From: Scott Froseth [mailto:scott.froseth@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 09, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Susman, Mary Beth - City Council <MaryBeth.Susman@denvergov.org>
Cc: Lucero, Theresa L. - Community Planning and Development <Theresa.Lucero@denvergov.org>
Subject: Re: Concerns about the Church site @ 50 South Colorado Boulevard

Mary Beth -

I am the property owner of a home located at 3 S. Alboin Street which is within one block of the proposed rezoning and will state upfront that I am opposed to this action on a number of points which are outlined below. Please consider the following in addition to comments I submitted earlier. My wife and I purchased the home as it is located in a very single family neighborhood. This action is not in keeping with current land use patterns of a well-established single-family neighborhood.

1. The developer acquired the property knowing the current zoning of the site is E-SU-D, a singe family-zoning district that does not allow for multi-unit residential uses. The property does have development value by remaining in in its current zoning of single family. The developer should have considered existing zoning and perhaps conditioned the purchase of the property on a zoning change prior to acquisition of the former church site. Changing the zoning to allow for the profit of a corporation to make this change now has caused unneeded concern by adjacent property owners. I do note the community support seems to be in large from persons who are not immediately impacted, as we would be.

2. The staff report in consistency with Adopted Plans notes a few items, which I do not see as consistent and disagree, as they do not implement these plans for the city, and the neighborhood. For example Land Use Strategy 3-B, which states in part "infill development that is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood." The character of the neighborhood is single family, not multi-unit family. There is reference to "broadens the variety of compatible land uses." Multi-unit development is not compatible with the single-family nature of the neighborhood. Legacies Strategy 3-A refers to increasing density and new uses in areas were it is desirable and can be accommodated. This is only considered desirable due to a developers needs and wants, not what the neighborhood residents need or desire. As for accommodated - once the zoning is changed a great deal of accommodation can be made at the neighborhoods expense. Housing Objective 2 seeks to encourage preservation and modernization of Denver's existing housing stock and established neighborhoods. The change way too dramatic to preserve existing single family housing stock of Hilltop and introduces potential housing which is not in character with the single family nature of the immediate area.

3. By changing this site to G-RH-3 we will see more cut through traffic and more drivers looking for that all elusive shortcut to somewhere for some reason. The city streets in Hilltop where laid out for single-family development which encourage slower traffic speeds and encourages a walkable community. Communities can lose much of their "neighborhood feel" with more traffic from non-

homeowners. Yes, these are public streets but more traffic volume can destroy the neighborly connectedness that makes Hilltop a connected neighborhood.

4. What will be developed on this site with a change in zoning? Uncertainty is scary. Large mass concrete building with inadequate parking? Balconies for all night parties? Vehicle owning residents who have little regard for pedestrians and bicyclists? The site is best left in the E-SU-D District so development is compatible with surrounding land use. Or the developers with city assistance find a zoning district more suitable for transition between Colorado Boulevard and the interior single-family development.

5. Consider a small area plan (SAP) for Hilltop so requests for zoning changes fit. In reviewing plans on the city web site I noted that we are lumped in with Cherry Creek commercial area. Maybe it is time for a SAP for Hilltop as there is none to very little commercial activity on this side of Colorado Boulevard and is more residential. The SAP would provide long-range guidance on what changes should be considered.

I want to be clear, change is enviable. Some changes are good, while others such as the one being proposed are not good. I am sure you have heard from others why they are opposed to the change. The increase in traffic, the unknown of the future development, increase in population density in a single family neighborhood, concern with property values, safety, blocking views of the mountains and so on. Including the ones I have outlined above.

This is the wrong place and wrong time for changing the zoning.

Thank you,

Scott and Cori Froseth