From:	John Fischer
To:	Susman, Mary Beth - City Council
Cc:	dencc - City Council
Subject:	Fwd: #20141-00096 LRA zoning change
Date:	Sunday, June 28, 2015 1:31:49 PM

Mary Beth and Council Members---I just realized that the copy of my email regarding the rezoning referenced above was a draft and not in final form. This is the final copy which has grammatic and structural fixes, but the overall content remains the same. I apologize for any inconvenience, and hope you are able to have this copy in the record.

John Fischer

Honorable Denver City Council Members:

I am John Fischer, President of Crestmoor Park Home Owners, Inc., First Filing, and I address you in that capacity as well as in my individual capacity as a Denver resident living in close proximity to Lowry and the Boulevard One development, and in each capacity I urge you to deny the requested zoning because it does not fit the character of the overall development of Lowry nor is it consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods.

I also addressed you in regard to the rezoning of 195 S. Monaco Parkway several weeks ago, and I feel compelled to clarify a few misunderstandings which might have played a role in the outcome of that hearing since these issues were raised by Council during deliberations, first being that many more residents of surrounding neighborhoods were opposed than in favor, as is the case here again; second that Crestmoor is in fact closer to the development than Hilltop, as is the case here again; third that Crestmoor is in fact contiguous to the development, and again here just across Monaco Boulevard from this development; and fourth, and critical to the

issues at hand, that we were in favor of limited development that was consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods, and so here again are many representatives of the surrounding neighborhoods in favor of limited development but not over-development as proposed, and which the requested zoning would permit.

For almost one year I was a member of the Lowry Community Advisory Committee as the GDP for Boulevard One was developed. At each and every meeting concerned nearby residents spoke articulately, thoughtfully and sometimes passionately about their concerns regarding density, resulting traffic and parking issues, and public health, safety and welfare issues, among others. Those opposed to the revised GDP outnumbered those in favor by a margin of, at a minimum, four to one. I became convinced during this time that the overall density was just too much for the site.

Back in the early 1970`s when the Air Force was considering moving their Accounting and Finance Center to the Buckley Annex, they developed a comprehensive Environmental Statement in cooperation with City and State agencies, looking at traffic patterns, public transportation, access to the site and impacts on neighboring streets, air, noise and waste water pollution, and alternatives to reduce adverse environmental effects, among other issues, before moving forward. I am not aware of any such study for the proposed development at Boulevard One, which due to the character of the development has even greater environmental impacts. As well and very importantly, there is no form of convenient public transportation, nor is RTD planning light rail or mass transit for this area, and as far as I know not even a City comprehensive transportation plan, even though the development is expected to produce almost 10,000 new automobile trips per day.

By requesting and receiving C-MX-5 zoning, the LRA could deviate from previous commitments regarding setbacks, building heights and perhaps even density, instead of requesting zoning that is appropriate for the site, the overall project, and what has been essentially promised.

I respectfully ask that you deny the requested zoning in consideration of the above.

John P. Fischer, Esq.