

ADUs in Denver

Outreach and Feedback Summary for Project Phase 6

This document summarizes public feedback received in phase 6 (Adoption Process) of the ADUs in Denver project, key themes, and highlights of how public input was used to shape the project. The document includes links to more information available on the project website.

Outreach was conducted using the following approaches:

- Connecting with neighborhood groups and industry organizations
- Online comment form

Outreach surrounding office hours in GVR:

- Mailer details, fliers were mailed out to over 4,000 properties
- Social Media
 - CPD posted on Nextdoor to the Green Valley Ranch neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods
 - CPD posted on Twitter
 - The City and County of Denver created two Facebook events for the office hours
- We alerted the registered neighborhood organizations, community groups, and HOAs identified by Councilmember Gilmore

Information made available on the [project website](#), via project newsletters, targeted outreach, and social media

Please visit the [project web page](#) for additional information.

Summary of Outreach

Phase 6: Adoption Process

April 2023 – May 2023

Engagement focused on gathering feedback on the proposed draft strategy and associated text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code.

Key Engagement Events in Project Phase 6

Presentations to Neighborhood Groups

- Green Valley Ranch Rec Center – Office Hours – May 15, 2023
- Green Valley Ranch Public Library – Office Hours – May 17, 2023

Public Review Draft of the Text Amendment to the Denver Zoning Code

The ADUs in Denver text amendment draft was available for public review and comments March 8 – March 27, 2023.

Newsletters

City staff sent a newsletter update about the ADUs in Denver project to community members who signed up for email updates at <https://bit.ly/ADUsInDenver>.

- May 29, 2023: [City-Council-Hearing-Approaching!](#)

Website Comments

From April 2023 to May 2023, the ADUs in Denver project received 53 comments and/or questions from the general public related to the project, submitted through an [online form](#) available at <https://bit.ly/ADUsInDenver>. Below is a summary and synthesis of key themes and demographics from comments submitted to the website in project phase 6.

Comments Received Regarding Public Review Draft

Comment Themes

- Participants expressed the desire for additional flexibility for rear setbacks, in the form of further reducing or eliminating them.
- Participants expressed concerns around a ‘blanket ADU neighborhood wide rezoning’ (this project is not a rezoning of any properties)
- Participants expressed concern about the permitting process including the length of time and the requirement that only licensed contractors may construct ADUs.

Demographic Information

- 94% of respondents were homeowners. 6% of respondents preferred not to answer.
- 61% of respondents identified as male, 32% identified as female, and 6% preferred not to answer.
- The age of respondents was fairly evenly distributed. The majority of respondents (26%) fell into the 35-44 age category.
- 74% of respondents identified as white, 10% identified as Hispanic, Latino/Latina/Latinx, or Spanish, 3% identified as Black or African American, and 13% preferred not to answer.
- The household income of respondents varied, though 84% of respondents reported household incomes of \$50,000 or more.

Appendix A includes a complete listing of comments and questions submitted through the project website from March 2023 - May 2023.

Response	Tell us what you think!
Submission	
DateTime	We want to hear from you. Questions or comments about the ADUs in Denver zoning code project can be shared in the text box below.
04/05/2023 23:00 PM	<p>Just wanting to know if adus are allowed in my area.</p> <p>Why do you require a soil report for an ADU and you dont require one to build the garage. When the garage is converted to an ADU this is the same living space as the garage especially if their is no expand soil. I hope that Senate Bill 23-213 passes as municipalities create to many zoning code requirements and excessive fees especially for owner occupants.</p> <p>Not every neighborhood is appropriate for ADU's and RNO's and HOA's should have a say in what's approved for their neighborhood. If approved for a neighborhood then height restrictions should be applied such that no ADU can exceed the height of any dwelling within 300 yards of it. Densification may have some benefits but it's not really an enhancement to the quality of life enjoyed now.</p> <p>Hello --</p> <p>I write in support of the changes under consideration to enhance and allow for ADUs.</p> <p>I write as the president of the Lower Downtown Neighborhood Association - LoDoNA.</p> <p>Our neighborhood is in one of the densest areas of Denver, with little to no areas where ADU's are expected to be available under the zoning being considered.</p>
04/07/2023 14:29 PM	<p>Irrespective of the neighborhood context, we are very much in favor of higher density and the proposed change.</p>
04/07/2023 16:45 PM	<p>ADU's are another means for people to secure housing otherwise unavailable to them. They are practical for multiple generations. In the case of older residents, an ADU has the capacity to offer alternative means of healthy care for that individual(s) probably at a significant financial savings.</p> <p>While ADUs should be allowed citywide, they also ought to fit their context. Requiring ADUs to follow the general mass, form, and architectural cues of the primary structure and/or surrounding structures will ensure the relative visual continuity of neighborhoods, and likely suffice otherwise critical neighbors. Compatibility necessitates neither matching materials nor other architectural replication of the primary structure. Nor does "fitting in with the neighborhood" constitute a "difficult to enforce additional building standard."</p> <p>Albeit somewhat subjective, evaluating similar standards for additions or secondary structures happens regularly in the Landmark Preservation division of CPD. In fact, the Landmark Preservation Design Guidelines offer a good example of how to enable the construction of additions and accessory structures without overtly sacrificing existing conditions. "Public vantage points" play an important role here. "Projects that are not readily visible...may have greater flexibility." Accordingly, interior lots and denser blocks usually enjoy a rare advantage over large and/or corner properties, a more equitable outcome.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>First, I must say that I'm extraordinarily disappointed that the city did not reach out directly to recent ADU applicants. I am one of them. It seems that a personalized invitation to comment would have been appropriate from the outset of this process, not at the end.</p> <p>I have just spent upwards of \$15,000 to get my ADU building permit approved by Denver. But I can't build it. I have been living this nightmare for a few years now.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>1. Cost. The white elephant is in the room, but missing from your proposal. I'm not sure which lobbyist got whose ear, but making a General Contractor do the work is THE single problem in Denver. They are holding the city hostage by adding a \$150K surcharge to all ADU projects. I suspect it goes up to \$200K after this passes. Where is the economic analysis of building costs and rental return? If it's not included, please rip it up and start again.</p> <p>Solution: I can be my own GC to "pop the top" or do an extension, but not an ADU. No, it's not a truly separate house since it can never be separate from the main property. That alone would cause a building rush. The GC industry lobbyist should win an award for getting this absurd requirement into the current rules. Again, no ADUs will be built as an investment, only for personal use. I've spoken to a few developers who ONLY build ADUs if they're also building the main house at the same time.</p>
04/08/2023 7:59 AM	<p>ADU's are another means for people to secure housing otherwise unavailable to them. They are practical for multiple generations. In the case of older residents, an ADU has the capacity to offer alternative means of healthy care for that individual(s) probably at a significant financial savings.</p> <p>While ADUs should be allowed citywide, they also ought to fit their context. Requiring ADUs to follow the general mass, form, and architectural cues of the primary structure and/or surrounding structures will ensure the relative visual continuity of neighborhoods, and likely suffice otherwise critical neighbors. Compatibility necessitates neither matching materials nor other architectural replication of the primary structure. Nor does "fitting in with the neighborhood" constitute a "difficult to enforce additional building standard."</p> <p>Albeit somewhat subjective, evaluating similar standards for additions or secondary structures happens regularly in the Landmark Preservation division of CPD. In fact, the Landmark Preservation Design Guidelines offer a good example of how to enable the construction of additions and accessory structures without overtly sacrificing existing conditions. "Public vantage points" play an important role here. "Projects that are not readily visible...may have greater flexibility." Accordingly, interior lots and denser blocks usually enjoy a rare advantage over large and/or corner properties, a more equitable outcome.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>First, I must say that I'm extraordinarily disappointed that the city did not reach out directly to recent ADU applicants. I am one of them. It seems that a personalized invitation to comment would have been appropriate from the outset of this process, not at the end.</p> <p>I have just spent upwards of \$15,000 to get my ADU building permit approved by Denver. But I can't build it. I have been living this nightmare for a few years now.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>1. Cost. The white elephant is in the room, but missing from your proposal. I'm not sure which lobbyist got whose ear, but making a General Contractor do the work is THE single problem in Denver. They are holding the city hostage by adding a \$150K surcharge to all ADU projects. I suspect it goes up to \$200K after this passes. Where is the economic analysis of building costs and rental return? If it's not included, please rip it up and start again.</p> <p>Solution: I can be my own GC to "pop the top" or do an extension, but not an ADU. No, it's not a truly separate house since it can never be separate from the main property. That alone would cause a building rush. The GC industry lobbyist should win an award for getting this absurd requirement into the current rules. Again, no ADUs will be built as an investment, only for personal use. I've spoken to a few developers who ONLY build ADUs if they're also building the main house at the same time.</p>
04/10/2023 17:02 PM	<p>2. Wasted first floor space. I see that you're simultaneously increasing the maximum habitable space from 650 to over 800, while also increasing from 1.5 to 2 stories. This proposal still doesn't allow for good use of the first floor space. If I'm limited to 650sf on the first floor, and a car takes up around 360sf, that leftover space combined I've been reviewing the new zoning draft. These new regulations are going to allow for so much more flexibility for ADUs. I think you all did a great job! My only comment is the in Section 11.8.2.1. I can see you made a lot of changes to this section, but I believe its still too limiting for SU zones. By restricting the GFA of the dwelling use to 864 SF / 1000 SF the regulations are encouraging large 1st story garages with a maxed out dwelling space above. So even though you've allowed for more flexibility we'll be getting the same result. I've tested this out on one client already. He wanted to max dwelling space possible, so I designed for him a 2 bed / 1 bath apartment that measured about 700SF on the second level. The extra 100 SF was dedicated to a interior stairway and small entry on the 1st level. This then forced us to build a oversized 3 car garage that was twice as deep as needed. I tried to push the client to put more dwelling space like a bedroom on the first story and reduce the overall size of the building but he said it would rent better if all the living space was continuous on one level. And since he's going to be paying 300K+ on this investment, he wanted the biggest ADU possible.</p> <p>So I think that one rule still needs tweaking. I would suggest getting rid of SU limitations all together. Why are we limiting the interior layout and uses? If people put more living space below or parking it doesn't really change the overall size of the building. I believe it actually might make it smaller. Most of my clients want the extra living space more than the garage parking.</p> <p>So those are my thoughts. I've started designing 3 ADUs now with the new zoning edits. 95% of the edits that you all made have been extremely beneficial and my clients are already very happy with the changes in their designs. So keep up the great work!</p>
04/11/2023 9:46 AM	
04/11/2023 22:05 PM	We need more housing in general and ADUs shouldn't just be allowed for primary residences
04/11/2023 22:07 PM	Eliminate the residency requirement for primary occupancy
04/15/2023 15:20 PM	<p>I feel ADUs will not integrate well into existing neighborhoods. Without an overall plan in place it is going to result in a real hodge lodge of structures. There is one proposed across the alley from my house which will not only be constructed poorly, judging from previous construction, but will look directly into my yard and infringe upon privacy.</p> <p>Hello! I had a question relating to the changes proposed for the Suburban (S) districts. We had someone recently ask if they were allowed to use their finished basement as an attached ADU. Their current zoning district is S-SU-D, which doesn't allow detached ADUs at the moment. In the draft report I saw that there will be a new district created called S-SU-D1, which does allow detached (and presumably attached) ADUs. But I also saw that the report said "no properties will be rezoned." This is a bit confusing to me, as new zoning districts are being added but no properties being rezoned is a bit conflicting. Could you provide some clarity on this?</p>
04/21/2023 9:03 AM	<p>Thank you!</p> <p>I previously applied to build an ADU on my brick and concrete garage. The plan included setting back the improvements five feet from the back and north (adjoining house) by five feet. The garage itself is a side load garage very close to the alley lot line and I see that the new ordinance proposal provides that as long as this garage is a "side-load" the "offset" for improvements in the rear would comply with the new ordinance. However, I cannot find similar language for the interior lot line. In my case the 50 year old garage is within 2 ft. of the interior lot line. My question is this, if I set back the ADU improvements five feet from the lot line, despite the 2 ft location of my garage (an additional 3 ft up top) would this plan be covered by the proposed new ordinance for ADUs?</p>
04/21/2023 14:49 PM	
04/23/2023 21:05 PM	Can I do an ADU in montbello. If not why?

By keeping the primary residence requirement you are formally declaring that the City of Denver will remove housing units if the owner needs to move away. You are saying you would rather have an ADU sit empty or even decommissioned than have 2 renters living in the primary house and ADU.

The modern day redlining is not racial, but economic. How are you justifying this to renters?

04/25/2023 14:34 PM The goal of this project was to remove barriers to ADU construction and by not addressing the primary residence topic, you have failed. When will the new ADU zoning take effect?

04/26/2023 14:31 PM Thanks,

05/02/2023 8:01 AM The ADU map does not cover my home at 5070 W. Alaska Pl. I know it was zoned SU. Is that designation under reconsideration?

05/02/2023 8:07 AM I fully support allowing ADUs broadly in my neighborhood. I believe many homes in Westwood would allow for ideal ADU conditions because of the lot sizes and lack of alleyways. Given the size of the homes on most of these lots, I would suggest proportional zoning that would limit the size of the ADUs by square footage and/or bedroom count, but with the cost of housing on the rise the allowance for ADUs is not just consistent with the culture and character of the neighborhood, it is an economic necessity that will have an enormous multiplier effect across the entire city and the region.

05/02/2023 14:16 PM Are you 13 F...ing Marxists out of your minds. The citizens didn't want Park Hill Golf Course developed, you did. The vast number of citizens don't want ADUs, you do. Privacy gone! Personal property rights eliminated. Zoning changes took place for Denver not too long ago and your blowing apart all the work that was done. People want to use cars and not live like sardines. You pompous asses. Ed Quinn

05/02/2023 14:33 PM I think you've already made up your mind about how you want the city to look, and we're going to get that outcome no matter our concerns, just as happened with rezoning a few years ago. I think ADUs are a neighborhood blight, but you'll phrase all the polls so that it looks like citizens want more density.

05/02/2023 14:49 PM This is a terrible idea. We have seen what temporary rentals have done to the housing market and this will exacerbate the unaffordability crisis. This will not be used to alleviate housing but will hurt housing and neighborhoods. There are many other solutions for Denver's housing issues with fewer negative consequences that should be explored.

05/02/2023 14:55 PM There are many concerning issues within the proposed density plan throughout the City and County of Denver, especially in areas where single family homes are located. The purpose of living in such neighborhoods is for the quaint and distinctive nature these areas represent. Approving ADUs without restrictions and within these areas, as well as high-density developments, are not in the best interest of these neighborhoods, and these neighborhoods will deteriorate over time and lose their distinctive qualities. Density creates crime, insecurities, congestion and undesirable neighborhoods, and ADUs will eliminate any chance of privacy within one's own home. I strongly disapprove of this plan and very concerned that the majority of those who disagree with this plan are not recognized, and the plan just moves forward, notwithstanding the many objections to this plan, similar to the East Denver Plan. Is it really worth participating in this process?

05/02/2023 15:28 PM I have owned my property near 17th Ave and Niagara St. in South Park Hill for 32 years. The integrity of this charming neighborhood is entirely at risk under the proposed ADU rules. One of the principal reasons for purchasing a home in the South Park Hill neighborhood is for the wonderful space we have on our lots and around our homes. Under this proposal, it appears that any property over 6000 sq. ft could build an ADU with little to NO size or height restrictions. My primary dwelling unit (AKA my HOME) is 1220 sq.ft on a 6100 sq. ft alley lot. As I interpret these proposed rules, an owner in my area could build a looming ADU even larger than my home. I think the lack of height and size parameters would be EXTREMELY detrimental to the current character and charm of the neighborhood. I'm fundamentally opposed to these proposed changes to the zoning in my neighborhood.

05/02/2023 15:50 PM Please DO NOT ALLOW and INVASION of overbuilt ADU's into my neighborhood! DO NOT allow ADUs to be developed in Denver without the stipulation that they be one level only, so as not to intrude into the privacy of their neighbors, and DO NOT allow ADUs to be built without requiring the homeowner to live in the primary unit. Absentee landlords have no commitment to the neighborhood, as residents do. This is very important to those of us who have developed good relations with our neighbors and who value the upkeep of the property in which we have invested our life savings and our time and energy for decades.

05/02/2023 15:50 PM I object to ADUs being a use by right and I strongly object to allowing ADUs to penetrate bulk plane limits. At the very least, Denver should require input from Registered Neighborhood Organizations and neighbors before allowing ADUs, and penetrations of bulk plane limits should be strictly prohibited.

Construction of ADUs without consultation of neighbors and notice to RNOs can be expected create animosity and contribute to conflicts among neighbors, especially if the ADU intrudes on a neighbor's privacy or shades their property. ADUs have great potential to shade neighboring gardens and devalue neighbors' investments in passive and active solar energy improvements. Because of this, penetrations of bulk plane limits should be prohibited. After all, construction of ADUs is still a matter of choice and people who choose to have an ADU should have to follow the same rules as those who chose not to have one when it comes to determining what goes on inside of the bulk plane of their property.

Denver should also maintain strong requirements that lot owners live on the property containing an ADU. Such a requirement ensures that lot owners and occupants of their ADU have some 'skin in the game' in terms of maintaining the neighborhood's environment and quality of life.

05/02/2023 17:23 PM Finally, it is nice that Denver apparently cared to seek neighborhood input before it recently adopted blanket rezoning to allow ADUs in Valverde and Athmar Park. This principle of informed consent should be applied before rezoning other areas, too. To the best of my knowledge, this has not been done in the East Area where I live, and I recall that there was scarcely any support for ADUs in the East Area Plan adopted in 2020. Before imposing a 'one size fits all' solution to the areas included in the East Area Plan and elsewhere, Denver should ask the residents of the affected areas if that's what they want and then heed their wishes. The area of South Park Hill is seeing a huge push for greater density from city officials.

05/02/2023 18:06 PM This is not in keeping with the desires of most neighbors, many of whom have been here their whole adult lives. Affordable housing is an issue, but allowing encroachment into the bulk plane and reducing set back requirements in neighborhoods like Park Hill is not going to increase the livability of these communities. Instead, it will foster short term rentals which disrupt the neighborhood, and burden property owners who have their entire life savings in their well kept and desirable neighborhoods. The City has been pushing the BRT project which will push more and more traffic into residential streets north of Colfax. This, coupled with the relaxation of set back and bulk plane encroachment standards proposed with this ADU proposal will further burden current residents of South Park Hill, an area where the property taxes have jumped exponentially and long time residents are having difficulty maintaining the quality of life we have enjoyed because of too much growth, which the City continues to foist on us. The City derives significant tax revenue from these desirable neighborhoods, yet continues to develop policies that make it increasingly less tolerable to live in them. My home has no alley behind it. If my neighbors on Krameria St want to, under your proposal, they could have a 2 story ADU at the back of the lot encroaching into the bulk plane which will destroy the privacy of my back yard. The City needs to stop prioritizing the needs of renters over the people who are paying the ever growing property taxes that support the City planners and other city services. The property values in this area are a direct result of the way existing homeowners have maintained their properties and created a strong community. If ADUs are to be allowed, they should not be allowed to place burdens on existing homeowners such that they encroach on the property line and invade the bulk plane. That is an improper burden that should not be allowed. There is no need to relax those standards and the City should not allow that as a matter of right. It is unfair to Park Hill to provide those relaxed standards when other similarly situated neighborhoods do not have that proposed for them. I strenuously object to the proposal to the extent it allows relaxed set back requirements and allows encroachment into the bulk plane for Park Hill. This is an unfair application of policies and is a denial of the property owners due process rights.

05/02/2023 18:21 PM Think about the parking problems that will come along with over building. People own cars in Denver. Our public transportation is not good enough and people want to drive to the mountains.

05/02/2023 19:32 PM Don't ruin our great Family neighborhoods.

05/02/2023 20:24 PM I live in the Denver East neighborhood that will be affected by ADU's being constructed all over the place without a specific plan. This will result in haphazard constructions that will be a blight on the integrity of the neighborhood. I strongly oppose this ill thought out process.

05/02/2023 22:19 PM My answer is NOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO!! Sick of any kind of development!!!!!!

ADUs if allowed (which i dont think they should), should be required to adhere to current bulkplane, height, 5' setbacks from property lines, and impermeable cover requirements for all lots regardless of size. Increasing density should not destroy/degrade the neighboring area around the new builds.

05/02/2023 23:18 PM We vote NO on ADUs in central Denver. We love Park Hill, because it is a neighborhood that cares about its neighbors, its kids, its streets, its walkability and neighborhood businesses. We are made up of single-family homes, primarily owner occupied, most with garages or off-street parking, lawns and backyards. We appreciate the neighborhood as a safe place for our children and grandchildren. Traffic and crime are not big problems here. ADUs, by contrast, will allow for high density living, diminished green space, increased on-street parking, traffic, and increased crime. We have paid dearly to live in Park Hill. ADUs will destroy our neighborhood's appearance and will devalue our highly taxed property. I have to ask: What is the city's goal in providing high density housing in what will have to be a high rent neighborhood, such as Park Hill? Clearly, it will not benefit the population the city may be attempting to serve. Is the goal to put even more money in the pockets of builders and landlords or is it to raise money through taxes for the city? There are better ways for everyone, than to destroy historic one hundred-plus-year-old neighborhoods, such as Park Hill. Please hear our neighborhood's cry-WE DON'T WANT ADUs!

05/02/2023 23:39 PM The constant push by city planners to infill every possible square inch of Denver's 'Core Area' neighborhoods with new development, seemingly without real regard to the inevitable negative impact on quality of life for existing residents is beyond comprehension. Residents that are aware of the implications to their property are uniformly opposed to the proposed plan. Investor and developer stakeholders champion the change. With yet another massive property tax bill reportedly on its way, insufficient roadways, rising crime to persons and property, and nearby open space filled - one has to wonder why we as resident citizens are having to wage continual campaigns to keep the city from further eroding our neighborhood character and quality of life. More unwanted density in the Denver's core area is not the best solution to Denver's housing needs - there are many more suitable options available to the city. Please do not proceed with the ADU zoning code project plan as outlined. It will cause problems for our neighborhoods and residents alike.

05/03/2023 8:11 AM I am perplexed that the city seems to have researched the ADU issue without addressing parking on the streets and the number of cars allowed per house and ADU!!! It is already difficult to drive down city streets with the number of cars parked on the street! Now that streets have barriers it is even more difficult. The city cannot control the speed of traffic and now it wants to add more cars in neighborhoods. Please look at parking and address the speeding problem. Putting heads in the sand that people will give up cars to ride busses when there are not enough drivers and the bus plan is ridiculous.
The quality of my life in this city has deteriorated due to more cars, people and lack of municipal management.
The City's promotion of Auxiliary Units contains inadequate protection for existing neighborhoods and burdens core area properties to a greater extent than properties in more suburban areas (many of which have larger lots in the first place).

To prevent visual intrusion on neighboring properties, regulations for Auxiliary Units should limit height and bulk. To protect privacy of neighboring properties, regulations should not permit balconies facing neighboring properties.

Allowing Auxiliary Units to be larger than the primary residence should not be allowed. The current draft allows Auxiliary Units to be built on alleyways without any setback. This will result in canyon-like alleys, increasing a claustrophobic feel to neighborhoods.

05/03/2023 9:27 AM Auxiliary Units should be allowed only on properties where a property owner is in residence. Denver already suffers from corporate owners buying housing stock for rental purposes. Promoting absentee landlords will degrade neighborhoods.

05/03/2023 10:41 AM The density of what you are proposing is horrible! Currently, the proposed Plan would allow ADUs without a minimum lot size! And, it would allow the penetration of bulk planes which WILL affect the privacy of neighbor's yards. The proposal also allows ADUs that are larger than the primary residence and in some instances, ADUs could be built without any setback from alleys. This is crazy!
All this proposal does is maximize density with ZERO regard for the potential effects on neighboring properties in the core neighborhoods of Denver.
This is an assault on all existing homeowners in the metro. Why do you ignore us? Existing property owners should have rights, not just developers!
ADU Comments

When ADUs were presented to us, CCD staff made a linkage between the CCD/RTD proposal for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on East Colfax Avenue and the construction of ADUs for this community. The BRT justified the ADU zoning between 13th Avenue and 17th Avenue, and the rezoning justified the BRT, in a perfect circle of logic.

I entered the field of community and regional planning in the mid-70's with passion and idealism. For almost 25 years, I did regional watershed restoration planning work on behalf of the State of Colorado, all over Colorado. I've organized numerous public engagement meetings in many communities. In each place, I knew I was answerable to local residents and business owners and to the Director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources at that particular moment in time. I was conscious of situations when I was effectively "a guest in someone else's house" and of the importance of respecting the "locals".

My commitment to public transit has now lasted more than 60 years. I was 9 when I began riding city buses from my single-parent home to school and back to home daily. A few years later, when I worked full-time, I rode the #15 bus (back when there was no 15L) then the 15L, for more than 25 years. I have been a fan of TOD for more than 50 years.

05/03/2023 14:28 PM I've lived in three metro areas with very good transit agencies and have visited relatives living in two more such metro areas. Metro Denver is not on that list. I have seen

1. IN the situations where you do not provide setbacks in the alley, who will be responsible for the damage done to an ADU or service vehicle because there is not space to service our alley ways? Is there enough room for the trash cans and the linke?
2. Neighbors should retain the right to object meaningfully and the objections to be considered and weighed seriously when an ADY is being built as "one size cannot fit all". Especially since very few people wish in the EAP to have ADUs as a matter of right . Only 44 people out of the 6600 comments said ADUs were important.
3. Invading the bulk plane and the use of balconies will invade someone's privacy.
4. No mention of the materials in this proposal. Seems to sjirt around the plans and Blueprint Denver to keep the characteristics of a neighborhood.
5. There is not requirement up front that the impact upon infrastructure should be considered before submitting a plan. There are certain areas that need to have that type of review before approving the ADU. This will change as the City becoemes denser.
6. Allowing a bigger structure on smaller lots will change the character of the neighborhood.
7. With your goal of only desiring density, you are ignoring the past requirements that each lot carry a certain amount of green space. This will contribute to the heat island effect.
8. There are ways to become denser and it appears you allowed the suburbs to retain more distance, protect shadowing, and the like. This is not equity!

05/03/2023 15:25 PM I hope the size and scale will be proportional to the home is affiliated with. I hope it all incorporates similar design features of the home it is affiliated with. I also hope the will be significant 25% + of building sight will be left as open space with permeable surfaces. I hope roof lines will be both varied and generally retained . I hope dedicated parking is a part of the ADU.

05/03/2023 15:54 PM I am opposed to Denver forcing ADU'S on us. There should be no absentee landlords and adjoining residents should be able to veto them. Under no circumstances should these be a use by right.

No balconies anywhere. Setbacks should be substantial. Don't you people remember how much residents hated having long houses built next to them?

How do we recover the peace and quiet of our backyards? Who will reimburse us for the lost value of our homes?

It's amazing. Denver just raised the value of my home by 50% and my taxes will skyrocket but Denver wants me to subsidize others who want to put ADU'S at the cost of others' properties.

Whatever justifications you trot out for ADU'S, this will damage the City's character irreparably and just enrich developers and speculators.

You want to increase affordable housing, but this is not the way to do so.

05/03/2023 15:57 PM BTW, your notice efforts about this were, as usual, atrocious. I only learned of this from an opposition group.

05/03/2023 16:47 PM ADU's purpose and building codes as proposed, will be runned by developers to build out and up to maximize profit in the name of "density", and profit. It takes away all power and agency of the neighbors and citizens of the neighborhood to maintain open space, room to breathe, and raise a family.

05/04/2023 16:08 PM As far as I can determine, the city does not have support from the public, especially those living in the affected area, for the ADUs being discussed. When citizens say "no" and say it repeatedly, government should listen. We have lived in many cities in many states and what is being proposed here in Denver is wrong for all the reasons so many of us have already stated. Please listen.

05/08/2023 10:28 AM When the vote takes place in June will the new zoning rules go into effect immediately?

05/10/2023 12:49 PM I really like the proposed updates....I will begin building a new home in the Berkeley neighborhood this year and I would like to incorporate the new rules into my homes plans.

05/10/2023 12:49 PM It is a terrible idea as it will be used for air b and b take advantage of low income people. Spread crime and drugs through neighborhood.

05/12/2023 17:44 PM I did not buy this house so the next door can be tjwana

05/22/2023 21:23 PM Hello,
We are looking to see if our property is zoned for us to get a permit for an ADU. We are looking to add a mother-in-law suite for our elderly mother (detached and attached are both options).
Our address is 4673 S Zenobia St.

05/12/2023 17:44 PM Thank you,
Holly and Dave Frankovic

05/22/2023 21:23 PM How soon after the June 5 public hearing will we find out if full 2-story ADU floor plans are going to get approved?

05/22/2023 21:23 PM First sentence from the ADU Strategy Report:

"Denver's population has grown, and we need to make it easier to provide a range of housing options that fit in with existing neighborhoods."
Clearly the author's of this document are pro-ADUs.

Of the 104 comments listed in the Appendix, only 9 focused on the negatives of increased ADUs.

Some of the comments are from developers (obviously pro). I get the impression that the residents who are interested in building an ADU are looking at it as an income generator, much like Airbnb. This is self-serving, short-term thinking, which in the end will harm us all with jammed city streets. Since my move here in 1988 the city population has increased from 479,719 to 713,252. This increase of 233,533 (+48.7%) is increased density. There has been no increase in land mass or city streets. The entire metro Denver population has increased from 1,650,489 in 1990 to 2,963,821 in 2020. That's an 80% increase. Many metro residents travel into Denver for work and entertainment. Increased density is not the answer. We all understand the cost of housing is high in Denver, just like it is in many locations in our state and country. Legislation does not fix issues like this and never has. There is no easy answer to issues like this but the free market will come up with solutions. Examples include:
•Pay scales will need to be increased by businesses and local governments.
•Businesses can provide housing credits as a benefit.

05/29/2023 9:36 AM Hello,

I am a Denver resident as well as the Senior Long-Range Planner for the City of Lone Tree. I want to take a moment to provide comment on the ADUs in Denver Proposal, as a resident and a land use professional.

I am strongly in favor of this proposal. It has been carefully crafted to consider the context within various neighborhoods and streamline the built form to mitigate any potential negative externalities. It even goes as far as to consider some of the more subjective elements of design. With that said, it is important that we consider incremental changes to meet in the middle those who have prioritized aesthetic over functionality.

05/30/2023 20:55 PM We aren't just facing a housing crisis. We are facing an inflation of the housing market due to years of restricted supply. Please adopt this incremental, yet foundational change to closing that supply gap.

05/30/2023 20:59 PM On one hand, the City of Denver desires more housing, i.e., ADU's. On the other hand, there is concern and a desire for an 'urban canopy', i.e., trees, vegetation, green space, etc. Where is the balance between the two? It seems to me, that in many cases, newly constructed ADU's would have a negative impact on our 'urban canopy',.

05/31/2023 6:22 AM I am wholeheartedly in favor of ADUs! I've lived in Denver for all of my 70 years. Denver needs housing, seniors benefit from ADUs, and density is good for the planet.

05/31/2023 10:51 AM We already have ADUs in Central Park and they are great: useful, attractive and efficient.
Please make it easier to build ADUs throughout Denver. ADUs increase affordable housing, add gentle density, and provide additional streams of income to allow families to stay in their homes.

05/31/2023 11:51 AM To whom it may concern -
I am writing to oppose any blanket zoning change that would allow ADUs in all neighborhoods in Denver. Any effort to make ADUs permissible with the changes to existing zoning codes, must take into account the neighborhood. Making this change in historic areas of Denver will have little impact on the need for affordable housing and instead will damage the historic element of these neighborhoods, which are a vital part of Denver. Housing density should be focused in areas with significant public transport and infrastructure to accommodate these higher density needs. Most historic neighborhoods in Denver do not have the space for parking, and for the extra trash and recycling that is generated if ADUs were permitted. Allowing ADUs in these neighborhoods is simply an overall loss for the city.

05/31/2023 11:51 AM Thank you.

I strongly support the idea of making ADUs easier to build in Denver.

This is one of the most important strategies the City can engage in to address affordable housing while also maintaining the integrity of our neighborhoods.

We saw a lot of extreme measures introduced in the legislature in the name of affordable housing. However, one thing we can all agree on is that allowing homeowners to build an ADU is one of the lowest-impact ways to add housing stock, and targeting help for renters which is overlooked by many.

05/31/2023 15:40 PM Thank you for your work on this important issue.

05/31/2023 16:02 PM Please legalize ADUs citywide and remove cumbersome barriers to construction like off-street parking requirements, restrictive height limits and setbacks, and other design regulations. People should be able to build ADUs on their properties without having to endure and pay for excessive review and permitting processes. We are in a housing crisis and the city should do everything it can to make it easier and cheap to build more housing.