neighbors. The developer for the 2400 block of South University Blvd. appears to fit into the latter. Denver recently undertook the long, thought out project of revamping our zoning laws, but it seems we are right back into the cycle of large zone change requests again.

In March, we attended a presentation meeting hosted by the architect, land owner, and developer. There was opportunity to learn about the proposed project, as well as a question and answer time. When we asked to see the plans for the design that **would meet** the current zoning laws we were stunned to learn that there were none.

The meeting started out well, but quickly deteriorated as we learned of the impact the proposed project would have on our neighborhood. Basically, we learned that the zone change request is simply to maximize the profit on the project without regard to the impact to the quality of life of those who live around it. When we asked for a breakdown of the demographics of their target market(s) and the expected range of rent rates, again we were told that they did not know, or consider that information. How can you propose developing a project that requires a zone change without basic information as to who your market might be and the price range that market would be expected to bear? Very suspect.

It is our understanding that a majority of the property on the 2400 block has been owned by the same family for 40 years. It has been allowed to become run-down over the years with obvious little effort being put into its upkeep. During the meeting, the property owner pointed out that the property has become "blighted" and that they are actually doing us a favor to develop the eyesore. The neighborhood attendees quickly pointed out that the property owners are actually responsible for its current state, and that they don't get to play both ends against the middle. In truth, the property is not blighted. It was home to several small local businesses that were an asset to the community. The property owner simply needed to put a small bit of effort into the upkeep of the property on a consistent basis for it to remain viable to our community.

In the meeting, we also learned that the developer is from New York and thus, will NOT have a vested interest in being certain the project will have very limited negative impact on the surrounding community. He will not have to live with the results of the development of the property as the neighbors will. As well as apartments, they are proposing shops, restaurants, and underground parking with access to the parking from the alley. This will put a tremendous amount of traffic into the alley that is shared with the residents of Josephine, and possibly for several blocks onto Josephine itself. Heading southbound on University from Evans there is very limited availability to turn left to gain access into the proposed development. Presently it is bordered on one end by a left hand turn access on Wesley, but a no left hand turn on the other end at Harvard. By the plans, the entrance to the underground parking is at the Harvard end of the proposed development. There are no designated left hand turn lanes on University by this property. A left hand turn is done by waiting for access to turn, which in turn stops the traffic flow, while the person waits for a break in traffic to complete the turn.

The traffic flow from I25 through the D.U. and the University/Observatory Park neighborhood is slow at best. At rush hour, getting off of the I25 and heading south, is often a nightmare, with traffic backed up to the highway itself. The narrow streets, frequent traffic lights, increased traffic due to the event centers at D.U., and heavy pedestrian traffic all play a part in impeding the flow of traffic. On many occasions it has been easier to turn north on University, and turn around to go south, than it is to wait on the long exit ramp through the traffic light changes to make your turn. We simply **DO NOT** need to increase the traffic onto University Blvd by offering yet another zone change request that will bring increased traffic to our neighborhood.

Please remember that the **massive** project of Kent Place at the intersection of Hampden and University has not even come on line yet. When that project is finished and full with residents, the possibility for greatly increased traffic from I25 heading south on University Blvd. becomes very real. Please consider this when considering the zone change request for the 2400 block of South University Blvd. As long time residents of University/Observatory Park we are opposed to the zone change, and do not want to bring additional traffic congestion into our community by increasing the zoning size for this property. We also have great concern about lining University with high-rise buildings that create a canyon effect. We already experience dangerous ice build ups on the roads during the winter that are caused by the shadows cast from existing tall buildings.

We understand that Denver is a land locked city and that additional tax revenues would be gleaned by granting the zone change request, but we do not need to get additional revenues by forever changing the charm and integrity of historic University/Observatory Park.

Most sincerely,

Janice and Brent Nelson
303-757-5754

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: South University Boulevard Development
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:33:19 AM

From: Rebecca Risch [mailto:rrisch@denverpost.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 9:25 AM
To: dence - City Council
Subject: Re: South University Boulevard Development

Hello, please distribute to all 13 Council Members. Thank you.

Dear Council Member,

I am a neighbor in Observatory Park, and I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed rezoning from three stories to five stories at 2400 S. University Blvd.

I find it very frustrating that the city would take great care and solicit community input to create the Denver Zoning Code (including the 2010 comprehensive zoning update and the 2008 Small Area Plan), and yet repeatedly toss aside the agreed-upon plan to appease developers.

It's clear that developers no longer need to take into consideration the existing zoning laws when purchasing land and designing their projects. The city has become a rubber stamp, approving all rezoning requests, despite outcry from residents who wish to keep the integrity of their neighborhoods.

Why even have zoning laws, if any builder can just petition to exceed the limits and know they will be approved? This disturbing trend has created uncertainty among homeowners and has a chilling effect. Why trust our city government when it keeps renegeing on promises, which is essentially what a zoning plan is - a promise to enforce the plan in place.

As specified in the code:

Providing clear regulations and processes that result in PREDICTABLE, efficient, and coordinated review processes.

By consistently approving rezoning requests, all predictability is gone.

Valid concerns include parking, traffic, high-density units (in what should be medium density at its highest), solar issues, vacant retail in the area, etc.

But an even larger issue for me is that we need to be able to trust the city to keep its promises and enforce its existing codes.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Risch

--

Rebecca Risch

2474 S. Josephine Street, Denver, CO 80210

rebeccarisch@me.com

303.437.8242

@rebeccarisch

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafoya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Univ. Park Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 8:38:46 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: cecilia smith [<mailto:cicismith1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 7:57 PM
To: denc - City Council
Subject: Univ. Park Rezoning

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THIS TO ALL 13 MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL - THANK YOU!!!!

I live in the neighborhood and understand that "things" change and get updated. However, THIS WAS REZONED JUST 4 SHORT YEARS AGO. And to 3 stories - that is pretty good. What does this say about zoning laws? To me it simply says they are pretty flimsy and can be changed based on one big developer who wants to make money. So wherever you purchase a home, you have to assume that the neighborhood can be rezoned at any time. This is not fair. this should not pass.

thank you for listening.

Cici Smith

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Univ. zoning
Date: Monday, April 14, 2014 3:08:07 PM

From: Tom Regan [mailto:julesmr4tj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2014 2:34 PM
To: dence - City Council
Subject:

My wife and I are opposed to the re zoning of the 2400 Block of South University Blvd. and feel this rezoning would be a detriment to our neighborhood.

Tom and Julmary Regan
2257 S. Fillmore St
Denver, Co 80219

From: [Velez, Kelly - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Tafuya, Ean T - CC Legislative Services](#); [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: university park zoning hearing
Date: Friday, May 09, 2014 9:55:53 AM

From: Eldridge Hardie [mailto:ehardie@mho.com]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 9:25 AM
To: denc - City Council
Subject: university park zoning hearing

We would like all 13 members of City Council to have a copy of this letter.

Dear Council Members,

As forty-five year residents of University Park we would like you to know that we strongly oppose the granting of approval of the non-conforming plan to develop the property on the east side of the 2400 block of South University Boulevard. It has only been a few years that the updated zoning plan has been established. It violates the whole spirit that these carefully worked out controls be by-passed for the benefit of a developer. We urge you to respect the intent of the zoning and the wishes of the neighbors of University Park and deny this application.

Thanks you for your consideration,

Ann & Eldridge Hardie
2382 S. Fillmore St
Denver, CO 80210

303.756.5662

From: [dence - City Council](#)
To: [Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8](#); [Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6](#); [Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - City Council](#); [Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4](#); [Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3](#); [Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9](#); [Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council](#); [Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10](#); [Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1](#); [Susman, Mary Beth - City Council](#)
Cc: [Bartleson, Debra - City Council](#); [Smith, Shelley - City Council](#); [Williams, Gretchen - City Council](#)
Subject: FW: University Park Zoning
Date: Monday, April 14, 2014 9:25:01 AM

From: Chris Carriere [mailto:montana006@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2014 9:03 AM
To: dence - City Council
Subject: University Park Zoning

To Whom it may concern,

The rezoning is a very bad idea for the University Park neighborhood. The East side of So University backs up to a neighborhood that is established as one of the Best to Live in, in Denver. On the west side of So University are businesses which back up to apartment building, which not a perfect neighbor they are still lower in the 3 story height zoned (businesses are open after 10PM and

Increased the noise and lights to the surrounding neighbors. When the rezoning of Denver was done a few years ago this section of So University was looked at carefully by both the committee from the neighborhood and the city planers at the time. Everybody who worked on this project felt that 3 story was a good limit for this section of So University therefore it was rezoned to what it is today with the height limit of 3 stories. The Denver Planning department was the group that wrote it should be no higher. Now it seems that that same committee is changing their minds about what should be allowed.

This is not right to go back on what they initially wrote into the zone book. The impact to the neighborhood will be increased traffic to side streets, parking issues for the homeowners, increased drive through traffic, and increase of population that will not contribute the current UPCC. Keep the current zoning in place, keep University Park a location in Denver where people want to live on the streets of So Josephine, So Columbine in the 2400 blocks and their adjacent blocks of 2300 and 2500. This zoning change effects this entire community.

Sincerely,

Chris Carrierer