From:	j.breese@comcast.net
To:	Brooks, Albus - City Council District 8; Brown, Charlie - City Council District #6; Shepherd, Susan K. - City Council District 1; Faatz, Jeanne R. - City Council Dist #2; Robb, Jeanne - City Council Dist. #10; Lehmann, Peggy A. - City Council Dist #4; Lopez, Paul D. - City Council Dist #3; Ortega, Deborah L. - City Council; Montero, Judy H. - City Council District #9; Nevitt, Chris - City Council Dist #7; Kniech, Robin L. - City Council; Herndon, Christopher J. - City Council District 11; dencc - City Council; lowryunitedneighborhoods@gmail.com; Susman, Mary Beth - City Council
Subject:	zoning application 2014-00096
Date:	Thursday, June 25, 2015 4:32:30 PM
Attachments:	buckley rezone ltr council.doc

Dear Members of the Denver City Council: (I have also attached my letter as a separate document)

James B. Breese
225 Kearney Street
Denver, Colorado 80220

June 25, 2015

Councilwoman Mary Beth Susman and other Members of the Denver City Council

Re: Buckley Annex GDP and Blueprint Denver

Dear Councilwoman Mary Beth Susman and other Members of the Denver City Council:

I urge you to reject the final and by far the most controversial proposed zoning changes for Buckley Annex, now known as Boulevard One. **I also urge the Council to delay the vote until after the new Council is seated.** The new Council has been selected to be more representative of the City than the existing one. To have our neighborhood affected for scores of years without having recently elected members is an injustice. There should be no rush for this vote. The neighborhoods have been fighting this since day one, nearly unanimously. Now that we will have a Council that is attuned to the public's reaction against dumping density in the midst of established neighborhoods.

My wife and I have been residents of the neighborhoods surrounding Lowry for twenty five years. We searched for many years to find a suitable home in Crestmoor, seeing it as an area of great stability and quality. We spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to tastefully remodel the home we bought in a manner consistent with the neighborhood's existing architecture. We invested our resources in reliance upon this stability. Others in surrounding neighborhoods, including new Lowry residents, made the same reasoned decision to live in this stable area.

This letter and comment will primarily assert that the Buckley Annex

plan is at odds with the overall intent and purpose of Blueprint Denver. As you know, compliance with Blueprint Denver is a prerequisite for any GDP that promotes new development. Blueprint Denver is a document to guide Denver's future redevelopment. Blueprint Denver repeatedly states that areas of stability like our neighborhoods, are to be respected and preserved, and that any development nearby should be consistent with current housing and use patterns. Likewise, the stated goals of the redevelopment Task Force of Buckley Annex state that it should "respect adjacent land uses by mirroring existing land uses". The plan mirrors no existing land use on three of its four sides.

Buckley Annex is surrounded by three neighborhoods that consist almost entirely with detached single family homes. Each of these neighborhoods has densities less than 1/3rd the density of that proposed for Buckley Annex. The fourth neighborhood, now Berkshires, has higher density, but contains no businesses at all. Buckley Annex, with its proposed commercial activity is inconsistent even with the character of Berkshires.

I realize that the Buckley Annex is shown as an "area of change" under Blueprint Denver. Areas of change are generally described as areas of stagnant commercial centers and other "areas where all would agree that the redevelopment would become an asset to and supportive of the surrounding community". But Buckley Annex is atypical of most areas of change, like Stapleton. It is a small area, with little capability to gradually transition from single family homes into dense areas with tall buildings. It is nestled in the midst of areas of stability.

Blueprint Denver encourages "areas of change" to be located to shift development to areas near transportation corridors and to land around major transportation hubs like light rail stations. Unlike many other "areas of change" this area is *not* on a major transportation corridor and is *not* suitable for intensive densities. This redevelopment will increase transportation problems that are already of great concern. Blueprint Denver states that "adding density to areas that are single use, far from transit with a low density street pattern simply adds an equal number of auto trips."

Blueprint Denver states that "forecasted growth is to occur in areas of change where it will be most beneficial and *away* from areas of stability where it may have negative consequences". Buckley Annex is no such place. This redevelopment is surrounded by areas of stability and will have huge negative consequences to the neighborhoods around it. Areas of change are those "where most people would agree that development or redevelopment would be beneficial." The people in surrounding neighborhoods do not agree the type of development proposed for Buckley Annex would be beneficial.

This project is at odds with several other major tenets of Blueprint Denver. The planning goals for Buckley Annex properly state that the redevelopment plan should balance the needs of the community, Air Force and future developers. It acknowledges that "a plan backed by broad

community and political support has more value to a developer." I submit there is no broad public support for this development. By contrast there is major opposition to this development. This makes it far less attractive and valuable to a developer. At the last truly public meeting five years ago on November 14, 2007 a straw poll showed 90% of participants opposed the Buckley Redevelopment Plan. Although the plan has been improved in many respects since that meeting, it does not mean the public now accepts it.

These are not subtle points. Any objective viewer would conclude the Buckley Annex plan is completely out of character and inconsistent with the surrounding stable communities in which we live. The Lowry Redevelopment Authority should drastically modify its plan to make it significantly more congruent with the surrounding neighborhoods' wishes and the City should insist upon such changes.

Blueprint Denver also specifically sets forth the necessity for meaningful public involvement in the planning process. The public is to "be heard and heeded". Fortunately, Councilwoman Susman has decided the GDP process should not rush forward. Now hopefully there will be a better opportunity to educate and inform the public and to consider public comment. I realize, of course, there have been various task force meetings that were "open" to the public. These were not meetings to educate and inform the public. Instead they dealt with compartmentalized development issues without the opportunity of seeing the entire picture.

Throughout the Buckley Annex planning process those who differed with the plan have repeatedly been reassured that their objections can be raised and will be heard during the GDP process. That is the purpose of public involvement. Many cynically believe this is a "done deal" and the public will have no say in the outcome. I urge you to heed the concerns of the citizens who live nearby and make appropriate changes to the current plans.

Thank you for carefully considering these comments.

Sincerely,

James B. Breese