July Community Outreach Supplemental Update

The Shea team utilized the additional month resulting from the city noticing error to continue outreach and engagement efforts beyond those previously described in the application. In addition to the Community Open House held in April, the Shea team held a second Open House at the project site on July 18. Notice was mailed to properties within 500' of the site, more than doubling typical city notice requirements. Notice included a QR code with the project website for additional information. Approximately 35 people attended the Community Open House, with a majority of those in attendance coming from Cherry Hills Village. Attendees represented diverse viewpoints with many seeking to learn more about the project, some expressing strong support for providing more affordable housing through repurposing a long-vacant neighboring office building, and some expressing concern about traffic, proximity to amenities and appropriateness of affordable housing in the area.

In addition to the Community Open House, Shea team members engaged with property owners in the Villas at Cherry Hills Homeowners Association and the Cherry Point Homeowners Association to address questions and provide detailed project information. Shea team members also discussed the project with Greenwood Village Mayor and met, along with CPD staff, with Cherry Hills Village Mayor, Councilmember and Planning Director to discuss their feedback.

4340 S. Monaco
Shea Properties
Supplemental Community Outreach Information

Additional project community outreach has continued following submission of the zoning application. Though neither group has responded, information and an offer to meet has been shared with Strong Denver and Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC)'s Executive Committee. Briefings also occurred with former District 4 Councilwoman Kendra Black and several interested District 4 residents, members of the Metro Mayors Caucus and area businesses. Shea has also publicly presented to Centennial City Council meetings as part of their affordable housing capital stack efforts.

On April 24, 2024, Shea Properties and The Pachner Company hosted a Community Open House at the project site. An informational flyer (including a QR code for the City's project webpage) and invitation to attend the open house was mailed to all property owners within 200 feet of the property, emailed to citywide Registered Neighborhood Organizations Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC) and Strong Denver, and shared with the District 4 Council office. In addition, because the 2 closest properties to the project site are multifamily rental properties, the project team provided the flyer to the on-site management at Tangent and Bell Denver Tech Center apartments and requested that the flyer be shared on their community information boards to raise awareness with residents of these two neighboring properties.

Approximately 10 people attended the open house, including 2 residents from the neighboring apartment building (Tangent), a resident of the Southmoor neighborhood, a representative from Denver South, members of the Centennial City Council, and District 4 Councilwoman Diana Romero Campbell and her staff. Information was presented to attendees on the project vision, Shea's experience with affordable housing, and the zoning request and timeline. Because the event was held on the project site, attendees were able to tour the existing building and see how the building will be adapted. Centennial council members were particularly interested in seeing how the units would be laid out given that they have recently approved designating a portion of their Private Activity Bond allocation to this project to support this regionally beneficial affordable housing. Overall, there was significant excitement for the project amongst attendees.

## Exhibit A

### Community Outreach

The Applicant, Shea Properties Management Company, Inc., in conjunction with community outreach consultants The Pachner Company, has engaged District 4 Councilwoman Diana Romero Campbell through a series of meetings and a site tour, to provide her with an overview of the Project goals in advance of submitting the rezoning application. As the Project has pursued affordable housing funding opportunities, Councilwoman Romero Campbell has provided support for funding applications and continues to engage in regional conversations on the funding side of the Project.

District 1 Councilwoman Amanda Sandoval, as the Chair of the Land Use, Transportation and Infrastructure committee, was also provided with general information on the Project ahead of submission of the rezoning application.

The project team has engaged with Denver South Economic Development Partnership, a regional organization comprised of Mayors, County Commissioners, and business leaders in the Denver South area. The project team has also briefed neighboring jurisdictions including Arapahoe County, Centennial, Englewood, Littleton, and others. Finally, the project has been discussed with the neighboring businesses and property owners. Regional organizations, surrounding jurisdictions, and neighboring businesses are supportive of the Project. They are excited for much needed additional affordable housing in the area, and they are interested in seeing a successful office-to-affordable adaptive reuse project that can be a model for others in the region.

Though this Property does not fall within the boundaries of any District 4 Registered Neighborhood Association and a very limited number of properties (portions of two multi-family apartment properties and a small portion of a townhome project) are within a 200’ radius of the subject Property, the project team will host a community meeting with the neighboring Denver properties to provide information on the Project and rezoning application.

The project team will also conduct one-on-one briefings with several area property owners based on feedback from the Council District office. Because of the unique opportunity presented by this project as a regional affordable housing/adaptive reuse project, engagement is also occurring with neighboring jurisdiction and with housing advocates. Community outreach will continue throughout the rezoning timeline and will be enhanced by additional individual meetings and group briefings.

4340 S. Monaco
Shea Properties
Supplemental Community Outreach Information

Additional project community outreach has continued following submission of the zoning application. Though neither group has responded, information and an offer to meet has been shared with Strong Denver and Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC)'s Executive Committee. Briefings also occurred with former District 4 Councilwoman Kendra Black and several interested District 4 residents, members of the Metro Mayors Caucus and area businesses. Shea has also publicly presented to Centennial City Council meetings as part of their affordable housing capital stack efforts.

On April 24, 2024, Shea Properties and The Pachner Company hosted a Community Open House at the project site. An informational flyer (including a QR code for the City's project webpage) and invitation to attend the open house was mailed to all property owners within 200 feet of the property, emailed to citywide Registered Neighborhood Organizations Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation (INC) and Strong Denver, and shared with the District 4 Council office. In addition, because the 2 closest properties to the project site are multifamily rental properties, the project team provided the flyer to the on-site management at Tangent and Bell Denver Tech Center apartments and requested that the flyer be shared on their community information boards to raise awareness with residents of these two neighboring properties.

Approximately 10 people attended the open house, including 2 residents from the neighboring apartment building (Tangent), a resident of the Southmoor neighborhood, a representative from Denver South, members of the Centennial City Council, and District 4 Councilwoman Diana Romero Campbell and her staff. Information was presented to attendees on the project vision, Shea's experience with affordable housing, and the zoning request and timeline. Because the event was held on the project site, attendees were able to tour the existing building and see how the building will be adapted. Centennial council members were particularly interested in seeing how the units would be laid out given that they have recently approved designating a portion of their Private Activity Bond allocation to this project to support this regionally beneficial affordable housing. Overall, there was significant excitement for the project amongst attendees.

**KENDRA BLACK**
3500 E FLOYD DR – DENVER, CO 80210
303.877.7912
kendrablackdenver@gmail.com

April 2024

Edson Ibanez
Community Planning & Development
City & County of Denver

RE: 4340 S Monaco, Denver 80237

Dear Mr. Ibanez,

I am a near life-long resident of southeast Denver and know the area very well. I also served as the Denver City Councilwoman representing District 4 in southeast Denver for eight years. During those eight years I worked closely with Shea Properties on a number of issues including planning and rezoning for Marina Square and planning for an affordable housing project in the DTC area.

I am so pleased to see that Shea's affordable housing project is moving forward. The DTC area is in great need of affordable units, and has an abundance of office buildings. Shea's innovative project to transform an empty office building into affordable units is exactly what our city needs at this time. The rezoning from B-4 with waivers to Planned Unit Development with a S-MX-5 base is a simple solution to the complexities presented by the old zoning code.

**I strongly support this rezoning and urge the Planning Board and City Council to unanimously support it.**

Shea's project will be a model for other developers to convert office buildings to much-needed housing.

Thank you for your work on this project.

Sincerely,

Kendra Black

# Planning Board Comments

| | |
|---|---|
| **Submitted on** | 23 April 2024, 1:19PM |
| **Receipt number** | 653 |
| **Related form version** | 3 |

## Your information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name** | Braden Kallin |
| **Address or neighborhood** | 4500 S Monaco St |
| **ZIP code** | 80237 |
| **Email** | bradenkallin@gmail.com |

## Agenda item you are commenting on

Rezoning

## Rezoning

| | |
|---|---|
| **Address of rezoning** | 4350 S Monaco St |
| **Case number** | 24i-00027 |

## Draft plan

**Plan area or neighborhood**

## Proposed text amendment

**Project name**

## Historic district application

**Name of proposed historic district**

## Comprehensive Sign Plan

**Address of comprehensive sign plan**

**Case number**

## DURA Renewal Plan

**Address of renewal project**

**Name of project**

## Other

**Name of project your would like to comment on**

## Submit your comments

| | |
|---|---|
| **Would you like to express support or opposition to the project?** | Strong support |
| **Your comment:** | Given the presence of taller high rises in the immediately adjacent Belleview Station area, I believe this could/should be upzoned even further to allow higher than 5 story construction. However this is a great start. |

**If you have an additional document or image that you would like to add to your comment, you may upload it below. Files may not be larger than 5MB.**

DENVER SOUTH

April 30, 2024

Case: 2024i-00027

Edson Ibañez
Edson.Ibanez@denvergov.org
Community Planning & Development
City and County of Denver
201 W. Colfax Ave
Denver, Colorado 80202

Greetings from Denver South! As you likely know, we are an economic development and transportation partnership servicing the eight-mile corridor along I-25 south from roughly Belleview to RidgeGate. We also work closely with the city and county of Denver on a variety of key transportation and economic development initiatives.

Denver South is writing in support of the 4340 S. Monaco project being proposed by Shea Properties. This project brings new affordable housing to the area which will help to address one of the top concerns of employers in our region. Additionally, this project is strategically situated close to the Belleview RTD light rail station providing much needed multimodal options for its residents.

Our team recently released the South I-25 Corridor Study and found that advancing affordable housing near our light rail stations is one of the most pressing needs in the development of the south I-25 corridor. Advancing this important stretch of the metro area is critical for all of Colorado.

In our team's professional judgment, the uniqueness of this project, along with the stellar reputation of Shea Properties, will continue to augment the positive momentum this neighborhood has amassed. We hope you support the rezoning from B-4 with waivers to PUD G-34.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

David Worley
President & CEO
david@denver-south.com

**From:** Brittany Morris Saunders
**To:** Ibanez, Edson - CPD Senior City Planner
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Application 2024100027
**Date:** Thursday, May 23, 2024 5:04:22 PM

**This Message Is From an External Sender**
This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Dear Edson,

I am writing in support of the rezoning of 4340 S. Monaco (Application 2024100027) to allow for residential uses on the site and facilitate an adaptive reuse of a vacant office building. As a resident of the Southmoor neighborhood, I am pleased to see high quality affordable housing options added within close proximity to light rail and in alignment with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint Denver.

The use of a PUD to preserve the conformance of existing buildings on site while ensuring that future new development will fit with the neighborhood context is appropriate. District 4 is home to a variety of amazing housing options, but has fewer projects than other areas of the city that are designed to serve affordable housing needs at a lower AMI level. This project will provide housing that will serve those that are employed in the Denver Tech Center (an employment area rivaling Downtown), allowing people to truly live and work in District 4.

The City's Comp Plan calls for a city that is equitable, affordable and inclusive; a city made of strong neighborhoods; an economically diverse and environmentally active community and a healthy and active city. This adaptive reuse affordable housing project meets those goals and furthers the welfare of our city. I ask that you join me in supporting this rezoning and bringing this project closer to fruition.

Thank you,
Brittany Saunders

# CITY OF CHERRY HILLS VILLAGE

2450 E. Quincy Avenue
Cherry Hills Village, CO 80113
www.cherryhillsvillage.com

Village Center
Telephone 303-789-2541
FAX 303-761-9386


June 12, 2024

Edson Ibanez, Senior City Planner
Community Planning and Development Services
201 W. Colfax Ave., Dept. 205
Denver, CO 80202

RE: #2024I-00027; Request for Rezoning at 4340 – 4350 S. Monaco St.

Mr. Ibanez,

The City of Cherry Hills Village supports the goal of increasing housing and housing opportunities in the area. However, this specific application has failed to meet some critical thresholds.

The purpose of this letter is to address certain inaccuracies in the application and your staff report dated April 24, 2024, and to identify certain violations of due process regarding the application to rezone 4340-4350 S. Monaco St. The City of Cherry Hills Village respectfully requests that this application be continued to allow factual inaccuracies to be corrected, to correct the failures of due process, and to allow reconsideration of the application with more complete and accurate information.

Cherry Hills Village challenges many of the assertions, facts, and opinions presented as facts included in the application narrative and staff memo recommending support of this rezoning application. While more detail is provided below, our objections are generally related to three main areas:

1. Despite claims that input was sought from neighboring communities, the immediate neighbors to the west and south (Cherry Hills Village and Greenwood Village) were completely unaware of the application. The staff memo incorrectly identifies Cherry Hills Village as unincorporated Arapahoe County. Denver's process requires that all properties within 200' of the subject property be notified; that was not done. In addition, the applicant sought feedback from communities such as Littleton, Centennial and Englewood which are more than 5 miles away while excluding the immediately adjacent neighboring communities.
2. The recommendation for approval and determination that the application meets the required criteria is heavily predicated upon an incorrect assessment of access to transit. The application repeatedly mentions a bus stop on the property but there is no bus service at that stop. The closest bus stop with RTD service is .7 miles away and only served by one bus route which runs every 30 minutes. The bus line also ends at Belleview Station and there is no bus service for points south. The Belleview Light Rail station is 1 mile away with service that runs hourly. The assertion, in the vast majority of criteria, that people could live in that location without access to a car is wholly inaccurate. While it is unclear what Denver's definition of a "transit-oriented" area is, this location does not meet the criteria of a transit-oriented community as defined by the state legislature.
3. The staff memo recommending approval also grossly misstates the satisfaction of criteria in the Equity Evaluation. The memo states that the proposal meets the requirement for access to fresh food because of a farmer's market at Belleview Station, one mile away, that operates approximately 16 days per year and sells high-end prepared foods. In fact, the area meets the USDA's definition of a food desert. The area is mostly residential with a few office buildings interspersed. All the restaurants, shops, and services are in the Belleview Station area, one mile away, and cater to a high-

end market with businesses such as Ruth's Chris Steakhouse and clothing boutiques that sell designer clothing.

Details supporting the above-mentioned general objections are as follows:

- Page 10 of your staff report states; *"CPD information notice of receipt of the rezoning application to all affected members of City Council, registered neighborhood organizations, and **property owners: 3/29/2024**"* This is not accurate. **No property owners in Cherry Hills Village that are within 200 feet of the property boundary were provided with the notice as required by your Code. This is a violation of due process and subject to a challenge, should the application proceed. This application must be sent back to the Denver Planning Board, and proper notice must be given.**




- Page 4 of your staff report states; *"An unincorporated residential area within Arapahoe County is to the west of the site."* This is not accurate. This is incorporated Cherry Hills Village and has been since the late 1960s.
- Page 5 of your staff report states; *"The current zoning is B-4 with waivers and condition, UO-1, UO-2. B-4 is a Former Chapter 59 zone district intended for 'commercial uses adjacent to arterial streets' that allows moderate-intensity commercial **and residential uses*** **(emphasis added)***."* Based on this language, residential uses are allowed by the current zone district. The application, nor your analysis, establishes why a PUD Zoning is necessary, when the existing zoning already allows for residential uses.
- Page 6 of your staff report states; *"Given the size of the site, the property was reviewed for Large Development Review applicability. Through a detail analysis conducted by Development Services LDR reviewers, LDR was deem not applicable and a letter of inapplicability was given to the applicant."* The staff report provides no context for how this decision was made or the criteria for such a decision. Cherry Hills Village requests more information on the detailed analysis and how this decision was made.
- On Pages 7 and 8 of your staff report, the images do not accurately depict the context of this area showing only the multi-family housing to the north and south. It does not show the Denver townhomes or the very low-density single-family homes to the west. A more contextual view of the area shows the low-density single-family context of the neighborhood. Neither the application, nor your analysis, discuss the impacts to this neighborhood character.

- Page 8 of your staff report states; *"The purpose of the proposed PUD District 'facilitate continued use and adaptive reuse of Existing Structures compatible with Suburban Neighborhood Context zoning standards while allowing the continued use and modification of the Existing Structures, which do not fully comply with the S-MX-5 building form standards'."* The proposed conversion to a multi-family development is not consistent with a suburban neighborhood context as defined in Blueprint Denver as "largely single unit". This same page goes on to say; *"The proposed PUD-G 34 will contribute to the vibrancy of the surrounding neighborhood."* The staff report does not provide any analysis supporting this statement. The City of Cherry Hills Village contends that if this were approved, the vibrancy of the neighborhood would be reduced by the elimination of an alternative land use that provides opportunities for employment. The contention that there is reduced demand for office space as a result of the Covid-19 Pandemic is a short-sited approach to the community's vibrancy.
- Pages 9 and 10 of your staff report indicate that; *"…the rezoning application is referred to potentially affected city agencies and departments for comment."* Regretfully, the two neighboring communities (Cherry Hills Village and Greenwood Village) were not notified of this application, we have not been afforded an opportunity to review the complete application, nor has either jurisdiction been provided an opportunity to comment on the proposal. As a property owner less than 300 feet from the subject property, the City has standing to have an opportunity to participate in this process.




Additionally, the Cherry Hills Village residents that will be most impacted by this rezoning have not had an opportunity to participate in the process. They should have the opportunity to review the application and ask questions of the applicant.

- Page 10 of your staff report provides the "Public Review Process" to the extent there was public review. Cherry Hills Village was never provided with an opportunity to review or comment on the submitted application. Furthermore, no residents from Cherry Hills Village were invited to the applicant's "engagement event" or notified of the rezoning application. To say that there was

"public review" is inaccurate. Cherry Hills Village requests that this application be continued until such time as the applicant conducts additional outreach to the impacted stakeholders. Specifically, The City of Cherry Hills Village, The City of Greenwood Village, and the impacted residents of Cherry Hills Village.

- Page 11 of your staff report provides the approval criteria for a rezoning. Cherry Hills Village contends that the application, in its current form, does not meet Criteria 4, 6c, and 6d.
  - Criterion 4 - The applicant has not demonstrated "Justifying Circumstances". The area around the subject property has been developed for decades now and there has been no fundamental change in the land use pattern that would justify a rezoning. Furthermore, the statement that there is a reduced demand for office space is a short-sited observation that does not justify a rezoning.
  - Criterion 6c – The proposed development on the subject property is feasible under other zone districts and would not require an unreasonable number of variances or waivers and conditions. The City of Denver has zone districts, that are not PUD, that allow for this type of residential development. The application for a PUD designation is a result of the applicant wanting shorter timeframes and reduced cost. These reasons are not listed in the approval criteria.
  - Criterion 6d – The proposed PUD is not compatible with existing land uses adjacent to the subject property. The introduction of more high-density multi-family apartments does not strike the balance indicated by the suburban context.
- Page 12 of your staff report states; *"Encourage infill development that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and offers opportunities for increase amenities."* As noted above, the proposed rezoning does not facilitate development that is consistent with the true surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, there are no opportunities for an increase in amenities as a part of this rezoning.
- Page 12 of your staff report states; *"Encourage mixed-use communities where residents and live, work and play in their own neighborhood."* The proposed rezoning will reduce the opportunity for people to work in this community. The area is primarily low-density single-family homes that rely on office buildings such as these for employment. Removing the opportunity for jobs is not consistent with this goal.
- Page 13 of your staff report states; *"The intent of the proposed PUD's base zone district of S-MX-5 is to 'promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled, diverse areas and enhance the convenience and ease of walking, shopping, and public gathering within and around the city's neighborhood … The proposed rezoning is appropriate and consistent with the Suburban context plan direction, as it will allow for redevelopment of an appropriately scaled mixed use node along a commercial arterial street and embedded in a moderate residential area'."* Those that are most familiar with this area know that it is not a "pedestrian scaled" area with "enhanced convenience and ease of walking, shopping, and public gathering". The site is bounded by S. Monaco Street to the west (a four-lane arterial street) and I-25 to the east (a 10-lane interstate). There are no commercial amenities in proximity to the site and there are no public gathering spaces. The closest amenities are not within walking distance, so the proposed PUD does not meet the intent of this goal.
- Page 14 of your staff report states; *"…and will foster a better balance of residential and employment uses than the current zoning with waivers allows."* This statement is false. The proposed rezoning reduces the opportunity for employment and further skews the land use balance in favor of multi-family development, which is not consistent with the true context of the area.
- Page 16 of your staff report states; *"Limit the use of site-specific, customized zoning tools – such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and waivers/conditions – to unique and extraordinary circumstances. The zoning code offers a wide variety of zone districts that cover the diverse context and places of Denver."* The use of a PUD is not necessary to achieve the desired use. The City of Denver has zone districts, that are not PUD, that allow for this type of residential development. The application for a PUD designation is a result of the applicant wanting shorter timeframes and reduced cost.

- Page 17 of your staff report states; *"... they intend to provide on-site bike and scooter share services to allow for easy access to nearby parks and Cherry Creek Reservoir, and the many recreational amenities they offer. The site is approximately one mile from People + Produce Farmer's Market located at Belleview Station."* Bike and scooter share services require payment for the service. As noted above, there are no parks within this area. According to Google Maps, Cherry Creek Reservoir is 11 minutes by car (3.7 miles), 1 hour by transit, 1 hour and 11 minutes by walking, and 22 minutes by bike. To affirm that there is easy access to public space is inaccurate. While the site is near Belleview Station, it is inaccurate to suggest that it provides easy access to groceries. According to Google Maps, the closest grocery, King Soopers, is 2.5 miles away. People + Produce operates once a week for 4.5 months (June 2 to October 13).
- Page 21 of your staff report provides the criteria for a rezoning. It states; *"Since the date of the approval of the existing Zone District, there has been a change to such a degree that the proposed rezoning is in the public interest. Such change may include: Changed or changing conditions in a particular area, or in the city generally; or a city adopted plan, or that the city adopted the Denver Zoning Code and the property retained Former Chapter 59 zoning."* There has been no change in this area that warrants the proposed rezoning. The true context of the area is low-density single-family homes that rely on office space such as this for employment. The proposed rezoning will not *"ensure more consistent and high-quality development outcomes"* as you contend in your staff report. The same or better development could be achieved with one of Denver's existing zone districts.
- Page 22 of your staff report provides further criteria for a PUD. It states; *"...in return for the flexibility in site design a PUD District should provide* ***significant public benefit not achievable through application of a standard zone district*** **(emphasis added)***, including but not limited to diversification in the use of land; innovation in development; more efficient use of land and energy;* ***exemplary pedestrian connections, amenities, and considerations*** **(emphasis added)***; and* ***development patterns compatible in character and design with nearby areas*** **(emphasis added)** *and with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan."* The proposed rezoning has not demonstrated a significant public benefit that could not be achieved by a standard zone district. As demonstrated above, the proposal does not provide "exemplary" pedestrian connections or amenities. Finaly, the proposal is not compatible with the character and design of the true nearby area.
- Page 23 of your staff report states; *"The PUD District allows building heights and building forms that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods."* This is inaccurate for the reasons previously discussed. Your staff report goes on to say that; *"The proposed PUD-G 34 will utilize the S-CC-5 General building form for the existing site plan and S-MX-5 for future development, which are compatible with the building forms used in the neighboring area. The majority of the surrounding area is currently in the B-4 zone district, which permits multiple unit dwellings and other uses. Further, the surrounding area includes several multi-story apartment and residential units and buildings. The proposed rezoning proposes deviations from the S-MX- and S-CC building form standards to facilities adaptive reuse, as stated above, but will be compatible with the adjacent existing buildings."* Again, this is inaccurate. This statement only accounts for the Denver side of the neighborhood and ignores the true neighborhood context, which includes low-density single-family homes.

While not addressed in your staff report, the letter dated April 23, 2024, and signed by Thomas J. Ragonetti, states; *"The Property's close proximity to I-25, I-225, and the Belleview Light Rail Station, as well as the on-site covered bus station and nearby bike share services, allow for multi-modal transportation and micro-mobility options for getting around the Denver Tech Center, and the greater Denver Metro Area."* This statement is inaccurate. According to Google Maps, Belleview Station is one mile from the property and a 24-minute walk. This is well outside of the generally recognized "walkable" access to public transportation of one-quarter mile or one-half mile at the most. While there is a covered bus stop adjacent to the south entrance of the site, this stop is not recognized or served by RTD. See the

RTD System Map and the covered stop with no RTD signage indicating bus route(s). The applicant should address what organization operates at this "bus stop" and how it will or will not serve to support the rezoning.



For the reasons stated in this letter, the City of Cherry Hills Village strongly requests that the vote on this application be continued until the required public notice and due process requirements have been met, all the necessary stakeholders have had the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process, and the factual errors have been corrected, and the applicant more accurately addresses the criteria required for this type of application.

Sincerely,

Kathleen B. Brown

Katy Brown, Mayor
kbrown@cherryhillsvillage.com

cc'd: Dan Sheldon, Councilman – District 5
Jim Thorsen, Interim City Manager
Paul Workman, Community Development Director

Greenwood Village
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
AND CITY COUNCIL
6060 SOUTH QUEBEC STREET • GREENWOOD VILLAGE, COLORADO 80111-4591 • MAIN: (303) 773-0252 • FAX: (303) 486-1558

June 11, 2024

Mayor Mike Johnston
City and County of Denver

Re: Official Zoning Map Amendment Application #2024I-00027

Dear Mayor Johnston:
I am writing to express my disappointment in your Planning Department's handling of the above-referenced Zoning Map Amendment Application seeking to rezone 4340-4350 S. Monaco Street (the "Property") from B-4 with waivers to PUD-G 34. Exhibit A to your staff report dated April 24, 2024, indicates the project team briefed "neighboring jurisdictions including Arapahoe County, Centennial, Englewood, Littleton, and others." I do not know who the "others" might be, but they did not include Cherry Hills Village, which is located directly adjacent to the property, nor Greenwood Village, the other closest neighboring jurisdiction.

The "Property" is located over two miles from Centennial, and one must travel through Greenwood Village to get to Centennial. Likewise, Littleton and Englewood are both over four miles away and utilizing the most direct route, you will drive over three miles through either Cherry Hills Village or Greenwood Village. Yet neither Cherry Hills Village nor Greenwood Village were ever informed about this project. Equally unacceptable is your description of the residential subdivision 70 feet from the Property's west boundary, Charlou at Cherry Hills, as "an unincorporated residential area within Arapahoe County." The Charlou at Cherry Hills subdivision is located in Cherry Hills Village. While the property is within Arapahoe County, it is part of an incorporated home-rule municipality.

Denver's Zoning Code, section 12.4.10.4 (D) states the Manager "shall transmit copies of the application to other agencies that might be affected by the proposed application." Despite the failure to inform Cherry Hills Village and Greenwood Village of this application, Denver's Planning Department has deemed it ready for Planning Board approval. Please consider this letter Greenwood Village's official opposition to proceeding with this application, which is being done contrary to Denver's Zoning Code.
Sincerely,

George E. Lantz
Mayor
cc. Adam Paul, Edson Ibanez

| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Derek Stertz |
| **To:** | Ibanez, Edson - CPD Senior City Planner |
| **Cc:** | Webb, Andrew - CPD CE2159 City Planner Principal; Weigle, Elizabeth K. - CPD Rezoning Planning Supervisor; Paul, Adam - MO Director of Regional Affairs; Rachelle Bruno; George Lantz; Derek Holcomb |
| **Subject:** | [EXTERNAL] Re: Official Zoning Map Amendment Application #2024I-00027 |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, July 2, 2024 4:42:50 PM |

**This Message Is From an External Sender**
This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Dear Mr. Ibanez,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to address application #2024I-00027.

While we appreciate the amendments made in the staff report, in response to the letter by Greenwood Village Mayor Lantz. The staff report does not fully address the procedural concerns regarding future referrals and the consideration of Greenwood Village.

The City of Greenwood Village echoes the apprehensions raised by the City of Cherry Hills Village (CHV). Our primary concerns, as detailed in the revised staff report, include:

- **Increased Traffic**: The intersection of S. Monaco and Belleview is already subject to significant congestion during peak hours, particularly near the I-25 interchange. The proposed changes threaten to exacerbate this issue.
- **Zoning Revisions**: There is not a pressing need to transition to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). As CHV has articulated, the existing B-4 zoning, supplemented by waivers and conditions, alongside UO-1 and UO-2 designations, is a relic of Chapter 59, which was originally conceived for commercial activities along arterial roadways, permitting moderate-intensity commercial and **residential developments.**
- **Overstated Amenities**: The portrayal of local amenities is considerably overstated. From our perspective, the practicality of accessing parks, shopping centers, and other facilities on foot, bus, scooters, and bicycles from S. Monaco is not aligned with the lived reality of the area or Greenwood Village.

In light of these points, please accept this correspondence as a formal expression of the City of Greenwood Village's opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Regards,

**Derek A. Stertz - AICP, GISP**
**Planning Manager, Community Development**
**City of Greenwood Village**
**6060 South Quebec Street, Greenwood Village, CO 80111**
**Main: 303-486-5783 | Desk: 303-486-5774 | Cell: 303-483-3804**

Denver City Council
1437 Bannock Street, Room 450
Denver, CO 80202
dencc@denvergov.org

August 5, 2024

Dear Members of the Denver City Council:

My family and I consider ourselves fortunate to live in Council District 4, and today I write in support of Shea Properties' proposed rezoning at 4340 S. Monaco Street to afford other families the same opportunity. The proposed PUD brings this property into the Denver Zoning Code and aligns with area zoning and plans, in addition to bringing 143 units of much-needed affordable housing in a mix of bedroom types to the district.

As an economic development professional, I am keenly aware of the need for affordable housing options to attract and retain employment talent. From service workers to child care professionals to social workers (all of whom may be served by this housing at the proposed AMI levels), this project will allow workers in one of the region's employment centers to live close to their jobs and invest in their community. Workers who are employed in Denver as well as neighboring Greenwood Village and Cherry Hills Village deserve quality housing, and this project will serve as a regional asset.

As a member of the Board of Directors for the YMCA of Metro Denver, I see that our daycare providers, instructors, and other childcare professionals desperately need affordable options nearby where they work to support Denver families. Investments, like what Shea Properties is undertaking, will create opportunities for the people taking care of my children to afford to live nearby where they work.

Denver is short more than 44,000 units of affordable housing over the next 10 years and the sooner we can begin bringing units online the better. As an adaptive reuse of an existing building, this project will be able to move forward on an accelerated timeline. Approving the zoning for this project on August 12 is the next step in ensuring Denver will

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sam Bailey
District 4 Resident

CC: Edson Ibanez (Edson.Ibanez@denvergov.org)