

DATE	NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION	POSITION	COMMENT
7.31.24	Kari Mattes-Ritz	kmattesritz@gmail.com	Support	I'm so glad this is moving forward. Thanks for all your work on it and for leading the charge.
7.31.24	Heather Noyes Gregg	heather@studiocpg.com	Support	AWESOME! GREAT!!!! WOW.....!!!! Fully support!!!!
7.31.24	Jim Farnsworth	farnie303@gmail.com	Oppose	<p>I have read reports today that the Council - led by the three of you - is seriously looking to put a moratorium on gas stations within the city limits. With no direct interest in these businesses I nonetheless stand in full opposition to this idea and urge you - and all Council members - to reject it. The arguments being made in support (article attached above) are weak at best and laughable at most. To be succinct: Suggestions that filling stations take up too much room on a lot is ridiculous when the real problem is massive high rise apartment complexes (that are likely 10x the size of a filling station) approved by the City constantly and create more problems than a filling station. Consider too that the exemption on stations with groceries will only result in larger footprints anyway. How about the Council be more responsible on the true causes of massive growth and the strain on infrastructure? Affordability arguments made are simply not true and do not consider human behavior. The apartments constantly being built do nothing for affordable housing, and reducing or curtailing filling stations will drive fuel prices up and send business to the suburbs. The goal is clearly to make Denver more unfriendly to drivers, but will have the opposite effect until we have more efficient and safe alternatives. RTD is a disaster in quality, it's unsafe, and does not operate on either speeds or schedules that make it a compelling alternative. The list goes on and the Council owes it to the citizens to listen deeply and sincerely for potential unintended consequences which idealistic legislation tends to produce. I have been a resident of this city for 30+ years, however, we continue to be on a path of degradation that the Council should spend more time addressing. Crime is high (despite the PS Director arguing with how citizens perceive it); the citizens have been disregarded and disrespected on the camping ban; we have a horrible vagrancy problem (yes, the seriously homeless are NOT the issue but the druggies and mentally ill are); declaring us a sanctuary city made the cost worse at the expense of other services and offering financial reward to those coming into the country in contravention of our laws is insulting to the citizens on top of it. City services are weak or curtailed (I have to wait another year for a compost bin you promised by summer of 2024?); streets are in poor shape; the bike paths are unwieldy, barely used and make traffic worse; and DIA is a money pit of non-stop construction. Please focus on bigger issues that are more impactful. Listen to citizen concerns as we are your CUSTOMERS. Stop the decline in the quality of our city. Thank you</p> <p>Jim Farnsworth 2911 S Madison St Denver CO 80210 p. 303.522.0714</p>
8.1.24	Thomas Topero	Thomas.Topero@gmail.com	Support	<p>Council persons, I support limiting gas station development to areas that are underserved & wouldn't be suitable for multi family housing.</p> <p>The claims that it would help address, housing affordability, mixed-use development, opportunities, near transit corridors, and promote walkable and sustainable development is possible but not guaranteed. Thus we don't need to make outlandish claims in order to promote changes that would benefit the residents & neighborhoods.</p> <p>I would ask that you consider taking this concept to another level for authentic improvement of the pedestrian & micromobility parts of our common spaces (AKA public spaces). Prohibiting further development of drive throughs that are accessed directly via an arterial or collector street, especially when an alley access is available, including parking structures. This has successfully been implemented in peer cities like Minneapolis & has improved conditions.</p> <p>Similarly, we need to repair the damage caused by vehicle first & only prioritization for curb cuts & driveway aprons that cut across bicycle & pedestrian zones creating dangerous conflict points not in line with VisionZero. When alley or off-arterial or -collector street access to a lot or parking is available, that this access point be the priority, shifting this for existing properties when public works projects are done adjacent to the access point, pedestrian enhancements and/or bike infrastructure is installed adjacent or in front of parking apron.</p> <p>There are numerous examples where this occurs in all your districts. Also where driveways have been abandoned or no longer used/useful. While not in any of your districts, Central Broadway, with the recently (engineering) completed "bike lane" project (delayed for years to get multiples of funding for non-bicycle improvements before any bicycle infrastructure was developed) is a perfect example.</p> <p>Along the east side of the stroad (if you're not familiar with the term, search for it online with "Strong Towns"—a chapter of the organization is working in Denver) where the bike lane was permanently installed & extended. Where existing driveways or curb cuts existed, they were maintained or rebuilt. There was no attempt to remove several that no longer serve the buildings that they once did (former car showrooms & repair shops) despite parking being installed in front of it.</p>

8.1.24	Thomas Topero	Thomas.Topero@gmail.com	Comment Continued from Above	<p>Where the driveways were maintained or restored, the angle of view required that numerous on-street parking spaces were removed so drivers could theoretically see oncoming traffic, including pedestrians & bicyclists, without having to drive & sit in the sidewalk and/or bicycle lane to wait for traffic to clear. Because of the culture we've created where drivers are superior, it is rare a driver will stop & wait for traffic to clear from both directions before crossing into the conflict zone with pedestrians or bicyclists before turning into the driving lane.</p> <p>Instead of designing on-street parking to accommodate deliveries, pick up & drop offs, short term parking & supplement off-street parking, the existing parking meters are inconsistently ignored or checked, with many spots having no meters while some meters are in disrepair. Engineering completed; design disregarded! In one case (pics 2-3), a driveway was removed where 4 driveways to a small parcel existed—a good thing except that they filled the entire R.O.W. (normally a tree lawn) with concrete on a block that has virtually no shade or greenery to speak of. This is in direct conflict with ANY concept of addressing climate change (which is a red herring for addressing the pollutions that we create & can control locally but choose not to).</p> <p>Again, this is not in your district but these conditions absolutely exist in each of them around the city, including yours. If you'd like specific examples in your district, I'd be happy to share with you where & how we can authentically solve this issue. By the way, passing it onto DOTI as their problem is why we continue to be afflicted with these conflict zones & why VisionZero is impossible while we reinforce & create these conflict zones throughout our great city. We need the city departments to work WITH the residents, not just in a check-the-box manner, but authentically seeking ways to address the challenges of the people affected by things being done TO us, even if the intent is FOR us.</p> <p>Thank you, Thomas Topero c/bt: 720.468.0022 Thomas.Topero@gmail.com LinkedIn/Twitter: topero</p> <p>Pic 1: useless curb cut maintained along block with no trees; a pedestrian ramp for ADA access from parallel parking could be rebuilt with gutters to allow for shade trees to be installed in the same area. Pic 2: new concrete apron installed with bike lane construction to be removed & filled in with new concrete months later; pic 4 area shown just beyond red oval. Pic 3: new concrete infill & curb replacing recently installed driveway apron, with no tree or drainage area (yes, limitations exist for poorly placed signals, but principle still stands. Pic 4: adjacent to property in pic 2&3 with planting area & wide sidewalk in same area filled in with concrete on adjacent lot.</p>
8.1.24	Craig Stack	stackinco@yahoo.com	Oppose	<p>Hi All, Limiting the development of new gas stations would eliminate new competition which keeps gas prices and convenient store prices low; which benefit low and middle income communities. Also, the newer gas stations often have electric charging stations, more food options which sometimes include healthier options and better access to public restrooms. We've seen a lot of old gas stations torn down and replaced with new businesses and residential development. This replacement of older inefficient properties also helps bring new gas stations into better environmental regulatory compliance and removes old leaking underground storage tanks. Further, allowing only grocery store owned gas stations consolidates power and pricing into more large corporations and putting location barriers will again allow more monopolistic pricing power instead of competition to keeps gas prices low. The current code allows for specific review of each project before they pull permits which can allow for public comment and or city council to weigh in on these concerns for specific proposals. Blanket zoning overhauls causes many unintended consequences. If your goal is to encourage more housing and other development, then expediting rezoning applications, and permitting process would be a better use of council time and effort. Thanks for your consideration. Craig Stack</p>
8.5.24		bwwbtr@gmail.com	Comment/Question	<p>Thanks for this, Councilman Kashmann. I posted a note on the website of that particular news outlet, asking them to dispense with personal slights and focus on getting the facts straight about your collective objection to more gas stations. An informed reporter should know that it's City Council's job to consider alternative land uses, keeping in mind the broader impact of [insert purpose here] on Denver residents' quality of life. Keep up the good work.</p>
7/31/2024 8:46	Mark Geyer	mark.geyer3455@gmail.com	Comment/Question	<p>Wherever new gas stations are built, please mandate installation of EV charging stations. EV charging stations should also be mandated in any multi-family house project. Thank you</p>
7/31/2024 9:40	Ted Harberg	harbergt@gmail.com	Comment/Question	<p>Why would we limit proximity to low-density residential but not high-density? It seems like gas stations are typically a feature of low-density, auto-oriented neighborhoods. Higher-density and mixed-use areas seem to be a MUCH more appropriate place to restrict new gas stations - not in low-density areas where the residents are the primary users of the gas stations.</p>
07/31/2024 13:12 PM	Ben Daniels	ben.t.daniels@gmail.com	Support	<p>I support this proposed regulation and would like to see more housing, not more gas stations.</p>
07/31/2024 13:52 PM	Arnold Uers		Oppose	<p>Seriously? Far less than 10% of cars on the road are electric and limiting availability of a necessity seems unreasonable. How about limiting the number of pot shops, liquor stores and fast food joints all of which are not necessities and have clear health risks. If your goal is to provide a healthier environment through social engineering that would seem to be a good place to start. The city and county of Denver cover an area of 155 sq miles and your article purports that there are 144 existing stations in the city limits or less than one per sq mile. That does not seem excessive. Instead of chasing layering the City with more refs and code how about putting your attention on timing of traffic signals. Benefits are clear, less congestion LESS OZONE from idling cars and less consumption of gasoline. The fix is a math problem, not out of reach. Just once I would like to see P Kashmann et al get behind something that has clear and immediate benefits to all residents. You have a mandate from the EPA to reduce ozone, why not address it by grabbing the low hanging fruit. This group will never stop amazing me.</p>

				<p>I'd like to know the number of new gas stations that are started in Denver for each year in the past 10 years. Of these, how many are associated with grocery stores? How many of the new ones would not exist or would be in different locations if new regulations were put into effect?</p> <p>Concurrently please show the number that were terminated.</p> <p>What are the current zoning requirements for gas stations?</p> <p>When a gas station goes out of business, is someone required to remove the tanks?</p> <p>At what rate is the demand for gasoline projected to decline in the next 10, 20, 30 years?</p> <p>These answers should be readily available from zoning, planning and the federal government. Without that data, how can anyone give you valid comments??? And if they try, the comments aren't too meaningful.</p> <p>Other questions are more difficult, like how long until a gas station is obsolete? In terms of volumes, efficiency, viability of the tanks? What happens then? what is the availability of "acceptable" locations for new stations are are you just planning on longer lines with the idea that will encourage more people to use public transit or EVs?</p> <p>Frankly I can't help but think that you and your assistants time is better served on other projects, but I'll reserve judgment until you provide those simple answers. IMO, more stations are eliminated than added; most that are added are affiliated with grocery stores or places like Costco. If that is true, what you will be encouraging is keeping the old ones and expanding the footprint of new ones. In addition, the number of stations is directly affected by supply and demand AND the number of people living in an area.</p>
8/5/2024 11:17	Barbara Ridgway	barbridgway@hotmail.com	Comment/Question	If you believe that lines will reduce the number of cars, you should visit Costco.
9/12/2024 12:41	Josue Reynoza	josuereynoza@outlook.com	Support	I fully support the zoning code revisions for gas stations. This would help make our city more affordable and removes the blight of a car-reliant city. We should make go even further and remove parking minimums.
9/19/2024 12:54	Allen Lampert	allen.lampert@dhlb.com	Oppose	As a commercial real estate broker specializing in retail pad sales for 28 years in Denver I am very much against any restrictions in land use. However, if one is to be amended for gas stations the distance between stations should be measured by direct automotive access from the pumps/canopy and not a radius from any point on the lot if the intent is to limit the number of gas fueling sites. Also, there should be a method whereby an owner (small business or otherwise) wishing to build a station, which most likely includes convenience items, food and beer wine and liquor (retail sales tax) may petition for a waiver if deemed to be within the restricted area. Happy to provide further feedback. Thank you! Allen
10/2/2024 11:32	N Smith		Oppose	My vote is that City Council does NOT make more rules restricting gas station placements.
10/02/2024 14:01 PM	Rob Mak	robmak@rocketmail.com	Oppose	This is woke ridiculousness at its worst! I "holistically" disagree with this absurd ruling. City Council Members should not be permitted to sway the public landscape according to their climate dilutions and biased political leanings. Governor Polis and the mayor are a devastation to the state and city. We are relocating our companies to Dallas next year due to the utter incompetence of city and state government. Stop killing Denver before we're all gone!
10/02/2024 15:01 PM	Richard Mestetsky	richmest@gmail.com	Comment/Question	Does the restriction "within a quarter-mile of an existing gas station" apply to locations within a quarter mile of existing gas stations outside the city of Denver?
10/3/2024 8:17	Dorothy Bernay	debernay@outlook.com	Support	Makes sense.
10/3/2024 8:27	Dennis Fadden	denfad1950@yahoo.com	Oppose	I have been living at Windsor Gardens for over 15 years now, I moved to Denver over 40 years ago, it was a very nice quiet community, but no longer, too much traffic, too much noise, too much crime, what you are proposing will do nothing but invite more traffic, more noise, and more crime, Denver has become a very high crime city and one of the most expensive cities to live in in the USA. I truly and respectfully hope this proposal does not go through.
10/3/2024 9:21	Mike Weiman	mike@thefoothillsgroup.com	Oppose	It's interesting that members of City Council are attempting to restrict the free enterprise system under the guise of providing a more pedestrian friendly environment. If the City Council is truly interested in improving the city and enabling pedestrians to have a better experience they should first look at the pedestrian areas that already exist in Denver. People that have chosen to live on the street are provided greater protection and more access than tax paying citizens. Everywhere you look there are parks or pedestrian purposed walkways that have been closed off due to the filth that those living on the streets have brought to areas.
10/03/2024 15:53 PM	Rob McDaniel	rc_mcdaniel@hotmail.com	Comment/Question	I'm unclear on why there shouldn't be a gas station near light rail. It seems that this is an ideal place to get gas and convenience items.
10/03/2024 16:03 PM	Keith Henrichs	keith@henrichs.net	Comment/Question	If prohibited within 1/4 mile of light rail transit stations, WHY NOT ALSO PROHIBIT WITHIN 1/4 MILE OF BUS RAPID TRANSIT STATIONS? (Existing stations could be grandfathered, but new ones prohibited.) Many of the Colfax BRT stations will be in residential neighborhoods, already impacted by BRT and gas stations add insult to injury.
10/03/2024 17:20 PM	Camille Pahl	camille@ovllc.com	Support	I'm glad to see this! Gas stations often negatively impact important corner lots and hurt walk ability. The locations for not having these make sense, i.e. where they already exist and near transit. I do not see the correlation with near SU zoning however, as single unit residents tend to drive more than those living in denser contexts. I worry this will concentrate gas stations near the very places we hope to be walkable for a larger number of people.
10/03/2024 18:52 PM	Andrew	aschecter@gmail.com	Support	Supportive if this and much more ...
10/03/2024 20:16 PM	Zach Lamb	zachlamb94@gmail.com	Support	I think it's great to reduce new gas stations as we phase out of using fossil fuels!

10/4/2024 8:18	Tony Frey	tony@wecandenver.org	Support	This is a great idea, but I ask that you please consider including proximity to other gas stations, train stations, etc. OUTSIDE municipal boundaries in your proposed methodology of limiting placement of new gas stations in Denver. This would open even more land for housing, pedestrians, etc. while their gas station needs may already be met just across the street in Lakewood, Aurora, Edgewater, etc. Tony
10/4/2024 9:33	Kelly Scanlan	kellyscanlan@gmail.com	Support	This is a great idea, but I ask that you please consider including proximity to other gas stations, train stations, etc. OUTSIDE municipal boundaries in your proposed methodology to limit placement of new gas stations in Denver. This would open even more land for housing, pedestrians, etc. while their gas station needs may already be met just across the street in Lakewood, Aurora, Edgewater, etc.
10/4/2024 10:46	Taylor Thompson	taylorjanethompson@hotmail.com	Support	On the corner of Sheridan and Colfax, a Walgreens is closing and there is neighborhood talk of a new gas station being proposed. At this time, there is no direct neighborhood, municipality, etc. need for an additional gas station. Our needs are met by the gas stations spread throughout Sheridan in Edgewater and Lakewood. This area could greatly benefit from additional housing projects or storefronts to increase local business and deter further crime and drug abuse.
10/04/2024 15:29 PM	Heather Howell	hreneeh1@gmail.com	Support	There are enough gas stations throughout the state. We do not need anymore.
10/04/2024 16:00 PM	Cheryl Acierno	cheryl@aciernocompany.com	Oppose	Geez....can you guys ever leave anything alone? Third generation Denverite, and I don't even recognize this city because of all the zoning changes you keep making. As for gas stations? I live in Cherry Creek and because of all the ridiculous development, we don't even HAVE a gas station anymore. I have to drive around looking for one. Please just stop changing everything. Also, quit changing the zoning to allow taller buildings. One last thing: I don't know ANYBODY who is a fan of your bike lanes. You've just made Denver uglier and harder to navigate. But I guess that's the point.
10/04/2024 19:37 PM	Kimberly A. Shinabery	chapelkim1@gmail.com	Comment/Question	STOP SENDING ME THESE THINGS BY MAIL. I ONLY WANT COMMUNICATIONS VIA EMAIL. YOUR EXCESS JUNK MAIL IS ADDING TO MY STRESS.
10/5/2024 5:45	Nina Black	nblackgj@gmail.com	Support	I love that you are working on this! I live in district 5 and there are way too many gas stations already. The space could be used much better for housing or green spaces. And gas stations leave a lot of contamination behind. They are expensive to clean up. Thank you for doing this!
10/05/2024 16:03 PM	Ginny Hammond	ghammond@comcast.net	Support	Excellent proposal
10/6/2024 7:44	Randal	ranlaps522@aol.com	Oppose	Let the free market determine the location of gas stations.
10/6/2024 8:00	Nun ya business		Oppose	Disagree, the gas stations that exist today are already concentrated based on the existing buffers. Buffer around light rail zones as is already create enough of headache for a simple convenience purchase or refill during the week. Bigger fish to fry instead of making life more inconvenient for Denverites that commute!
10/6/2024 10:34	David Eisenberg	david.p.eisenberg@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I want to expand housing. I don't see how limiting gas stations does that. Just remove zoning barriers to building new housing, remove zoning barriers to building denser housing (duplexes, triplexes, high rise apartment buildings, etc.)
10/06/2024 13:11 PM	John and Despina Balafas	balafasd@gmail.com	Oppose	Please do not take property rights away. This is an over reach. I am not taking right away from your home so please do not take rights away from my property.
10/7/2024 11:20	Mike Shearman	mike.shearman@trust-in-soft.com	Support	Love it. Yes.
10/7/2024 12:31	Larry Bell		Oppose	Another solution to no problem. More government control over our lives
10/07/2024 16:09 PM	Mitch		Support	I support this amendment.
10/8/2024 8:44	Sherri Fey	sifey@msn.com	Support	I think all new gas stations should be required to add EV charging stations also. I agree with limiting gas stations.
10/8/2024 10:27	Cornelia Maes	richiecornelia@gmail.com	Oppose	My wife and I are opposed to the changes to the zoning regulations. "integrate future development into existing neighborhoods" is new-speak for more development, building, more high rises, more corporate stores and building, more glass and steel, GROWTH, noise, dirty smelly air, lights, litter, garbage, parking meters, water pollution from gas stations, huge delivery trucks changing our neighborhoods into noisy, dirty urban areas. Thank you.
10/08/2024 17:01 PM	Jim	11thavenuehotel@gmail.com	Oppose	Please do not limit the installation of gas stations. There are plenty if not to much oversight from the EPA on this matter. Fueling stations provide jobs for low income persons, provide a convenience for neighborhoods, provide easy and close access to community needs limiting pollution by being close. Stations that do not provide these services will cease to exist, and stations that supply the basic necessities well will thrive. The landscape changes in accordance with community needs over time. Think long term and if these are not necessary they will be replaced by what becomes necessary. Quit thinking that we need to regulate everything, because if we keep doing that as a community eventually we will have nothing.
10/08/2024 21:25 PM	Kathryn Spritzer	kspritzer@icloud.com	Oppose	There are more important things for Council to be concerned with, like safety. competing gas stations keep gas prices lower for consumers; this proposal will hurt the people who can afford gas the least. I am handicapped and I have to drive. People commuting from the suburbs have to drive. You can't legislate to make people take the bus and bike.
10/10/2024 11:13	Scott Johnson	scott.tj95@gmail.com	Support	I think the City Council is right to focus on creating walkable, mixed-use development near public transport. The Council should take bold action beyond this initiative to promote more building and development. That includes: 1) eliminating burdensome regulations and permitting requirements that hinder development, 2) promoting the building of different types of housing (mixed-use, multi-family, single family) to account for different housing needs, and 3) eliminating local veto points so busy bodies can't hold up development that would provide greater benefits to the community. Denver (and Colorado more broadly) face a housing shortage that needs to be tackled by creating an environment conducive to build, build, build.
10/10/2024 12:15	Alex Walker		Support	Thank you for your time! Approve new zoning.

10/11/2024 7:15	James Macek	jem0101@aol.com	Oppose	As a local small business man for over 30 years in the community, I respectfully oppose this initiative. We need gas stations and easy access to them in all neighborhoods. They serve the community well with access to gas and other needed products, and provide jobs as well. While I appreciate the intent; it is not in the best interests of those who live and work here. Thank you.
10/11/2024 9:04	Connie and Dennis Dixon,	dmdixon5115@gmail.com	Support	We, Connie and Dennis Dixon, support this Proposal
10/11/2024 12:53	Matthew Knudsen	matt.j.knudsen@outlook.com	Support	Good day. And thank you for the communication. Gas stations could be obsolete in a few decades so this issue would not be top of mind for me. Our role as community leaders is to establish zoning requirements. After that, the free market will determine the type of development that will occur within zoning limitations. Interfering with the free market seems counterproductive. The issue of affordable housing does not appear to be related to gas station placement. I could really get behind a bold initiative that lifts people out of poverty. Creating the "best education system that the world has ever known" would be a bold initiative that I could get behind.
10/14/2024 17:34 PM	Paul Cella	pauljcellajr@gmail.com	Oppose	Government should not get involved in markets. This is an attempt to force people to buy electric cars because government will make it very difficult to buy gas. This is wrong and unfair to hard working people who depend on their cars to get to work, school, and doctors.
10/16/2024 5:25	Anne Perera	banjo_python@hotmail.com	Support	Gas stations are a terrible use of valuable and scarce city land. I support restricting their permitting as proposed here. We need more density and housing, not more catering to personal automobiles and the corporations that profit from them.
10/18/2024 13:17 PM	Sam DeLeo	sam.deleo@gmail.com	Support	I understand the reasoning behind this proposed regulation and, as a homeowner in the affected area, would agree to it only if there were no additional loss of off-street residential parking spaces. I would prefer to commute to my job via public transportation instead of driving a car, but there is currently not a public transit system that would allow me to do this. We have seen a huge loss of parking spaces in District 10, specifically in and around the Capitol, and while I appreciate the added biking spaces and pedestrian access, my commute is too long for me to ride a bike to my job. This has become a voting issue for affected residents like me, thank you for your time.
10/19/2024 16:32 PM	Drake Shepard	dabshepard@gmail.com	Support	This is a great idea, but I ask that you please consider including proximity to other gas stations, train stations, etc. OUTSIDE municipal boundaries in your proposed methodology to limit placement of new gas stations in Denver. This would open even more land for housing, pedestrians, etc. while their gas station needs may already be met just across the street in Lakewood, Aurora, Edgewater, etc.
10/21/2024 9:12	Tyson Marinis	ttmarinis@gmail.com	Comment/Question	The Walgreens lot at Sheridan and Colfax should not be a gas station as it does not align with the Denver West Area Plan Recommendations.
10/25/2024 8:47	Keelan Sears	keelan.sears@gmail.com	Support	This small change sounds great, but I'm not sure how this actually helps with housing density in Denver. It's just preventing gas stations from being built, so I hope there is actual effort being made to eliminate things like parking requirements and other zoning obstacles around building on small pieces of land. Preventing excessive construction of gas stations is like the bare minimum, and does not get us much closer to the European density lifestyle that people in Denver crave. Not to sound ungrateful because this is absolutely a step in the right direction, but the lethargy of meaningful change in this city/state (I'm a native) drives me nuts! I'm 33 and I'm pretty sure I'll be dead before someone can take a train to Boulder. End rant :)
11/02/2024 14:25 PM	Wesley brown	wesleybrownb@gmail.com	Oppose	I am opposed to the proposal. Goes too far.
11/7/2024 11:21	Brad Yoshimitsu	brad@corcoranperry.com	Support	It should be a minimum of 600 ft from low-intensity residential zone districts.
11/07/2024 18:42 PM	Joshua Saunders	joshsaunders@gmail.com	Support	Hi, I think these new regulations are an important step forward for us as a city. However, I would update it to be a bit more stringent. I would also prevent new gas stations from within a 1/4 mile of any high frequency bus lines and/or update the required distance from 1/4 mile to 1/2 a mile for all affected categories.
11/12/2024 15:02 PM	Alexa Miles	alexamiles@hotmail.com	Support	I would like to recommend the scope of this amendment include gas station locations outside of the Denver city limits.
11/13/2024 9:34	Kira O'Connor	kira.p.oconnor@gmail.com	Support	Please add to this amendment a clause broadening the scope to consider other bordering municipalities. For example: the Lakewood/Denver border at Sheridan Blvd & West Colfax.
11/21/2024 16:20 PM	Patricia Bernard	pmtbernard@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I've been way more annoyed and concerned about the number and density of pot shops than I am gas stations.
11/23/2024 12:52	Shaun		Oppose	Oppose. If gas stations are being built that signals demand for the gas station. Making gas stations less available will congest existing gas stations wasting Denverites time.
11/30/2024 14:03 PM	David G. Anderson	dganderson@comcast.net	Comment/Question	The rationale for this change is unclear. What are the sponsors of the change concerned about? Is the demand for new gas stations in Denver growing? Are there commercial interests that are motivating the change, and, if so, what are they? Are existing gas station owners trying to protect themselves from new competitors? Are the sponsors simply trying to force people out of cars and onto public transit? What is the theory of urban development that justifies this government intervention in the private market for gas stations?
12/01/2024 15:09 PM	Glenn Zazulia	dengov@g.zazu.com	Oppose	While I don't particularly care for a proliferation of gas stations, I don't believe this is a real problem. This proposed zoning legislation "solution", though, is a problem, and I oppose it. This is another misguided attack targeting businesses that don't appeal to a certain segment of our city. I was pleased to see that a similar special interest attempt to ban slaughterhouses and fur sales was rejected by Denver citizens -- again, not that I have any interest in fur products or Superior Farms meat. Such ban attempts are really attacks on our country's fundamental principles and attempts to push a socialistic agenda at the expense of free market capitalism. Slaughterhouses and gas stations are both legal enterprises that serve public interests. If enough Americans reject animal-based diets and fossil fuels, then market demand will drop, and such businesses will reduce out of economic necessity. Or if activities are declared illegal, that would be another matter. According to several websites I checked, there are 180 gas stations in the city of Denver. By comparison, 9news reported over 300 pot shops. Do we really need 300 such enterprises? Why target gas stations and not pot shops?

12/4/2024 11:03	Andrew Reid	andywreid@gmail.com	Oppose	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed zoning text amendment that would limit the establishment of new gas stations to locations more than 1/4 mile from existing stations. While I understand the intent to promote walkable, mixed-use development, I believe this regulation could have unintended negative consequences on competition and gas prices.</p> <p>Research indicates that gas stations engage in strategic interaction with neighboring stations when setting prices. The presence of nearby competitors helps to keep prices competitive. By limiting the number of gas stations in a given area, this regulation could reduce competitive pressure, leading to higher prices for consumers. https://journalofeconomicinsight.com/index.php/joei/article/download/119/118/</p> <p>Additionally, studies on market structure and price controls have shown that regulations limiting competition can create barriers to entry for low-cost retailers, indirectly lowering productivity and affecting prices. The proposed zoning changes could similarly create barriers to entry, reducing competition and potentially leading to higher gas prices.</p> <p>In markets with monopolistic competition, such as the retail gasoline market, firms have some degree of pricing power. Limiting the number of competitors increases each firm's market power, which can result in higher prices for consumers.</p> <p>I urge the City Council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternative measures that promote walkable, mixed-use development without restricting competition in the retail gasoline market.</p>
12/10/2024 11:06	Kevin Mossey	kgmossey@icloud.com	Support	As a resident of Lincoln Park I approve of these changes and would love to see Denver moving towards being less car dependent and more pedestrian friendly.
12/10/2024 15:21 PM	Mark Edward Geyer	mark.geyer3455@gmail.com	Comment/Question	Hello, and thanks for letting me comment. I have only one comment. Please consider the REQUIREMENT to install electric car charging in all new gasoline fueling station projects. I know this proposal is for regulating new gas stations in certain areas, but I strongly believe the city should mandate provision for car charging for all new gas station locations regardless of location.
12/17/2024 17:22 PM	Gary Fritzier	glfritzier.colorado@gmail.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly. Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options. If Planning Board and Council want to better support low-income households, the ordinance should be modified to encourage fresh food options at convenience stores – and incentivize companies that provide that.
12/17/2024	Daniel Ergon Frank	daniel@dfrankinc.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly
12/17/2024	David Isaac	david@summitbreakers.com	Oppose	<p>While I understand the goals of discouraging fossil fuels and promoting housing, this ordinance has the unintended consequence of unfairly protecting outdated gas stations, which keeps fuel prices artificially high and limits consumer choice. By effectively blocking new, modern fuel stations that offer improved services, higher environmental standards, and integrated EV charging infrastructure, this ordinance rewards older, less efficient businesses while stifling innovation and progress.</p> <p>This lack of competition harms consumers. Without competitive pressure, businesses have no incentive to modernize, improve their environmental impact, or lower prices. In addition, the proposed quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large and unnecessarily restrictive, further limiting options for residents and businesses.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Board and City Council to significantly reduce the proposed radius. A more balanced approach will encourage innovation, provide consumers with better options, and align with environmental and economic goals for the city.</p>

12/17/2024	Matt Stewart	matt.stewart.co@gmail.com	Oppose	<p>Implementing policy retroactively is wrong and will impact people/business owners who have made capital allocation decisions prior to this ordinance being proposed. This is anti-business and completely unfair. If it is prudent for reform to happen then those policies should be articulated to the public and scheduled to go into effect at a future date, not retroactively.</p> <p>While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly.</p>
12/17/2024	Paul Fishman	pifishman80@gmail.com	Oppose	<p>It's a win-win to allow new gas stations near light rail stations. The new gas station will be environmentally compliant and have ev chargers available. It will encourage light rail use as follows--coming off the light rail and going to your car you are close to a station to charge up or fill up. Coming off the light rail you are close to a convenience store to pick up some necessary items to take home.</p> <p>Please don't interfere with healthy business ideas.</p>
12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	<p>Even though Colorado's EV car sales have increased in the last year, we're still very far away from being in a position where we can afford to ban gas stations. Fewer gas stations mean longer drives for fuel. This increases car emissions and pollution, defeating the city's environmental goals. Rather than improving sustainability, the ordinance pushes drivers to burn more gas to access the fuel they need. There's simply no reason to enact a quarter-mile ban from existing gas stations. Instead, cluster them together so the impact is negligible.</p>
12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	<p>Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The juice isn't worth the squeeze on this one. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and revisions.</p>
12/17/2024	Sean O'Keefe	sean_okeefe@yahoo.com	Oppose	<p>This proposed ordinance contradicts its own goals. Newer fuel stations and convenience stores oftentimes sell fresh food options, and include both fueling stations and EV chargers. By blocking new stations, Denver limits charging options for EV drivers and slows the city's clean energy transition. Please ensure that this ordinance does not impact new, technologically superior convenience stores and gas stations by prohibiting them from within ¼ mile of light rail stations or gas stations.</p>
12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	<p>Did you know that the average gas station in Denver was installed in 1997? With more than 200 active gas stations across Denver, a significant amount of older gas stations pose significant environmental risks, such as corroding tanks, or lack modern leak prevention or vapor recovery systems. Not only older gas stations lack modern safety measures, environmental safeguards, and amenities like EV chargers. Blocking competition from new, advanced stations means Denver's gas infrastructure will remain outdated and inefficient. I'm sure the intention behind the ordinance is a positive one, but the risk of unintended consequences here is very high.</p>

12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	Did you know that the average gas station in Denver was installed in 1997? With more than 200 active gas stations across Denver, a significant amount of older gas stations pose significant environmental risks, such as corroding tanks, or lack modern leak prevention or vapor recovery systems. Not only older gas stations lack modern safety measures, environmental safeguards, and amenities like EV chargers. Blocking competition from new, advanced stations means Denver's gas infrastructure will remain outdated and inefficient. I'm sure the intention behind the ordinance is a positive one, but the risk of unintended consequences here is very high.
12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	STOP SENDING ME THESE THINGS BY MAIL. I ONLY WANT COMMUNICATIONS VIA EMAIL. YOUR EXCESS JUNK MAIL IS ADDING TO MY STRESS.
12/17/2024	Rodney Stephen Kulbe	spudk2010@hotmail.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly.
12/17/2024	Walter Bleser	walterbleser@hotmail.com	Oppose	Gas stations are a necessity for drivers. Instead of banning them citywide, focus on zoning that keeps them away from neighborhoods. This ensures easy access for drivers while maintaining peace for residents. Smart planning—not outright bans—benefits everyone.
12/17/2024	Geoff Sanders	g7s7@yahoo.com	Oppose	Unintended Consequences: Less competition leads to higher gas prices in the City as existing locations have a monopoly. The proposed restrictions disproportionately affect low-income households that rely on affordable internal combustion vehicles, as EV adoption remains limited among these demographics. Car Registrations for 2023 show that less than 2% of the cars currently registered in Colorado were Electronic Vehicles (EV). Even with the State and Federal tax credits available, electronic vehicles remain inaccessible to lower income households. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Risks of Entrenched Old Stations: Restricting new developments entrenches older stations, which often lack modern leak prevention systems, updated underground storage tanks, and effective vapor recovery systems, exacerbating environmental risks. A competitive market, driven by new developments, pressures older stations to upgrade infrastructure and comply with modern environmental and safety standards.

12/17/2024	Geoff Sanders	g7s7@yahoo.com	Continued from Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern Convenience Stores Support EVs: New convenience store gas stations are better equipped for the EV transition, with those in Denver required to install two Level 3 fast chargers per location, unlike older stations with limited space and no motivation to provide chargers. • Enhanced Consumer Options: Newer gas stations provide expanded amenities, healthier food choices, and innovative services, elevating customer experiences compared to outdated facilities. • Major Car Transit Routes Need Convenience Options: Most light rail stations in the I-25 corridor are near major interstate interchanges. These I-25 interchanges necessitate gas stations and convenience services to support commuters and highlight the inefficiency of blanket buffer zones. A nuanced approach, integrating modern infrastructure, environmental sustainability, and equitable access to essential services, better aligns with Denver's long-term development goals. Prohibiting gas stations within ¼ mile of light rail transit stations undermines the city's transit-oriented development goals, as these stations are adjacent to major commuter corridors where fuel and convenience services remain essential. • Contextual Buffer Zones: Quarter mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations go too far in effectively banning new gas stations in convenient locations throughout the City. Contextual buffer zones, tailored to neighborhood density and land-use context, would better balance accessibility with development goals, particularly in highdensity urban areas.
12/17/2024	Vangie Pappas	vangpappas@yahoo.com	Oppose	<p>The proposed Zoning Code change for Gas Station Limitations will be EXTREMELY costly to me and my family. This property is my sole income, and I have been working with a Gas Station Buyer since January 2024 with an expectation to sell my property to them. If this proposed change by the City of Denver causes this Buyer to walk away, it will be catastrophic to me. I am single woman, living on my own relying on this property for my retirement/income. Not only that, as a part of my negotiations, I am to sell my property with as little lease term in place and will lose my largest tenant because of that. If this ordinance passes, not only will you cause my Buyer and my expected retirement to go away, my largest income producing tenant will be vacating. I strongly encourage you to reconsider, not only for me, but that area specifically could use a nicer convenience option. Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options. If Planning Board and Council want to better support low-income households, the ordinance should be modified to encourage fresh food options at convenience stores – and incentivize companies that provide that.”</p>
12/17/2024	Elaina Grauer	elainagrauer@yahoo.com	Oppose	<p>Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The juice isn't worth the squeeze on this one. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and revisions. Our family has owned this property for over 50 years and we should not be penalized by the state on what we would like to do with our property.</p>

12/17/2024	Sean Grauer	sean.grauer@gmail.com	Oppose	Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options. If Planning Board and Council want to better support low-income households, the ordinance should be modified to encourage fresh food options at convenience stores – and incentivize companies that provide that.
12/17/2024	Rebekah Quinlan	rebquin@live.com	Oppose	Even though Colorado's EV car sales have increased in the last year, we're still very far away from being in a position where we can afford to ban gas stations. Fewer gas stations mean longer drives for fuel. This increases car emissions and pollution, defeating the city's environmental goals. Rather than improving sustainability, the ordinance pushes drivers to burn more gas to access the fuel they need. There's simply no reason to enact a quarter-mile ban from existing gas stations. Instead, cluster them together so the impact is negligible.
12/17/2024	Jackson Naylor	jackson.naylor@navpointre.com	Oppose	Did you know that the average gas station in Denver was installed in 1997? With more than 200 active gas stations across Denver, a significant amount of older gas stations pose significant environmental risks, such as corroding tanks, or lack modern leak prevention or vapor recovery systems. Not only older gas stations lack modern safety measures, environmental safeguards, and amenities like EV chargers. Blocking competition from new, advanced stations means Denver's gas infrastructure will remain outdated and inefficient. I'm sure the intention behind the ordinance is a positive one, but the risk of unintended consequences here is very high.
12/17/2024	Kevin Bodkin	bodkink@yahoo.com	Oppose	By preventing new gas stations, this ordinance shields older, inefficient ones from competition. When businesses aren't pushed to compete, consumers pay higher prices and get worse services. Denver deserves modern options, not policies that keep old businesses entrenched. Besides, the ordinance should not be applied retroactively to companies that have already submitted their applications to the city.
12/17/2024	David Fritzler	dfritzle123@gmail.com	Oppose	While I understand and agree with the objective to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated and inefficient gas stations which keeps prices high and limits choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and poor environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly.
12/17/2024	David Fritzler	dfritzle123@gmail.com	Oppose	With more than 200 active gas stations with an average age of over 20 years across Denver, a significant amount of older gas stations pose significant environmental risks, such as corroding tanks, or lack modern leak prevention or vapor recovery systems. Not only older gas stations lack modern safety measures, environmental safeguards, and amenities like EV chargers. Blocking competition from new, advanced stations means Denver's gas infrastructure will remain outdated and inefficient. I'm sure the intention behind the ordinance is a positive one, but the risk of unintended consequences here is very high.

12.18.2024	Erika Shorter	eshorter@evgre.com	Oppose	There will be unintended consequences if this is passed. While I appreciate council striving for more dense/walkable development and affordable housing, limiting gas station and single family/two-unit residential development will not help with this effort. Limiting these uses will reduce redevelopment options for blighted areas, contributing to the problem. By limiting gas/convenience stores and low density residential, the City will see more vacant land and uninhabitable structures. In addition, by limiting competition, the cost of gas and pricing of convenience items could go up in certain areas, hurting families. Limiting residential redevelopment will also contribute to, rather than help, the affordable housing crisis. Instead of limiting development options, the City should incentivize high density walkable mixed use/sustainable/affordable development by structuring incentives (lower impact fees, make it easier to obtain site plan approvals, etc.). Please consider flipping the paradigm and incentivize what you desire, rather than restricting what you don't, which will have unintended consequences.
12.18.2024	Deborah Rose Westwood	deb_r.westwood@gmail.com	Oppose	Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options. If Planning Board and Council want to better support low-income households, the ordinance should be modified to encourage fresh food options at convenience stores – and incentivize companies that provide that.
12.18.2024	Cindy Gothey	cgotchey@gmail.com	Oppose	Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The juice isn't worth the squeeze on this one. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and revisions.
12.18.2024	Scott Crosbie	scrosbie@creginc.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve!!!!
12.18.24	Mike Wall	mwall@walldevgroup.com	Oppose	Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The juice isn't worth the squeeze on this one. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and revisions.
12.18.24	Erinn Torres	erinn.torres@navpointre.com	Oppose	Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options.
12.18.24	Olivia Stoner	oantognoli@gmail.com	Oppose	Modern Convenience Stores Support EVs: New convenience store gas stations are better equipped for the EV transition, with those in Denver required to install two Level 3 fast chargers per location, unlike older stations with limited space and no motivation to provide chargers.

12.18.24	Sean Bennett	seanbennett77@gmail.com	Oppose	Banning new gas stations in Denver County will catastrophically affect certain commercial property owners ability to sell their property for redevelopment. It is not the place of the counsel to limit the amount of businesses that can be built in their City. Gas Stations are in high demand and create great retail and gas tax revenue. Please consider the market forces that are willing to spend money on this form of capital investment.
12.18.24	W. Jack Riley	wir12@columbia.edu	Oppose	There's a good reason why the court won't allow the Albertson's / Kroger merger: it limits competition and can lead to rising prices for consumers. The same is true of gas prices. By limiting the options available to households that rely on cars to get around, you're taking away their right to shop around for the lowest gas prices. Please consider the impact of this ordinance on working families before deciding to ban new gas stations.
12.18.24	Calvin Andrews	calvinandrews@gmail.com	Oppose	housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly. Low-income families rely on affordable gas and convenient access to fuel. Restricting new gas stations forces drivers to travel farther, wasting gas and time. With public transit still not a viable option for many families and workers, this ordinance disproportionately burdens those who can't afford electric vehicles or expensive fuel from limited options. If Planning Board and Council want to better support low-income households, the ordinance should be modified to encourage fresh food options at convenience stores – and incentivize companies that provide that. Did you know that the average gas station in Denver was installed in 1997? With more than 200 active gas stations across Denver, a significant amount of older gas stations pose significant environmental risks, such as corroding tanks, or lack modern leak prevention or vapor recovery systems. Not only older gas stations lack modern safety measures, environmental safeguards, and amenities like EV chargers. Blocking competition from new, advanced stations means Denver's gas infrastructure will remain outdated and inefficient. I'm sure the intention behind the ordinance is a positive one, but the risk of unintended consequences here is very high. Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important
12.18.24	Collin Tedesco	collin.tedesco@navpointre.com	Oppose	Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used. It also sets a bad precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The juice isn't worth the squeeze on this one. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and revisions.
12.18.24	Alaura Gage	alaura.gage@navpointre.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly.

12.18.24	Matthew Kulbe	matt.kulbe@navpointre.com	Oppose	Property owners deserve the freedom to develop land to meet community needs as well as get the value for property they deserve. This ordinance undermines property rights by retroactively imposing arbitrary restrictions on how industrially zoned land can be used, removing significant value from Property Owners, property owners who may rely on these properties as their only source of retirement. It also sets a terrible precedent and can have important impacts on whether companies decide to do business in Denver or not. The long term consequences of this ordinance FAR outweigh the minimal impact. Please do not support the ordinance without significant and material improvements and/or revisions.
12.18.24	Brandon Sockwell	sockwebr@gmail.com	Oppose	A limit on gas stations will have a negative impact on the citizenry in the greater Denver area. Limiting supply and protecting legacy businesses as the expense of innovation and entrepreneurship is anti-competitive and will drive up prices at the expense of the consumer. The zoning code exists for a reason and should govern where gas stations can be developed.
12.18.24	Matt Call	Matt.call@navpointre.com	Oppose	While I understand the objectives to discourage fossil fuels and promote housing, this ordinance unfairly protects outdated gas stations, keeping prices high and limiting choices. Instead of encouraging modern, efficient fuel stations with better services and EV chargers, it creates an unfair advantage for older businesses with outdated technology and environmental standards. Consumers lose when competition is stifled, and businesses aren't pressured to improve. The quarter-mile restrictions from existing gas stations and light rail stations are far too large. I urge Planning Board and City Council to reduce the proposed radius significantly.
12.18.24	David L. Antognoli		Oppose	The practical effect of the proposed regulations will be a virtual ban on new convenience stores. Thus, the regulations will grant existing stations monopoly-like protection against competition, likely resulting in higher prices, among other undesirable consequences, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many older stations pose substantial environment risks. They lack state of the art leak prevention systems, modern underground storage tanks, and effective vapor controls. Regulations that immunize older stations against competition create a strong disincentive to upgrade their infrastructure and follow best practices relating to environmental and safety issues. • Banning new convenience stores will retard efforts to transition to electric vehicles. New stores must install at least two fast chargers, whereas existing stations have no motivation to provide chargers, and, in any event, many existing stations lack the space to install charges. • Consumers will be deprived of the amenities, healthier food choices, and other benefits offered by newer stations. • Most light rail stations in the I-25 corridor are located close to major interstate interchanges. These interchanges need gas stations and convenience services to support commuters. Depriving commuters of new gas stations in convenient locations will detract from the desirability of light rail use, leading to more congestion and more air pollution. In short, allowing existing gas stations to monopolize the market is bad policy. The likely adverse consequences of the proposed regulations far outweigh the supposed benefits (if any). This is particularly true where, as here, existing zoning regulations offer the City ample means to prevent new gas stations in inappropriate areas. So I hope you will oppose these arbitrary, anti-competitive regulations. Thank you for your consideration.

				<p>Please oppose or at least amend this proposal. Gas stations, whether you like them or not, are necessary amenities in our automobile centric society, and provide a critical food options in grocery deserts. In addition, gas stations now provide critical electrical vehicle charging infrastructure in dense urban areas where EV charging is not possible residentially.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No more than 2 stations within 1/4 mile of each other because competition is critical for keeping prices low at any given intersection and only one station per intersection does not provide for that competition. 2. Allow for 1 gas station within 1/4 mile of a light rail station... The reality is the majority of our light rail usage is car to train transfers so having a fuel option near the light station actually helps facilitate mass transit use. 3. Eliminate the distance requirement from low density housing... It's discriminatory in concept by pushing less desire-able commercial uses against high density, more affordable housing options, and actually is contrary to common sense... Our less dense areas are more automotive reliant and need more automotive services.
12/18/2024 8:05	Tyler Carlson	tylercarlson@gmail.com	Oppose	
				<p>The practical effect of the proposed regulations will be a virtual ban on new convenience stores. Thus, the regulations will grant existing stations monopoly-like protection against competition, likely resulting in higher prices, among other undesirable consequences, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Many older stations pose substantial environment risks. They lack state of the art leak prevention systems, modern underground storage tanks, and effective vapor controls. Regulations that immunize older stations against competition create a strong disincentive to upgrade their infrastructure and follow best practices relating to environmental and safety issues. •Banning new convenience stores will retard efforts to transition to electric vehicles. New stores must install at least two fast chargers, whereas existing stations have no motivation to provide chargers, and, in any event, many existing stations lack the space to install charges. •Consumers will be deprived of the amenities, healthier food choices, and other benefits offered by newer stations. •Most light rail stations in the I-25 corridor are located close to major interstate interchanges. These interchanges need gas stations and convenience services to support commuters. Depriving commuters of new gas stations in convenient locations will detract from the desirability of light rail use, leading to more congestion and more air pollution. <p>In short, allowing existing gas stations to monopolize the market is bad policy. The likely adverse consequences of the proposed regulations far outweigh the supposed benefits (if any). This is particularly true where, as here, existing zoning regulations offer the City ample means to prevent new gas stations in inappropriate areas. So I hope you will oppose these arbitrary, anti-competitive regulations.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
12/18/2024 16:40 PM	DAVID L ANTOGNOLI	david@ghalaw.com	Oppose	
1/4/2025 9:58	Jill Osa	jillkosa@gmail.com	Support	<p>I am in 100% support of this zoning text amendment. It supports compressive plan 2040 and vision zero and is in alignment what the citizens of denver want. I especially appreciate how this text amendment protects neighborhoods comprised of single family homes from having gas stations butting up against them. As a city we have a sufficient number of gas stations and adding new ones in protected districts, near transit hubs and near other gas stations will not support the vision of Denver as a whole.</p>
1/4/2025 11:01	Troy Howell	thowell03@gmail.com	Support	<p>I prefer to not see a gas station put in at Yale and I-25. Zoning that would prevent that from occurring with be supported. I feel that sufficient gas stations are available at this point.</p>

				<p>Public Comment in Support of Amendment to Limit New Gas Stations Dear City Council/Planning Commission Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed amendment that would limit the building of new gas stations within Denver. This thoughtful proposal addresses critical land use, safety, and community concerns, and aligns with the city's long-term vision for sustainable growth and equitable transportation access.</p> <p>Land Use & Planning Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land, and every development decision carries weight. With fuel demand in Denver remaining flat, as indicated by research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council, adding more gas stations is unnecessary and detracts from opportunities to develop the multimodal, community-oriented spaces we need. This amendment encourages more strategic use of our finite resources by prioritizing thoughtful urban planning over redundant services.</p> <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns The East Yale corridor exemplifies the challenges our city faces in balancing vehicular and pedestrian needs. Disconnected bike lanes, incomplete sidewalks, and wide travel lanes already create dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, while traffic congestion at key intersections like Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale exacerbates these issues. Adding a gas station in this area would only increase traffic volumes, worsening safety hazards and undermining efforts to improve multimodal access to transit stations. We need to prioritize infrastructure investments that enhance connectivity and safety for all users, not developments that increase car dependency.</p> <p>Community Protection This amendment's thoughtful buffer requirements—a 1/4 mile separation between gas stations and a 300-foot distance from residential zones—are vital for maintaining neighborhood quality of life and safety. Oversaturation of traffic-generating businesses near residential areas disrupts the tranquility and livability of our neighborhoods. Instead, the city should focus on fostering developments that support community well-being and multimodal accessibility.</p> <p>I urge you to adopt this amendment as a step toward creating a safer, more sustainable, and thoughtfully planned Denver. Thank you for considering the voices of residents who are deeply invested in the health and future of our city.</p> <p>Sincerely, Megan Williams</p>
01/04/2025 22:45 PM	Megan Williams	meganwilliamsmontana@gmail.com	Support	
				<p>Public Comment in Support of Amendment to Limit New Gas Stations Dear City Council/Planning Commission Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed amendment that would limit the building of new gas stations within Denver. This thoughtful proposal addresses critical land use, safety, and community concerns, and aligns with the city's long-term vision for sustainable growth and equitable transportation access.</p> <p>Land Use & Planning Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land, and every development decision carries weight. With fuel demand in Denver remaining flat, as indicated by research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council, adding more gas stations is unnecessary and detracts from opportunities to develop the multimodal, community-oriented spaces we need. This amendment encourages more strategic use of our finite resources by prioritizing thoughtful urban planning over redundant services.</p> <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns The East Yale corridor exemplifies the challenges our city faces in balancing vehicular and pedestrian needs. Disconnected bike lanes, incomplete sidewalks, and wide travel lanes already create dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, while traffic congestion at key intersections like Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale exacerbates these issues. Adding a gas station in this area would only increase traffic volumes, worsening safety hazards and undermining efforts to improve multimodal access to transit stations. We need to prioritize infrastructure investments that enhance connectivity and safety for all users, not developments that increase car dependency.</p> <p>Community Protection This amendment's thoughtful buffer requirements—a 1/4 mile separation between gas stations and a 300-foot distance from residential zones—are vital for maintaining neighborhood quality of life and safety. Oversaturation of traffic-generating businesses near residential areas disrupts the tranquility and livability of our neighborhoods. Instead, the city should focus on fostering developments that support community well-being and multimodal accessibility.</p> <p>I urge you to adopt this amendment as a step toward creating a safer, more sustainable, and thoughtfully planned Denver. Thank you for considering the voices of residents who are deeply invested in the health and future of our city.</p> <p>Sincerely, Aaron Connell</p>
01/04/2025 22:48 PM	Aaron Connell	connell024@gmail.com	Support	
1/5/2025 7:09	Whitney Martin	whitneysellsdenver@gmail.com	Comment/Question	No

1/5/2025 8:27	Margaret Kriete	boxy-size-rhyme@duck.com	Support	Living in the neighborhood near 5500 E. Yale Ave. my family is in support of the Denver amendment that would put limitations on where and how new gas stations are built. And in particular concerning the proposed location of a QuikTrip gas station at 5500 E. Yale, my question is, I guess there is no desire to make Yale Ave walkable, ever? Whatever happened to that traffic study that showed how dangerous this area of Yale between I 25 and Monaco is? A busy gas station here would be very dangerous for pedestrians. There's not even a sidewalk across the street as an option. I feel this 5500 E. Yale landowner, Jerry Glick, determined to ruin our vulnerable, congested, neighborhood. Thank you. Kriete Family
1/5/2025 8:57	Claire	claireawagner11@gmail.com	Comment/Question	No gas station at 5500 Yale
1/5/2025 9:08	Zoe Harrier	Zkharrier@gmail.com	Comment/Question	No thank you!!
1/5/2025 10:00	Antonio V.A.	rctvalenzuelaamaya@gmail.com	Comment/Question	Big no! A gas station is not needed at this location. We have gas stations at Hampden and also at Evens. Thats one street over. We already have a high number of homeless people that roam our neighborhoods, it be best to not give them another place of refuge.
1/5/2025 10:20	Penny Maw	pennymaw@gmail.com	Support	Please pass zoning regulations on gas stations immediately. Real estate investors are ignoring and disrespecting residential neighborhoods. The Yale Corridor has been extensively studied and it is not capable of safely supporting gas stations. Example: we live across Yale from proposed gas station site at 5500 E Yale Ave. It is a street with no other outlet and we have difficulty exiting already. Traffic accidents and pedestrian accidents in this corridor are already one of the highest in the city. Please don't let gas stations contribute to the already overcrowded streets that are surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Thank you for helping by urgently passing this ammendment.
1/5/2025 10:24	Pam Murdock	pampem@aol.com	Comment/Question	The Yale St. area off I25 is very congested and dangerous. Thank goodness there are not any businesses in this area. That would add to the danger. This is a community of houses and should not have a gas station. There are plenty on Evans which is commercial. Please don't add to our congestion.
1/5/2025 11:04	Steve Davey	steve.m.davey@gmail.com	Support	Land Use & Planning: Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely. Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations Safety & Traffic Concerns: Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average. The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks. Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems. The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections. Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety. The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic. Community Protection: The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent over-saturation while maintaining adequate service. Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety.
1/5/2025 11:04	Steve Davey	steve.m.davey@gmail.com	Support	Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.
1/5/2025 12:03	Katherine Regan	katherine.regan@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I oppose the building of a gas station at 5500 Yale, it is a residential area, there is a transit station right there and it is bad for the environment. We have plenty of gas stations within proximity to this area. We already live in a terrible place, please don't make it worse.
1/5/2025 12:30	David Bowdish		Comment/Question	They are better described as convenience stores. They offer inexpensive meals and basic food items. Hopefully the new zoning allows for more in neighborhoods
01/05/2025 13:11 PM	Jim Kenley	jkenley@gmail.com	Oppose	This is a waste of the cities time. We have bigger things to worry about and the city council is proving issues like crime and homelessness don't matter.
01/05/2025 14:25 PM	Briana Wilberding Brannig	briana.w2@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I am a homeowner at Yale and Holly, and the sidewalks in the area are already very narrow and I don't feel safe riding my bike on Yale. A gas station will exasperate this issue and I would rather create more safety for pedestrians than build gas stations which will only further the issue of pedestrian safety with a further influx of vehicle traffic. For example, I have almost been hit by cars several times legally crossing the exits for I-25 on Yale on my way to the Yale Light Rail station.
01/05/2025 15:09 PM	Ryk McDorman	ryk.mcdorman@gmail.com	Support	Additionally, we already have a couple gas stations within a mile which have been enough for everyday errands. I support the proposed gas station related changes to our zoning code.
01/05/2025 16:07 PM	Sky Gould	skygould.dragon@gmail.com	Support	Hello, As a resident of the Yale /Holly Hill neighborhood I do not wish for a new gas station to be build on 5550/5570 E. Yale Ave and ask council to ratify its considered zoning regulations that would stop this development.The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service and protects residential areas, maintaining neighborhood quality of life and safety. Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat. Simply put we don't need more gas stations. Please do not let this station be build and please protect the neighborhoods of Denver that make this city great.

01/05/2025 17:21 PM	Ditsa		Comment/Question	We do not want a gas station at 5500 E Yale. We already have a lot of trouble getting out of our neighborhood. And there is already a traffic jam during peak time. There is already a gas station down the road at Safeway.
01/05/2025 18:18 PM	David E. Diver	Dilemup@yahoo.com	Support	<p>I support the new zoning regulations for gas station construction in the City and County of Denver.</p> <p>I am citing an example in my neighborhood where a new QuikTrip station is scheduled to be built near I-25 and Yale and would worsen the following problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average 2). The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks. 3). Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems 4). The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections <p>In sum, adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety</p>
01/05/2025 22:04 PM	Denise Glass	gshopping@comcast.net	Comment/Question	The purposed gas station at 5500 Yale Ave would not be a good idea! There is already too much traffic on this one lane street where the gas station would be located. It is virtually impossible to turn left onto Yale during rush hour. Please do research for this proposal! I am a neighbor who has lived in this area for over 30 years and we already have plenty of gas stations in the area.
1/6/2025 9:08	Tyler Burgett	tyler.burgett@gmail.com	Support	I think the new proposed gas station regulations are a step in the right direction. There are currently plans underway to add a gas station just east of I25 on Yale Ave. That area is already known by the city to have significant safety issues in terms of speeding, vehicle accidents, and vehicle on pedestrian accidents. Adding significantly more traffic to that area would negatively impact pedestrian traffic and the neighborhood behind the proposed building. There are only 2 entrances to the neighborhood that lie on either side of the location.
1/6/2025 9:44	Callie Jakubcin	calliejakubcin@yahoo.com	Support	<p>Dear Southeast Denver Neighbors,</p> <p>Denver City Council is considering a zoning text amendment that would limit where gas stations can be placed throughout Denver. Your voice matters in this decision in order to protect neighborhoods and the health of the community and we ask you support this I oppose the proposed QuikTrip at 7500/7700 e yale Ave This location is inappropriate for a gas station due to many safety and traffic issues as well as will create a burden on the neighborhood entrances and exits.</p> <p>Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <p>Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic Community Protection:</p> <p>The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access. I support these proposed buffers.</p>
1/6/2025 10:27	Celeste Paranjape	girishandceleste@msn.com	Support	I am in support of this regulation regarding new gas stations. I live in Southeast Denver and I have 9 gas stations within a mile or less from my home. We do not need additional gas stations in my neighborhood. I have read the amendment and it addresses exceptions for areas in the city that may be in better need of gas stations in their neighborhoods.

1/6/2025 10:39	Nanette Shea	nettie@marrsrealtymgmt.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <p>Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations</p> <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <p>Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic</p> <p>Community Protection:</p> <p>The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.</p>
1/6/2025 12:41	Samantha Bernstein	samantha.luterman@gmail.com	Support	<p>First and foremost, I'm worried about safety and traffic. We live on S. Jasmine St. off S. Holly and Yale and purchased our home in 2021. Yale construction has taken such a hit on our street. Where our children could once bike outside and play freely, where we could walk our dogs and chat with neighbors, it is now a speeding pass through zone because of constant road work. I can only imagine what would happen with construction and then a gas station and its traffic. We've also seen a major increase in encampments and safety issues, Our residential areas should be allowed to stay just that with a buffer.</p> <p>Additionally, we are mostly middle to upper middle class dual income families. We have seen an increase in property taxes, much like everyone in Denver, that have caused our personal mortgage to go up \$1000 in less than 4 years. Our house value has not. This has left us wondering if we should be staying in Denver or Colorado at all. The housing crisis is taking its toll not just on the lower class. This amendment protects those of us who have worked very hard to be homeowners and are trying to earnestly raise our children in Denver. We do not deserve to be pushed out.</p>
1/6/2025 12:44	Jake Miller	jemill121@gmail.com	Oppose	<p>I think this will negatively impact the neighborhoods. Modern gas stations, like quick trip, newer 7-11's, Wawa's, etc offer not only gas, but affordable coffee, and food. They are more of a restaurant, corner store that offer gas vs. A typical gas station.</p> <p>The only way I would support this change is making requirements more strict. As in new gas stations have to be linked to a building with a fully functional kitchen, and provide electric car charging. This would allow for larger (Costco, kings) to operate them as they have kitchens, and would allow EVs to be allowed. Blocking beneficial business growth for a 'not in my backyard' feeling is not a way to implement government restrictions.</p>
01/06/2025 14:00 PM	Therese Blackwell	tbuckmast@aol.com	Comment/Question	<p>Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic</p>
01/06/2025 14:02 PM	Therese blackwell	tbuckmast@aol.com	Support	<p>The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.</p>
01/06/2025 17:10 PM	James Curtin	cuja07@gmail.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <p>Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations</p> <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <p>Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic</p> <p>Community Protection:</p> <p>The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.</p>
01/06/2025 21:47 PM	William A Harris, Jr.	bill.a.harris@mac.com	Support	<p>This regulation is important because we don't need more gas stations. Especially, within a quarter mile of other stations. We also don't need them near residential areas. Gas station produce fumes that reduce the health of people that are around them all the time. This is important legislation. Please move quickly to pass this.</p>
1/7/2025 12:02	Cari	gingerfire43@gmail.com	Support	<p>I am in favor of the new zoning regulations for new gas stations.</p>

1/7/2025 12:37	ELIZABETH MOORE	emoore@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic <p>Community Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.
01/07/2025 13:56 PM	Dylan Tobin	dylan.tobin1@gmail.com	Comment/Question	Don't build the gas station at Yale and Hudson! Yale can't handle the traffic it has now, the last thing it needs is a gas station. There are plenty of gas stations on Evans and Hampden, there's no need for one here in the middle of tons of residences on a street that (again) cannot handle an increase in traffic volume. It is unnecessary and detrimental to the quality of life of the surrounding residents.
01/07/2025 13:56 PM	Jason Sandry	jwsandry@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I don't think this area would be a good fit for a gas station. The area is already incredibly busy and shrinks to a single lane in the proposed area. For a small community with normal flow, the streets can accommodate but it couldn't handle the in-and-out traffic of a large gas station.
01/07/2025 14:24 PM	Christy Gannon	christyallbee@yahoo.com	Comment/Question	The Yale Corridor study showed issues with traffic and safety for this proposed location. We already have 9 gas stations within a mile of our area.
01/07/2025 15:52 PM	Autumn Martin	autumnallen@gmail.com	Support	I'm writing to emphasize my support of the new regulations limiting the building of new gas stations. Our communities could use more beneficial development over new gas stations and I believe they should be limited. There are already 9 gas stations within a mile of my home.
01/07/2025 16:26 PM	David Scalisi	dscalisi@gmail.com	Comment/Question	I am writing about your proposal for a new gas station on 5500/5700 E Yale Ave. I will fight against the placement of a gas station in this location because it is very obviously not a suitable location for a gas station. Which is if the city of Denver and the County of Denver was aware of the traffic problems on Yale Street they would know this immediately and not even consider congesting the area even more by having a gas station at the end of a 2 lane yale going into a one lane causeway at Holly. Additionally I have eight gas stations within 1.5 mi from my home so I don't really see a need for a quick stop at this location. The community will not allow this to happen there's a terrible decision and a terrible idea. Why not make Yale two lanes both ways all the way to I-25? And then maybe we could talk about building other things along Yale
01/07/2025 16:58 PM	Moira Mennona	Mennonas@mac.com	Comment/Question	I am against having a Gas station at the the Yale/ I 25 proposed site.
1/8/2025 9:56	Gabrielle Gould	ggould@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic <p>Community Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.
1/8/2025 10:47	Ross Dauzat	Rdauzat@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic <p>Community Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.

1/8/2025 11:04	KATHERINE T MOELLER	kmoeller@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>I have worked for a CPA firm at the corner of Yale and Holly for the past 20 years. I have witnessed numerous accidents along this route directly in front of my corner office. This gas station would increase traffic problems we already have and concerns for community safety if located next door and using the easement at the back of our parking lot. I am specifically concerned for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic. •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.
1/8/2025 12:11	Cassandra Valdez	cvaldez@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic <p>Community Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.
1/8/2025 12:59	Teri Spector	terispec@gmail.com	Support	<p>As a resident near a proposed new gas station on Yale Avenue at Hudson, I firmly oppose this location. There are several gas stations within a close proximity to that intersection. More important, the proposed station would be located on a street that merges to one lane heading east. The traffic from Yale alone, in addition to traffic exiting from I-25, both north and south, can be very heavy and a standstill. The Holly intersection just a block away is busy with traffic, bicyclists, walkers and joggers from the Highline Canal. I urge the Denver City Council to vote for this amendment. Thank you.</p>
1/9/2025 8:55	Teresa McAlisiter		Comment/Question	<p>Please do not move forward with a Quik Trip at 5500 E Yale ave.</p> <p>I am worried about the following:</p> <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic
1/10/2025 10:53	Barbara Barlow	bbarlow@rgo-cpa.com	Support	<p>Land Use & Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Denver is a landlocked city with limited available land that should be used wisely •Research from the Colorado Wyoming Petroleum Retailers Council shows fuel demand in Denver remains flat - we don't need more gas stations <p>Safety & Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bike and pedestrian accidents in our intersection are already three times higher than the city average •The East Yale corridor already faces significant safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists due to disconnected bike lanes and sidewalks •Wide travel lanes in the area contribute to speeding problems •The corridor experiences significant vehicular congestion at Colorado/Yale and I-25/Yale intersections •Adding a gas station would increase traffic and further compromise pedestrian safety •The area needs major infrastructure investment & improved multimodal access to transit stations, not more vehicular traffic <p>Community Protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed 1/4 mile buffer between gas stations helps prevent oversaturation while maintaining adequate service •Protecting residential areas with a 300-foot buffer is essential for neighborhood quality of life and safety •Reducing additional traffic-generating businesses would support the corridor's need for better multimodal access.

1/11/2025 10:41	Cedric		Support	I fully support limiting new gas stations, if anything we should outright ban new ones entirely and start pushing the existing ones to change to EV charging infrastructure. This dragging our feet into a more climate friendly world is going to ruin our city if we don't start acting.
1/12/2025 10:02	Robyn DiFalco	rdifalco@gmail.com	Support	I support the proposal to limit new gas stations across the City & County of Denver. There are plenty of gas stations in my neighborhood and any other part of the city I've visited. Especially along transit corridors, we should be prioritizing high-density mixed income housing right now and addressing the housing shortage. (There is no shortage of gas stations.) Smart land use planning means establishing policies that induce more of what we need (housing) and less of what we don't need. Thank you to the council members who proposed this.
01/22/2025 14:43 PM	Monica Stockbridge	monica.stockbridge@gmail.com	Support	Hello! I support this amendment to limit gas station placement throughout Denver, specifically regarding the proposed QuikTrip gas station at 5500/5700 E Yale Ave. This location is inappropriate for a gas station due to current traffic and safety issues highlighted by the city in the Yale Corridor study. The gas station would utilize only two entrances/exits off of Hudson and Holly, further contributing to the safety issues we face on Yale Avenue. We already have 9 gas stations within a mile of my home.
1/23/2025 12:10	katie beck	kdrapp129@gmail.com	Oppose	As a Denver resident, I think banning new gas stations will make life harder for regular people like me. A lot of families depend on having nearby and affordable gas stations to get to work and school. If we can't have new stations, we'll have to drive farther, which wastes time and gas. Gas prices are already high, and less competition means they could go even higher. Please rethink this plan and find a way to encourage better gas stations with fresh food and other good options.
1/23/2025 12:48	Cale Longnecker	clongneck66@gmail.com	Oppose	The quarter-mile rule for gas stations is a bad idea. If new stations can't be built within .25 miles of existing ones, people will have to drive farther to find gas. That wastes time, fuel, and creates more pollution, which goes against the city's environmental goals. Grouping stations closer together would work much better for everyone.
01/23/2025 21:42 PM	Samara Denk	Denk.samara75@gmail.com	Oppose	Changing the rules for gas stations after businesses have already made plans sets a bad precedent. It's like telling someone they broke a rule they didn't even know about. This kind of retroactive change makes it harder for companies to trust Denver as a good place to work. The rule should start in 2025, not back in May. That would be much more reasonable and fair.
1/24/2025 7:56	Daniel Garcia		Oppose	I don't think banning new gas stations is fair. Most gas stations in Denver are really old and not very clean. Stopping new ones just keeps us stuck with old places and fewer choices. People might have to drive farther to find gas, and that's not helpful. Please think about how this will affect everyone.
1/24/2025 8:19	Hermelinda Reyes		Oppose	Retroactively applying this ordinance is a mistake that risks harming Denver's reputation as a trustworthy place for businesses. Imagine planning a project under one set of rules, only to find out months later that the rules have changed and now apply to the past. This kind of unpredictability discourages investment. To avoid these issues, the effective date should be 2025, giving businesses a clear and fair timeline. Let's prioritize consistency and trust in our city's policies.
1/24/2025 11:05	Joseph Lisieski	jlisieski@hotmail.com	Support	The minimum distance limitation for new gas stations from existing ones should be at least 4 times the distances proposed, that is, 1 mile from existing gas stations and light rail stations, and 1200 feet from a protected district. There are already more than enough gas stations in Denver (and surrounding areas), and people can quickly and easily drive a mile (and more) to refuel. The proposed distances are too small to make a significant impact on the goals for sustainable development for Denver's limited land.
01/24/2025 14:28 PM	isabelle barrera		Oppose	As a Denver resident, I'm concerned that applying this rule retroactively to last May sends the wrong message. It makes businesses feel like the city isn't reliable. Imagine if you were told to follow a rule that didn't exist when you made your plans—it would feel impossible to succeed. Let's enact the rule in 2025 to build trust and confidence in Denver.
1/25/2025 10:12	Bart Accardo		Oppose	I don't think the rule about banning new gas stations within 1/4 mile of existing ones is a good idea. Even if more people are getting EVs, most of us still need gas. If new stations can't be built nearby, people will have to drive farther to find fuel. That wastes gas and creates more pollution, which doesn't help the environment. It makes more sense to let stations be grouped closer together.
1/25/2025 10:56	Jessica Woodyard	woodyardj77@gmail.com	Oppose	I'm concerned that this ordinance to limit new gas stations will harm both families and businesses. The city's average gas station is decades old and lacks the safety, environmental protections, and even EV chargers that newer stations provide. Blocking these modern facilities doesn't solve our problems—it just creates more by driving up gas prices and forcing people to travel farther. I respectfully ask the Council to revise this ordinance to support fresh food and modern safety standards at gas stations instead of an outright ban. I'm a Denver resident by the way.
1/25/2025 12:04	Renee Shirk	Rsimmons1214@gmail.com	Oppose	Retroactively applying this ordinance undermines trust in Denver as a reliable place for businesses to invest. Imagine running a business and suddenly being held to rules that didn't exist when you made your plans—it would be nearly impossible to operate. To avoid this kind of uncertainty, the ordinance should take effect in 2025, giving businesses clear guidance moving forward. A city's strength lies in its ability to provide stability, and this change risks sending the opposite message.
01/25/2025 14:36 PM	Jennifer Scheer		Oppose	I'm a Denver resident and believe that retroactive rules, like this gas station ordinance, create a bad precedent for Denver. Businesses need clear guidelines to trust the city as a good place to grow. Making the ordinance apply to last May is confusing and discouraging for companies. Instead, the Council should enact it in 2025 to give businesses time to adapt and show Denver is committed to fairness and transparency.
01/25/2025 17:00 PM	tesla mcall	teslabenton@yahoo.com	Oppose	Retroactive rules, like this gas station ordinance, create a bad precedent for Denver. Businesses need clear guidelines to trust the city as a good place to grow. Making the ordinance apply to last May is confusing and discouraging for companies. Instead, the Council should enact it in 2025 to give businesses time to adapt and show Denver is committed to fairness and transparency.
01/25/2025 18:46 PM	Lindsey Bailey		Oppose	This ban on new gas stations isn't fair to the people of Denver. Most of our stations are old and not well-maintained, and this plan would stop us from getting cleaner, better options. It also means fewer choices for affordable gas and longer drives for fuel. I hope you'll rethink this ordinance to make it more balanced.
01/26/2025 16:48 PM	Daniel Varos		Oppose	The proposed ordinance banning new gas stations within 1/4 mile of existing ones seems counterproductive. This restriction forces drivers to travel farther for fuel, increasing emissions and undermining Denver's environmental goals. Instead, clustering stations closer together would minimize their footprint while maintaining accessibility for residents. Let's rethink this approach to better align with sustainability efforts.
01/26/2025 17:56 PM	Pete Reynega		Oppose	I've lived in Denver for years, and I'm writing to oppose the proposed ban on new gas stations. While I understand the need for environmental progress, this approach feels counterproductive. Limiting competition in the fuel market will only drive prices higher, disproportionately impacting working families who already face economic challenges. Older gas stations often lack modern environmental protections, and banning newer ones prevents the city from benefiting from safer, more sustainable infrastructure. Please consider revising the ordinance to encourage modern updates rather than restricting progress entirely.

01/26/2025 19:34 PM	Donovan Kim	donovankim@gmail.com	Oppose	I'm concerned that this ordinance to limit new gas stations will harm both families and businesses. The city's average gas station is decades old and lacks the safety, environmental protections, and even EV chargers that newer stations provide. Blocking these modern facilities doesn't solve our problems—it just creates more by driving up gas prices and forcing people to travel farther. I respectfully ask the Council to revise this ordinance to support fresh food and modern safety standards at gas stations instead of an outright ban. I'm a Denver resident by the way.
1/27/2025 9:06	Janet McCaslin		Oppose	As a Denver resident, I believe this ordinance to ban new gas stations is shortsighted. Most of our current gas stations are decades old and lack modern cleanliness and technology. Preventing new stations stifles competition and limits options for affordable fuel. It may also lead to longer travel distances for drivers, which wastes time and fuel. I respectfully ask the Council to revise this proposal to support modern, cleaner stations.
01/27/2025 16:59 PM	marianne hauck		Oppose	This ban on new gas stations isn't fair to the renters of Denver. We already spent so much money on rent each month, and this ordinance is going to reduce competition and likely drive gas prices higher (just like Boulder). Besides, most of our stations are old and not well-maintained, and this plan would stop us from getting cleaner, better options. It also means fewer choices for affordable gas and longer drives for fuel. I hope you'll rethink this ordinance to make it more balanced.
01/27/2025 22:16 PM	Shelley Varelas		Oppose	I thought City Council was supposed to work to make our lives easier, especially now that Trump is in office. I live in Denver, and I think banning new gas stations isn't the right move. It will just make gas more expensive and harder to get, especially for families that depend on it to get to work and school. Plus, older gas stations don't have the same safety or environmental features as newer ones. We need smarter ideas that encourage better gas stations, not fewer of them. Please make changes to this ordinance to help families and the environment.
1/28/2025 8:19	Otis Plant		Oppose	I've lived in Denver for almost my whole life, and I think this ordinance makes it harder for businesses to trust our city. Changing the rules and applying them to last May creates confusion and uncertainty. Instead, the rule should start in 2025 so everyone knows what to expect. Clear rules are what keep Denver a great place to live and do business.
1/28/2025 9:03	Courtney Phillips		Oppose	As someone who lives in Denver, I don't support the ban on new gas stations. Most of the gas stations here are old and outdated, and we need better, cleaner ones. This ban feels like it's protecting older stations instead of giving us better options. It might even make people drive farther to find gas, which isn't good for anyone.
01/28/2025 14:35 PM	Crystal Crewse		Oppose	I'm concerned that this ordinance to limit new gas stations will harm both families and businesses. The city's average gas station is decades old and lacks the safety, environmental protections, and even EV chargers that newer stations provide. Blocking these modern facilities doesn't solve our problems—it just creates more by driving up gas prices and forcing people to travel farther. I respectfully ask the Council to revise this ordinance to support fresh food and modern safety standards at gas stations instead of an outright ban. I'm a Denver resident by the way.
1/29/2025 8:18	Jahaziel Rodriguez		Oppose	Considering how high egg prices and groceries are getting, I'm very worried about what this gas station ban could mean for our community. Gas is already expensive, and limiting new stations will make it harder for families to find affordable options. This hurts low-income families the most and adds unnecessary challenges for people who rely on driving for work. Instead of banning new stations, why not encourage ones that include EV chargers and fresh food options? A balanced solution would be much better for Denver.
1/30/2025 9:36	Bernadette Rios		Oppose	I've lived in Denver for most of my life, and I think this ordinance will make life more expensive for workers, and make it harder for businesses to trust our city. Changing the rules and applying them to last May creates confusion and uncertainty. Instead, the rule should start in 2025 so everyone knows what to expect. Clear rules are what keep Denver a great place to live and do business.
2/1/2025 10:07	Mark Burgoon	burgoonm@yahoo.com	Oppose	Dumb idea. Think about it - there are probably valid reasons that gas stations are so frequently located on intersection corners - access, visibility, revenue to match taxes for site to name a few. LET THE MARKET FORCES dictate how many and where gas stations should be located. WE HOPE that these proposed restrictions are not a lame attempt to force green energy mandates on residents by forcing pain and misery for traditional fuels that the vast majority of travelers use. Your scheme will only limit the number of filling stations and drive up the price of gas. NO ONE believes that busy intersections are desirable as "developable land for housing."
2/1/2025 10:14	Drew Davis		Oppose	This is yet another policy that looks to make doing business in Denver more difficult & prevent the free market from creating choice & efficiency. Not good.
2/1/2025 12:55	Gretchen Cheverton	lindygrey@yahoo.com	Oppose	This is a bad idea. There are two corners with two gas stations, alameda and downing and Holly and Florida, and gas is always significantly cheaper at those stations. Reducing competition artificially will mean everyone pays more for gas. Housing prices are already falling, Denver is already too big. We don't need higher gas prices city wide in exchange for more shitty apartments.
02/02/2025 13:10 PM	Brian Gustavson	bg@1060llc.com	Oppose	Developers want to make money. If there was demand for a housing project vs a gas station, they would develop housing. There is not a conspiracy to build gas stations, just a market demand for gas. Please focus on what denver residents care about. For example, please widen Pena Blvd. Having a two lane road going to an airport makes Denver look like a joke.
02/02/2025 13:19 PM	Alice Turak	aturak@comcast.net	Support	The restrictions on gas stations is fabulous. Why not make it 1/2 mile? Oil and gas has to stop polluting our air. What are the plans for more electric vehicle chargers?
02/02/2025 17:24 PM	Jacque Marks	jtrose55@gmail.com	Oppose	I think it's utterly ridiculous to limit the building of gas stations. Let the free market rule! Let consumers rule! Stop government interference!
2/3/2025 7:14	Molly Goodwin-Kucinsky		Support	I'm very excited to see this proposal to limit gas station density to help make neighborhoods more walkable.
2/11/2025 8:32	Chad Wegner		Oppose	As a Denver resident who values affordability and convenience, I strongly oppose the proposed gas station ban. Limiting competition by preventing new stations from opening—while protecting older, established ones—will only drive up prices and hurt working families. Many of these new stations also offer high-quality food options, providing more than just fuel. Why should our city make it harder for businesses to innovate and serve our communities? Please amend this misguided ordinance and focus on policies that expand, rather than limit, access to essential services.

2/11/2025 8:41	Chris Ahern		Oppose	<p>I've lived in Denver for over 20 years, and I'm shocked that the Council is considering a policy that retroactively blocks landowners from using their own property. People bought land and followed the rules, only to now be told they can't build because of an unfair new law? That's not right. This ordinance changes the rules mid-game and punishes honest businesses and landowners who played by them.</p> <p>Beyond that, stopping new gas stations means fewer choices and higher gas prices. In my neighborhood, newer gas stations offer clean, modern services and good food. We need more of that, not less. Please reconsider and vote against this ban.</p>
2/12/2025 11:27	Aaron McLean		Comment/Question	<p>how and when was the cutoff date for Concepts submittal timeline established for May 13, 2024? And why this date?</p>
2/12/2025 11:58	Isaac Haberman		Oppose	<p>I drive all over Denver for my job. This ordinance means fewer gas stations, less competition, and higher fuel costs for people like me. It also shuts out small business owners who want to invest in new locations. Why are you protecting old gas stations while making it harder for new ones to open? We need lower prices and better options, not the government picking winners and losers.</p>
2/10/2025	Megan Williams and Aaron Connell		Support	<p>Dear Denver City Council,</p> <p>I am writing in strong support of the proposed amendment to limit where new gas stations can be built in Denver. This amendment is a necessary step to align our city's development with public health, environmental protection, and responsible urban planning.</p> <p>Why This Amendment Matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protecting Community Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oGas stations release benzene vapors, a known carcinogen. While modern vapor recovery systems help, benzene exposure still poses long-term risks. oPlacing gas stations too close to homes increases residents' exposure to harmful air pollutants, affecting vulnerable groups like children and seniors. 2. Aligning with Denver's Sustainability Goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oCities like Louisville, Broomfield, and Sacramento have already taken action to limit gas station expansion. Denver should follow suit to encourage cleaner energy alternatives. oLimiting gas station growth supports Blueprint Denver and the Comprehensive Plan 2040, which emphasize reducing pollution, cleaning up contaminated sites, and prioritizing pedestrian-friendly urban design. 3. Preventing Oversaturation & Prioritizing Smarter Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oDenver already has 180 retail gas stations, while 318 have closed, reflecting shifts in demand. oThe amendment prevents unnecessary clustering of gas stations, which inhibits housing and retail development. oA buffer from residential areas ensures that neighborhoods remain safe and livable. 4. Encouraging Thoughtful, Future-Focused Land Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oTransportation is evolving, with increased adoption of EVs and alternative fuels. oInstead of prioritizing fossil fuel infrastructure, we should be incentivizing mixed-use developments, grocery stores, and transit-friendly businesses that better serve our growing population. <p>I urge the Council to approve this amendment to ensure Denver's growth reflects our shared commitment to public health, sustainability, and smart land use planning.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to assist in this effort.</p> <p>With gratitude, Megan Williams & Aaron Connell District 4 Residents</p>
2.12.2025	James Land		Oppose	<p>I own a small business in Denver, and I see firsthand how competition keeps prices fair and services better. Limiting new gas stations means protecting old businesses at the expense of consumers. If we did this in any other industry—banning new restaurants near old ones, for example—there would be outrage. Why is fuel any different?</p> <p>This ordinance also unfairly punishes landowners who have followed the rules. Many new gas stations offer fresh food and essential services that benefit our neighborhoods. The city should be welcoming innovation, not shutting it down. I strongly urge you to rethink this amendment.</p>
2.12.2025	Lexi Froneberger		Oppose	<p>I oppose what the Council is trying to do here. This decision will impact small business owners like me who have to drive around town all day long. More importantly, the retroactive rule is just unfair. If someone follows all the rules when they apply for a permit, they should be judged by those rules—not new ones that didn't exist when they started. That's like changing the score after the game has already started. This kind of unpredictability makes it impossible to invest in our businesses and our community. I urge you to rethink this.</p>

2.12.2025	Delia Cawthon		Oppose	<p>I've lived in Denver a long time. I've seen the city grow, and I want it to keep getting better. But this proposal doesn't make sense. Why would we block new gas stations that are built to be safer and cleaner? And why are we punishing businesses that followed the rules? If my neighbor starts a home project with a permit and then you suddenly change the rules and tell them to tear it down, that's just wrong. That's what this retroactive ban does. Please find a way to encourage modernization without stifling competition and hurting business.</p>
2.11.2025	Bernadette Rios		Oppose	<p>I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed gas station ordinance, which unfairly protects existing businesses while preventing new development. The retroactive nature of this proposal is legally questionable and will lead to lawsuits, wasting taxpayer dollars on a policy that does more harm than good. Property owners who have followed existing zoning laws should not be punished for acting in good faith, nor should we as residents be forced into fewer choices at higher prices.</p> <p>Beyond the legal concerns, this ban will limit consumer access to modern gas stations, which provide much more than fuel. Many of these businesses offer fresh food, safe and well-lit facilities, and local jobs. It's frustrating to see the Council promote a policy that prioritizes protecting old, outdated stations rather than encouraging newer, cleaner, and more consumer-friendly options.</p>