

From: [Internet Privacy Advocate](#)
To: [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [president@cherryhillsvista.org](#); [Safe and Sound Denver](#)
Subject: [BULK] [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Group Living Amendment | School Buffer Zones Removed
Date: Monday, October 12, 2020 10:27:15 AM

The Communist City Planners in Denver are out of control. **Vote no** on this amendment. In fact, **abolish the entire proposal**. It will destroy the quality of life in the city for the great majority of hard working law abiding citizens.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Safe and Sound Denver** <safeandsounddenver@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 12, 2020 at 9:13 AM
Subject: Group Living Amendment | School Buffer Zones Removed
To: George Bodley <gbodley@gmail.com>

[View this email in your browser](#)



School Buffer Zones Removed

DPS Silent, DCTA Supports, CPD Obscures

One of many major changes in the massive Group Living Zoning Code Amendment is the removal of the buffer zone between Denver schools and community corrections facilities.

The current Code requires a 1,500 ft buffer zone. The Amendment deletes that provision.

The current code does not allow community corrections in residential neighborhoods. The Amendment will allow community corrections in ALL residential neighborhoods in Denver.

This change will affect all schools in Denver -- public, private, charter -- and will take effect 1 week after Denver City Council approves the Amendment. The Amendment will likely have a City Council public hearing/vote at the end of December or early January 2021.

There are approximately [93,800 students in 207 Denver Public Schools](#) and thousands more in [50+ Denver](#)

[private schools.](#)

DPS Silent

The Denver Public School Board was contacted, asked if they were aware of the change, and if DPS supported the Amendment. They were also asked if they had communicated this impending change to their parent community. There was no response received.

The Denver Public School Superintendent was contacted, asked if she was aware of the change, and if DPS supported the Amendment. She was also asked if she had communicated this impending change to the parent community. There was no response received.

Community Planning and Development (CPD) was asked who had been involved in this discussion as a DPS stakeholder, and when that input occurred. There was no response received.

DCTA Endorses

The Denver Classroom Teachers Association (DCTA) endorsed the Group Living Amendment, with no exceptions.

[DCTA's Housing Committee](#), chaired by North High School French teacher/YIMBY activist [Anna DeWitt](#) and Columbian Elementary early literacy specialist/realtor [Jessica Dominguez](#), led the endorsement effort.



CPD Obscures

Community Planning and Development (CPD) failed to disclose the removal of the 1,500 ft buffer zone in community presentations.

In response to a direct question about the removal of 1,500 ft school buffer zones, Andrew Webb, CPD Project Manager stated, **"...there are so many schools in the city that there are very few places in Denver where these [community corrections] facilities can actually be established...we are proposing to remove those limitations on location."** ([Capital Hill United Neighbors Zoom Meeting, 8/25/2020](#))

These excerpts from the Group Living webpage FAQ fail to clearly state the Amendment's removal of 1,500 ft school buffer zones:

[Will existing buffers from residential areas or schools go away? \(pg 7\)](#)

The code currently requires that shelters and community corrections facilities (halfway houses) be located a certain distance away from schools and residential areas, despite there being no evidence that these buffers have any impact on the safety of these facilities or surrounding neighborhoods. The buffers used in the past have been largely arbitrary and have created major barriers to the establishment of much-needed facilities.

[How does this proposal affect halfway houses and how they are regulated? \(pg 9\)](#)

The proposal would remove some of the current restrictions on where they can be located, but it would not change other regulations, codes or oversight that apply to these types of facilities, how they are established, how they are run or who is eligible to live in them.

Community Corrections summary information on the [Group Living webpage](#) is not specific about the current 1,500 ft buffer requirement, provides no statistics/source for their statements, and is in conflict with these recent statistics:

- **Colorado has a 50% recidivism rate** (convicted criminal re-offense); 10 points higher than the national average of 40% ([CPR, 2/2019](#))
- **Denver's recidivism rate is 41%** ([Denverite, 8/2019](#))
- **2/3 of Denver's halfway house population are felons exiting prison**; 1/3 have been deferred from state prison
- **31% percent of people who "exited" Denver's program did so because of an escape**, nearly twice the state average ([Denverite, 8/2019](#))
- **56% of parolees completed their programs** at Denver Community Corrections-run halfway houses ([Denverite, 8/2019](#))
- **54% of parolees failed their program at Tooley Hall and Williams Street**, run by GEO (now closed), a national operator; **76% of parolees failed their program at Independence House**, run by a local, independent operator ([Denverite, 8/2019](#))
- **Violent crime increased 15% statewide** ([CPR, 2/2019](#))
- **Property crime and larceny increased 4% statewide** ([CPR, 2/2019](#))
- **42% success rate of Denver halfway houses** (success = 2 years without re-offending); **58% failure rate** ([Denverite, 8/2019](#))

This is another example of the Group Living Amendment's big experiment on Denver's residents and neighborhoods.

CPD and City Council propose to remove school buffer zones -- because they say buffers are "arbitrary" -- infer that Denver's student population will be safe and Denver's recidivism rate will somehow magically improve.

Forward this email to parents with children in Denver schools -- they deserve to know how this might affect their children. They should be part of this public discussion!

[Contact Your City Council Person:](#) Vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment!

Legislative Timeline for the Group Living Amendment

10/6	LUTI Committee Household Regulations, Alternatives + Revisions
11/3	LUTI Committee Residential Care Introduction
11/10	LUTI Committee Residential Care Regulations, Community Corrections Type 2 (11-40 person)
11/17	LUTI Committee Former Chapter 59, Enforcement + Monitoring
12/1	LUTI Committee Introduction into Committee + Vote 4 votes to pass
TBD	City Council Public Hearing + Vote 7 votes to pass
JAN	Implementation of Group Living Zoning Code Amendment

[Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee \(LUTI\)](#)

Tuesdays 10 a.m.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_oHyXcJ7ETQ-LJuFdpcEV5A

Password: Denver

[Watch via Denver Channel 8](#)

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [NextDoor](#) | [SafeandSoundDenver.com](#)



Safe and Sound Denver, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:

Safe and Sound Denver
1685 S Colorado Blvd
Denver, CO 80222-4000

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

This email was sent to gbodley@gmail.com

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)
Safe and Sound Denver · 1685 S Colorado Blvd · Denver, CO 80222-4000 · USA



From: [Jerry Doerksen](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [BULK] [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 12:16:43 PM

Denver City Council Members:

The Group Living Amendment is, by far, the most onerous legislation I have seen in my 49 years as a Denver resident. This amendment to the Denver Zoning Code should be defeated for the following reasons:

1. There has never been an answer given to the question as to the origins of the proposal. Who/what was behind it?
2. There was no consideration given to the opinion of Denver residential property owners prior to the formation of the Group Living Advisory Committee. Nobody I know was ever asked for their thoughts, or even informed, about this proposal. Not until this had been going on for over two years did it come to my attention. Many Denver residents are still unaware of this proposal which will dramatically affect their neighborhoods if left as currently drafted.
3. Public comment in the various phases of the progression of the amendment is at 80% to 90% in opposition. How can an amendment with that kind of opposition be given serious consideration?
4. There should be no place for correctional facilities or large residential care facilities in residential areas, other than those permitted by Federal law. Such facilities would seriously compromise the accepted ideas of what a single family residential area should be.
5. The GLAC membership was comprised of individuals primarily interested in promoting their own causes. It's evident from scrutiny of the member's affiliations that the GLA was representative of their various interests. The interests of the neighborhoods affected by the proposal were not properly represented. Only eight of the forty-eight members of the GLAC represented neighborhoods and only one of them attended more than four meetings. The others saw it as a waste of time because the outcome was predetermined.
6. This amendment, if adopted, would cause, over time, a dramatic change in demographics. Property owners will leave for other neighborhoods that offer a similar neighborhood environment to what they enjoy now. That void, in many cases, would be filled by rental homes, or co-op type arrangements, increasing density and accompanying related problems.
7. There never was an impact study. One would think any proposal of this magnitude would undergo an intensive review and investigation to assess what impact it would have on infrastructure, quality of life, schools, ordinance compliance, safety, and other related issues.
8. There is no funding allocated to deal with anticipated added costs such as trash pickup, staffing to investigate ordinance violations, demand on staff to administer building applications, etc.
9. Homes in residential areas were designed to accommodate single families, not a group of unrelated individuals living together. A single family of five, for instance, is not the same as a group of five unrelated individuals. As an example, a single family would, most likely not have more than 2-3 vehicles while an unrelated group of five would likely have five vehicles. A family unit is mostly a stable unit while a group of unrelated persons is much more volatile. Many other examples could be made.
10. A comparison of peer cities published on the Group Living site reflects an average of less than three unrelated persons living together in cities where a larger number is allowed. That being the case, I propose that the number of unrelated occupants of a single family residence be increased from the current number of two to a maximum of three, certainly reasonable

given the statistics provided by the study.

SUMMARY: Residents in single family zoned areas live where they do in order to avoid the very conditions the Group Living Amendment would create. Contrary to the suggestion by Andrew Webb, Senior City Planner and a few other Council members that current zoning was the product of racial motivations or other biases, whether true or not, simply has no bearing on why people live where they do at the present time. I have lived in my current home in SE Denver for 45 years and prior to that in the Park Hill neighborhood for 6 years. I was not advised prior to purchasing either of those homes that I was engaging in a racist activity nor have I been alerted to that possibility at any time since, until the GLAC concluded that, unbeknownst to me, my decision to live where I do must have indeed been racially motivated. What a bunch of garbage. People live where they do because the neighborhoods meet their personal preferences. To insinuate otherwise does a great disservice to those, like me, who feel that injustice of any type is wrong. This proposal was conceptually flawed from the onset, was developed without any meaningful public input, is opposed overwhelmingly by Denver residents, and deserves to be resoundingly DEFEATED. Please vote NO on this ill- conceived amendment.

Respectfully,
Jerry Doerksen

From: [E J Lorimer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Jimenez, Christian - MO Associate Administrator](#); [Fry, Logan M. - CC YA2245 City Council Aide](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 9:25:50 PM

Correction Communities and GLAC

It appears that GLAC did not consider (and if they did consider, did not care) that State can also insert contracts into Denver for correction communities, parolee home rentals and neither the State nor the County (ie Denver) have to check with one another beforehand.

You also indicated before that there are no 'per capita' limits on how many facilities go into any one neighborhood so potentially, one neighborhood of 500 rooftops could have a dozen home units used to house non parole and parolee folks. Add to this, homeless shelters that can expand and contract at the snap of one director's fingers and a neighborhood could become overwhelmed with situations never dreamed of in Denver.

Pretty soon, the homeowner will become the minority resident in a neighborhood. Is that what GLAC envisions? Is that the translation of "Denver- A world class city".

Jane Lorimer

From: [Carter Henry](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 2:02:12 PM

All,

I oppose the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.

The majority of Denver residents with whom I speak are livid about the proposed zoning changes, which will be devastating to our family centered neighborhoods. I am sure it's not relevant to you, but many of us have lived in our neighborhoods for more than 25-30 years and have put our lives, love and investments into our homes. We worked hard for many years, saved our money and eventually were able to buy a home. We have raised our children and grandchildren in this neighborhood. We know our neighbors, trust them and take care of them when they need us. Your proposed changes upend all of our lives and not for the better.

There are so many reasons I oppose these zoning changes!

Here is one of many: Apparently, Andrew Webb just acknowledged that the 1500 ft distance requirement from correctional facilities and schools would be abolished with this amendment because there are "too many schools". This was not a widely publicized change.

I'm sure you are well aware of the opposition to the muddy language in the bill and the manner in which the public was kept in the dark until the last moment as this was pushed through.

I have read that significant numbers of Group Living Advisory Committee members involved in these changes have a financial interest in these changes. I was surprised in one of the zoom meetings I "attended", by the comment, "How will we make any money if the fire code requires sprinklers?".

This has gone on for more than two years and still, so many Denver residents are unaware of what is in store for them.

Sincerely,

Henry Carter

From: [Jeanette Goodwin](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 7:26:19 AM

Absolutely NO. Not in my city. I am a NO for the proposed Group Living Amendment. VOTE NO

From: [eileen petersen](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 11:44:42 AM

(GLAC) wants to allow operators of **community corrections facilities and homeless shelters** to set up shop in a home in our neighborhoods.

This just is not what we the people of Denver and surrounds want. Why not ask us?

Please be forward thinking and see all the complications, trouble, and bad news this would bring. It is not the solution to help these people!!!!

Very sincerely yours,
Eileen Petersen

From: [Gene Brown](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 4:21:04 PM

VOTE NO, NO to Group Living ZONING CODE proposals!!!! GENE Brown, 1858 S
LAFAYETTE St. 80210

From: [Tracey Baldwin-Mitchell](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] "NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment"
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 7:05:25 PM

Hello

I wanted to pass along my concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of our residential neighborhoods. It is a complicated issue for sure.

Effect on property values and safety is worrisome. Not everyone wants to live next door to a scenario that is a residential care facility, currently or if your house is up for sale. The removal of periodic permit review/renewal process which allows neighborhood impacts to be assessed is a bad deal for adjacent neighbors and the neighborhood. What happens when there is a situation similar to a short term rental when there is a bad player who is able to set up any one of the types of residential care facilities and not follow the rules and impacts the health and safety of the area? It puts all of the responsibility on the neighbors to prove there are issues which ultimately pits neighbor against neighbor and no one wins in the end.

If approved - The notification only for new use allows no recourse for neighbors. Neighbors should have a say in how this will be executed and included and to not be involved does a huge disservice to responsible citizens and allows for no recourse for homeowners/neighbors to know this is happening or more importantly to voice a concern and have input regarding.

We have a process for dispensaries, restaurants and liquor stores which allow the community to have an input and understand and come up with a solution. This process is set up to protect the integrity of neighborhoods and the most vulnerable citizens why wouldn't we follow this model of approvals?

My thoughts on possible solutions

I am thinking of alternative, resourceful creative and positive ways to solve our issues. With Covid more companies are moving to a working from home model. Why aren't we looking at options in other types of buildings that have a surplus of unoccupied space in areas with transit options. This is a great an opportunity to look at different solutions. Additionally we need to look at ways to task developments current and completed construction to allocate a certain amount of square footage or units Why aren't developers mandated to include more affordable options in their overall occupancy? Over development and gentrification of areas have contributed greatly to our problem of affordability and homelessness. The burden should not fall upon homeowners and neighborhoods to foot the bill and solve the problem.

Thank you! I appreciate you reading my concerns and urge you to think about the overall negative impact to our amazing city and neighborhoods we need more dialog and conversations to better implement a plan for all

Many thanks

Tracey Baldwin

From: [Tricia Ramsey](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ADU and amendment 7
Date: Saturday, September 19, 2020 7:18:42 PM

Good evening City Council Members,

I am a Denver resident and voter. I am a public school teacher and active in my work and home community.

I reside at 1042 Locust St, Denver, CO 80220.

I am concerned about an application to allow group living at 1055 Locust.

I don't understand why two residences will be allowed on a single lot when a duplex right next door is empty.

Although I understand the need for group living as described in the amendment and I support sober living for those in recovery or experiencing housing insecurities, the site at 1055 Locust is not a suitable site.

Please do not approve the application for a proposed ADU 8 bedroom house in front of the current home at 1055 Locust.

Sincerely,
Patricia K Ramsey

From: [Donna Fryer](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Against zoning amendment for unrelated people
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 6:10:44 PM

I am in Cherry Creek East. I do not want you to change the unrelated people zoning. Please leave as is. Also I do not want to change allowing residential care facilities in our neighborhood.

Thank you.
Donna Fryer
170 S Jackson St
Denver CO 80209

From: [Mary Jo](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Amendment 7
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 1:35:39 PM

I urge you to vote AGAINST the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment 7. Don't ruin our neighborhoods. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [CHARLES HOUCHENS](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Amendment 7
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2020 3:37:15 PM

To Denver city council and mayor Hancock

I would like to express my disapproval of the the proposal of rezoning residential living to group living zones. This is not safe nor what single family neighborhoods want.

Thank you

Duane and Judy Houchens

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Claudia and Stan Humbargar](#)
To: mayorsoffice@denver.gov; [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Changing the Single Family Zoning
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 9:15:14 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council,

We have great concern about the changing of the single family zoning code that you are going to be voting on soon. We love living in the city of Denver and we have been residents of Hampden Heights East over 40 years. We are concerned that allowing property owners or investors to convert their single family homes into a community corrections facility or into a homeless shelter for residents of 10 or more, per home, depending on the square footage would be a very big detriment to the city of Denver.

We believe that since there is no way to control this zoning change, a greedy landlord would be more concerned about the money they are going to make by buying houses in Denver and converting them -- than truly being part of the neighborhood community that they own property in. We also have sober living homes not only in our neighborhood but also across Denver. They have a limit of 8 residents living in the house plus many strict rules. We would hate to see the numbers going up to 10 or more, with the increase in parking and trash in a residence initially built as a single family residence. I don't know that the homeless and corrections people would have the same strict rules as the sober living houses do. As homeless camps are removed from Denver all we hear about is the amount of used needles, trash and abandoned property left behind. Another concern is the amount of undesirable social issues, such as possible mental illness, that homeless residents may present in neighborhoods where young children are present. We don't feel that these facilities would be good to have in residential neighborhoods. The correction facilities are likely to have people being released from incarceration early and may become dangerous to those around them.

Specific to the Hampden Heights neighborhood, it already has numerous multi unit apartment and condo complexes surrounding the entire subdivision, with many more already being constructed. We have a lot of cars parked on our residential streets from these multi unit buildings because apparently their complex owners only allow them to have limited parking spaces per unit, so the overflow of additional residents or their guest's cars ends up being parked on our neighborhood streets.

We also have increased traffic flow on Hampden since we can no longer access southbound I-225 to get to southbound I-25 from Yosemite at I-225. Therefore, all that traffic from southeast Denver has to use either eastbound Hampden to I-25 or continue south to Bellevue to access southbound I-25. Additionally, since the placement of medians on Hampden from I-25 to Tamarac the traffic flow has deteriorated substantially. The number of U turns on this stretch of Hampden has become extremely dangerous. Also, we have witnessed, multiple times, emergency vehicles stuck in traffic because the vehicles in front of them have no way of pulling to the side to allow them to pass. With the additional traffic that these zoning changes would create the situation would only become worse.

We just don't feel that it is a safe practice to allow community corrections facilities or conversions of single family homes into shelters to pop up anywhere. Overall we think it would decrease the desirability of people moving into Denver County when they can just go to the suburbs and not have to deal with the zoning changes that could potentially pop up next

door. However, we understand that you have exempted your own neighborhoods. This is a concern to us that you would exempt certain or any neighborhoods if you feel this is really a good safe practice. So we think by your own actions it's telling us that you do not think this is good for everyone equally in the County of Denver.

It is our opinion that it would better serve the homeless community or corrections people to be in a facility in more of a retail commercial zone. For example, the Kmart that is on Evans and Monaco which we understand is now under contract to be developed into an apartment complex, but that would have been a great place to purchase and set up a shelter of some sort with occupational and training, having ample parking and potential jobs nearby. Also, there are many rundown hotels and senior homes that are standing empty around Denver that might also work in some capacity as intermediate group homes or shelters. Hampden Heights already has a group home in the community and an additional one that is set up and run nearby.

There is a larger facility, run by the Volunteers of America, at the southernmost boundary of Hampden Heights East that seems to be well run and causing no problems within the community. The big difference there is that it is being operated by a commercial/professional entity, whereas the individual residences that may become correction or homeless residences would be owned by individuals, within residential blocks, with the owners not living in or caring for the surrounding residences.

In conclusion, we feel that this zoning consideration is not in the best interest of the Denver property owners and residents and should be denied. Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Stan and Claudia Humbargar
3364 S Clinton Ct
Denver, CO 80231

Life long residents of Denver and 42 year residents of Hampden Heights East

From: [Bear Valley Improvement Assoc.](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Channel 7 Story on the Group Living Amendment - Backlash grows over Denver's Group Living Proposal
Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 11:24:51 AM

Bear Valley Residents and Friends,

If you are concerned about Denver's Group Living Proposal, you are not alone - registered neighborhood organizations all over Denver are opposed to the GL Amendment. The Bear Valley Improvement Association officially opposes the GL Amendment and you may agree or feel differently, If you oppose or support the GL Amendment, there is still time to contact the mayor and members of city council council to let them know how you feel. **At a minimum, please contact the mayor, your councilperson and the at-large council members, as they were specifically elected to represent you and they want to hear from you!!**

Click on the link below to read the most recent Channel 7 news story

"Backlash grows over Denver's Group Living proposal allowing 10 unrelated adults to live in one house."

<https://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/360/backlash-grows-over-denvers-group-living-proposal-allowing-10-unrelated-adults-to-live-in-one-house>

For your convenience, here are some important email addresses:

Mayor Hancock michael.hancock@denvergov.org; mayorsoffice@denvergov.org;

City Council (all members) dence@denvergov.org

At-Large Robin Kniech kniechatlarge@denvergov.org

At-Large Deborah Ortega ortegaatlarge@denvergov.org

District 1 Amanda P. Sandoval districtone@denvergov.org

District 2 Kevin Flynn Kevin.flynn@denvergov.org

District 3 Jamie Torres Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org

District 4 Kendra Black Kendra.Black@denvergov.org

District 5 Amanda Sawyer DenverCouncil5@denvergov.org

District 6 Paul Kashmann Paul.Kashmann@denvergov.org

District 7 Jolon Clark Jolon.Clark@denvergov.org

District 8 Christopher Herndon Christopher.Herndon@denvergov.org

District 9 Candi CdeBaca District9@denvergov.org

District 10 Chris Hinds Chris.Hinds@denvergov.org

District 11 Stacie Gilmore Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org

Respectfully,

Richard Saiz

From: [Larry Bell](#)
To: [Mayorsoffice](#)
Cc: [City Council District 5](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment to Planning Board, Group Living Zoning Proposal
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2020 4:19:11 PM

To Mayor Hancock, Andrew Webb and City Council Members,

We are totally against the Group Living Zoning Proposal.

First, these three items - group living, community corrections and residential care - should be unbundled. They have nothing to do with one another.

Second, while the council touts the great job they have done communicating this proposal to its constituents, we have found the opposite to be true. In fact, we feel the city and council have been intentionally hiding this proposal from Denver voters.

Third, we do not want halfway houses in single-family neighborhoods. The City cancelled its contracts with GEO Group and CoreCivic. Now they want to foist that expense and responsibility onto the residential neighborhoods.

Fourth, Forty people will be allowed in residential care - homeless, corrections and assisted living - properties of 12,000 square feet. There are thousands of lots that size in Denver.

Fifth, There will be no supervision of any of these halfway houses since they will all be "Use by Right."

Since these items affect every citizen of Denver, we absolutely should be able to vote separately on these proposals.

My homeowners association, Cranmer Park/Hilltop is against this proposal.

Thank you,

Larry and Nancy Bell
360 Fairfax St
Denver, Colorado 80220
303-619-9237
larry@goldenbellpress.com

From: [Amy Wright](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 4:31:51 PM

I have been a property owner in Denver for 42 years. I do not live in an HOA, nor a Ch 59 zoned area. I am upset that the Denver community does not have access to the proposed amendments on Group Living prior to the LUTI Committee's vote on Dec 22, 2020, and so I am left to speculate on what changes might be made. I ask that you hold off on the City Council's final vote on Group Living until the entire community has access to the revised draft amendment for Group Living and time to comment on it.

Please consider the following two positions:

1. I am most opposed to placing unlimited Type 1 and particularly Type II facilities in single unit zoned neighborhoods. It shifts the structure of these neighborhoods and impacts them in a negative way. It favors developers and commercial operators over citizen buyers and has the potential of homeowner flight from communities without HOAs or Ch 59 protection to HOA and Ch 59 communities or flight out of Denver. This would be devastating to Denver's many wonderful neighborhoods and to the homeowners who want to live there. I live in a neighborhood that already has much housing diversity with a good balance of single-family units with a blend of apartments, religious places, schools, and small businesses. It does not need the addition of unlimited developers turning single unit dwellings into Type I and Type II facilities, displacing homeowners. Keep Type I and Type II out of single unit districts and do not change SU district designations.

2. I ask that there be a limit on the total number of people in any house in SU districts. The recommendation of unlimited related people could create overcrowding and unhealthy living conditions. Cap the total number of people, related and unrelated adults and children to a number that is considered healthy in SU districts.

Please allow the community to comment on the revised draft amendment before a final vote is made.

From: [SHARON Pearson](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments re: group living proposal
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 10:14:15 AM

While I understand the need for more affordable housing, I am most concerned with the impact of the decision to allow 5 unrelated adults to live in one house.

My family recently sold my mother's 1100 s/f house (across the street from mine) to the niece of a friend. We were all told that a lovely young couple was moving in, planning to marry in April, and then start a family. The couple IS lovely - but they have come with 3 roommates - so meeting the "5" criteria. I know the house well and can't even imagine 5 adults living there comfortably together, but that is not the problem. IT IS THE CARS.

The lovely young couple and their roommates come with a total of SEVEN cars. The house has a small two car driveway, in which 4 of the vehicles are jammed, and 3 on the street. Not to mention that one is a loud hot rod and two are trucks.

Their arrival has changed the character of our little university hills north neighborhood - where all the homes are under 1100 s/f as originally built. Their original plan was to expand the driveway and create a parking lot for all of their vehicles, but luckily current zoning prohibits that.

While one house with 5 unrelated adults and 7 cars is probably not world ending, think if this becomes the neighborhood norm. It is not workable.

I strongly feel that the issue of multiple vehicles needs to be taken into consideration as these plans evolve. It is often not the people, but the stuff that comes with them that changes the character of a neighborhood.

Sharon Pearson
2400 S Birch St
Denver, CO 80222

From: [Charles Dickinson](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Commercial Special Interests Are Driving Denver Group Living Proposal
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 9:56:52 AM

In reference to Denver's Group Living proposal, Denver City Councilman Kevin Flynn recently confirmed: "The process was dominated by self-interested providers of commercial services in residential neighborhoods." How can any City Council member, in good conscience, vote yes on a proposal that so blatantly reeks of commercial self-interest and corruption, and massively destroys decades of zoning laws that have protected Denver neighborhoods from rampant commercialization, including the introduction of a revolving door of released violent community corrections offenders? As Denver residents learn of the true impact of this proposal, disguised as somehow being an affordable housing initiative, they are rising up in overwhelming opposition. The inexplicable staunch support of this proposal by some Council members, and the speed by which this is progressing, makes me wonder if they might somehow personally benefit from its passage, or whether they might be connected to these special interests? Resident opposition to this proposal far outweighs any support.

I urge all City Council members to vote NO on the Group Living proposal, and to require the full community engagement that has been lacking throughout the process.

Charles Dickinson
Denver Resident

From: [eileen petersen](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Community planning gone horribly wrong
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:11:30 PM

This DISASTROUS initiative being pushed on Denver by Andrew Webb, Senior City Planner, is totally unacceptable. It would, among other things, throw the zoning laws for “suburbs” out the window and allow up to five unrelated individuals and their families (maximum of 36 people in a home) to live in a 1,500 square foot home in Denver. The city would purchase homes and use them for correctional facilities, homeless shelters, and recovery housing.

This is moving forward quickly. I have shared this information with my network and asked everyone to reach out to the mayor’s office, city council, etc.

I trust a better and more sustainable, humane solution will be put in place instead of his.

Very sincerely yours,
Eileen Petersen

From: [Gail Sykes](#)
To: [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Covid and the Group Living Proposal for Denver
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:32:53 PM

Dear Denver city council members and Mayor Hancock,

The Center for Disease Control has issued a moratorium on rental evictions until 2021 due to grave concerns about the spread of Covid. Our national government is concerned that, by people being evicted and living in more group situations, the virus will rapidly spread, negatively affect, and even kill citizens.

The current Covid health crisis, alone, should be grounds for Denver city council to postpone its vote on the Denver Group Living proposal until after January, 2021.

How can Denver defy the national concerns of this virus and advocate for more than tripling the number of persons, per domicile, at this very critical and dangerous time in our country?

What up until now has been a very ill advised and politically driven agenda for The Denver Group Living Proposal, has become a potentially deadly situation for Denver and its residents.

If Denver city council does not postpone voting on this measure until the virus is contained, It will be an act of gross negligence on each and every member's part, and the public will judge him or her accordingly.

Respectfully,
Gail Sykes
80209

From: [Janell](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Denver Group Living Amendment Comment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 5:42:06 PM

12/15/20

All:

I strongly oppose the Denver Group Living Amendment as it is currently proposed. In particular, I am against:

- 1) Allowing residential care as a use-by-right instead of use-by-permit.
- 2) Removing a periodic permit review/renewal process that allows neighborhood impacts to be assessed.
- 3) Notification only for new use; no recourse for neighbors to deny a use.
- 4) Removes current 1,500 ft buffer zones between schools (preschool, elementary, middle/junior, high school) and community corrections facilities.
- 5) The current inadequate and inconsistent enforcement of zoning regulations.
- 6) There are already too many houses in our neighborhood that are not occupied by the owner of the house. The needs of young families and “empty nesters” are very different from the desires of people living in a house that they do not own. Home owners have an interest in their homes and in the neighborhoods they live in. Renters and occupants of group homes generally do not.

Finally, if group homes are so great, then why does Mayor Hancock live in a neighborhood that is exempt from the proposed Denver Group Living Amendment? Denver is already too crowded and congested. It does not need to have numerous non-owners living in neighborhood homes.

Dr. Janell Edman

From: [Paula vonLindern](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Denver Group Living Zoning
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 2:06:25 PM

As a resident of West Washington Park I cannot believe you are seriously considering this proposal, especially since there is also one to remove street parking to accommodate bicycle lanes (which I am also against). Our area as well as most older Denver "suburbs" does not have the capacity for both and there has been no recommendations as to how there will be any enforcement for any group living and parking arrangements. To assume people will park in lots far from their residences and walk or bike home is absolutely ludicrous.

Also the number of residents in these group homes, because of including their relatives, is too large. A great COVID 19 spreader!

Paula von Lindern
1001 E. Dakota Ave.
Denver, CO 80209
paulavon@msn.com

From: [Carol McCallister](#)
To: [Kristina Wright](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] District 8 NO!!!!!!!!!!!!
Date: Sunday, November 22, 2020 12:19:51 PM
Importance: High

NO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

On Group

living

Zoning

Code

Amendmen

t#7

Carol E McCallister
President/Owner
Champion Business Services
2668 Dexter Street
Denver Colorado 80207
303-873-9147
303-873-9149 fax
carol@championbusiness.com
<http://www.championbusiness.com>



From: [Lawrence Murray](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Paige Burkeholder](#); [Nancy Bell](#); [Joni Caldwell](#); [Ann White](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Article on Single Family Housing in Other Cities
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 1:54:10 PM

To All Concerned,

I was asked to ensure this memo went to city council, the mayor and Andrew Webb based on the link below and my perspective on the upcoming proposed changes to Denver Zoning guidelines.

This was posted a few hours ago by Denver 7 : <https://kdvr.com/news/local/vote-on-group-living-proposal-expected-in-denver-committee-tuesday/>

MS Paige,

Thank you for sending this article out. It comes at a timely point in my thinking. Let me make this point first. From my exposure to all the meetings on this issue of rezoning to mitigate homelessness, house felons placed on parole and secure housing for special needs those that advocate for this zoning change have been silent. We hear very little from those who believe this is a good idea. A few of the council members have been forth coming. But, little from those Denver citizens one would believe they would benefit. This article however, spoke only to one aspect of our issue. That is the demise of the single family home to accommodate larger or multifamily dwellings. It speaks to changing zoning to accommodate that effort. It also speaks to the reason minorities have been left out of the single family home markets because of old traditions of red lining, banks under qualifying or disqualifying minorities and simply down right racism in the system forcing minorities to actually live in multifamily conditions in an occasional home but mostly in apartments. It just so happens that my community (Montbello and Green Valley Ranch) has been a haven for minorities to experience the single family experience here in Denver Colorado. I know this is an old song, but many of the residences of these communities have had their homes for decades with the impression established decades ago that single family living is good. Guess what? It was good! We like many others living in Denver would like their neighborhoods to remain

single family dominate. However, I understand things change. If there is a segment of the population who wish otherwise, push for zoning changes for new development to that end as stated in this article. Simply leave existing single family communities alone!!!!

I grew up in Philadelphia! That is why I chose to live in Denver! Space, separation and togetherness because of that separation. I lived in a three story brown stone, one bathroom, two bedrooms, living room on second floor and only a bedroom on third floor. The first floor was a tailor shop and also the location of our kitchen. You may have heard of the historic underground railroad during the time of slavery. Well my house was that of sorts during the 50's and 60's. My family are children of the Jim Crow South and when they came to Philadelphia they became the way station for our migrating family members looking for a better life in the North. I rarely had a bedroom to myself growing up. You learned to share everything (seven people one very small bathroom)! But, it was understood, once they got jobs they found places to live . It was never a permanent thing. This idea of blended families or taking in friends who are down on their luck is not a new phenomenon. The article seems to suggest that and provides that as a reason to change and move away from single family homes. I call BS! This city needs to look for other resources other than placing the burden on a generation that has played by the rules and in some cases by the burden of the rules and have achieved what is perceived as the American Dream. For many of us, this is a slap in the face and for many reasons stated in many of those community meetings, the so called zoning changes we believe are counterproductive especially during this pandemic. Finally, I care about the homeless and I care about those who due to this pandemic may have become homeless. I absolutely care about those that are disabled and who would have a better life living within the community. For the former, we need to temporarily support them for the latter is a lifelong condition for some. However, they actually bring little to no impact on the communities they reside. AS for halfway houses, I vigorously protest. Let's be honest. Getting rid of Chapter 59 is just away to open up less affluent areas so that those of means will escape this new zoning proposal and halfway houses. I am sorry, but the city has not been serious in enforcing the current zoning guidelines. Some of those in the city government may

feel differently and can provide stats that back them up. I simply say get out of your offices (homes now) and walk in the communities! Your stats have flaws. Now, all that I have written falls into a particular format I use on FB. Everything I have presented is "JUST MY OPINION."

There is an old saying related to that perspective. I will reframe because this is for consumption by all. But, this is how a great many of folks in this district feel and I suspect, that is the case of other districts as well. It is up to the city to be credible! Stop this movement to adapt this zoning change and consider placing it on the ballot just like you did on the pit bull issue. Council members, if you feel this is a good thing for the people of Denver, then let the people confirm that by voting on it! I mince no words! I oppose this zoning change as it is designed now. I strongly suggest that the individual council members speak up now and provide where they stand as well as the mayor!

L. Murray

P.S. What makes this zoning proposed change so weak is the element of enforcement! What I see is this proposal is forced on us and my community suffers even more because the city does not enforce its guidelines now. How about doing that first and then come back with a proposal that has incorporated suggested changes of the folks in the communities and has teeth to see compliance. "JUST MY OPINION."

From: Paige Burkeholder <pburkeholder@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 12, 2020 9:37 AM

To: safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com

Subject: Article on Single Family Housing in Other Cities

This article was posted on the YIMBY Facebook site. The focus seems to address the comments of those that support the Group Living Amendment. Just sharing information.

<https://www.inquirer.com/real-estate/housing/affordable-housing-single-family-suburbs-american-dream-20201209.html>

From: [David Bufalo](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Cc: [David Bufalo](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Don't let HUD go back to making federal zoning policy. the Denver Gazette 12-14-2020
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 8:45:29 AM

This article debunks the idea that zoning changes are needed to "increase diversity". Denver should take note. There is no reason to change Denver's zoning code to address housing discrimination. Moreover, the fair housing act prohibits discrimination in housing, so the issue is already established in federal law.

Within a 15-minute walk from my house in southeast Denver, there are 4 black families, 3 Hispanic families, one Muslim family and two gay couples. There are at least 2 families with adult children living at home for financial reasons. All is peaceful.

Dave Bufalo
Licensed Professional engineer
Denver
303 337 3202



[Don't let HUD go back to making federal zoning policy](#)

The Denver Gazette
14 Dec 2020

Housing policy may seem like a dull subject, but this century has proven it is anything but. Just consider for a moment the importance of housing in your personal life — where you choose to or must live and the costs it entails. And then think of...

[read more...](#)

© 2003-2020 [PressReader Inc.](#) All rights reserved.

From: [MELISSA RUSS](#)
To: [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [dencec - City Council](#); [mayorsoffice@denver.gov](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Group Living Proposal
Date: Sunday, September 20, 2020 4:58:52 PM

Mr. Kashmann,

I appreciate you signing onto the guest commentary by Kendra Black and Amanda Sawyer published in the Denver Post on 9/16. I fully concur with this commentary as well as Lee Terry's. (See below) I find the group living advisory committee's proposals shortsighted and ill-timed now during the pandemic. And, it is preposterous for them to say that this will reduce homelessness and make housing more affordable. It will merely cram more people into houses and incentivize landlords a.k.a. slumlords to convert more rentals into high occupancy homes. The number of unrelated people (and their families) proposed to be allowed to occupy a house/townhouse is absurd and I submit will destroy the fabric of our fair city.

I urge you and the City Council to reject the proposal.



Melissa Russ
2753 S. Milwaukee St.

From: [NANCY YOUNG](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: Objection to Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 12:32:16 AM
Attachments: [Group Living Amendment comments from Land Use committee Sept 1, 2020.pdf](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: [NANCY YOUNG](#)
To: paul.kashmann@denvergov.org
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 5:30 PM
Subject: Objection to Group Living Amendment

Dear Paul,

I am writing to express my strongest objections to the Group Living Proposals. I have attended a public meeting in the spring and listened to the August online planning meeting. I have done research on the effects of the abolishment of single family housing in other US cities. I have made comments and signed petitions. I have read the comments of Council members as summarized in the attachment to this email. It is obvious there are many glaring problems with the proposal.

It is clear to me that the Planning Dept. is trying to force this through regardless of the will of the people of Denver. It begs the question as to what ulterior motives exist.

I would make the following general objections.

Denver is full of neighborhoods with varying characteristics. It does not make sense to try to apply a single code to the

entire city. We have districts because of those differences. Citizens in a particular location should have a say through a normal permit process for new uses to facilities in their vicinity. This is done for licensing pot shops, for example.

A small increase in the number of unrelated individuals in a residence can be considered. However, the total number of people, including dependents, has to be limited. I believe city code has a provision whereby a structure with more than 10 residents must have a fire sprinkler system installed. Problem - who is going to enforce this? In fact, who is going to enforce any of these new provisions. The planning dept. can not police this. It depends on neighbors snitching on their neighbors which is not very healthy.

The planning dept. ignores any potential problems or unforeseen circumstances arising from the amendment. For example, there is definitely a potential street parking and trash management issue arising from a significant increase in density on a single-family residential street. As the right of way is not their concern, the planning dept. simply states that the agency dealing with street parking/trash will deal this as and when the problem occurs. I believe if the planning dept. wants to change land use for the entire city of Denver, they have an obligation to consider all potential problems, liaising with all other departments to develop solutions before proposing the overall zoning changes.

Cities across the country are dealing with incredible problems and the City Councils have to reflect the wishes of the people. I believe it is incumbent on Denver to delay this blanket proposal. It should be broken into several different pieces to be considered after fuller input and research.

I would like to share my comments with all council members and the mayor if that would help their consideration.

Thank you,

Nancy Young
682 South York Street
Denver, CO 80209

From: [Kristi Sweeney](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [mayorsoffice@denvegov.org](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: REVISE the Group Living Proposal
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:04:24 PM

To:

District 1: Amanda P. Sandoval

District2: Kevin Flynn

District3: Jamie Torres

District 4: Kendra Black

District 5: Amanda Sawyer

District 6: Paul Kashmann

District 7: Jolon Clark

District 8: Christopher Herndon

District9: Candi CdeBaca

District 10: Chris Hinds

District 11: Stacie Gilmore

At Large:

Robin Kniech

Debbie Ortega

Mayor Michael Hancock

This is my second email to the Council. I think this Amendment must be rethought and revised because it will not benefit a majority of the residents of Denver. I am thinking of all of the neighborhoods in Denver, not just my own.

The current Group Living Amendment was pre-determined by the committee (most with conflicts of interest) at inception and it did not represent all Denver neighborhoods and districts. It will actually increase the total market driven rent for a home. The unintended consequence of this amendment, as it stands, will be exorbitant rents, too expensive for folks who want to rent a single family residence or for three or four people (like students or young or older singles) who want to share rent. It will create low quality of life and high density due to high rents. If the goal is lower rent for families, this is not the solution.

Consider this: If an owner of a single family residence is ready to sell, it will behoove him or her to consider, instead, the opportunity of renting it out to 5 to 10 unrelated people (depending upon the size) ----instead of selling it. This financial opportunity will occur to many who are ready to move. It will certainly occur to investors ready to buy single family properties at a discount. I imagine that the committee anticipates and hopes for this response as there are investors on the committee. If this Amendment passes, instead of just getting \$2,000 or \$3,000/ month rent for a single family home, the owner can rent to 5 to 10 unrelated people and collect (market driven) rent from each of them. Imagine being able to rent a 2600 square foot home to 10 people and charge each unrelated individual \$800.00, collecting \$8,000 per month or more. Rents for homes will double and triple and

will be unaffordable for families. This will not help families who will be forced to move out of Denver, or forced to live with multiple other families to afford housing in Denver. The quality of life will be diminished with this “experimental” proposal. Is this what our City Council representatives want to see happen? How does this help anyone?

Regarding the household size, I hope that the Council will consider a cap of 4 unrelated persons in any size home with an additional reasonable cap that includes minor children (but not unlimited # of family members).

Please do not pass an amendment that encourages third party investment in housing stock resulting in high rents and the decline and instability of neighborhoods. Consider, instead, an amendment that would recognize the positive aspects of Denver neighborhoods and would encourage housing stability, quality of life and affordability for families. If the amendment passes in it’s current form, it will be a sad day for Denver.

Kristi Sweeney
4034 S Niagara Way
Denver, CO 80237

#303-773-0200
kristis@sweeneyassoc.net

From: Kristi Sweeney

Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 5:54 PM

To: districtone@denvergov.org; Kevin.flynn@denvergov.org; Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org; Kendra.Black@denvergov.org; Paul.Kashmann@denvergov.org; Jolon.clark@denvergov.org; Christopher.Herndon@denvergov.org; District9@denvergov.org; Chris.Hinds@denvergov.org; Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org; kniechatlarge@denvergov.org; ortegaatl@denvergov.org; denc@denvergov.org; michael.hancock@denvergov.org; mayorsoffice@denvergov.org

Subject: REVISE the Group Living Proposal

To:

District 1: Amanda P. Sandoval

District2: Kevin Flynn

District3: Jamie Torres

District 4: Kendra Black

District 5: Amanda Sawyer

District 6: Paul Kashmann

District 7: Jolon Clark

District 8: Christopher Herndon

District9: Candi CdeBaca

District 10: Chris Hinds

District 11: Stacie Gilmore

At Large:

Robin Kniech

Debbie Ortega
Mayor Michael Hancock

Dear City Council Members and the Honorable Michael Hancock;

Please see my email below that was sent to Andrew Webb on 7/30/2020 regarding the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment proposal.

Besides the suggestions I have made below, I have 2 additional comments:

First, Why can't the residents of Denver vote on a final draft of a proposed amendment? The outcome will affect all of our lives, and yet, we are not able to vote on this. This is not Democratic.

Second, The Group Planning Committee did not fairly represent even a majority of the districts of the city and county of Denver. If they had represented all of the districts, I believe that the proposal would be more acceptable to the residents of more of the districts, including those with single family households. The planning committee seems to have decided on the proposal before they took feedback. It did not matter that the feedback was overwhelmingly negative. The residents' objections were not objectively considered, but, even so, the committee claims to have heard from the public and "compromised". This does not feel like Democracy.

Kristi Sweeney
4034 S Niagara Way
Denver, CO 80237

#303-773-0200
kristis@sweeneyassoc.net

From: Kristi Sweeney
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 5:34 PM
To: andrew.webb@denvergov.org
Subject: comments concerning the Group Living Proposal

To: Group Living Proposal Planning Committee
Attn: Andrew Webb
Date: 7/30/2020

While I understand that Denver needs to increase housing options, the committee has decided to do so by changing the zoning codes in the city to increase density. I have a concern that other options were apparently not considered (for instance, the opportunities presented by more numerous vacant shopping centers and vacant buildings). Considering the zoning changes as a solution, I think that a modified proposal that would still provide more options for housing, would be more acceptable to the single family residents of Denver. I am interested in preserving the residential diversity that we have in our great city. However, I share the concerns of many Denver residents that new zoning proposed may have difficult unintended consequences.

Here are some changes to consider that could be more acceptable:

1. Household size: Could you consider a maximum of 4 unrelated people plus their family members? 5 to 10 unrelated residents plus their family members in a typical single family home is overwhelming. People need space and (possibly less than) 200 square feet per person seems inadequate under any situation. I can see an investor looking for profits or even a non-profit on a budget now being able to pack in people without their permission or consideration for their wellbeing. Imagine seniors and people with developmental disabilities. It is also a recipe for neighborhood blight and I do not think anyone wants to see more blight created in Denver. It seems reasonable to change the zoning from 2 to 4 unrelated people plus their family members.
2. We have several small group homes in our neighborhood and low income housing in our community. Our Southeast Denver community is much more economically and racially diverse than it was only ten years ago which we enthusiastically welcome. Our neighborhood schools have children from many ethnicities and cultures and that is a wonderful thing. I support the very small residential care proposal, but I do not support community corrections or shelter in residential neighborhoods. When the cost of homes are high, that may not happen anyway, so by removing these types of housing from Very Small Residential Care, I do not think it will result in fewer possible locations for this housing need. Perhaps the numerous empty buildings and shopping centers could serve the temporary and transient needs of these populations. Unfortunately, due to Covid, it is possible that in the next year or two many retail stores will close their doors. These buildings should not remain empty when there is a need for residential facilities, shelters, halfway houses or rehab facilities.
3. I support the idea of adding new zone districts where residential facilities of any size, including community corrections and shelters are allowed. However, I am adverse to the proposal to have Small Residential Care in residential neighborhoods when they have 12000 square feet, or any size for that matter. A facility of this kind and size is a commercial endeavor and is not in character with residential neighborhoods. I do not think that would happen if the cost of a home in a neighborhood was too high, but I have concerns for homes in lower cost neighborhoods that happen to have a larger lot size. I am not only thinking of my neighborhood, but the flavor of Denver with lovely family neighborhoods that are available to people of many income levels.

Many Denverites with much at stake have expressed their objections and their fear to the proposed Group Living Proposal primarily because they felt that it is too extreme. They do not feel they will be considered. There are too many unknowns. How would the Group Living Proposal change their neighborhood? What are they being asked to sacrifice? The fear of unknown and trepidation about unwelcomed consequences makes it hard to accept the aggressive changes proposed. Hopefully, you will consider the more modest changes and ideas I have suggested so that we can meet the needs of those who are inadequately housed as well as the needs of the people who love Denver, love their neighborhood and their neighborhoods and would happily share them with new folks who want to be a part of their community. A compromise solution would help solve the issues, but make residents of Denver neighborhoods feel more comfortable.

Thank you,
Kristi Sweeney

From: [donna kirsch](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: NO TO GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE ADMENDMENT
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 9:42:51 AM

----- Original Message -----

From: donna kirsch <kirschd2@comcast.net>
To: "michael.hancock@denvergov.org" <michael.hancock@denvergov.org>
Date: 09/08/2020 9:26 AM
Subject: NO TO GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE ADMENDMENT

I may not be able to put in words how I feel about the GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT (GLAC) except to just say **NO**. I am not a racist, homophobic or radical I just want to live in peace, be safe walking the streets of my neighborhood where I've lived for the past 30+ years.

I do not want inmates, homeless, murderers, child abusers, sexual offenders, carjackers and kidnappers living next to me. These people are not GUESTS of Denver and have no right to CAMP on public property or in the parks my tax dollars pay for. These people leave trash (iv needles) and disease in their wake. Give these people jobs and stop supporting bad their behavior!!! If you're going to defund the police who will keep the people directly impacted by these types of living situations safe? Will you ask to have one of these facilities built next to your home??

Stop catering to outside interests who probably don't live in Denver and don't give a damn about Colorado. They will line their pockets with the blood sweat and tears that so many generations before us have spent and be on their way.

We in the impacted areas are the back bone of the city and if this passes those of you who vote in favor of it will be responsible for the further decline of our beautiful streets, parks, neighborhoods and way of life in Denver.

I have lived in Denver all my life and never imaged living anywhere else but this change will certainly make me move and take my "spending" with me.

Donna

From: [The PEETZ](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: No to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 7:04:30 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: The PEETZ <denverpeetz@msn.com>
Date: September 10, 2020 at 7:02:11 PM MDT
To: "michael.hancock@denvergov.org" <michael.hancock@denvergov.org>
Subject: **No to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment**

Dear Mr. Hancock:

I respectfully ask that you do not allow this zoning code amendment for Group Living to pass in our Denver neighborhoods. We have invested our entire adult lives in our current home/neighborhood. This neighborhood was zoned single family when we bought into it and due to safety, overcrowding, trash, parking, noise Concerns, urgently plead that the zoning not be changed.

Sent from my iPad

Sincerely
Anna Peetz
6541 W Linvale Pl
Denver, Co 80227

From: [Karen McGuire](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [District 9; kniechatlarge](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [ortegaatl@denvergov.org](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GL Amendment/ LUTI Comments
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 7:03:57 AM
Attachments: [GL Use Permit Review Presentation4 FINAL UPDATE.pptx](#)

Hello Andrew,

Below are my comments to LUTI regarding the Group Living Amendment: I am cc'ing Denver City Council members and the Mayor.

I thank you for the efforts you have made, though I must say in retrospect, after months of trying to find a middleground on this issue, that there are too many people behind this amendment with ***misplaced compassions***. You forget which people in Denver have the work ethic to sustain a beautiful Denver: I suspect a lot of them don't have hours this week, the end of Hanukkah and the week before Christmas during Covid, to voice their opinion on this issue.

1. I am submitting comments to LUTI but at this point do not even know what the UPDATED Amendment looks like. Comments are due December 16th and you are not providing Denver residents with the UPDATED Amendment until December 18th. This to me, if I were in your shoes, would be and is unconscionable.

How can Denver residents fully address what they can't even read? What are the details? Why such a short time frame? This speaks of deceit and fraud. You *pretend* to ask for comments on the proposed amendment; and then you don't provide the amendment. I would say this lack of public engagement and transparency is the theme throughout the entire GL Amendment process.

2. A perfect example of the fraudulence of Council Members in favor of this Amendment is captured in the December 1st LUTI meeting where Amanda Sandoval speaks favorably of the Independence House in her District 1. OK - it's been there a long time and some residents shovel snow - but Amanda Sandoval fails to disclose the number of Police Incidents happening at this Community Corrections Facility on a regular basis: more than one serious incident per week, involving on average 2 police cars. I personally reviewed Premise History Reports (i.e. police incidents) for Denver Community Corrections Facilities and provide this information in the attached PowerPoint which I have already shared with Councilwoman Kendra Black. Please see Slide 5 for this Facility.

Notably as well: the Denver Police Department was not part of the Group Living Advisory Committee.

3. Finally, you have intentionally mislead and under-informed Denver residents about

the impact of this Amendment on neighborhoods. Nevertheless, 90% - plus residents providing feedback to you have opposed it because of the overreach and the negative consequences. More unrelated adults per residence - which in moderation I support - does not justify all the changes you are trying to make or the flawed and unfair Zoning Amendment process for which you are responsible.

I urge the LUTI Committee to vote NO on the Group Living Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen McGuire
District 4
720-203-3611

From: [saleali](#)
To: mayorsoffice@denver.gov; [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC Amendment #7
Date: Friday, November 27, 2020 10:14:48 AM

Please vote NO on this amendment.

Thank you
Shirley Leali

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jeff Levine](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC Amendment
Date: Friday, November 20, 2020 1:46:30 PM

Vote no on GLAC Amendment

From: [E J Lorimer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC Updates
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 2:37:53 PM

Dear Andrew and City Council

The recent presentation left a bunch of question marks still for me.

Number of Unrelated

What is the recommended number of unrelated adults? Five still seems a bit too many. Four would be more acceptable given their minor children can also live there. Married people are related but I am concerned that cousins, aunts, uncles and others are included and think the description should be modified or if not, that household SF would determine a capped safe number per home unit.

Correction Communities

Thank you if true that correction communities are removed for SU and TU zoning. I'm sure there will be loop holes eventually, but the immediate impact has been lessened a bit.

We have a situation in our area - parolee home with about 10 men is located across the street from a public school and 1/2 block from a private pre-school. Why is there no buffer needed for schools - and yes, I recognize this is not a GLAC issue, but it needs to be on the radar.

Residential Care

How many total residential care units per capita? What is reasonable given parking concerns, traffic concerns, location near public transit (which has not yet been addressed in this plan at all)?

Council Members

Denver's public transit needs should be the priority v. new ways to densify without adequate transit in place first.

What are the policing reforms? Aren't those a priority too?

Why is GLAC being pushed when there are so many other true needs for this city?

Why has no homeless plan been put forth considering the tens of millions spent in the name of homeless. 5000 homeless and \$45 million thrown at it with no real changes and please do not blame COVID for all of this. Now, a homeless tax - where is the plan for its use???

From: [Gail Wheeler](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC
Date: Sunday, December 20, 2020 9:20:07 AM

I strongly oppose the plan. Please vote no.

684 S Oneida Way Denver 80224

Gail Wheeler
Coldwell Banker Devonshire
201 Columbine Street
Suite 200
Denver, CO 80206
License # FA40021750
Office License # EC100024099
303-726-7202

Sent From iPhone

From: [Jeff Aldrich](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Elaine Aldrich](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC
Date: Tuesday, December 29, 2020 4:59:53 PM

As a homeowner and resident of Winston Downs in the city limits of Denver I have read and oppose the new GLA as written. I request the city de-bundle the omnibus ordinance changes and consider the impacts on a community by community basis. As only 28% of Denver's neighborhood associations could find or approve small or single parts of the Amendment this piece of legislation does not have community support as written.

The city is to be commended with attempting to envision methods to increase affordable housing and reduce homelessness but the methods proposed by the Denver Planning Department have not succeeded in either achieving the vision nor obtaining community support. We deserve better than "just trying to get something done" and a plan that is designed to fail to get community support is failed plan.

Sincerely

Jeffrey Aldrich
462 S Magnolia St
Denver, CO

Sent from my iPhone

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal.

From: [Randy & Colleen Wells](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Home at 1055 N Locust #20i-00062
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 1:35:34 PM

greetings and salutation Sirs and Madams,

I am a concerned home owner and lucky to be in the Mayfair/ Montclair community and neighborhood.

A number of us will follow this unwelcomed change to the streets that we call home very closely and we ask for your support in the decisions ahead.

Application number is 20i-00062 (postcard reads 2021-00062)
The first hearing is sign POSTED as October 7 at 3pm, room 389
we hope you can help us when we get the facts

Thank you
Colleen Wells
1080 Locust rclwells@q.com

From: [Jody Nielsen](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2020 11:52:32 AM

I strongly oppose group living in Denver. my sister had one next to her and it was terrible. Broken windows and screaming a night long. Please No group living in our neighborhoods.

Sylvia Nielsen- SW Denver
Sent from my iPhone

From: devron@ecentral.com
To: [denc - City Council](#); [Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [kniechatlarge](#)
Cc: ["Bear Valley Improvement Assoc."](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Advisory Council - Code Changes
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2020 1:36:45 PM

Hello,

We have not been in favor of the proposed [code](#) change since we first heard about it last year. In spite of the 'homeless housing crisis', this approach would likely cause home valuations to plummet and will deteriorate stable communities at a cost to the long time established landowners. After reading the proposed changes summary, we are also appalled at this wording that would allow an unlimited people to live together:

Permit up to 5 unrelated adults and *any number* of relatives to each to live as a household in any dwelling unit (house, apartment, etc.).

Placing a community corrections facility within an established single family housing neighborhood is a very bad idea. We are totally against this concept and implementation. It seems that rather than follow TABOR rules and ask that taxpayers fund public facilities for the homeless and \ or corrections housing, the Council would rather circumvent established lawful, best practices without citizen approval and as a result create neighborhood decline and loss of property values.

Another serious concern is that of the increased number of on or off street parked vehicles that will accompany the influx of people with the traffic, congestion, crime and noise that will occur.

We urge that you reconsider making **any** code changes affecting\ allowing community corrections facilities within residential neighborhoods.

Additionally, we urge you to not make any group living rules changes at all or at least to ratchet back on the excessively high numbers of allowed inhabitants and to remove vague wording as that shown above.

Sincerely,
Ronald Messing
Devona Messing
2767 S Upham St
Denver, CO 80227-3566
District 2

From: bergerl@aol.com
To: [City Council District 5](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment # 7
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:05:14 AM

Dear Councilwoman Sawyer,

As my District 5 representative, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Denver Zoning Code as it presently reads. Denver is a large city with many diverse areas and neighborhoods and a one-size fits-all Zoning Code does not make sense. It may make sense to update the current code but it should be done with the unique & diverse neighborhoods in mind. As a longterm resident of the Hilltop area I value the peace, quiet, and safety of a neighborhood that is accessible to city services - restaurants, shopping & other commercial services but I do not want to live in the middle of them. If I wanted to live in a densely populated neighborhood, I would have chosen a home there, but I did not!! As a single woman, I value the safety and security that I enjoy in this neighborhood. I feel comfortable walking all over the neighborhood and our local parks and I want to see that preserved.

I also value the family-oriented character of my neighborhood. I don't care about the race, ethnic origin, gender preferences or sexual orientation of these relationships but only their interest in maintaining the character of Hilltop, including the pride of ownership in maintaining the property and property values. I do not see that interest displayed in areas of the city which are primarily rental units or shared housing. The landscape is frequently weed-infested and neglected as is the building exterior.

As has been pointed out in numerous articles and studies, similar zoning changes in other cities such as San Francisco, Seattle, Portland & Atlanta did not provide access to more affordable housing as planners had predicted but led to increased housing costs and an increase in the homeless population.

Please consider the needs and desires of your District constituents when making your decision.

Thank you,

Leona Berger
120 South Birch St
Denver, CO 80246

From: [DeAnna Mayes](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment - LISTEN TO YOUR CITIZENS
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 7:54:24 PM

I'm writing to voice my displeasure about the proposed Group Living Amendment and the manner in which it is being rushed through the approval process.

I'm particularly concerned that the City seems to be selectively choosing anecdotal information regarding crime statistics in order to refute concerns about crimes associated with corrections-based group living homes. Safe & Sound Denver paints a very different picture indicating crime is a likely a more significant issue than the City has disclosed. The truth is likely somewhere between those two positions and the City owes it to their citizens to carefully research and honestly present the facts.

I strongly suggest the City Council slow the process on such a major code revision and allow more research and community involvement. This is especially important as COVID protocols have had such a major impact on effective group meetings. It seems very reasonable, with the U.S. starting to turn the corner on COVID (hopefully) that greater and more effective community engagement will soon be possible.

Please slow down, research and listen to Denver's citizens on this very important matter.

DeAnna Mayes
93 S. Monroe St
Denver CO 80209

From: [mjermance](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: andrewwebb@denvergov.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment - NO to Community Correctional Facilities in Residential Areas!!!
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 4:46:02 PM

To Denver City Council Members:

Thank you for accepting input on the Group Living Amendment - Community Corrections.

Prison inmates still serving their sentence should NOT be scattered all over the residential areas of Denver. The attempt to foist this on neighborhoods because the city was irresponsible enough to terminate contracts with halfway house providers without any alternative plan in place, is shameful and makes clear the city's lack of respect and disregard for the safety of its law-abiding citizens, including its children and other vulnerable members of the community.

I urge you to completely remove correctional facilities from the residential care category of the proposed amendment!

Respectfully,
Mary Jermance
3860 W Union Ave
Denver, CO

From: [Patrick O'Toole](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment -- SLOW DOWN!
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 7:33:29 PM

I'm writing to voice my displeasure about the the proposed Group Living Amendment and the manner in which it is being rushed through the approval process.

I'm particularly concerned that the City seems to be selectively choosing anecdotal information regarding crime statistics in order to refute concerns about crimes associated with corrections-based group living homes. Safe & Sound Denver paints a very different picture indicating crime is a likely a more significant issue than the City has disclosed. The truth is likely somewhere between those two positions and the City owes it to their citizens to carefully research and honestly present the facts.

I strongly suggest the City Council slow the process on such a major code revision and allow more research and community involvement. This is especially important as COVID protocols have had such a major impact on effective group meetings. It seems very reasonable, with the U.S. starting to turn the corner on COVID (hopefully) that greater and more effective community engagement will soon be possible.

Please slow down, research and listen to Denver's citizens on this very important matter.

Patrick O'Toole
93 S Monroe St, Denver
peotoole@gmail.com
(303) 524-2412

From: [Dustin Gaspari](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [niki laceby](#); [john reilly](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment - Strong Opposition
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 7:50:59 AM

This amendment will only bring Denver closer to the unsustainable living conditions in cities such as Portland and San Francisco which have become unlivable due to poor policies and city management.

Me and my neighbors will vote against anyone who supports this terrible piece of legislation.

Dustin Gaspari
C: 214-212-8413
dustin@gaspari1.com

From: [lynne bruning](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment - vote NO
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 8:15:15 AM
Attachments: [CITY COUNCIL BRUNING GLA and PSH September 21 2020 copy-merged-compressed.pdf](#)

Dear City Council Clerk,

Please confirm receipt of this email to lynnebruning@gmail.com and distribute attached three page PDF to all City Council members.

Thank you for your assistance.

Wishing you a stellar week,

Lynne Bruning

720-272-0956

lynnebruning@gmail.com

From: [David Yates](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment #7 NO!!!
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 1:24:22 PM

I *strongly* oppose this amendment. Terrible idea

From: [Linda Moiseyev](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment #7
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 12:42:46 PM

I am vehemently opposed to this amendment.
Please put these Group Living facilities next to your own homes, NOT
MINE.

From: [chariscraven](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living amendment #7
Date: Saturday, September 26, 2020 2:26:53 PM

Please do not pass this. A very bad idea for the integrity of our neighborhoods. There has been little information sent to us so you are doing this without our informed consent.

I repeat we think this is a very bad idea.
Thank you for paying attention to a concerned citizen.
Charis Craven

From: [Mallory Sisler](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment #7
Date: Monday, September 28, 2020 5:36:28 PM

Hello,

I am concerned about my safety being at risk due to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7, namely the sober living homes for up to 40 people per home. I'm also concerned about the residential halfway houses for up to 40 convicted felons from all over Colorado.

As a young woman, I generally feel safe in my neighborhood, but still worry about being at risk.

Please consider this.

Respectfully,
Mallory Sisler

From: [Marlene Bunch](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 8:13:36 AM

As a long time Denver resident, I strongly encourage you to vote against this amendment to prevent further decline of our city & neighborhoods.

Marlene Bunch

Sent from my iPad

From: [Miguel Verano](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 6:52:42 PM

I am a resident of Bonnie Brae. I urge you to vote NO on the upcoming Group Living Amendment. Help us preserve the private, quiet quality of our neighborhood and those surrounding it.

Sincerely,
Miguel Verano

959 S Josephine St
Denver, CO 80209

Sent from my iPad

From: [Amie Jaynes](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment 7
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 3:20:53 PM

Hi,

My name is Amie Jaynes and I live with on the 200 block of S Corona Street in Denver with my husband, 3 year old, and 8 month old. I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the group living amendment 7 in our neighborhood. Our neighborhood is already overly congested with the 2 high rises that were built at the north end of S corona.

We strongly oppose group living zoning code amendment 7 and will definitely look into moving from the neighborhood if this passes. There are over 10 families on our street with small children and if this passes it would ruin our neighborhood and the family feel of the area that is close to Steel elementary, Byers, South high school to mention a few of the near by schools.

Our neighborhood has worked hard to get the city to change some of the traffic patterns on Alameda and Downing area as the already increased density of people in the area makes it a hazard to walk on the streets close to Alameda as well as several accidents in the area and close by Steel elementary. We don't need more people that aren't families living in the area to create more traffic and accidents.

We strongly vote against group living amendment 7!!

Thank you,
Amie

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Helen Glunz](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment coming to City Council
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 1:39:39 PM

I am very opposed to the amendment for Group Living that will soon be voted on by city council. It was done in a sneaky way by the city government and developers, businesses in that business already and others who would profit from this aggressive zoning change.

Leave these old neighborhoods alone with their zoning. They are filled with young families, young singles, old people who have struggled all their lives, very diverse population with many races, living styles, types of work.

You will destroy these old neighborhoods that have many poor and old people.

Use our resources on teaching people how to work at many jobs.

Good article in Sunday paper about teaching people to work in construction.

Sincerely,

Helen Glunz (long time resident of Southwest Denver, King Soopers B.V. area)

From: [Nancy Bell](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment objection for LUTI committee
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 2:06:29 PM

Please include this for the LUTI committee.

Everyone knows that 90% of the affected homeowners are against this rezoning effort known as Group Living. And yet, in spite of this, the city council pushes on.

You would not believe the time and anguish that we the constituents have had to invest and endure. I call it “self righteous indignation” on the part of city council and the GLAC. Just look at the GLAC membership and follow the dollars.

Instead of representing the taxpaying constituents, council wants to force this incredible overreach of government on each and every homeowner in the city - except those that are exempt (Chapter 59). And then they give themselves congratulatory pats on the back.

This whole process has been cloaked in secrecy, disinformation, a lack of information (Chapter 59), a lack of communication, a lack of reason... AND NO VOTE FOR THE CITIZENS.

We constituents are in the process of having to sue just to get the records of who and how this mess got started.

There are well over 200 people in the planning department who have nothing to do but plan. At some point it has to be planned to death. BUT NO! We plan by asking what is being done in Portland, Seattle and Minneapolis.

They don't want this in Montbello, Green Valley Ranch or Park Hill. Where do you think these halfway houses are going to popup. My guess is Montbello, Green Valley Ranch and Park Hill, not to mention Five Points. There goes your “North Star” to collaborative equity.

City Council's lack of constituent representation is exactly why Mary Beth Susman and Albrus Brooks were voted out of office.

Nancy Bell
Denver 80220

From: [Bryan Wilson](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [District 9](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [president@congressparkforall.org](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment SUPPORT for Increased Total & No bearing on Blood Relation
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 4:03:17 AM

Hello Members of Denver City Council,

I watched the presentation from Andrew Webb and the subsequent Q & A session. I would like to echo the sentiments of a few Council members, particularly CM CdeBaca & CM Kniech.

I too am concerned that we are still placing any consideration on Blood Relation. Should have no bearing on number of people permitted in the home. Nothing to stop people from simply lying and therefore isn't enforceable for fire code. Won't even get into the racial issues that could result.

I also don't think we are going far enough with the cap either. By stopping at a total of 4 or 5, we are essentially eliminating the opportunity to form co-ops or for the existing co-ops to become legal. Not to mention leaving a large amount of potential living space left unused. Instead of a fixed cap, why not consider the total bedrooms and therefore the total number of egress points in the unit. A legal bedroom has the door, which egresses into a common area and at least one window outside. I ask that you consider revision to permit any two adults, related or not, per bedroom in the unit.
Example: 3 bedroom would allow 6 adults.

This will be enforceable, as well as comply with fire code to my knowledge.

Not to mention, significantly increase the available housing in Denver.

Please recall the attached slide from the presentation. Our peer Cities all average fewer than three unrelated adults per household whether the cap was anywhere from 2 to 8.

I urge ALL of Denver City Council to please request the cap and any blood relation requirement from the amendment; instead considering something that is Equitable and Enforceable. My suggestion is to go with something like two adults per legal bedroom in the unit.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,
Bryan Wilson
Congress Park
District 10

From: [Beverly Goodwin](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living amendment#7
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 7:35:43 AM

Please vote NO on GroupLiving Zoning Code Amendment #7 to protect our neighborhoods and our property values.

Thank you,

Beverly Goodwin and family

Sent from my iPad

From: [Shawna Crocker](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 6:53:19 PM

I have lived in a university neighborhood in Denver since 1978 and I KNOW what the impact of too many people living together in one single family home, regardless of whether related or not. Besides the additional cars parked in the neighborhood, there can be additional challenges of civility and community care, house and yard upkeep, property values and more. It is not fair to those of us who have worked hard to obtain and maintain our homes in what was supposed to be single family zoning and neighborhood character to diminish our quality of life. Law enforcement already cannot or will not enforce the number of people allowed in one home, so I don't expect it to happen when there are far more people in the home. The fact that the 5 people (unrelated, and illegal as it's zoned for R1) living next to me could, under the new proposal, turn into an unlimited number of relatives moving in if each of the 5 invites their families is too overwhelming to me to imagine. I guess this native will have to leave as Colorado is no longer the state I used to love.

Shawna Crocker
Shawna.crocker@gmail.com

From: [GARY R MILLER](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 8:35:54 AM

Mr. Webb,

We remain against the plan to expand the number of unrelated individuals allowed to live in a single family residence in the City and County of Denver. While we can understand the need for affordable housing this does not seem a solution that is in the best interest of the residents of Denver. Most of our single family homes are not mansions with sufficient square footage to support more than two or three individuals, especially if their relatives would also be allowed to reside in the home too. We already have one of these homes in our neighborhood causing loud parties, appears drugs, neighbors report having seen weapons flashed, too many cars preventing them from parking in front of their own homes... In fact one neighbor reports they have advised their family/friends not to visit as they feel it is unsafe.

Expanding to 5 or 6 unrelated individuals AND their relatives, a number I've heard being considered, would stress the neighborhood with too many people, cars, trash, congestion...there would not be the pride of ownership and our city would deteriorate even more. We already have unkempt medians, on/off ramps, yards and homes.... Finally the increased density would be unsafe for our children to be playing outside. Why would anyone move to Denver if Denver doesn't care about their city and neighborhoods?

Enforcement today is non-existent at current limits so we have no expectation that would change, only that crime would increase and the city would further deteriorate. Denver would become a 2nd or 3rd class city. The fact that other cities have increased their capacity limits doesn't make it a solution for Denver.

Why is this not being put to a vote by ALL the residents of Denver? IF a change is made without a resident vote it should apply to ALL NEIGHBORHOODS in Denver with NO EXCEPTIONS.

Thank you,
Linda and Gary Miller
48 year residents of Denver

From: [Joan A. Baronberg](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [denc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [City Council District 5](#); DeGette@mail.house.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 3:04:23 PM

Dear elected representative,
Since you are elected to represent “the people”, please note that I am one of the people—I vote; I pay taxes and have paid taxes here for over 40 yrs.; I live in a healthy residential area which I help to keep healthy, safe, and attractive so that even non-residents can benefit by it; I keep my property clean and respectable; I require a minimum of city services as I shovel snow, sweep my area, do not speed, do not need narcotics-evasion programs and other so called “compassionate” human services; and I help to make Denver a fairly prosperous and fairly safe, and fairly good place to live.

Please do not wreck our healthy neighborhoods.
You may speak your minds under the heading and claim of being “compassionate,” but as a taxpayer, I urge you turn also to principles of economics. Look at what you have done to downtown Denver and the civic center area; do you think that will attract new companies and new jobs and new taxpayers?
Being compassionate can be translated into helping support a safe, clean city. Being compassionate and effective may mean keeping our parks and recreation facilities available and funded well enough by people who **pay taxes**. Actually, my guess is we pay your salaries too, even when some of you do not protect city principles or even city regulations.

As a taxpayer and voter, I will support people who help to reinforce safe neighborhoods rather than disperse unsafe people (egs., installing half-way houses and ex-prison inmates and social service cases into current healthy neighborhoods) to our neighborhoods.

Please remember too that Denver’s history includes “flight to the suburbs” years. Why did that happen? Please respond to me and tell me Why that happened and WHAT you are doing and intend to do to ensure that does not reoccur.

The current proposed Group Living Amendment needs to be tossed into oblivion and not waste anyone’s time any further.

Allowing tent cities to flourish and expand has already diminished safety and culture in our city; spend your time moving those people to supported public housing and job training or if that doesn’t work for you, send them off to California where they might have migrated anyway or invite them to live at the Governor’s residence or the Mayor’s residence.

So-called “homeless people” are often not homeless at all. Find that out and see if they want job training or mental health help; but don’t reinforce their negative behaviors and don’t put them in my neighborhood where children will be unsafe due to their presence.

Let’s reward good behavior rather than allowing tent cities and proposing programs to relocate miscreants into currently functioning Denver neighborhoods.

We have enough other problems to attend to in this era of Covid-19.

Please note that I expect an email response.

Thank you,

Joan A. Baronberg

Denver, CO

joanyaffa@gmail.com

From: [Nick Pelliccia](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 11:58:48 AM

Hello,

I am writing (as I have already done to Councilwomen At-large Kniench, Ortega, and Sandoval) to once again voice my opposition to the proposed Group Living Amendment. I speak for myself and others when I say we emphatically do not want this in our neighborhoods.

To date I have received either no response, or blanket-form responses that avoid the direct concerns with this proposal.

Please listen to the people who live in the neighborhoods impacted by this proposal and those like myself who may be impacted by it in the future. Those of us who have worked so hard to "buy-in" to the extremely expensive Denver housing market don't want to have that investment ruined or have to move our families (and dollars) out of Denver.

Regards,
Nick Pelliccia

From: [Cindy Shearer](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 12:12:15 PM

I am writing to you as a citizen in District 6. I have been deeply distressed by the drafts of the Group Living Amendment and the rush to push it to a final vote. Today I received emails saying final comments were due by December 16 but the final draft would not be available until the 18th with the final vote to occur December 22. This process reminds me of a story of my own experience many years ago. I was on the phone with a car salesman trying to price vehicles I was interested in buying. He said he would tell me the price if I committed to buy the car first. How ridiculous, right! Asking for comments prior to seeing the final draft is equally as ridiculous!

I have been following the meetings and have been encouraged by some of the proposed changes but am not certain at all that I have a good grasp on what the final amendment will look like. The proposals to eliminate half-way housing in residential areas, to reduce the areas allowing other group housing, and to reduce the number of unrelated parties allowed in one residential unit are all going in the right direction. They are proposals, however! What does the final look like? What is the final distancing between group housing. What is the final number of unrelated persons in a residence? Are an unlimited number of related persons allowed or is there a limit? Is there money allocated for enforcement and increased services?

I sincerely hope you can extend the time for the final vote and allow comments to be submitted after the public can review the final draft.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cindy Shearer
chshearer1@gmail.com

From: [Juan Gutierrez](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 9:26:30 AM

As a Denver resident I am appalled at the amount of secrecy the city is participating in when it comes to this issue. I am personally opposed to the current proposal and the process it has taken. I believe that if moved forward in its current stage, it will cause irreversible damage to our city and the communities where we live and you serve.

Juan Gutierrez
285 South Fairfax St.
Denver, CO 80246

From: [Ronald Brown](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 8:21:45 AM

PLease do not pass the group living amendment. There are more negative than positives about this proposal. Thank you Dr. Ronald Brown

From: [DiscoverTheSelf](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:05:11 PM

Vote NO!. How else can I say it?
Do I have a vote, or do you know best?

David Hoefer 2836 S Joslin Ct, Denver, Co 80227

From: [DiscoverTheSelf](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 11:24:12 AM

My name is David Hoefer. I'm a resident of Bear Valley
Please vote NO! on the group living amendment.

From: [DiscoverTheSelf](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 12:47:34 PM

Dear Council Member,

You were elected to represent the constituents, not developers.
No one I know of in Bear Valley wants group living units in this neighborhood.
Please stop this action now.

David Hoefer
S Joslin Ct
80227

2836
Denver, Co

From: [Christine Verano](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Miguel Verano](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] group living amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 12:47:50 PM

I am a resident of the Bonnie Brae neighborhood. I urge you to vote NO on the upcoming group living amendment. Help us preserve the private, quiet quality of our neighborhood and those surrounding.

Sincerely,

Christine Verano

959 S Josephine St

Denver, CO 80209

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Connie Larkin](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 1:31:02 PM

Hello Mr. Webb,

I only moved to Denver 7+ years ago from upstate NY. My entire career was based in commercial real estate. I find it interesting that zoning gets changed but I hear very little verbiage about health,safety, and fire issues that are being addressed.

A common description in NY would be a group home or rooming house, but with that there are regulations as to fire code and health and safety (how many persons to a bathroom/kitchen) - this type of use would need to be in a commercial zone. Just because you can put people in a space that is 300+ sf or whatever number, there would be additional health and safety issues that would be added to that zone.

I just think back to that big fire in FL at the nightclub where all the doors to exit were locked. Everyone pointed fingers at everyone else as to who's fault it was, who should have known. Many individuals lost their lives. The communities I did business in in NY would not allow structures over 2 stories to be inhabited. An exterior fire escape from that floor had to be added if the floor was going to be used for anything more than storage. I rarely see fire escapes for 3rd floor living structures here in Denver. I understand people want change but don't be so quick to make change without thinking the whole process through for the habitants that will be living in these structures (it could be one of your family members.)

Let's say you are in a residential neighborhood within a 3 story structure - more than likely no elevator, your typical stairwell - not a fire rated area which you would find in a commercial structure. Each person in the home occupies "X" square feet - with no depiction of it having to be a legal conforming bedroom (having a window & closet if upstairs, if below grade needs a legal window well). My home has 3 bedrooms yet you could put 5 unrelated parties in one structure and if some are family it could be even more.

How many bathrooms does the structure have? Is there only one common kitchen? Will this group home have annual fire inspections to ensure all would be safe should there be a fire. Usually fire chiefs are looking at furniture that blocks egress in case of a fire - this is necessary. Then what about the ADA compliance. What if an older or less able person who doesn't get up and down stairs easily is on an upper or lower floor (this is where most if not all the bedrooms are) how will they be impacted?

Personally I think you need to keep people safe and have more regulation about the standard condition of the structure. This is why it might be better to keep the group homes in a commercial zone where many regulations have already been created. Many homes in Denver within the one or two family designations are just not suitable for group living.

Respectfully,

Connie Larkin
104 S Monroe St
Denver, CO 80209

From: [Cherry Creek East Association](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Cc: [Chris Ward](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Amendment: No Longer Equitable
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 9:15:40 PM

When the LUTI group first proposed the GLA, it was presented as an equitable solution across all Denver neighborhoods. That made sense because past practice was not equitable.

However, under pressure LUTI has removed residential care corrections facilities from single family, duplex and RH 2.5 zones. So it is no longer an equity based amendment.

We respectfully request that RH 3 zoned areas also be excluded from the amendment. There is little distinction between RH 2.5 and RH 3 zoning.

The alternative is to return the amendment to its original intent i.e. corrections facilities, etc. allowed across all Denver zones.

Bill Tanner

From: [Gail Bell](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Changes
Date: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 9:52:46 PM

To: Councilwoman Stacie Gilmore and Andrew Webb

At the Zoom meeting with the Montbello neighborhood, I asked the question why was this process being rushed through in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic when people are struggling to deal with survival, and enormous sadness. There has been little to no coverage of these suggested changes in the local news media, and virtually no transparency to the public. The only reason that I know about this is because I am a volunteer on Councilwoman Gilmore's Community Cabinet. I was included in the email about the Montbello Zoom call a number of weeks ago. I live in Fairway Villas in GVR, and the GVR area is just finding out about this issue on December 3.

I am, once again, requesting that both the Denver City Council, and the Denver Planning Board immediately put this very important and consequential issue on hold until we, the people, get through this horrendous pandemic, and then have an opportunity to actually carefully review and contemplate the consequences of these pending changes to our home ownership situations, and to provide informed and enlightened comments. We, the people, deserve nothing less!

In my estimation, you are rushing through this process at a time when people are just trying to survive. That is unconscionable, and it is undemocratic.

Gail Bell
Denver, CO

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Anne Waage](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [keivn.flynn@denvergov.org](#); [Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Kyle, Polly A. - CC Senior City Council Aide At Large](#); [Lowell, Christopher - CC City Council Aide At Large](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - CC Member At Large Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [mountbross@yahoo.com](#); [rjsaiz05@gmail.com](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Code Admendment
Date: Monday, August 10, 2020 3:07:09 PM

All -

The proposed changes to the Group Living Code are extremely concerning to me and my family as long-time home owners in the Bear Valley community. We urge you to drop the proposed code changes and come up with a community-friendly option that does not negatively impact the core attributes of an established neighborhood.

Our Bear Valley neighborhood is currently a quiet/peaceful, well-kept and cared for, family oriented, working-class neighborhood. Adding Group Facilities to the neighborhood, such as, homeless shelters, community corrections, etc. would change that neighborhood model which we choose when purchasing our home.

Changing code that could allow up to 40 people in a "facility" placed in the center of single family dwellings would hugely impact the quality of life for the single family dwelling owners. I would be devastated to have a facility placed next to my home. The magnitude of negative impact on the single dwelling home families would be immeasurable. Here are just a few of the impacts that would occur even in a small group home situation.

- The accompanying noise of having more than a single family living next to us would be deafening. One of the reasons we bought in this neighborhood was to have some space around us and to not be assaulted with excess noise.
- The additional parking needed and increased traffic flow from group home members, suppliers, visitors, personnel, etc. would be constant and unacceptable. The bigger the facility, the greater the negative impact to the surrounding single family dwelling home owners.
- Increased potential for people coming into our neighborhood who use drugs, have criminal records, etc. We work hard to keep our neighborhood as safe place to live and want to feel secure in our home.

We purchased our home in Bear Valley to be able to enjoy the suburban lifestyle. We did not want to live in a high density neighborhood and more than strongly OPPOSE the proposed code changes.

As mentioned earlier, let's find a solution that doesn't harm existing home owners but provides needed facilities for rehabilitation, homelessness, etc.

Regards,
- Anne Waage

From: [I](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [Laura Aldrete](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Disasters in Montbello
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 12:55:52 PM

Mayor Hancock and City Council Members,

I am taking time to express my feelings about the last Montbello Town Hall regarding proposed Group Living changes. I want to be as respectful as I can in saying this, but I was very disheartened to see how one sided this town hall really was. First of all Councilwoman Gilmore, I know it may represent your personal connection to your family's future regarding affordable housing, but I felt that your comments were very inappropriate for this meeting. What about the voices of all the other residents of Montbello that you were elected by and to represent? The questions were so contrived and staged, that it really made me feel very disgusted to even be a part of such a slap in the face session.

As a privileged white member of the Montbello community for over 25 years, I have been very repulsed and disgusted at the meetings that I have attended, where I have observed the blatant lack of respect, and berating comments toward the Senior Black Members of the Montbello Community! These members have been active participants in this community for almost fifty years, since the planned inception of Montbello, one of the original suburban developments devoted to the Black population of Denver. You asked for, and community members have attempted to make their voices heard, but like in the last meeting, one Montbello member spoke up, but was rudely shut down with, Oh, we need to move on! How is this reckless and blatant disregard for the long time Senior Black members of the Montbello community, not a form of reverse discrimination. WOW, Black and Senior Citizen constitutes two minority groups in my grounded understanding and perspective! But alas what do I know, since I am just a concerned community member trying to get my voice heard like so many others! You asked that concerned members speak up, but only if it fits your and Mayor Hancock's agenda! Place yourself in their/our positions, and step back and start listening to Montbello and ALL of Denver Residents, the community members who put you and all of City Council into office to represent our interests, not the interests of outside special groups and agendas.

I think Mayor Hancock and all of Denver City Council needs a reality check! First of all, you work for us, we don't work for you! You were elected to represent ALL of Denver, not just a few who have their own agendas. Secondly, if this proposal was so important, WHY WAS IT NOT PLACED ON THE BALLOT THIS YEAR? If pit bulls can garner space on the ballot, why was something as important as these far reaching changes not given room on the election year ballot? It should not be up to just a few, Mayor Hancock and City Council, to make changes that will negatively affect our quality of life, safety, and property values! Thirdly, we come to the very important issue of enforcement. I have reported over 250 violations, did you get that, over 250 violations to code enforcement in the last two months. Maybe we should be looking at revising the code violation policy of only thirty days into maybe a year for

open cases, since enforcement is a complete FAILURE here in Montbello. Residents know the game and refuse to RESPECT their NEIGHBORS and OUR COMMUNITY! Really, if enforcement was working the way it was intended to, we would not have so many violations to address. But again what do I know, since I am just a privileged white member of the Montbello community!

In these meetings, we have been promised our own code enforcement officer for the past two plus years, but it never happens. What is the common theme in these meetings regarding enforcement? In its current state, IT DOES NOT WORK! Please listen to their/our voices. Most of them, as concerned residents have to take a stand and shut down these violations with their own personal fight. Why are we not being represented or taken seriously, when it comes to code enforcement and the violations? Fourthly, how did the failures of Mayor Hancock, City Council, and City Government Officials inability to address the affordable housing problem, and now crisis, become PUNISHMENT for all of us tax paying citizens? All of you were elected to address these concerns, but why are Denver Residents being made to suffer because of YOUR failures? The proposed Group Living changes are really unethical if you think about it. How are elected officials given so much abuse of power and control to negatively impact our standards of living and quality of life? Who is representing my voice and all other Denver homeowner's voices and rights in this process?

I can go down the path of how devastating the passage of these unethical changes will be to all areas of Denver, but will my and other concerned voices be heard? Probably not! The message we are given is SHUT UP and GO AWAY! I reported a house on Wheeling Street that is full of Cholo Mexican gang members who fired over forty (40) rounds and hit four (4) people in two separate incidents the end of May and first part of June. I found one of the spent bullets in the middle of my driveway. I even had a nice conversation with Chief of Police Pazen about this incident. So are group homes that congregate this type of violence okay? These changes will not only allow these upstanding and reputable residents a place to live, but foster and promote even more homes full of gang members, parolees, offenders, etc. Also, I find it very intriguing that this violent crime spree garnered no media attention. Maybe it has to do with Mayor Hancock's old neighborhood and the suppression of any negative publicity that might contradict this agenda?

Let me share another example of why Code Enforcement does not work. Finally, after over eight months of reporting a rental house, (yes slumlords abound here in Montbello), illegally selling food out of the residence on my block in the middle of the worst pandemic since 1918, (nobody wearing masks), and by the way has twelve to fifteen residents, two weeks ago Denver Police showed up, after I threatened to call the Colorado State Health Department and also included Chief Pazen on my email response to our community resource officer. Did I did mention earlier, how well reporting this to code enforcement worked! It takes concerned neighbors who are willing to take a stand and fight their own fight to make sure neighborhood issues get resolved, and not rely upon Code Enforcement and laws in their current state!

Noise violations and crowded parties are off the charts also. I called the non-emergency number for a noisy party at a house on Worchester Street back in

October. There was a huge crowd of partiers where nobody was wearing a mask and the loud music played until almost 2 a.m. Why do the same rules and restrictions not apply to all of us in the middle of this pandemic? But alas, when we have a mayor who tells us not to travel for Thanksgiving, but takes it upon himself to violate the same rules and guidelines that he himself put in place, no wonder we have the out of control craziness going on here in the Montbello Community.

Leaders are elected to lead by example, not apologize after the fact, just because they got caught!

Trash is also already an issue. Just drive down and look at the trash in the drainage canals off Andrews and 51st Streets. It was nice that you secured grant monies to paint the canal next to Andrews and Peoria, but did you really take time to stop and see how much trash and pollution it holds at the bottom? It is reprehensible!

Both on and off street parking violations are already off the charts. Vehicles that are never moved remain on the street for months and years with flat tires, abandoned, junk, crashed and wrecked cars that Right of Way ignores; weeds as high as the vehicle and trash accumulates around them since street sweeping can't do their job; parked too close to stop signs and crosswalks; parked on unpaved surfaces; front yards poured with full concrete driveways (code violations that never get addressed) which include as many as ten cars parked in front of the residence (sold and resold in violation of code by realtors who could care less, other than making a profit); street sweeping inability to clean the paved street surfaces due to so many vehicles on the street; horse trailers and fifth wheel trailers, boats, jet skis, other recreational vehicles parked on dirt in front yards; commercial vehicles and trailers that litter the street like the weeds and trash that accumulates around them. Why are we wasting taxpayer dollars on street sweeping and no right of way enforcement, when there are so many vehicles illegally parked around the home that street sweeping is unable to efficiently and effectively clean the street?

I challenge all of you to visit the Montbello community in person! Mayor Hancock is aware of these problems and has seen them first hand, but nothing seems to get addressed. Mr. Webb has also commented in prior meetings about the CHALLENGES going on in the Montbello Community. How would you even know the concerns of community members, if you are not open to hear their concerns, do an in person visit, nor live in that community? It used to be a requirement that you must live in the City and County of Denver to be employed by the city. This was brought up in one meeting by a senior member of the Montbello community, but it just fell on deaf ears!

Maybe if you admit there is a problem, then you take ownership of it, then you have to address it, and that would require leadership and integrity!

Montbello is a living, breathing microcosm of group living and code enforcement failures! When you run any neighborhood into the ground and increase population density, what envelops that community is more crime, more violence, more gang shootings, more drugs, more despair for the residents who live in that neighborhood!

I could go on and on since the violations are so out of control! As a member of the Montbello Community, I am very saddened to see the degradation of this once beautiful community, and how the homes and community are being so unjustly disrespected. Montbello has some of the best Perl Mack built homes in all of Denver, and shame on Mayor Hancock and City Council for even considering such an unethical proposal that will only destroy what little sense of community and quality of life that we and other parts of Denver have left!

But alas, what do I know, since I am just a concerned member of the Montbello community trying to get my voice HEARD, along with so many others!

With Great Concern and Trepidation,

Rod Carr
Orlando Boatner
25 Year Residents of Montbello
Fighting for Our Voices to be Heard and Standing Up for Our Rights as Concerned Homeowners!

From: [Gail Lane](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Plans for Denver
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2020 1:00:50 PM

Dear Mayor Hancock,

This provides input to the Group Living Plans currently under consideration.

I am not one to say “not in my backyard”, especially now because I can see that homelessness is likely to explode, given the pandemic and the terrible mismanagement of it from a federal level. Likewise, the entire idea of community corrections is to rehabilitate people who need an opportunity to rebuild their lives outside of prison. In both cases, I can understand why a Group Living strategy is needed.

What I ask as the city moves forward is to utilize current properties that are not embedded into the heart of neighborhoods, rather are built on the perimeters and adjacent to existing neighborhoods. My property is in Southwest Denver between Wadsworth and Sheridan. All our existing homes are single family and there are a few duplexes. But there are many properties along the main streets that could serve group living, providing residential settings for those in need but not disrupting the interior of the neighborhood. Yale, between Sheridan and Wadsworth is one avenue I could see serving this purpose and there are several stretches along Sheridan that would greatly benefit from higher density rebuilding. We’ve heard a great deal of talk about revising the entire area between Evans and Jewell it’s such an eyesore now. Why not build higher density housing in that area? It would accommodate a very large scale apartment community.

If planners move ahead to just let group living operators establish anywhere throughout neighborhoods, please, please, please restrict group living facilities to no more than one every several blocks. And don’t allow them to be built where parking will become a huge problem...example, across the street from a school. We live near JFK HS and street parking is nonexistent during school activities.

As for liability, group living properties must be responsible for the behaviors of their clients. There should be clear actions and recourse neighbors can take should group living residences or residents cause harm (property or societal). In addition to extensive insurance requirements of group living owners, the city should also have funds established to compensate other property owners for harm or violation to them or their properties.

I pray that you will make the right decision for those of us who bought homes intentionally in a quiet, suburban setting, while also building the needed housing for group living.

Please renovate and build out the urban blight areas before considering disturbing quiet inner neighborhoods.

Rita Lane

From: [Travis Heath](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Proposal Update
Date: Saturday, December 12, 2020 11:29:50 PM

Denver City Council,

After reviewing the information from the December 8th Group Living Town Hall, I must reiterate that I am against this proposal, which continues to not solve the issues it proposes to, creates too many issues for those who own property and live in Denver, and just is not right for our city. It is clear that a number of changes were listed, but I remain opposed.

Travis Heath

From: mahannigan@netzero.net
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [kniechatlarge](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Proposal
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2020 6:10:17 PM
Attachments: [Group Living Proposal.docx](#)

Hello,

Please see attached letter concerning the proposed Group Living.

Best Regards,
Michelle Hannigan
303-986-1762

From: [Dave Kenny](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: planning.board2@denvergov.org; [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living proposal
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 7:39:21 AM

Please include my name as
OPPOSED TO THE GROUP LIVING PROPOSALS being presented to the City Council.

I am disheartened by the chastising over race and redlining history that has become a primary focus for proposed changes. And by the lack of transparency of this committee that failed to bring this to the citizens of Denver until it served them.

David Kenny

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Tessa Goldhamer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Ortega, Deborah L. - CC Member At Large Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Mayorsoffice](#); [City Council District 5](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Proposal
Date: Monday, August 10, 2020 2:05:52 PM

I oppose the Group Living Zoning change being considered by the City of Denver.

I have lived in Denver for over 50 years; prior to that, I lived in Littleton. I treasure Denver's beauty and relative calm. Its residential neighborhoods provide a respite from the stresses of daily living and the commotion of the business areas. I understand why Denver has become such a major attractor of new residents however the City should not allow the influx of new residents to destroy the residential neighborhoods of Denver., an essential characteristic of the city. The proposed Group Living Zoning changes would lead to that destruction. I have personally seen homes that are occupied by 5 or more unrelated individuals that have deteriorated and are negatively impacting the neighborhood. These residents are allowing the exterior and yard to deteriorate, trash is littering the yards, and residents are sleeping on porches.

The proposal to allow more than 2 unrelated persons to occupy a residence has morphed into a draconian overhaul of zoning that could disrupt neighborhoods and destroy the very things that make Denver a desirable place to live. The changes could cause real disharmony among neighbors as too many people crowd into small accommodations. Homeowners associations will be triggered to enforce covenants to protect neighborhood peace.

The current 2 unrelated person limit is being cited as a reason for the Code modification but the proposal takes off from there to fundamentally change the Zoning Code. The entire overreaching Code change effort should be rejected. Legitimate areas of needed change should be examining one by one and appropriate adjustments made.

Historically a major purpose of early zoning efforts was to deal with the health and sanitation problems that arose in densely populated areas. In the current pandemic situation, we have seen vivid depictions of the perils of density. Don't destroy Denver by creating a vehicle for unregulated density. Please vote no on the overreaching proposal. If there is a need to address issues, do it in a focused way and in a manner that safeguards neighborhoods such as renewable licenses. Home occupancy could be loosened but still reasonably limited by bathroom, parking, and reasonable square footage per occupant ratios applied to ALL the occupants present. The addition of relatives should not be an opening for unlimited occupancy.

The whole Group Living proposal needs to be rejected; the issues it attempts to address should be addressed individually and incrementally and responsively to neighborhoods.

Thank you for considering these comments,
T Goldhamer

From: [Laurie Boyle](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living proposal
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 9:46:13 AM

Good morning,,

Please note that we remain 110% opposed to Denver's group living proposal. We feel that our concerns continue to not be heard by the Denver City Council.

4-6 unrelated people and unlimited relatives in one home is not a viable solution for the city of Denver. This is nothing but a terrible idea. If you have 8 individuals in a home and they each have a car - where would they park all of their vehicles? In the middle of their yard? Trash services for group homes would result in trash all over our beautiful Denver neighborhoods. Noise, traffic, safety and city infrastructure are all unaddressed issues.. It is unfair for true single family homes incur the infrastructure costs to support group living homes.. This plan does not appear to be well thought out as this would seriously damage the value of our Denver homes. We are disappointed this idea is still being pushed onto our community as it is clear that our community does not support the Group Living project. By commercializing our homes please explain to me how is the city supporting the interests of neighborhood residents? We the voters who remain not being listened to. Please tell us the plan to accommodate parking, trash, infrastructure and protect home values?

Rather than changing zoning of existing homes, have you given any thought of new developments? What about the possibility of developing the land near DIA/Pena Boulevard and zone this area for group living? This location has mass transit, jobs and it can be built to accommodate the needs of the tenants.

While we oppose this matter we are hopeful the city can find a win-win solution for every Denver city resident on this matter.

Denver can do better!

Thank you,

Laurie and Randy Boyle

From: [Aaron Schultz](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living proposal
Date: Saturday, December 5, 2020 11:47:06 AM

To whom it may concern,

To afford the average home in Denver, one must earn twice the average income. This situation is not improving, and every proposal is watered down to satisfy the 'investment' of homeowners who have seen their home values increase exponentially.

Three quarters of Denver is zoned for single family, and is only intended to absorb 20% of increase in population by 2040. Many of these neighborhoods are still changing, with modest homes close to the best schools, parks, and transit being scrapped for larger and more expensive homes.

The cap on the number of individuals that can live in any home, and the limitation of where certain groups can live, only further insulates the richest Denverites from the massive problems facing our community. The wealthy who live in neighborhoods that don't have transient villages, where infrastructure isn't a problem, and where there will never be "affordable housing" forcing them to mix with anyone outside their social class.

This multi-year process being described as rushed, when the proposal has been watered down to a shadow of its former self in just a few months of an unprecedented pandemic and global recession, makes me truly sad. It's a dereliction of duty by elected and appointed officials, and another example of a well-intentioned initiative to address housing inequality that falls so far short of its potential.

I was born in Denver, but will likely never be able to afford to live here - even as I actively look for homes that grow increasingly out of my price range. I love this city, but less and less each day. It, like the Boulders and San Franciscos, continues to try to protect its "character" by pushing out anyone without a 6 or 7 figure income. As a median-wage earner, I shouldn't have to fight so hard to find a basic place to live.

The watered down proposal will probably pass - if not watered down further - and speaks volumes about our city's unwillingness to address massive inequality out of perceived fear of a more equal system. I continue to be dismayed, though should cease to be surprised.

Thank you,
Aaron Schultz
6 N Broadway
Denver, CO 80203

From: [Pamela Staeck](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zone Code
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 9:27:49 AM

I would like to urge the City Council not to allow this, please DO NOT VOTE for this. The Indian Creek subdivision does want the negativity this will create for our neighborhood. The safety concerns, it will lower property values, increase of traffic and noise....the trash the homeless leave behind, because they don't care!

I urge you to find another solution, PLEASE!!

Pamela Staeck

From: [Dr. Karen Betstadt, SOS, Inc.](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning #7
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 10:22:12 AM

As an older homeowner I am quite disturbed that in my already dense area of Wash Park that I may be living in the midst of noise and cluster in my single housing neighborhood. We need to figure out a more reasonable solutions and adequate housing alternatives than making our neighborhoods crowded with rotating strangers and the loss of safety that that engenders for those of us who had worked very hard to have a quiet spot in our wonderful city.

Thank you for your attention,
Karen Betstadt

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Elizabeth MacDonald](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 5:24:29 PM

Please vote no. I live alone and am a disabled senior. Denver has been my home for 42.5 years. I'm too old to move. The zoning amendment scares me. I feel we citizens have been lied to. Please think long and hard about upsetting our nice neighborhoods. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [shannon sauro](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Amendment
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 8:31:17 AM

Dear Mayor Hancock and Council Members,

I am a 4th generation Coloradoan, growing up in Jefferson County, attending CSU, and then owning a home in the city and county of Denver for the past 20 years. My grandparents met at the dance hall at Elitch's, Denver is like a member of my family.

I am writing to express my opposition for the Group Living Zoning Amendment #7. Although your intentions may be good, this amendment will destroy this beautiful and vibrant city at the base of the Rocky Mountains.

New York City's Upper West Side is a great example of this destruction. My sister was a resident of the Upper West Side in NYC just before that Mayor DeBlasio and the City Council instituted this type of zoning change. If you've not been to the upper west side prior to 2017, it was filled with a diverse selection of restaurants, cafes and shops being frequented by families of all racial backgrounds. After the zoning change, many older hotels were converted to house the homeless, and those recently released from prison. Overnight the streets went from clean, quiet and safe to a dumping ground for the most undesirable urban elements (i.e. human feces, discarded drug paraphernalia, sex acts being performed out in the open by drugged out zombies). To see these results for yourself, check out the Facebook page "Upper West Siders for Safer Streets".

Property values in the Upper West side have dropped 50%. That will be Denver in less than 2 years. You, as the Mayor of Denver together with the City Council members will leave a legacy of orchestrating the death of this great city. My husband and I will make arrangements sell our home and move our three children to a county outside of Denver County.

If the goal is to turn the city into the next Upper West Side or Seattle or Portland, just tell us, at least then, we'll be prepared for the coming death of a family member.

Sincerely,
Shannon Sauro

From: [Gail Bell](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living zoning changes
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 2:37:18 PM

How will the City and County of Denver enforce the new zoning code violations when you obviously have been totally inept in enforcing the current zoning violations for years?

Also, there has been little to no transparency or information to the public about this issue, and it is outrageous that you are forcing this through during the pandemic, and with the holidays upon us. Shameful!

Gail Bell
Denver, CO

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bob Schneider](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Adjustment
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 4:08:21 PM
Attachments: [Amendment #7 Rebuttal.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

Attached is my rebuttal to some of the positions proposed by the GLAC. Please take these factors into consideration and vote NO on the present proposal as written.

Regards,

Robert Schneider
2922 S. Saulsbury St.
Denver, CO 80227

From: [Susie Peek](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code Amend. #7
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 7:25:00 PM

I have lived for over 20 years in the Sunnyside neighborhood in Denver. I am not happy with some of the changes that I see, and I'm not happy with the idea that some further changes could happen if Group Living Amendment #7 passes.

Already, I am unhappy with the giant, cheap looking and ugly apartment buildings and duplexes that are being built here. They are totally changing the look and feel of the neighborhood.

But I really don't want more of the individual family homes here to be torn down and replaced with multi-family homes, multi-person rental properties, halfway houses, or homeless shelters. Especially not when they will be bought by developers who build cheap and ugly buildings there. Instead of ruining old, established neighborhoods, if you have to build this sort of thing, please build them in areas which are not yet developed. There are many areas not far from me that have recently been developed and empty land all around. Build them there. I don't want extra traffic (it has already increased SO much in the past 6 years), extra trash, more cars parked on the street, and I really don't want any increased safety concerns. And I also don't want my property value to go down.

Please find another way to deal with growth, without harming the people who have lived here for many years.

thanks, Susie Peek

From: [Carole Ibarra](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment # 7
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 9:26:23 PM

Hello,

My name is Carole Ibarra and I am a voter living in the Park Hill neighborhood. I am extremely concerned that the city is considering allowing group homes in all parts of Denver. Please reconsider this initiative. Destroying city neighborhoods that are family friendly does not strike me as a positive step for the city of Denver. Are you actually trying to drive families to leave urban areas? Please keep Denver an attractive option for middle class families. Thank you.

Carole Ibarra
1925 Glencoe Street
Denver 80207

From: wildrickdebbie@gmail.com
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7 OPPOSED
Date: Saturday, September 26, 2020 6:02:24 PM

Dear Denver City Council Members, I am writing about Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7 for which I am adamantly opposed.

I am not sure how this even got to a docket. Denver is a beautiful place to live. Certainly I can support programs for which help the homeless and mentally ill. BUT THIS IS NOT THE SOLUTION. And, I won't tolerate it in my neighborhood. I live in one of the oldest most valuable neighborhoods in the City, Highlands and particularly a historic district, Potter Highlands.

I am wondering how you might think that this is good for this city. This is betrayal of Denver homeowners. Find another way to support the homeless and mentally ill. And, certainly, the convicted criminals. It's not in our neighborhoods. And, it's not to benefit planners, developers and organizations vested in their own gain....period.

Thank you for your support,

Debbie Wildrick
wildrickdebbie@gmail.com
214-912-1676

From: [Linda Will](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code amendment #7
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 11:54:12 AM

> Dear city council members and Mayor Hancock:

>

> I am writing to you to express my extreme disapproval of amendment #7. As a resident of Park Hill for over 60 years, I know that it will be a total disaster for one of Denver's loveliest and oldest neighborhoods. When purchasing my property, I did so with the understanding that the zoning would remain unchanged. Now, however, if this proposal should pass, it would UNDOUBTEDLY mean the following:

>

- > 1. Lower property values
- > 2. Greatly increased traffic, noise, trash and congestion
- > 3. Strain on aging infrastructure (water and sewer lines). My home is over 100 years old!!
- > 4. Safety concerns for myself and my other family members.
- > 5. Increased crime
- > 6. Commercialization of single-family neighborhoods with investors and operators buying properties instead of owner-occupants.

>

> This threatens to erase the integrity of our neighborhoods, demolish property values and destroy the cultures that make our neighborhoods unique and desirable. We are well aware that this amendment is backed by planners, developers and organizations vested in their own commercial and political gain and not the interests of neighborhood residents!!!!!!

>

> Please, please come to your senses and DO NOT PASS such a destructive ruling that will impact every resident of Park Hill, completely change the landscape of this neighborhood, and forever change the lives of residents who have worked so hard to live in such an historical area.

>

> Respectfully,

>

> Linda Will

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

From: [Michael Danzer](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 1:57:23 PM

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to inform you that I am opposed to this initiative. You may have good intentions in your desire to increase the density of Denver but this is not the way to do it. This will destroy the character of my historic neighborhood. Currently, there is a single quadplex on my block. It is the least kept home. Rental property is generally not maintained to the same standard as owner occupied. Your solution will only add to the congested street parking as people do not seem to park in their garages any more. It will also reduce our property values. If you really feel this is the path forward it should be studied in depth and even better, put it out to the individual neighborhoods to vote on. Perhaps you should consider a group home next to your property as a first step!

Sincerely,

Michael Danzer
650 Josephine Street
Denver, CO 80206

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [DEAN YODER](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT #7
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 10:01:43 PM

Honorable Kendra Black and all Denver City Council Members;

I don't know if you can understand and relate to my shock to discover that you will be voting soon on the above mentioned zoning code change? How could such an amendment as this even be considered as a possibility is beyond me. Furthermore, I understand that certain Denver neighborhoods will be exempted where City Council members and Mayor Hancock live. How can such a code even be considered in the first place?

The rapid growth over almost the last fifteen years has disturbed and upset the balance of Denver as it is. Now you are going to force higher populations into most neighborhoods. Not only will there be higher numbers but you're going to "force" these citizens to deal with paroled convicts, ten in number and if lot size permits up to forty in number.

For years Denver has allowed small group homes to exist for battered women, and the mentally disadvantaged. But this new idea will quickly destroy the moral fabric of Denver and puts our children at risk and quite possibly will increase crime as well.

Are you all looking to be recalled or to lose your re-election next cycle?

I implore you to not even consider bringing this to a vote in October.

I have been a resident of Denver for forty years and an employee of the Denver Fire Department for twenty-five years, now retired. Never could I have dreamed that this code change could be considered by you our City Council members. I don't know if this is being endorsed by business men and/or developers who are paying you in some way to get this passed, but this code amendment should be trashed immediately. Thank you for your reconsideration. Sincerely,

Dean A Yoder
3093 S Florence Ct
Denver, CO 80231
720-635-9012

From: [kelly dobson](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 10:23:00 AM

Dear Mayor Hancock and City Council Members,

My husband and I have been made aware of the recommended changes to the Group Living Zoning Amendment, and we want to express our strong concerns and opposition to what is happening.

The Committee has lumped together so many major changes into this proposal that citizens cannot intelligently consider what the overall impact will be to our city.

The Committee says new zoning regulations will “simplify” the Zoning code for the city. We disagree. It will, in fact, create a quagmire for residents and make it impossible for us to address our neighborhood’s needs.

The proposed zoning changes push enforcement and monitoring onto residents while absolving the city zoning agencies of any responsibility for the effects of the changes. Citizens have been told we can call 311 or the police for help with violations, but there is no planned increase in staffing Neighborhood Inspection Services, police or fire.

We are rightfully concerned about overcrowding, homeless shelters, and community corrections facilities in our neighborhoods without clear and defined rules regarding density, proximity to schools, and adequate community gathering places.

We are respectfully requesting that you VOTE NO on this amendment.

*Sincerely,
Kelly and Tom Dobson
Wellshire Neighborhood*

From: [Jeff Ross](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, October 4, 2020 4:33:12 PM

As a long term resident of Denver I want to express my **strong opposition to Amendment #7**. It make no sense for the sake of a small number of homeless to damage the quality of neighborhoods enjoyed, improved and made safe by stable residents.

Sincerely,
Jeff Ross

Jeff Ross

ROSS AVIATION

3200 Cherry Creek South Drive, Suite 360, Denver, CO 80209

O: 303-830-7700

C: 303-898-3300

jross@rossaviation.com

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

From: [Ed Levy](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, October 4, 2020 10:22:04 AM

I got the flyer from Safe and Sound Denver which is prompting this email. Is this NIMBY? Sure. But I didn't take out a \$400,000 mortgage to move from an unsafe part of town just to have a group home or a homeless shelter show up in my neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Kathi Witulski](#)
To: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [mayorsoffice@denvergov.gov](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 9:05:59 AM

To all of the above:

We urge you to vote against the Group Living Zoning Amendment #7. Although we don't think it would impact our SE Denver neighborhood at this time, we don't feel it is necessary nor good for the whole of Denver.

Sincerely,

Dick and Kathi Witulski

From: [Marlene Bunch](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Saturday, September 26, 2020 8:29:59 AM

Hello,

I am writing to ask you to VOTE AGAINST this amendment. It would be terrible for our city and residents. We don't need this in our city!! It would cause a mass exodus, and that is never good and causes a city to deteriorate. I don't know who came up with this idea, but it's a terrible one for sure!!

VOTE AGAINST IT PLEASE!!

From: [Kathy Bell](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, September 20, 2020 7:56:08 PM

Please don't destroy our neighborhoods. Please vote against this amendment. Our neighborhoods were not designed to handle this type of increase and will destroy our infrastructure. It will compromise the safety of our streets.

Kathy Bell

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Terry Halligan](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 11:55:19 AM

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. As a resident of the Wash Park area of Denver, I am deeply concerned about the impact on our property values, increased congestion, personal safety, and the overall degradation of our neighborhood. Surely there are better solutions than kowtowing to developers and politicians who have a conflict of interest. Please vote to preserve our neighborhood, not debase it.

Thank You,

Terry Halligan
543 S. Vine St.
Denver 80209

From: [Harold Wippler](#)
To: [Mayor's office](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code amendment #7
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:54:29 PM

>>

>> Dear city council members and Mayor Hancock:

>>

>> I am writing to you to express my extreme disapproval of amendment #7. As a resident of Park Hill for over 60 years, I know that it will be a total disaster for one of Denver's loveliest and oldest neighborhoods. When purchasing my property, I did so with the understanding that the zoning would remain unchanged. Now, however, if this proposal should pass, it would UNDOUBTEDLY mean the following:

>>

>> 1. Lower property values

>> 2. Greatly increased traffic, noise, trash and congestion

>> 3. Strain on aging infrastructure (water and sewer lines). My home is over 100 years old!!

>> 4. Safety concerns for myself and my other family members.

>> 5. Increased crime

>> 6. Commercialization of single-family neighborhoods with investors and operators buying properties instead of owner-occupants.

>>

>> This threatens to erase the integrity of our neighborhoods, demolish property values and destroy the cultures that make our neighborhoods unique and desirable. We are well aware that this amendment is backed by planners, developers and organizations vested in their own commercial and political gain and not the interests of neighborhood residents!!!!!!

>>

>> Please, please come to your senses and DO NOT PASS such a destructive ruling that will impact every resident of Park Hill, completely change the landscape of this neighborhood, and forever change the lives of residents who have worked so hard to live in such an historical area.

>>

>> Respectfully,

>>

>> Harold Wippler

From: [Katie Graham](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, October 11, 2020 1:00:51 PM

I am writing to express my discontent with Group Living Zoning Code, Amendment #7. I do not think it is appropriate or good for long term growth and vitality of Denver to pass this amendment. The traffic is already a growing problem within Denver without well thought out solutions. Commercialization of single-family neighborhoods will destroy their feel and value and is a poor choice. Please vote against this amendment.



Katie Graham

"Every artist was at first an amateur." Ralph Waldo Emerson

In an effort to increase productivity through improved office efficiencies, I will be checking emails once in the morning and once each afternoon mountain time daily. There may, therefore, be a delay in my response.

From: [ANNE STERN](#)
To: [kniechatlarge](#); [dence - City Council](#); [mayorsoffice@denver.gov](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT #7
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 1:27:08 PM

Dear Councilwoman. Kniech, I have lived in the same Denver neighborhood for over 40 years and, when we made N. Lafayette St. our home, the neighborhood was Zoned R-0. Although people have come and gone over the years, the neighborhood is very stable, safe and pleasant to live in. I think that we are all well aware that being and having a good neighbor benefits everybody who lives here.

I am extremely concerned that GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT #7 will create instability in our neighborhoods by introducing residents who come and go, are not respectful of other people's property and lower residential values. I think that it is fair to say that nobody who purchases a home in a quiet neighborhood anticipates the possibility of the house next door becoming a group home for 10-40 people!!!

I think that the Denver voters have made it clear that they do not want the needs of people experiencing homelessness to take priority over the quality of life for those who also live in the city (and who vote and pay property taxes that support everyone). I know that the homeless situation is one of your interests and I hope that you will consider the views of what over 80% of the voters and residents want and need from stable neighborhoods.

Thank you. Anne Stern

From: [Holly](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #17
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 9:26:29 AM

Please do the right thing and do not pass Amendment #7! This is a betrayal of those of us who are Denver homeowners, who have worked to buy our homes and worked to keep them up, and worked to have safe, nice neighborhoods for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

This would destroy our family-friendly neighborhoods.

Holly Bodine

From: [Taylor Beckman](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment 7
Date: Saturday, September 26, 2020 11:50:17 AM

To whom it may concern,

As a local I want to express that I do not want the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment 7 to be passed.

Thank you,
Taylor Beckman

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [ERMA ZAMORA](#)
To: [MileHighMayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 4:27:25 PM
Attachments: [Dear Councilwoman Sandoval.docx](#)

Please give a copy of this email to each of the Council members listed at the top of the memorandum. Thank you.

From: [Lee Robinson](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 12:07:27 PM
Attachments: [Email to City Council and Mayor Hancock \(09-30-20\).pdf](#)

From: F. Lee Robinson
Resident of Capital
City Council District #10
Email: Leelee1049@yahoo.com

Date: September 30, 2020

City Council Members and Mayor Hancock

As a result of conversations with respected individuals in our neighborhood, I've become aware of the City of Denver's proposed **Group Living Zoning Code Amendment**. Given the concerns expressed, I have taken the time to read sections of these new regulations. I find certain provisions to be confusing and, in some cases, conflicting. There are also so many major changes in the Proposal that the overall substance of the authority is compromised as a practical constructive regulatory tool.

Of particular concern is the uncertainty of the Administration's ability to enforce or to oversee the regulations. The guidance to this is unclear. It appears that residents will need to take the interpretation of the regulatory authority upon themselves. As such, these regulations become unfunded mandates and potentially a significant burden on existing homeowners.

As to the number of residents per dwelling, the mandate by itself creates an unhealthy environment, both socially and medically. Aside from the health perspective, people in such close proximity with each other would likely encourage an increase criminal activity as well.

I respectfully request that you **VOTE NO on this amendment**.

From: [Mark Onstott](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 11:41:19 AM

Councilpeople;

We have worked hard all of our lives to afford safe and secure neighborhoods. Now arbitrarily, the proposed changes will lead to an unsafe environment in predominantly single family zoned areas of the city. I predict increased crime, traffic, noise, parking issues, trash and personal safety concerns.

I have paid increasing property taxes annually, but I am tired of supporting less services and quality of life in Denver. This is an ill advised change, please no.

Mark Onstott

Denver, CO

From: [David Eral](#)
To: mayorsoffice@denver.com
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); mschrader@denverpost.com EOC Media Partner COVID19 Response
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, September 27, 2020 11:22:41 AM

Dear Mayor,

I understand the Zoning Code Amendment is very fluid, and furthermore much of the recent correspondence surrounding its details is to some extent inaccurate. To this clarification/update, I want to give credit and kudos to my City Council member, Kendra Black.

However, its consideration by the Denver City Council brings to light my increasing concern as to how Democratic office holders are making governing decisions. These office holders are domiciled in Portland, Seattle, and Chicago to name a few. And this is the focal point of my email.

As yet another example, to not more aggressively speak-out against the recent "violent" protests at the onset is a travesty. Certainly, peaceful protests are deserving of a constitutional right - so I am clearly not speaking to that. In the case of Portland, Seattle, and Chicago (among others), all three mayors allowed the violence to accelerate until such time it showed-up on their own personal doorstep, whereby they then called on the very police protection that some in the country are calling-for to be "defunded". Furthermore, in the case of the Portland mayor, he had planned to sell and move from his condo (I believe this recently happened).

Office holders should govern as if the consequences of these decisions would play-out on their own personal doorstep - just like the rest of us. So, regardless as to how the Zoning Code shakes-out, please envision how you would feel if your home that you have worked for years in building equity, suddenly had 6, 8, 12 cars parked across the street with arrivals and departures 24/7. I am confident that home values in these instances would be immensely negatively impacted, and the momentum towards moving to the suburbs would only continue to accelerate - here in Denver as well as across an extensive list of cities across the country.

Sincerely,
David

From: [Gunnar Jacobs](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, October 28, 2020 2:41:54 PM

I wanted to write to express my deep concern with the group living amendment. I hope you have already received hundreds/thousands of emails with similar concerns, as I agree completely with what many are losing sleep over - safety, property values, congestions, etc.

But rather than go on and on about what you have already likely heard, I thought I would share a story from a friend who lives in a neighborhood that had a similar thing pass recently. A house was used to shelter convicted felons in a very family-oriented community, some of whom were sexual predators. Within 1 week of them moving into this house, one of those felons was found on the front steps of the local elementary school masturbating, middle of the day, while school was in session.

I have 3 young children. Please do not put our families at risk. This is by far one of the most ludicrous and nonsensical amendments I have ever heard of. Especially during COVID when people are not even allowed to have more than 5 people from 2 different families. This is a disaster waiting to happen. Please do not pass this amendment.

Thank you,

Gunnar Jacobs

From: [Gary Caskey](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code amendment
Date: Sunday, September 20, 2020 10:51:00 AM

My wife and I in southmoor Park East are against this amendment, please do not pass this amendment #7

Gary C. Caskey
Photographer
303-478-9697

From: [Howard Shapiro](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code changes
Date: Sunday, December 27, 2020 10:59:45 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the zoning to allow group living. I have lived in the Winston Downs neighborhood for the past 10 years. We chose this neighborhood because we liked the quiet suburb feel. Changes made to the zoning to allow group living means having halfway houses and section 8 housing which ruins every neighborhood that does this. A good friend of mine lives in suburban Chicago and his neighborhood did the same thing several years ago. Crime went way up, property values went way down, and quality of life was negatively impacted. If you pursue this zoning change, you will be responsible for the decline of Denver's suburbs as we know it. Other cities that have done similar zoning changes have seen people leaving those cities. Do you really want Denver to follow in the misguided and destructive footsteps of New York, Seattle, and Chicago? Keep the zoning the way it is.

Sincerely,

Howie Shapiro
Denver resident.

From: [Florence Sebern](#)
To: [Planning Services - CPD](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Text Amendment #7 | LUTI Committee Comment
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 12:01:24 PM
Attachments: [Sebern_Petition Signatures in Opposition_GL Amendment 7_LUTI.pdf](#)

Please see attached for the LUTI Committee comment period in the above matter.

regards,
Florence Sebern
Denver 80246

From: [Andrea's personal email](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living zoning code
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 5:16:23 PM

To whom it may concern,

I wanted to email in regards to the group living zoning code that will be voted upon in October. I am not in support of this change.

Andrea Tenenbaum
SE Denver

Sent from my iPad

From: [Tina Davis](#)
To: [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning comments
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 1:51:44 PM
Importance: High

BE AWARE THAT A PETITION IS CIRCULATING AMONG THE INFORMED OPPOSITION TO THIS TRAVESTY OF A PROPOSAL THAT HAS ALREADY REACHED 3,000 SIGNATURES AND IS LIKELY TO REACH CONSIDERABLY MORE. WE HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT IT WILL BE COUNTED AS A SINGLE COMMENT. THAT IS BLATANTLY WRONG. IN ORDER TO PRESERVE FAIRNESS AND DUE PROCESS, THE PETITION MUST BE COUNTED AS AN OPPOSING COMMENT BY THE NUMBER OF ACTUAL SIGNATORIES AT THE TIME OF SUBMISSION.

I listened to Wednesday's presentation by Andrew Webb regarding the recommended changes to Denver's Group Living Zoning, and I want to express my strong concerns and opposition to what is happening. The Committee has lumped together so many major changes in to this proposal that citizens cannot intelligently consider what the overall impact will be to our city. The Committee says new zoning regulations will "simplify" the Zoning code for the city. This is blatantly untrue. It will, in fact, create a quagmire for citizens and make it impossible for us to address our neighborhood's needs.

The proposed zoning changes push enforcement and monitoring of zoning regulations on to the citizens while absolving the city zoning agencies of any responsibility for the effects of the changes. Citizens have been told we can call 311 or the police for help on violations. What involved citizens are hearing and being sensitive to is what affects them - not the holistic body of changes being proposed and what this re-zoning proposal ultimately means for our communities.

Older people are threatened by all of the changes at once, particularly with all of the neighborhood issues we are already facing each and every day, without government support. They do not support the zoning proposal.

Homeowners and neighborhood communities are rightfully concerned about overcrowding, residential care facilities, homeless shelters, and prison facilities in the neighborhoods without clear and defined rules regarding density, proximity to schools and community gathering places, They do not support the recommended changes.

Some people may support pieces of the bill, but cannot currently consider or support them separately. I believe this is exactly what the special interests driving this initiative want - chaos, ignorance and apathy that will ensure approval of their initiative without allowing citizens to address each piece intelligently. This feels very much like what is happening to citizens on a national level, and is flat out wrong.

The "data", as we are consistently hearing from the Committee, is that it's good (!) for our neighborhoods to encourage: Severe overcrowding of single family residences without bathroom or minimum square footage requirements; unregulated and unlicensed halfway houses, residential care, nursing, rehab and correctional facilities without regard for children and home owners' well being; and expanded congregate living (rent by the room). Let me simplify - the Committee is paving the way for: overcrowding of neighborhoods and public services for the enrichment of landlords and real estate speculators, profiting by private investors for the unregulated care of our most vulnerable citizens needing nursing and rehabilitation services, price gouging and profiting by investors of private prison expansion (that WE tax payers will also be paying for) and, of course, Air B&B.

And for all of this "progress" under the guise of "affordable housing and helping the homeless", we taxpayers and citizens who have built these desirable neighborhoods to live in get to monitor and deal with the inevitable abuses and problems that will result. A selling point for the Committee is that Seattle, Portland, Washington DC and other cities have this progressive model in place and it's the way to go for Denver. This conclusion is based on naivety and / or stupidity. Denver is not those cities nor do we want to be.

In response to safety concerns voiced by citizens, Mr. Webb stated that city code requires sprinklers and other

safety installations. Therefore, we can be assured that domiciles under the new zoning proposal will conform to safety and fire codes. These building codes apply to new build, not to existing structures. Old domiciles will not need to update and conform, just as current homeowners are “grandfathered” in on other unsafe situations such as illegal apartments that don’t meet current zoning requirements. Most of the rentals in my neighborhood have out of state owners who contribute directly to speculative housing price increases, do not care for the properties they own, and do not contribute one thing to our neighborhoods or the fabric of our community. Why are we continuing to encourage more of this type of investment at the expense of our citizens? WE are the economic base for Denver city initiatives. WE are the fabric that holds community together and makes Denver a city that people of all ages want to live in. WE are Denver residents. Ignoring our concerns and lumping everything the Committee has proposed under one umbrella is unconscionable. Council representatives and mayor Hancock, I ask that you do the right thing for Denver and it’s citizens, and reject the Committee’s rezoning proposal.

Respectfully,

From: [PETER MEERSMAN](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Friday, December 18, 2020 10:04:31 AM

Dear City Council Members:

I strongly oppose the effort to increase the number of unrelated people in a residence.

I ask each council member to imagine five unrelated adults, and their spouses and kids, moving in right next door to you. Imagine the noise, parking, waste, and other problems which would certainly occur with 10-30 people living next door to you.

I am sure you all have encountered unscrupulous landlords in your role as a council member. Do any of you think these landlords won't stuff as many people as they can into their properties? This proposal provides the opportunity to turn the "house next door" into a "flophouse."

The panel who put this proposal together was not representative of the Denver population - those who would be affected. It was representative of those who wanted this proposal passed, as anyone could tell by looking at the list of participants.

And the initial drafts of the proposal reflects that bias. The fact that it was modified was due to pushback from people like me. However, the modification we want is for the non-resident household number remain at two, where it is now.

No one in Denver bought their property thinking the house next door would have a dozen residents, or two or three dozen.

This is a bad idea. And if you don't think so, please put the proposal on the ballot so the Denver residents can decide for themselves.

Pete Meersman
Denver Resident

From: [Susan Young](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 7:34:02 AM

This plan will ruin Denver. NO.
Too many people in a home.
Our infrastructure is not built for this many people.
This will drag the underserved down further, that is where homes will be bought up first.
Susan Young
Denver

From: [Tommye McLemore](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 9:11:53 AM

I am certainly against the changes for group living. Bear Valley is a pleasant place to live and I do not believe the suggested changes would be a good idea. It would make it where we had had a greater change of break ins and etc. Many older people Live in BV and this would make it more risky for them. Please don't allow these changes. We the residents, bought here because it was a great place to live, please don't ruin it.
Tommye McLemore

Sent from my iPad

From: [Steve Oltman](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 3:33:52 PM

12/16/2020

Denver City Council Members:

I hope you will respect the wishes of the overwhelming majority of your Denver constituents and reject the proposed Group Living policies for Denver neighborhoods. For a number of reasons, these proposals for opening single family housing to numerous unrelated persons, and allowing shelters and halfway houses within neighborhoods, would destroy those neighborhoods, and eventually Denver, as a desirable place to live. I have to assume some of you don't understand this, or don't care. We don't want to become Seattle or Portland or Minneapolis. Please reject this plan. There has got to be a better way.

Please. Thank you.

Steve Oltman; Bear Valley, Denver

From: [Laurel Olson](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 3:06:24 PM

I oppose the Group Living Code Amendment. Residential neighborhoods are for families, those who live in the house are related. The size of most families ranges from 2 to 6 related people. These families may have 2,3, or 4 vehicles, all of which fit in the garage or driveway with only 1 or 2 on the street.

Group living homes put too many people in a home as well as too many vehicles parking on the streets. Neighborhoods shouldn't be this congested. As a parent, I want my children growing up and playing with other neighborhood children, not living next to halfway houses, alcoholics/drug addicted people, as well as homeless people.

I realize that these are tough issues that our city needs to solve but putting these homes in residential neighborhoods is not the solution.

Laurel Olson

From: [Laurie Boyle](#)
To: mayorsoffice@denver.gov; [denc - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Sunday, September 20, 2020 2:01:42 PM

Good afternoon,

Please note that we are 110% opposed to group living.

Ten unrelated people and unlimited relatives in one home is not a viable solution for the city of Denver. It is nothing but a terrible idea. If you have 8 individuals in a home and they each have a car - where would they park all of their vehicles? In the middle of their yard? Trash services for such homes would result in trash all over our beautiful Denver neighborhoods. Noise, traffic, safety and city infrastructure are all unaddressed issues.. This plan does not appear to be well thought out as this would seriously damage the value of our Denver homes.

We are disappointed this idea is even being presented to the community as it is clear that our community does not support the Group Living project. By commercializing our homes please explain to me how is the city supporting the interests of neighborhood residents? It appears that we the voters are not being listened to at all on this amendment. We would like to know where we can pick up signs against this measure.

Rather than changing zoning of existing homes, have you given any thought of developing the land near DIA/Pena Boulevard and zone this area for group living? This location has mass transit, jobs and it can be built to accommodate the needs of the tenants.

Denver can do better!

Laurie and Randy Boyle

From: [Lisa Pearl](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living
Date: Monday, November 9, 2020 4:10:43 PM

To Whom it May Concern

The possibility of group living will cause great damage to neighborhoods and the people who live own and pay taxes in these neighborhoods. Please address this manner to safeguard people's property and the neighborhoods of Denver.

Lisa Pearl
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Elizabeth Stamm](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] group living
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 1:59:17 PM

All,

I oppose the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.

The majority of Denver residents with whom I speak are livid about the proposed zoning changes, which will be devastating to our family centered neighborhoods. I am sure it's not relevant to you, but many of us have lived in our neighborhoods for more than 25-30 years and have put our lives, love and investments into our homes. We worked hard for many years, saved our money and eventually were able to buy a home. We have raised our children and grandchildren in this neighborhood. We know our neighbors, trust them and take care of them when they need us. Your proposed changes upend all of our lives and not for the better.

There are so many reasons I oppose these zoning changes!

Here's one of many: Apparently, Andrew Webb just acknowledged that the 1500 ft distance requirement from correctional facilities and schools would be abolished with this amendment because there are "too many schools". This was not a widely publicized change.

I'm sure you are well aware of the opposition to the muddy language in the bill and the manner in which the public was kept in the dark until the last moment as this was pushed through.

I have read that significant numbers of Group Living Advisory Committee members involved in these changes have a financial interest in these changes. I was surprised in one of the zoom meetings I "attended", by the comment, "How will we make any money if the fire code requires sprinklers?"

This has gone on for more than two years and still, so many Denver residents are unaware of what is in store for them.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Stamm

From: [Emmett Hobley](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Saturday, December 19, 2020 8:49:55 AM

I am opposed to the Group Living amendment, I believe that the negative impacts of increased racist policies that will hinder the success of people of color, economically and socially. Montebello Neighborhood Improvement Association believes in equity, inclusion we are not willing to help anyone to the detriment of our own communities! # HOW WE FIGHT

From: [Rosemary Cullain](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group LivingZoningCode Amendment #7
Date: Thursday, October 15, 2020 12:41:26 PM

I am very opposed to this amendment. I bought a home in my neighborhood to avoid the situation that I endured in Capital Hill. I could not walk down those streets without dog feces everywhere, trash everywhere, used syringes and condoms littering the sidewalks. I know this was due to exactly what this amendment will result in. Our streets are already packed with parked cars who ignore the no parking signs posted by the city.

Take this idea to the suburbs and see how far you get with it!!

I will hold the city council responsible for this debacle if it goes ahead and will vote accordingly.

Rosemary E Cullain PhD

From: [Barbara Patton](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] group zoning
Date: Monday, October 12, 2020 2:08:18 PM

**Vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code
Amendment!**

Thank you, Barbara Patton

From: [Tom Fields](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GroupLivingChanges
Date: Sunday, August 16, 2020 3:48:37 PM

Dear Council Members,

The proposed changes to the Zoning Code will not solve the housing crisis but will increase the cost of housing and price young families out of the market.

Imagine a young family of two adults and a child. At present they are renting a 1200 square foot house for \$1200 per month. If this change is approved the landlord could easily rent the house to 4 (or more) individuals and charge each of them \$400 each increasing his income by 33% to \$1600 per month. (In the extreme, the landlord could rent that house to 6 individuals, charge them each \$600 per month and gain triple the income.) Such an increase in rent will certainly raise the price landlords are willing to pay for houses.

The effect will be to make it harder for the young family to buy their own home. They will be priced out of the market. They will be forced to remain renters indefinitely. Buying a home is the way generations of Americans have been able to accumulate wealth, prepare for retirement and pass on a legacy to the next generation. But they will not be able to access this route to realizing the American dream if the Zoning Code is changed as proposed.

This is not speculation. Large corporations are already buying up single family houses and turning them into rentals driving up the cost of housing. Allowing landlords to put increased numbers of renters in their properties will surely exacerbate this regrettable development.

The proposed changes will not solve the crisis but will make it worse. Please do not vote to approve them.

Thomas Fields
5680 E Bates Ave
Denver, CO 80222
303 756 2932

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Jay F](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Field](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I oppose the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 6:46:25 PM

Dear All City Council Members,

I advocate for the safety and well-being of our neighborhoods.

I oppose the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment

I have serious concerns about the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment, its massive changes, and using single-family neighborhoods as an experiment.

The Group Living Zoning Code Amendment will:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Degrade the safety, security and sense of community where my home is today
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->allow density in all single-family neighborhoods to increase from 2 to 5 unrelated adults in a time of Covid-19 crowding concerns & over crowding excess density in schools & in my neighborhood
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->allow new 1-10 person 24/7 homeless shelters in my & all neighborhoods, with no limitations and no spacing from schools
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]--> it will remove buffer zones from these unsafe facilities
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Kids won't be able to walk to school safely
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->I will not be safe in my neighborhood after dark with possible felons & homeless people in my neighborhood
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->allow new 11-20 person community correction centers with felons in my & many residential neighborhoods
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->and 24/7 homeless shelters in my & many neighborhoods, with few limitations and no spacing from schools
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->encourage & commercialize single-family neighborhoods as service providers and investors buy limited, existing single-family housing instead of owner-occupants
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->this will destroy my property value where most of my money is invested for my retirement
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->this is an unproven Group Living "experiment" by government near my home & neighborhood
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->encourage more trash in my neighborhood
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->insufficient parking in my neighborhood
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->who will enforce Group Living rules & laws. Police will not respond to anonymous complaints
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->felons will know that I Ratted them out
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->This is government takeover of my neighborhood. It is unfair and against my civil rights as a citizen.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->This is unsafe for the most vulnerable in our community ... the children, the elderly & others
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->It is an unfair political policy, with no common-sense basis. It is without sufficient input from the affected communities
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->It is without full transparency by those government employees, who are supposed to represent us & who we pay salaries to protect us & provide safety and well being to us as citizens of Colorado.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->Group Living Zoning Code Amendment is backed by city planners & real estate investors, who have a vested interest in seeing this amendment pass.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->The Group Living Zoning Code Amendment is forcing massive change on neighborhoods and is a DANGEROUS EXPERIMENT.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->· <!--[endif]-->IT IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY THESE GROUPS

Respectfully,

John Frazee
443 Garfield St,
Denver, CO 80206

From: [Samuel Allen](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Keep our neighborhoods safe
Date: Saturday, November 7, 2020 7:46:44 AM

To all concerning this issue.

No to Denver's Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. This amendment will drastically impact our neighborhood.

Let this be a warning to all Denver City Council members, your job is to prevent betrayal of all Denver homeowners!

Please be safe and stay healthy and please wear a Mask!

Best,

Sam Allen
Sam Allen Productions, Inc.
1742 Holly Street
Denver, CO 80220
P. 303.355.1117
C. 303.472.6975
sam@samallenproductions.com
<http://www.samallenproductions.com>

From: [Nancy Bell](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kniech and Ortega RECUSE on voting on Denver Group Living Proposal
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 8:31:56 AM

I firmly believe that the Denver City Council and Mayor Hancock should insist that the following Denver city council members recuse themselves from voting on the Denver Group Living Proposal coming before the city council for vote in October, 2020. Kniech, Robin Denver City Council Ortega, Deborah Denver City Council It is a clear and obvious conflict of interest to have these representatives vote on a plan they have helped develop and mold. It is not possible for Robin and Debbie to separate their investment in developing this plan from looking at it independently on behalf of the taxpayers. For the sake of good and transparent government either they must recuse themselves or the city council and the mayor must exclude them from voting on the Group Living Proposal. Respectfully,
Larry and Nancy Bell
Fairfax St
Denver, CO 80220

From: ny2az2co@aol.com
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Land, Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 9:48:58 AM

Honorable members of the committee,

I am writing to all of you to express my concerns about the lack of transparency and the timing of the committees actions with respect to potential zoning changes.

I write to you as an individual that has owned a home in Denver for 18 years and has lived in Denver for more than 25 years. I have deep concerns about the proposed changes and how they will negatively impact the quality of life that I and other Denver residents will enjoy, should it pass.

The passage of the proposed change in zoning will result in a far greater density of individuals living in residential areas. I see this daily, as I have a neighbor that has been renting his home out for several years to a group of his friends. On a daily basis, I count between 6 and 9 cars parked in the driveway, around the corner and in front of another neighbor's home. I also notice that the home generates a great deal of trash as I see it by the curb on Tuesday evenings each week. Lastly, with so many adults filtering in and out of the home, we have had several noise complaints and the police were called when one of the renters evidently shot himself while cleaning his gun. In short, many of the residents in the home are transient and have no commitment to respect the neighbors that purchased homes in this area for the peace and quiet that the neighborhood offers.

Home ownership is often called the "American Dream". To own the home I purchased to live in, I devoted 12 years of my life to working a full time and a part time job. My wife also worked a part time job as we raised our daughter. My home represents a substantial investment on my part and a commitment to be a good neighbor that respects my neighbors and the peace and quiet that the neighborhood has always offered those that live here.

I respectfully request that the committee operate in a more transparent manner and not try and rush this potentially damaging resolution to a vote.

Regards,

Warren Halpern
2911 South Sidney Court
Denver, CO 80231
(720) 635-9316
<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

From: [Sally Jones](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Safe and Sound Denver](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LUTI Committee Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 6:27:12 AM

I want to again protest the changes that will occur because of this amendment although baby steps have been made in making it more agreeable to those of us who feel single family residences are a valuable part of the structure of a living and viable city especially in this day and age of needing "defensible space" while we are being ravaged by the current pandemic.

I would still protest the time of viewing the amendment vs the committee vote and the glaring lack of transparency from Andrew Webb and his large group of planners. I have written him numerous times without a response. That is not acceptable and makes me suspicious.

I am also following closely the lawsuit against the Mayor and City regarding the emails that are not being produced in regards to this process. It looks suspicious!

I also believe that when changes are made they should apply to all neighborhoods. Council people who carve out areas in their districts that are exempt are not being candid. That is not acceptable.

Thank you.

From: [Anne Cox](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LUTI Vote on 12/22/20 on Group Living Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 8:45:27 AM

Dear Mr. Webb,

It is my understanding that you propose changes to the Group Living Amendment that will not be made public until December 18. Further, it is understood LUTI will vote on those changes December 22. The public comment period however, closes December 16, prior to publicly releasing the proposed changes to Group Living.

While there must be a reasonable explanation for closing public comment before the subject matter is published, it is equally certain that the LUTI vote should be delayed until the public is informed about the changes to be voted on.

The last-published Group Living Amendments would fail to deliver stable housing for those in need and will degrade the Denver experience for those who already own or rent dwelling units in the City. Investor ownership of Group Living dwellings will reduce the per-person cost of rent but will increase the income to landlords. The unintended consequence will price the dwellings out of reach for traditional families, thereby displacing them.

Although I am required to comment before I know what I am commenting about, to mitigate the foreseeable harms, the following measures may be considered:

1. Require that one or more Group Living occupants own the dwelling. This would help stabilize the social structure and improve maintenance and upkeep.
2. In addition, require licensure of Group Living arrangements. This would establish standards and give the City enforcement tools if standards are not met. All adult members of the Group should be required to execute formal documents explaining the duties and responsibilities of the occupants, and the consequences for violations of the Licensing standards. Licensure should also address attendant issues like parking, maintenance, governance, and health and safety.
3. Establish reasonable limits on the total number of people who may occupy the dwelling. We are flawed human beings and overcrowding, particularly where children live, creates opportunity for neglect and abuse. Every adult and related children should have a private sleeping space.
4. Recognize that unintended consequences develop in ways impossible to anticipate. Ease into Group Living to allow time for adjusting the standards and limitations over time. License Group Living arrangements on an annual basis so that the Group residents share the risks and have a stake in preserving the quality of life with the established neighbors.
5. Group living already exists in Denver, despite current zoning laws. Formalizing the system deprives Denver of existing enforcement tools to address the very few complaints the City has received.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Randolph Cox, JD

From: [Florence Sebern](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Laura Aldrete](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Missing Submission from Comment Logs | Group Living Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 8:32:59 PM
Attachments: [Webb Confirmation Sebern Petition Signature Submittal LUTI GL Amendment 8.27.2020.pdf](#)
[Sebern Petition Signatures in Opposition GL Amendment 7 LUTI.pdf](#)

Andrew,

I reviewed the comment logs on the Group Living webpage and did not find my submission of August 27, 2020 in either of these comment logs:

- [Public comments Received between August 19 and September 11](#) (PDF)
- [Public comments received between September 12 and October 7](#) (PDF)

Attached please find the confirmation that was sent upon submission of 2,143 petition signatures, verified as Denver residents, and printed as form letters. The original submission is also attached.

Please let me know why it wasn't included in the comment log for August 19-September 11.

regards,
Florence Sebern

From: [Steve Oltman](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Neighborhood proposals
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:45:27 AM

8/6/2020

Denver City Council members:

We were married in 1975, and immediately bought a house in the Bear Valley neighborhood. Forty-five years later, we are still here. We raised our two children here, they went to Denver schools, including participating in two or three years of forced busing in the 1980's. We obviously like it here – we have good neighbors with diverse ethnicities, the homes and grounds are well maintained for the most part, and the location is convenient.

But now our city's political leaders want to butt in and drastically alter the nature of our neighborhood, and every single-family neighborhood in Denver. They want to allow multiple unrelated individuals and their families to live in a single home meant for a single family. This will result in overcrowding, rundown properties not inhabited by owners, and the streets will be turned into parking lots. Investors will scrape off nice homes, and replace them with larger structures designed to hold multiple families. The attractive, pleasant neighborhoods of Denver will be destroyed.

On top of that, our leaders want to allow halfway houses for felons and homeless shelters to be scattered on various properties within family neighborhoods throughout the city. I can only imagine how unsafe this would be for families living in close proximity to a group of convicted felons and numerous individuals addicted to drugs.

I don't know what you are thinking. You are destroying family living in Denver. This is not New York or Los Angeles, and we do not want to become like them. It will add one more reason for stable residents to choose to leave Denver. Is this what you want your legacy to be? This is not leadership. This is misguided social engineering. We understand the need for affordable housing, but this is not the way to do it.

It makes us sad, discouraged and angry to anticipate what these forced regulations would do to our city and to our lives. We urge you with a strong sense of sincere desperation to reject these proposals. The future of our city and its residents depends on it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve and Nancy Oltman

Bear Valley, Denver

From: [Ross Leder](#)
To: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Rebecca Leder](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New to your district!
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 5:49:01 PM

Hi Kendra,

My wife Rebecca and I are new to the Southmoor neighborhood, we recently moved from capital hill and we love it! Just wanted to say hello to our Council Member.

Additionally we're aware of the upcoming vote for "Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7" While we understand the motivation for this measure, and feel strongly action is needed to address the social and living needs of our community... we feel this amendment is an over-correction and as your constituents we felt it imperative to express our view. Please vote no on this initiative.

Looking forward to getting more involved with our community.

Best,

-Ross & Rebecca Leder
3695 S Oneida Way

--

ROSS S LEDER
ross.leder@gmail.com | 612.836.3550

From: [jackie gentala longest](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New zoning changes
Date: Friday, December 18, 2020 9:12:26 AM

5 is too many, I've been following this for months, even went to a meeting. Please, please address the parking and trash. I have inquired countless times, all's I get is 'we'll leave it up to the municipalities' really???! They've already cut back on trash pick up. And you are not able to create parking lots in neighborhoods, at least not mine. I suppose you could tear down a home for one. Please think this through objectively, most are against this but you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Nina Rowell](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New zoning for multiple living situation
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 8:49:26 AM

Below is information that I would very much like you to take into consideration as you consider zoning for multiple people living in the same home. I believe it is an idea that will lead to far far more problems that will have to be dealt with after it fails. PLEASE GIVE YOURSELVES TIME TO COME UP WITH A BETTER PLAN.

Nina Rowell, a concerned Denver citizen

"The proposed zoning amendment would allow a minimum of five and as many as 10 unrelated adults and all of their relatives and an unlimited number of children to live in a single-family residence. **As a human quality-of-life issue, this is unconscionable and a dereliction of duty by government to protect the life, health, and safety of its residents.**

Overcrowding leads to the spread of disease, domestic violence, lack of storage space, depression, anxiety, stress, loss of individual privacy, disruptions of sleeping arrangements and patterns, among other adverse effects. A report done in England about how overcrowding affects families states what is considered acceptable for occupants based on what one bedroom can accommodate: a married or cohabiting couple; a single person over 21 years old; pairs of children under 10 years old regardless of gender; pairs of children aged 10 to 21 years old of the same gender, and a person aged 10 to 21 with a child under 10 of the same sex. Any occupancy level greater than this, constitutes overcrowding."

From: [Ruby Meredith](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO- Group Living Amendment No. 7
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2020 3:12:17 PM

I am against Group Living zoning code Amendment #7. It will negatively impact my neighborhood, my city.

Passage of this Amendment No. 7 will:

- overload our already crowded neighborhood schools, thereby effecting our young people's futures.
- increase traffic, noise, trash and congestion
- over commercialization of our quaint neighbors that I love so much.
- put money in pockets of investors and operators (by passing this 7th Amendment which would allow an increase in the number of unrelated people living in a single-family dwelling), at the expense of my families safety and well being.
- strain our aging infrastructure.

All items listed above will negatively effect mine, my families and my neighbors property values as well as quality of life.

Vote NO on Amendment No. 7, Group Living Zoning Code.

Ruby Meredith, Registered Voter
Monroe Street
Denver, CO 80206

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Paul Guthrie](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Mayor's office](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No Group Living
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 2:37:27 PM

I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the Group Living Plan. I recently returned to Denver from Dallas, TX. Denver has changed, but your Group Living plan will not help the homeless or the those who need to share a home. It will ruin the neighborhoods.

My career is in real estate. You change the code and you change the neighborhoods. You change the neighborhoods you will encourage people to move out of Denver and you will lose your tax base. Companies will also begin moving out. It will be a disastrous spiral. In the end you will not be helping the homeless or those that need support. Your plan will add even more homeless.

Your plan needs a rehaul. There are better ways to develop a city.

Paul and Amy Guthrie

[TREC's Consumer Protection Notice](#)
[TREC Information About Brokerages](#)

How did we do?

Click to rate your experience with AvenueWest Realty-Free Management

Regards,
[Paul Guthrie](#)
AvenueWest Real Estate Broker Owner
(214) 729-1916 direct
(214) 754-7171 office



From: [Ashleigh Rankin](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, November 8, 2020 7:43:56 PM

Dear Mayor and Council Member

Please vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code - Amendment #7. As a committed citizen to our city, I am not in support of the new zoning changes and I expect you to vote no in this amendment because it is not in the best interests of those you represent. Quite frankly this amendment will not be good for our city and your constituents. More people will leave the city and go to the suburbs, which will destroy our city and our economy. There are so many ways to help people in need in our city and my husband and I are in full support of organizations like Denver Rescue Mission and Cross Purpose, small organizations that can accurately distribute funds and be accountable. Vote No on amendment 7 if you want your city to remain the great city it is right now! Listen to the people you serve!

Ashleigh

From: [Jennifer Swanson](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on Amendment 7
Date: Saturday, September 19, 2020 11:31:01 AM

Please do not pass the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment 7. Please do not put the agendas of planners, developers, and organizations ahead of residents feelings of safety and security where we have paid to live. If this passes, it will have short-term and long-term disastrous consequences and I will no longer vote for you.

Please do the right thing.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Swanson

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Cindy Singleton](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on Amendment 7
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 12:38:06 PM

Single family residences should be just that for single family occupancy!!! If it is a duplex, then two family. And so on. . .- if we are going to drill it down further absolutely no more than two people per bedroom, but cars no more than can fit in the garage and safely on the driveway! Come on Denver! If you have multi-family, then higher concentration can be expected. HOWEVER, 10 people in a two bedroom apartment. I say NO! Absolutely not! If it is a code inspected 5 bedroom house, then maybe 10 people. Lets not ruin Denver or Colorado by being ridiculous! Stop the insanity!!!

From: [Natalie](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on Group Living Amendment #7
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 10:02:38 PM

Hello,

My name is Natalie Duperreault-Rohde, I am a Denver resident and home owner and I oppose the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. Please do not allow this to pass. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Natalie

Sent from my iPhone

From: [kara mckenna](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO ON GROUP LIVING PROPOSAL on 12/1/20!
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:06:15 AM

Vote NO! on the GROUP LIVING PROPOSAL. 90% are opposed to it!
DO NOT DESTROY our neighborhoods any more than you already have. 12/1/20 VOTE it
down.

-Kara McKenna, SE Denver homeowner

From: [Leslie Kannenberg](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:06:56 PM

Dear City Council Members,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Leslie Heguy and I am a lifelong Denverite. I was born and raised here, and I currently own a home in the city of Denver. I am writing today regarding the recommended changes to the Group Living Zoning Amendment, and I want to express my strong concerns and opposition to what is happening.

While I understand there is a housing crisis in Denver, I do not think residential neighborhoods are the place for the proposed changes to take place. There would be no restrictions on placing halfway houses near our schools with the proposed changes. This is very alarming to me. The current zoning regulations are in place to help keep our families safe and our neighborhoods quiet by preventing certain entities from invading into our residential spaces. The Group Living Zoning Amendment does not have public safety in mind, nor does it protect the homeowners of Denver.

Furthermore, there is not enough infrastructure set up to support these changes. Allowing up to ten unrelated adults and their relatives per home would greatly increase waste, without a plan from the city on how to handle the extra trash created per household. Allowing up to six cars per home parked on the property, plus any additional vehicles on the street, is not only an eyesore to the neighborhood, but will increase traffic, noise and overcrowd the already-limited street parking for existing residents. Our now peaceful neighborhoods will become loud, busy, dirty and overrun with people. All of this will decrease property values for the existing homeowners and will likely thwart future homebuyers from purchasing property within Denver.

Additionally, increasing the population density raises public health concerns, especially in a time of COVID-19. We have seen how fast coronavirus has spread in bigger cities like New York, where people live in closer quarters. Having multiple families in a single household would not only increase the spread of COVID-19, but would also increase the chances of spreading other pathogens and increase household pest infestations.

Neighborhood communities are rightfully concerned about overcrowding, homeless shelters, and community corrections facilities in our neighborhoods without clear and defined rules regarding density, proximity to schools, and adequate community gathering places.

I am requesting that you VOTE NO on this amendment.

Respectfully,
Leslie Heguy

From: [Kim Neitzke](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO ON GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMMENDMENT
Date: Sunday, October 18, 2020 8:42:22 AM

-

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Please listen to the people who voted you in, WE don't want large groups of people living in small areas. Thank you, Kim

From: [James Korn](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Denver's Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 10:20:10 AM

Please do not support and vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. Enough is enough. There have been many new rules and regulations pushed through recently that have made no sense or help to the health and wellbeing of Denver residents. This is another one. You represent the people of the city and county of Denver and they overwhelming said no to this. Please listen to the people. Please do your civic and represent the residents of Denver and your neighborhood..

I strongly recommend that this get voted down.

From: [Rick and Patty Holschuh](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Gidfar, Mansur M. - CC WW1111 Contingent Worker](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Zukowski, Liz S. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 10](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Denver's Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2020 7:32:54 PM

I am emailing all of you to evidence my opposition to the proposed zoning change to the Denver Group Living Code. Due to the complexity of this amendment, it is difficult to review in depth and fully digest. However, I am able to discern that the overall goal of this change will not be of benefit to my neighborhood.

My choice to reside in a single family home is one of intention. I am unable to see that this change will result in anything other than a reduction in quality of life for our Bear Valley neighborhood. In observing the general lack of oversight in the behavior of renters in single family homes, to me, serves as a superficial representation of the potential impact that will occur if property owners are able to maximize their profits by allowing an increase in unrelated adults reside in a dwelling built for the intention of single family occupancy. I have personally witness the impact upon our neighborhood of a rental in which it is difficult to discern who actually signed the rental agreement and who has been invited in to sublet the property from the individual on the lease. The exponential increase in parties occupying a single family dwelling will be akin to having a small apartment present on a neighborhood block. If I wished to have this type of situation, I would not have purchased a private home for our family in the suburbs. I can only imagine the potential impact of the convergence of unrelated parties. While parking is to be limited by code, I have watched other properties that have a large number of occupants clutter the street, driveway and front lawn with the vehicles. There is no way this change in zoning will not have a negative impact in a neighborhood setting and will decrease the likelihood of maintaining a sense of family lifestyle. Additionally, I do not feel that the infrastructure of a single family dwelling is adequately substantial to support a multitude of individuals residing in it.

Please do not erroneously think that my feelings about this change in zoning are in anyway related to racial bias. I welcome anyone to reside in our neighborhood. In order to purchase a single family dwelling, we all have to meet the same economic criteria to be a homeowner in a neighborhood built with the intention of one family residing in each dwelling; that is what will maintain the integrity of our neighborhood. Additionally, I do not believe this change in code will address the social ills of our city. I am a strong advocate of social programs, however this amendment is not the best way to address homelessness or house citizens with a history of substance abuse or criminal conviction. This integration is not conducive to neighborhoods.

Perhaps this change in code will be seen as beneficial for some neighborhoods, but I do not believe this to be true for the Bear Valley area. I am appalled that this magnitude of a change in zoning code, that will be an impact throughout all of Denver, has not, at the minimum, been widely publicised so that all property owners

are aware of the impending change. Moreover, I am of the opinion that this should be put to a vote by citizens so that the residents of Denver County can discern whether this amendment should be passed. This is far beyond what the members of the Denver City Council should be deciding for all residents of Denver.

I thank you in advance for reading my email and strongly encourage members who are prepared to vote in favor of this change to consider the consequences this will potentially have upon the impact of the homeowners of Denver.

Respectfully,

Patricia Holschuh
2786 S. Fenton St.
Denver, CO 80227

From: [Barbara Humphries](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Denver's Group Living Zoning Code Amendment - RE: residential care uses
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 3:35:42 PM

Dear City Council members:

The City of Denver's plan to send 750+ convicts into Denver neighborhoods is a reckless endangerment of our safety and lives. The US Department of Justice provides the most accurate data on recidivism and that is 76%.

Please consider the danger to victims of crimes, children, and unprotected households.

Please remove the correctional facility and halfway house inclusions in "residential care" uses and retain the 1500 foot protective buffer in our zoning code for schools and residential neighborhoods.

Denver City Planners promote a 2% recidivism rate as rational for placing correctional facilities in residential neighborhoods. This is flawed data.

Please read the Department of Justice comprehensive report I have cited below.

-

Safety

The U.S. Department of Justice has provided the most comprehensive, recent study on Recidivism: (rearrests, re-incarcerations). With and without halfway houses:

The number of released prisoners who are arrested again is very high:

43.4% in year 1

59.5% within the first 2 years

67.8% within the first 3 years

73.0% within the first 4 years

76.6% within the first 5 years

Most offenders were likely to be rearrested regardless of their offense by the end of the 5-year follow-up period:

82.1% of property offenders

76.9% of drug offenders

73.6% of public order offenders

71.3% of violent offenders

*Bureau of Justice Statistics 2005 Recidivism study following 404, 638 prisoners released in 30 states for 5 years (2005-2010), this study represents $\frac{3}{4}$ of all prisoners released in the U.S. in 2005 and is the most current comprehensive study

**See more detail in the “Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism” report (source: Congressional Research Service, January 12, 2015, by Nathan James, Analyst in Crime Policy, www.crs.gov RL34287)

From: [DIANA LAMBE](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 6:52:53 PM

Please listen to the majority for once! I heard during the Zoning online meeting from a committee member that the comments they received were 65% against and 35% for...

I've lived through an exact example of what you want to make legal: I have since moved to another house in 80210, but my old address (2377 S Humboldt Street) I lived next to a small home that was scraped and rebuilt as a huge mansion. That mansion was then rented out to 8+ school kids by the developer of that house. My small bungalow was next to a monstrosity full of partying kids. My visitors couldn't park in front of my house and the parties got out of hand. Only I had to work the next morning when they partied all night. I finally had to call the city to remove them and thank God they did.

DON'T ACT LIKE THIS STUFF DOESN'T HAPPEN – IT DOES AND DID – TO ME!!

But what would I do now that it would be legal? The way you are planning to cram people into homes with this amendment is outrageous and unthinkable in the time of Covid-19.

As it stands now, the only people who have anything to lose is the homeowners who have spent so much money maintaining their homes only to possibly find a halfway house next door, or loads of people filling up a small house and filling the street with cars.

Of course the special interest groups want this – they only see the upside for them. But what about the people on the other side of this transaction – the downside? That would be the MAJORITY of people currently living in these neighborhoods.

I heard the members of the COOP housing groups cry (they truly cried because they think it will sway people) and say what a wonderful thing it was for them, and you listen to them but not the homeowners who have spent their life savings on the biggest asset they will ever own and watch it deteriorate. Why do I work and pay taxes if you are going to ruin the biggest asset I own? Do I need to get on a call and cry too? Is that what is driving decisions now here in Denver?

You must vote against this amendment – it isn't what Denver homeowners want and you are listening to special interests over the people who made Denver a clean and safe place to live.

From: [A.H.](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to group living project
Date: Sunday, October 4, 2020 9:22:02 PM

The reason you are getting more complaints voicing opposition to this amendment is because now people are actually aware of this happening and it's not longer in the vacuum this was trying to be slid in from.

This should be a vote that goes out to the people or a vote by each neighborhood, if Rhino wants this then fine they can have it, but allow other neighborhoods to choose if they do not want this. Either way it should not be in just the hands of council, especially with so much influence from special interest groups that are pushing for this.

This is a drastic change that once implemented cannot be undone. I could see if it was a smaller increment to see how it goes but from 4 to a possible 10 with unlimited relatives is way too far. Please allow those of us who have saved and worked our entire lives to live in quiet neighborhoods to have what we worked for.

Thanks

From: [CenturyLink Customer](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zone Code Amendment
Date: Monday, September 7, 2020 3:41:43 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

With respect to changing the Living Zone Code Amendment in Bear Valley we are opposed to it.

We already have some low income properties and there are problems. Up the street from where we live there is a house that already has 8 adults living in it and around the corner there is another house that houses ~10 people. These house's are not kept up and they are an eyesore for the entire neighborhood.

We do not need inmates or homeless in this neighborhood since there are many elderly that currently live here.

Thank you,

A concerned resident of Bear Valley

From: [Richard Boehm](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning CChris.Hinds@denvergov.orgode Amendment
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 10:32:17 AM

I and many others reject the bulk of your proposal which nothing but a terrible plan for some people to rake in profits and destroy the integrity of the Neighborhoods. I've added some points below elaborating on these issues:

- The proposed zoning changes push enforcement and monitoring of zoning regulations on to the citizens while absolving the city zoning agencies of any responsibility for the effects of the changes. Citizens have been told we can call 311 or the police for help on violations.
- The Committee says new zoning regulations will “simplify” the Zoning code for the city. This is blatantly untrue. It will, in fact, create a quagmire for citizens and make it impossible for us to address our neighborhood’s needs.
- The Committee has lumped together so many major changes in to this proposal that citizens cannot intelligently consider what the overall impact will be to our city.
- The “data”, as we are consistently hearing from the Committee, is that it's good (!) for our neighborhoods to encourage: Severe overcrowding of single family residences without bathroom or minimum square footage requirements; unregulated and unlicensed halfway houses, residential care, nursing, rehab and correctional facilities without regard for children and home owners’ well being; and expanded congregate living (rent by the room). This is so much horseshit to justify tenement housing which hasn’t worked well in large cities. A selling point for the Committee is that Seattle, Portland, Washington DC and other cities have this progressive model in place and it’s the way to go for Denver. This conclusion is based on naivety and / or stupidity. Denver is not those cities nor do we want to be.
- Let me simplify - the Committee is paving the way for: overcrowding of neighborhoods and public services for the enrichment of landlords and real estate speculators, profiting by private investors for the unregulated care of our most vulnerable citizens needing nursing and rehabilitation services, price gouging and profiting by investors of private prison expansion (that WE tax payers will also be paying for) and, of course, Air B&B.
- These building codes apply to new build, not to existing structures. Old domiciles will not need to update and conform, just as current homeowners are “grandfathered” in on other unsafe situations such as illegal apartments that don’t meet current zoning requirements. **There should be not grandfathering on safety issues**
- Most of the rentals in my neighborhood have out of state owners who contribute directly to speculative housing price increases, do not care for the properties they own, and do not contribute one thing to our neighborhoods or the fabric of our community. Why are we continuing to encourage more of this type of investment at the expense of our citizens?

Try listening to your constituents and not the moneyed interests bribing you.

Richard Boehm
303.329.8999

From: [Dena](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#); [dencc - City Council](#); kendrablack@denvergov.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 11:33:39 AM

Good Morning,

I am writing to you concerning the planned vote on the Group Living Code Amendment. I am not in favor of this for the area that I live in and ask that you consider this when voting on this matter. I believe that there are too many vulnerable people in this area. In addition, I myself am a person who has been abused, and a victim of crime and this would not make me feel safe either. I am sure that you have the greater good and the well being of the community at large to take into account when you are making these types of decisions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kindest Regards,
Berdania (Dena) Mrsny
*2702 S Webster St.
Denver, Co 80227*

From: [Renee Hopkins](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 10:43:40 AM

Please vote NO to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.

We have lived in Park Hill for 17 years now and love the diversity, the sense of community, and the current zoning. If we wanted to live in an area with overcrowding, we would have moved to the west side of town. While we absolutely support affordable housing, this is not the answer. There are too many potential negatives to this plan and none that substantiate this change.

We will have to seriously consider moving out of Denver if this passes and I'm sure we won't be the only ones.

Thank you in advance of your consideration of the potential consequences of this change.

Best

Renee Hopkins

From: [Nina McGehee](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:06:34 AM

Hello!

I want my vote to be counted and I will not vote for anyone who votes "yes" on this amendment. I do not want to live with my neighborhood's decreased safety, higher traffic rates, absence of sufficient parking spaces and trash because of overcrowded lots. Regulation of these problems will be an issue, as there are not enough inspectors to deal with city housing issues as it is. I am proud to live in Park Hill with its record of integration and historic homes. I would like to keep it this way.

Thank you for listening!

Anita Grant
1758 Kearney St
Denver, CO 80220
msanitagrants@yahoo.com

--

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited

From: [Teresa Lynne](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Friday, September 11, 2020 11:27:38 PM

If this Amendment is passed Denver will become a Slum. These neighborhoods do not have the infrastructure let alone parking space for group living. Bear Valley doesn't even have street lights!

Homeless group homes? This is the best idea you people can come up with? Shame on you! This should not be a decision that's made by people who will not be affected.

GLAC is a BAD IDEA! I have worked too hard for you to come in and ruin my life!

Teresa Stoffel
720-373-7644

From: [Ben Stapleton](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 2:42:37 PM

My name is Ben Stapleton and I live near Cheesman Park.

Please vote No to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. It would ruin the historic nature of our neighborhood, crush property values, increase trash and noise and reduce safety.

We do not want community corrections in our neighborhood, as it would negatively affect the safety of my children.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

From: [Don Batt](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, November 9, 2020 4:17:11 PM

Council Members:

As a 30-year resident of Denver, and a 65-year resident of Colorado, I strongly urge the Council to vote NO on the amendment to increase density in Denver's neighborhoods.

Denver's residential neighborhoods are the envy of cities throughout the country. Homeowners have worked their whole lives to have secure and maintain homes in neighborhoods that contribute to the city. Research has shown that neighborhoods that contain single-family, owner-occupied homes contribute significantly to a city's quality of life. As a member of the Park Hill community, I urge you to help protect our city from those that would exploit our homes for mere personal gain.

Don Batt
2390 Eudora Street
Denver, CO 80207

From: [Travis Heath](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 8:05:14 PM

I have researched the information proposed in this amendment, and I am strongly opposed to the Group Living Zoning Code amendment for too many reasons than I have time to list.

Thank you,

Travis Heath

From: [Sal Jones](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 9:15:12 AM
Attachments: [83F50EE0DADA45688D60CF2CC512A1C5.png](#)

Vote no. This is not a good idea. Here are the reasons why.

Overcrowded, Unsanitary, Unhealthy *Former Denver Director of Construction Management Weighs In*

David Bufalo is a licensed professional engineer and was employed by the City and County of Denver from 1990 until his retirement in 2006. He served as Director of the Design and Construction Management Division as well as interim Acting Director of the Building Department, which was charged with the enforcement of the Denver Building Code and exists to protect the life, safety, and health of the occupants of buildings. Mr. Bufalo's opinion piece originally appeared in the [Denver Gazette](#).

Recently, I became aware of a proposed amendment to the Denver Zoning Code through a group called Safe and Sound Denver. I have reviewed the summary of the proposed zoning amendment on the city's website. The proposed amendment has several issues that concern me. My concern is primarily about single-family residences, but could equally apply to group homes and halfway houses. My concerns are as follows:

Trash

Based on a household with four adults, there would be an increase in the amount of solid waste when the occupancy could possibly more than double from four adults to maybe nine, as an example. The EPA has reported that nationwide per-capita generation of solid waste is 4.51 pounds per person per day. For a family of four, this equates to 126 pounds per week. If another five persons were to be allowed to occupy the same residence, the solid waste generation would now be 284 pounds per week, which is a 225% increase. This **increased amount of trash will not fit into the city-provided 65-gallon trash carts** that are typical in my neighborhood. This means that the surplus trash will have to wait for the next "large item pickup" day, which now is scheduled for every eight weeks. In the interim, any **bags of trash stored outside will attract insects and vermin, which in turn may spread diseases to humans and pets.**

Fresh Air Ventilation

The proposed zoning amendment makes reference to fresh air ventilation requirements via the Denver Rules and Regulations for Housing. These rules require a window or other means of ventilation. **Opening a window for fresh air when the outside temperature is around 20 degrees does not seem like a good option.** Forced mechanical ventilation through an air-to-air heat exchange would most certainly be better, however, this would be **costly and may be unaffordable.**

Hot Water

The proposed amendment only **requires a 35-gallon water heater**, which is **totally inadequate**. Even a 50-gallon water heater would not be sufficient to serve a household of say nine people. Based on a water heater's first-hour rating calculation, a 50-gallon water heater could only serve eight occupants.

Overcrowding

The proposed zoning amendment would allow a minimum of five and as many as 10 unrelated adults and all of their relatives and an unlimited number of children to live in a single-family residence. **As a human quality-of-life issue, this is unconscionable and a dereliction of duty by government to protect the life, health, and safety of its residents.**

Overcrowding leads to the spread of disease, domestic violence, lack of storage space, depression, anxiety, stress, loss of individual privacy, disruptions of sleeping arrangements and patterns, among other adverse effects. A report done in England about how overcrowding affects families states what is considered acceptable for occupants based on what one bedroom can accommodate: a married or cohabiting couple; a single person over 21 years old; pairs of children under 10 years old regardless of gender; pairs of children aged 10 to 21 years old of the same gender, and a person aged 10 to 21 with a child under 10 of the same sex. Any occupancy level greater than this, constitutes overcrowding.

Although it appears that the authors of this amendment have done some coordination with the Building Department and the Fire Department, **much more needs to be done — especially in the area of community involvement and inter-agency cooperation.**

From: [Amalia Torrez-Hayes](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, September 28, 2020 7:07:38 PM

Council Members,

I am fervently opposed to this amendment! In my immediate neighborhood people have lived here many years, raising their families, welcoming grandchildren and are a mixture of retired and still-working adults. They are homeowners who care for their homes and yards and are respectful, peaceful and quiet. Their comings and goings are fairly predictable, crime seems to be fairly low and we look out for each other.

Recently new people have moved into a rental next door to me with multigenerational members of 6 or more. Cars are coming and going at all hours of the day and night at times with 6 or more vehicles parked around the neighborhood. Loud parties have taken place when they first moved in until wee hours of the morning keeping those who live around them up. Loud conversations take place when people arrive or leave at any hour with car locks beeping. This has definitely changed the vibe!

I'm imaging this scenario times more of many unrelated adults living in a neighborhood dwellings if this amendment passes. The last renters didn't bother to keep up the property and had vicious dogs in the back yard who constantly barked keeping my family members from enjoying our yard.

Who wants to live amidst people who have no skin in the game of being responsible homeowners? Who wants a community corrections facility in their midst with young children in their home? Would you?

Let's give this more thought and consideration!

Sincerely,
Amalia

Sent from my iPad

From: [DAWN SCHIERLING HA](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 6:26:47 PM

Good evening Denver City Council and Mayor Hancock.

I am a long time resident of Bear Vally in Southwest Denver. I am emailing to voice my concern and dissent to the proposed change in the Group Living Code Amendment.

This is not the way to deal with affordable housing. Cramming more people into one house, does not make sense.

Please look at other ways to deal with affordable housing in Denver.

Dawn Schierling-Harder
Bear Valley resident

From: [Sandra Adams](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 11:33:32 AM

Mayor Hancock and Denver City Council,

I have been a life-long resident of Denver. My husband and I have purchased the home I am living at in 1982 and have had the pleasure of dwelling here since. Our neighborhood has always been kept clean and tidy and the people that dwell near me are neighborly and we look out after one another. We are mostly seniors with some families that have small children that live in my neighborhood and we enjoy the peace and quiet that has been considered part of our community for decades now.

I am writing to you, as a resident of Denver, to please say NO to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. I am very concerned what this plan will do to Denver but also to my local community. I also worry about the elderly, like myself, who live a very quiet life and we have worked many years to have a home, on a peaceful street, in a peaceful neighborhood. I would like to live my final years at my home and not have to worry about what kind of riff raff will be going on in my community. We struggle sometimes with vandalism and theft in my neighborhood but it is mostly teenagers. I would be far more worried about my safety and the safety of my neighbors should this amendment bring the type of community living presented by this amendment. Aside from the elderly that live here there are many families with children. Two blocks away from my home a boy named Jacob McKnight was kidnapped in the 90's and murdered right from our streets. His tragedy was never resolved and the murderer never caught. It hit our community hard. I never want to have another community member go through something that horrifying. As a Denver Resident I am asking you to please vote NO on this amendment and continue to keep our communities safe.

Respectfully,
Sandra L. Adams
Denver, CO 80227
303-986-6099

From: tullematra@aol.com
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2020 1:54:07 PM

I do not support GLT#7 as it is currently proposed. Provisional housing is imperative for a city experiencing the degree of homelessness as is Denver. I believe communities must respond to the needs of the unfortunate. However, the weakness I find in the current proposal is that the numbers of dwellings and individuals to be accommodated in neighborhoods like Bear Valley are unreasonable for the security and maintenance of character of the locales. Additionally, I would like to see detailed guaranties for the supervision and upkeep of the properties to the neighborhood standard. I request that continued thought be applied to this issue before action is taken. The protection of existing communities supersedes the desire of city planners to quickly solve a problem and be done with it. We, the citizens, will live with your impetuous solution. NO to GLT#7!

Christine Maxwell
5950 W Yale Ave
Denver 80227

From: chrisier8@aol.com
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2020 1:19:39 PM

Please vote against the proposal from GLAC as it affects the safety of all Denver residents with increased traffic and the housing of potentially dangerous people.

Thank you
Chris Reich

From: [Clarke McIlravy](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 8:42:11 PM

Dear Council Members,

I hope this finds you well. I recently heard about the Group Living Advisory Committee's (GLAC's) proposal and push for zoning changes in the City of Denver. In particular I am referencing their proposal to changing zoning regulations in regard to "small" and "very small" facilities. I am not sure if you have had a chance to fully review this proposal and what it would mean for the residents of Denver but this a dangerous proposal. This zoning change would allow homeless shelters and community corrections facilities to operate in 80% of Denver's neighborhoods including mine and yours. Under the GLAC's plan, inmates from all over Colorado will be eligible to serve the final months of their sentences in privately ran halfway houses in our neighborhoods. This is bad for our city, our neighborhoods and our residents. Please, I encourage you to fully review this proposal and do the right thing. Residents in this city do not pay some of the highest taxes in the country for homeless shelters and halfway houses to be allowed to move in next door to our expensive hard earned properties.

Thank you for taking the time to look into this and hear our input.



R. Clarke McIlravy

Industrial Piping Specialists, Inc.

Denver, Colorado

Direct 720-616-3978 | Toll Free 800.725.9100

<http://www.ipipes.com>

From: [John Gishpert](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:56:19 PM

Dear Denver City Council,

As a resident of Denver since 1961 I am very much concerned about your consideration of passing this group living Zoning Code Amendment.

I am very much against bringing these folks, who many have had lengthy criminal records, to serve the final months of their sentences in a privately-run halfway house as my neighbor.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion and request.

Kathleen Gishpert
2898 S. Ingalls Way
Denver, CO 80227

From: [Kevin Morton](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 4:31:56 PM

You are making a bad choice with the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. This does not make sense and could be dangerous to children in our neighborhood.

Please reconsider and VOTE NO to the group living amendment.

Thank you,
Long Time Denver Resident
Kevin Morton

From: [Amy Reynolds](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [jaime.torres@denvergov.org](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kneitchatl@denvergov.org](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayor's office](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 5:23:05 AM

Members of the LUTI Committee; Members of City Council and Mayor Hancock,

I am a life-long resident of Denver and we have lived in our modest home in Southwest Denver 39 years. We live in Council District 2, which is 39% white and 61% people of color. I am the member of a multi-racial family, we celebrate a gay couple, an ex-addict and a convicted felon among our family members. We are acutely aware of the struggles on all of these fronts as are our neighbors. Our community, Glenbrook, struggles with zoning issues (trailers, waist-high weeds, poorly maintained trees, etc.), especially since March. We are hard-working people. Our block alone organically represents almost all of the groups included in this amendment-people of color, convicted felons, people with mental illness, seniors, addicts. We don't need additional strife in our neighborhood to deal with. We don't want or have to "be trained" or meet with people from the City on how to deal with a new population of people struggling with life-we already have plenty of that.

A few reminders to all of you as this horrific amendment lunges forward:

- There are approximately 214 Registered Neighborhood Organizations and Homeowners Associations in the City of Denver, The Denver City Planning office presented to only 25 of those organizations (page 28), which is 1% of those organizations-a shameful statistic from anyone's perspective. Andrew Webb actually seemed proud of that effort as well as his offer to present to other groups in the Spring of 2020 (page 28). Someone should tell him we're in the midst of a global pandemic that started early March 2020. Certainly the Denver City Council is aware of the communication and physical barriers, emotional and financial stress your constituents are enduring-the timing for this amendment to be socialized, reviewed and understood by Denver residents could not be worse.

- Denver City Council is not the Planning Board, not the Department of Corrections. You are elected officials, not appointed by the Mayor. You are not listening to us-the people in your districts. The Mayor, Councilwoman Kneicht and special interest groups who are not directly impacted by this amendment are driving the bus and you need to slam the brakes on this amendment. Also note that Boulder is not part of the city of Denver. Clearly Andrew Webb is confused on that matter as he allowed people and organizations from Boulder to publicly opine on this issue taking precious speaking time from Denver residents during the last City Planning meeting. We were shocked-did he think we wouldn't notice?

- On Monday, August 5, 2019 in an 8-4 vote (Councilman Kashmann didn't vote), Denver City Council voted to terminate the "Community Corrections" halfway housing contract with CoreCivic. You had no alternate plan. You've extended the contract until June 2021. The plan looks like you're releasing over 500 convicted felons in halfway houses across the city of Denver in residential neighborhoods. If that's not the plan, now would be the time to communicate what the plan is. These felons come from all over Colorado; please tell me how this will improve our neighborhoods? Don't push this on Denver residents-you made the

decision to go in a different direction, now fix it without jeopardizing the safety of our Denver neighborhoods.

- I am not opposed to allowing co-op housing in the heart of the City, but that is a tiny piece of the proposal that is buried amid host of cost complex actions also being proposed. Do the people in Cap Hill realize they could have up to 40 convicted felons and drug addicts living next door or was that fact conveniently left out of the campaign by the City Planner's office to garner Capitol Hill neighborhood support? The City Planner's proposal will shove too many people in houses (we've yet to find out the maximum, dependents or who will oversee all of the different populations), allow six parked cars ANYWHERE on the property (yes, the front yard), and will turn our Denver neighborhoods into a sea of rental homes. Adding to that complex proposal is housing for convicted felons, seniors, drug and alcohol addicts, the homeless, people in need of transitional living-could it be more complex? Although the Planning Office is happy to propose the zoning amendment, it is very clear that they have NO stake in the downstream impact and unfunded mandates this brings to other Denver departments much less Denver residents and businesses. No one has the answers to the multiple questions raised. Some of you have looked to us for answers, suggestions. We're 30 days from a final reading on this complex amendment.

Please stop this amendment from moving forward and vote to oppose it. There are too many known and unintended consequences to approving it and there is not enough time to sort it all out by the end of September. It's too complex (at 174 pages last count) and the timeline is too tight. Do the right thing and stop this craziness. Don't discount or devalue our voices or our neighborhoods. From Southwest Denver to Montbello there are outcries to stop this amendment from moving forward for so many reasons. I hear them and are listening-are you?

Respectfully,
Amy Reynolds

From: [Marsha Tharakan](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 9:36:01 PM

Dear Mayor and Council Members -

I am writing asking you to vote no on the Group Living Zoning Code amendment. As written, this will result in serious overcrowding, potentially worsening the spread of communicable diseases like COVID, and breakdown of neighborhoods throughout the city. Allowing halfway houses to be put up anywhere means more difficulty with oversight and potentially exposing residents to crime and violence. This amendment is also something that the people of Denver should be allowed to vote on given its magnitude - it should not be decided on by a handful of people.

Thank you.
Marsha Tharakan

Sent from my iPhone

From: [DEBRA ARMENTO](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 2:34:24 PM

City Council members, Mayor Hancock and Andrew Webb,

We are writing to express our concerns and opposition to Denver's Group Living Zoning Proposal. This proposal will have a monumental impact on our city and we are not satisfied that you have listened and taken our concerns into consideration.

Here are just some of the reasons we are against this proposal.

- Our number one concern is for safety, security and well-being.
- Crime and violence in our neighborhoods that already exist will be exacerbated – assaults, vehicle theft, property theft, noise, trespassing and disrespect of people and property.
- Safety of children at schools, parks and in their own yards is very concerning.
- Overcrowding will lead to disputes, conflicts and violence among neighbors.
- Homeless shelters and correctional facilities in neighborhoods is of major concern. It is well known that:
- Many homeless choose that lifestyle and are in need of mental health care.
- Many of the offenders that will be released and living among us are violent offenders.
- Many offenders are repeat offenders.

These are not unrealistic or hyped-up concerns. It can be very frightening being accosted by unsavory individuals especially when caught off guard or when alone.

You will be forcing us to deal with:

- Increase in violence and crime.
- Encounters with belligerence.
- Issues having to be handled on our own when our police force is overwhelmed.
- The safety and well-being of our most vulnerable – the elderly, children and handicapped.
- Correctional facilities with violent offenders and repeat offenders.
- Severe overcrowding of our neighborhoods.
- Noise issues.
- Parking issues.
- Traffic issues.

Our government's number one concern and priority should be the safety and security of its citizens. This proposal is not right for the law-abiding citizens of Denver and it is infuriating and appalling that some of you have completely ignored our safety and concerns.

Each and every one of you need to take these concerns into consideration and we stress that this proposal be rejected.

Respectfully,

*Debra and Dale Armento
Harvey Park Neighborhood
Denver, Colorado*

From: [Laura London](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [jamie.torres@denver.org](#); [denvercouncil5@denver.org](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 9:41:36 AM

My husband and I live in Congress Park with our three young children.

There are too many changes in this single proposal providing little opportunity for the impacted community to understand the impacts holistically. We ask for you to vote NO to this Amendment.

The Planning Board has provided no evidence that the proposed relaxation of standards will ensure relief to persons experiencing homelessness. We continue to be puzzled by the Planning Board's insistence that Denver should aspire to the same futility in dealing with homelessness as its so-called "peer cities." If the Planning Board is holding out these "peer cities" as successfully ending homelessness, then the Planning Board should also explain how these "peer cities" have ended homelessness.

The proposed relaxation of household and group-living standards will allow landlords to prey on the upcoming wave of evictions and place more than five unrelated adults **and any number of relatives** into each house. It does not provide safe living spaces for children. Our most vulnerable, underserved persons deserve more from the City.

The Planning Board's willingness to create hubs for criminal activity near children and schools in Denver simply is not the solution to correctional facility demands. The people of Denver said so years ago when they demanded a moratorium on new community-corrections houses in downtown Denver neighborhoods. It is shocking that the Planning Board would willingly introduce known adverse impacts to Denver's children in their residential neighborhoods.

We are against the City's proposal to relax the household and group-living standards by amending Article 11 of the Zoning Code.

Thank you,
Laura London

From: [Brandon Fosbinder](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 2:03:27 PM

I would like to thank the Denver City Council and LUTI Committee for this opportunity to share my thoughts on the proposed Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. I am a resident of District 5.

I applaud your desire to make housing affordable in the City of Denver. The proposed Group Living Zoning Code Amendment which allows up to 10 unrelated persons to live in a single-family residence is a short-sighted plan that does nothing but stuff people into a box and call it affordable housing.

Denver needs to have diverse neighborhoods within the City, and single-family neighborhoods are one of those diverse neighborhoods. These neighborhoods result in stability. Your proposal will encourage short-term residents who will not have a long-term connection to our neighborhoods.

Additionally, the proposal would eliminate the requirement for Correctional Facilities to be located at least 1,500 feet away from schools, which is troubling because liquor stores, marijuana dispensaries and gun stores all will still have minimum distance requirements.

Does the Denver City Council value parolees, homeless people, and drug addicts over our most precious asset – our children?

Group living and residential facilities are two VERY distinct issues which should be addressed individually and not lumped together.

- Group living is based on the square footage of the house, the new proposal allowing up to 10 people to live in a 2,600 square foot home. This is nothing more than a flophouse. 260 square feet is the size of a motel room.
 - While I believe that having two (2) unrelated persons is antiquated, ten is also not acceptable.
- Residential facilities are based on total lot size. Facilities serving 11 or more people must be located on parcels that are greater than 12,000 square feet. The majority of these parcels are obviously in single-family neighborhoods. With the elimination of the 1,500 foot requirement to stay away from schools, you are setting a very dangerous precedent.

I implore you as City Leaders to LEAD – that means making the hard decisions and not pandering to the vocal “one-size-fits-all”. I expect you to vote against this harmful proposal and start again by unbundling these complex issues.

Regards

--

Brandon
720/320-7965

From: [Seery Maggio](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 2:00:15 PM

Dear Denver City Council and Mayor Hancock,
I would like to thank the Denver City Council and LUTI Committee for this opportunity to share my thoughts on the proposed Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. I own property in both District 5 and 6.

As a civic-minded citizen, I applaud your desire to make housing affordable in the City of Denver. However, the proposed Group Living Zoning Code Amendment which allows up to 10 unrelated persons to live in a single-family residence is a short-sighted plan that does nothing but stuff people into a box and call it affordable housing.

Denver needs to have diverse neighborhoods within the City, and single-family neighborhoods are one of those diverse neighborhoods. These neighborhoods result in stability. Your proposal will encourage short-term residents who will not have a long-term connection to our neighborhoods.

Additionally, the **proposal would eliminate the requirement for Correctional Facilities to be located at least 1500 feet away from schools.** Does the Denver City Council value parolees, homeless people, and drug addicts over our most precious asset – our children?

Group living and residential facilities are two VERY distinct issues which should be addressed individually and not lumped together.

- Group living is based on the square footage of the house, the new proposal allowing up to 10 people to live in a 2,600 square foot home. This is nothing more than a flophouse.
- Residential care facilities are based on total lot size. Facilities serving 11 or more people must be located on parcels greater than 12,000 square feet. The majority of these parcels are obviously in single-family neighborhoods. With the elimination of the 1500 foot requirement to stay away from schools, you are setting a very dangerous precedent and will destroy single-family neighborhoods.

I implore you as City Leaders to LEAD – that means making the hard decisions and not pandering to the vocal “one-size-fits-all”. I expect you to vote against this harmful proposal and start over by separating these complex issues to address them individually. Additionally, I urge you to put these issues to a city-wide vote. Taxpayers ought to have an actual say in how their neighborhoods are treated.

Thank you,
Seery Fosbinder

Cc:

District 1 Amanda P. Sandoval

District 2 Kevin Flynn District 3 Jamie Torres District 4 Kendra Black District 5 Amanda

Sawyer District 6 Paul Kashmann District 7 Jolon Clark District 8 Christopher Herndon

District 9 Candi CdeBaca District 10 Chris Hinds District 11 Stacie Gilmore At-Large Robin

Kniech At-Large Deborah "Debbie" Ortega Mayor Michael Hancock

From: [Charlie Kettering](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code amendment
Date: Saturday, September 19, 2020 8:09:02 PM

Dear City Council members, Mayor Hancock, and Andrew Webb:

It's important that you vote no to the proposed changes to Denver's Group Living Zoning. I've pasted below some of the well-understood concerns from the Safe and Sound Denver website (which are valid). Bottom line, it seems clear that this issue has been handled inappropriately by its proponents and would have undue (not to mention unfair, undisclosed, unequal, and unreasonable) impacts on Denver citizens.

As Democratic voters and significant participants in Denver's business and non-profit communities (we are investors, lawyers, and long-time supporters of the Rose Andom Center, which Mayor Hancock knows well), we understand some of the intent behind the measure, but it's just obviously poorly done. Our governments can't ram this type of thing through—it's not appropriate, and it strengthens our community's growing divisions. In the case of this issue, it seems to be strengthening divisions across many groups. Please don't support or validate a process or changes that do that.

Charlie and Shalyn Kettering

The proposed zoning changes push enforcement and monitoring of zoning regulations onto the citizens while absolving the city zoning agencies of any responsibility for the effects of the changes. Citizens have been told we can call 311 or the police for help on violations.

What involved citizens are hearing and being sensitive to is what affects them - not the holistic body of changes being proposed and what this re-zoning proposal ultimately means for our communities.

Some people are concerned that the current definition of unrelated adults and their families is discriminatory to the LGBTQ community and that it does not recognize current societal norms or desire for communal living. They do not support the zoning proposal.

Older people are threatened by all of the changes at once, particularly with all of the neighborhood issues we are already facing each and every day, without government support. They do not support the zoning proposal.

Homeowners and neighborhood communities are rightfully concerned about overcrowding, residential care facilities, homeless shelters, and prison facilities in the neighborhoods without clear and defined rules regarding density, proximity to schools and community gathering places. They do not support the recommended changes.

I believe the Committee is paving the way for: overcrowding of neighborhoods and public services for the enrichment of landlords and real estate speculators, profiting by private investors for the unregulated care of our most vulnerable citizens needing nursing and

rehabilitation services, price gouging and profiting by investors of private prison expansion (that WE tax payers will also be paying for) and, of course, Air B&B.

And for all of this “progress” under the guise of “affordable housing and helping the homeless”, we tax payers and citizens who have built these desirable neighborhoods to live in get to monitor and deal with the inevitable abuses and problems that will result.

Charlie Kettering
720.903.0220

From: [Jim Kelly](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 7:04:08 AM

I live in S.W. Denver and I am opposed to this amendment. My wife and I worked 2nd jobs to live and raise our children in Bear Valley and it is not fair to change this neighborhood with a stroke of a pen. This measure should be put to the vote of all Denver residents so our voices can be heard. Jim Kelly

From: [John Brink](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 4:46:41 PM

The LUTI Committee should vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment when it meets on December 22.

The City needs to do a better job of informing and meaningfully involving its residents about the proposal. As it stands now this proposal has flown below the radar, driven by stakeholders with an interest in removing any restraints on group living facilities and it has been crowded out of the public's attention by far more pressing matters, like the COVID pandemic and its devastating effects on public health and our economy.

Any revisions to the zoning code must establish a reasonable ceiling on the number of *related or unrelated* people who can live together in the same dwelling based on objective standards tied to the health and safety of both the homes and occupants themselves and the neighborhoods in which those homes are situated.

Instead of being made a use by right, all rentals *and especially group living dwellings* should be subject to appropriate licensure or registration based on their type and their impacts and they should be subject inspection and oversight by the City.

Finally, it is the pinnacle of hypocrisy that elected officials supporting this amendment to the zoning code live in Chapter 59 zoning code areas or areas governed by HOA rules and thus will not be affected by the changes they plan to impose on those who don't live in these protected areas.

The Group Living Zoning Code Amendment should go back to the drawing board and stay there until it addresses the fundamental unfairness of inequitable applicability across the City, inadequate public engagement and the dangerous precedent of establishing all rental dwellings and most group living establishments as a use by right.

John Brink

1901 Bellaire Street

4jmbrink@gmail.com

From: [Amy Wright](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO TO GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMMENDMENT
Date: Monday, November 9, 2020 10:50:45 AM

I am deeply opposed to the Group Living Amendments for the following reasons:

1. I do not feel that the neighborhoods were fairly represented in the committee meetings and that commercial enterprises dominated the make-up of the committee. Four community meetings is too few for residents to learn of the full impact of these extreme changes to our neighborhoods. The planning stage was clearly meant to benefit the developers and commercial enterprises, not the residents who will be impacted significantly. It is not equitable across the city as HOA's and Ch 59 areas are excluded.

2. **SU:** DO NOT REMOVE single family zoning. Do not allow three units on single family lots (house, garage type ADU, and basement type ADU)

3. Do not increase density to five unrelated adults in 1600 sq ft with a maximum of ten unrelated adults for 2600 sq ft or larger, with any number of children and related adults. This could greatly increase density in single family residential neighborhoods.

4. **Type I facilities:** Allowing commercial operators to plop Type 1 Group Living anywhere in Denver is an abomination to each neighborhood. Each neighborhood should have their own input regarding how many of these facilities will be in their neighborhood. The city should not allow an unlimited number anywhere. My whole block could become Type 1 facilities.

A suggestion: the city could require each neighborhood to find space for three Group Living Type 1 facilities in their neighborhood, allowing the neighborhood to determine the best location within their neighborhood. With 100 or so Denver neighborhoods, this provides the commercial operators about 300 Type 1 facilities.

5. **Type II facilities:** In Park Hill, north south blocks are 600' long and east west blocks are 300'. There are many lots along Montview Blvd and 17th that are the requisite 12,000 sqft size that could have one of these facilities. That means there is potential for one every four blocks east to west, or one every two blocks north to south. Filling in the neighborhood in this unlimited way corrupts the neighborhood and destroys the feel and historic character of single family homes and neighborhood.

A suggestion: The city instead could ask each neighborhood to find the best location for one Type II facility. With about 100 neighborhoods in the city, commercial operators could have 100 facilities with each neighborhood deciding the location.

Summary: The proposed changes benefit developers and commercial operators over the well-being of the residents of the city that the city should be serving. The residents have not been well represented in the process, only the commercial enterprises. The strength of Denver is in its residential neighborhoods. This plan could destroy the very backbone of Denver.

ACTION: VOTE AGAINST THIS ILL-CONCEIVED PLAN

Sincerely,

Amy Wright

P.S. For reference, I have been a Denver resident since 1978 residing in three neighborhoods, first renting and then buying three different homes in two neighborhoods, Wellshire (1979-1982) and Park Hill (1982 to present). I attended one of the four Group Living Meetings and have made comments at the meeting, online and to the Planning Board.

From: [DavidCatherine Hand](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to Group Living Zoning
Date: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 11:45:56 AM

I moved to Denver 10 years ago, however for the last year and a half my job relocated me to the Bay Area in California. I witnessed first hand the impact that "urban camping" has had in that area. It has RUINED the beautiful city of San Francisco. That is exactly what is happening to our once beautiful Denver. I was proud of the city of Denver for enforcing the "camping ban" and told everyone I could in the Bay Area that it absolutely made a difference. The word disappointed does not even come close to describing how I feel driving around Denver after moving back.

You have the power to keep Denver beautiful and not let our streets be turned into the bedroom and bathrooms of the homeless. Yes, we absolutely need to take care of our homeless but not in this way. It is getting harder and harder each and everyday that we do not enforce "No Camping" in Denver city limits.

You ARE NOT helping the homeless by giving them zoned areas to camp and live. YOU ARE taking away from what made this city beautiful. YOU ARE increasing crime and damaging this city. YOU ARE increasing the number of homeless on the streets. SOON this will start to become irreversible.

PLEASE I BEG YOU do what is right for your city and get this back on track before it is too late.

Sincerely,

David Hand

From: [Olga Zak](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [kniechatlarage@denvergov.org](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [district1@denvergov.org](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 9](#); [Planning Services - CPD](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Group Living
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 10:52:10 AM

The proposed zoning amendment benefits only certain special interests groups like developers and investors charging horrendous rents and management fees.

It does not benefit the very people we are trying to help, local homeowners, our schoolchildren and local homeowners. Rents will jump sharply up and rightly so if more people are sharing the houses they will degrade the houses faster.

Please vote NO!

Olga Zak, MS
District 6
2460 S Cook St
Denver, CO 80210

From: [Anne Cox](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to Group Living
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 9:40:58 PM

Good Evening.

Although well intentioned, the proposed Group Living Amendments will fail to deliver stable housing for those in need and will degrade the Denver experience for those who already own or rent dwelling units in the City. Investor ownership of Group Living Dwellings will reduce the per person cost of rent but will increase the income to Landlords and the unintended consequence will price the dwellings out of reach of traditional families, thereby displacing them.

To mitigate the harm, the following measures may be considered.

1. Require that one or more Group Living occupants own the dwelling. This would help stabilize the social structure and improve maintenance and upkeep.
2. In addition, or in lieu of ownership requirements, require licensure of Group Living arrangements. This would establish standards and give the City enforcement tools if standards are not met. All adult members of the Group should be required to execute formal documents explaining the duties and responsibilities of the occupants, and the consequences of violations of the Licensing standards. Licensure should address attendant issues like parking, maintenance, governance, and health and safety.
3. Reduce the number of unrelated adults who may co-occupy dwelling units to 4 adults to avoid overcrowding and establish reasonable limits on the total number of people who may occupy the dwelling. We are flawed human beings and overcrowding, particularly where children live, creates opportunity for neglect and abuse.
4. Recognize that unintended consequences develop in ways we cannot anticipate. The Slot Home experience degraded Denver neighborhoods without delivering affordable housing as promised as dwellings came on the market at \$600,000 and more. Yet the appointment of a Task Force to study outcomes did not occur until six years after the 2010 zoning change that allowed Slot Homes. After a year of study, the Task Force recommended changes eventually adopted, but the grace period allowed even more Slot Homes into the pipeline before the new rules took effect.
5. Group Living already exists in Denver, despite violating current zoning laws. Formalizing the system deprives Denver of enforcement tools already available to address the very few complaints the City has received. Andrew Webb admitted there have been very few complaints in a public Zoom meeting earlier this summer.

Please give attention to new forms of housing that will expand access without ruining Denver neighborhoods.

1. Single Room Occupant group housing would serve as a transition model for homeless persons who want to work and need an address and stability to move forward.

2. Dormitory style housing (similar to college or senior housing) would be appropriate for singles, couples, and families with or without children, who could live in dorm rooms with efficiency kitchens, private bedrooms and baths and the group could share common areas for living space and cafeteria style dining.

3. The establishment of homeless camps managed similarly to recreational campgrounds with 30 day time limits for a camping spot before moving on to another camp. This would improve the welfare of occupants by allowing clean-up and avoiding some of the problems we have experienced with long term urban camping.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Cox

From: [Katie Ginder](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO to group living/residential care zoning code amendments
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 3:25:30 PM

Mayor Hancock and city council members:

I would like to let you know that I am opposed to the group living/residential care zoning code amendments. These are unfair code changes that are not going to be uniformly applied to all residential areas. This issues also seems to be getting pushed through without input from current Denver residents.

My neighborhood is not equip to handle halfway houses and many adults and families in one home. Our streets are small and would not allow for any more street parking, it is already hard enough to find parking and just drive through these streets. Our alleys and trash pick up are not made to handle many people in one home. Not to mention, this is a family neighborhood - safety would be a big issue with transient and halfway house living. It would make us overcrowded, noisy and unsafe. All of this would drive families out and also bring down the property value for all of us that own our homes.

Please take this into account and stop the group living/residential care zoning code amendments.

Thank you,

Katie Ginder, DO MBA

From: [Darius J](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to revised Group Living Project also
Date: Sunday, December 6, 2020 2:33:47 PM

Hello,

I wanted to express my opposition to this new revision of this amendment and also the questionable tactics Andrew Webb and his office are taking to get this passed.

See if this sounds about right?

1: Start with a first revision that sets it's sights for an absurd and sky high amount of residents.

After everyone voices alarm to that bill revise said bill to what was originally intended so "it doesn't seem as bad now".

2: Have a few feel good stories in it about complete anomalies like one guy who helps out his neighbors and second show an addict who looks like your perfect everyday citizen, "she wouldn't hurt a fly!" Neither of these is even close to the norm so make sure you put an * as results may vary.

3: Put revision on the table for a December 22nd meeting so it butts up against the holiday when everyone is indisposed and make sure there is no time for the community to read and understand the new proposal,

4: no time for people to express their concerns

5: Outside investors from Washington and their lobbyists all get what they wanted and the people who made this city great all lose, well the working class and poor lose, the rich get to live in Cherry hills village walled away from this new nightmare.

No additional police, no addressing of school capacity, no additional handling of solid waste, unsafe streets lined wall to wall like capital hill just to name a few. Also the thought of packing people in more densely during a pandemic is in itself dense.

Please vote no on this or **let each neighborhood decide for themselves**, I pay my property taxes happily to maintain the neighborhood I chose to move in and this Group Living will pull that right out from under all of us.

Thank you
Darius J.

From: [Amy Barrett](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No to the Group Living Zoning Amendment #7
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 11:58:46 PM

This one is backed by planners and developers not the people living in these communities. This is a safety concern to the children, this would increase the shortterm rentals and have rehabs and 1/2 way homes. We have too many schools and children. Why would anyone need to pass an amendment to have 10 unrelated adults (with unlimited relatives) per residence.

Against this in every way.

Amy Barrett
2050 Leyden St
Denver, CO 80207

From: [Anthony Seganti](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO ZONING CHANGES
Date: Sunday, October 18, 2020 4:56:15 PM

NO to Group Living Code Amendment

Denver Resident,

A Seganti

From: [Barbara Patton](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO!!!!!!!
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 9:50:43 AM

**Vote NO on the Group Living Zoning Code
Amendment!
NO Experiments in Denver Residential
Neighborhoods!**

From: reid@osrno.com
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Old San Rafael RNO letter to City Council members
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 10:55:19 AM
Attachments: [OSRNO letter to Mayor and City Council 9-17-19.pdf](#)

Please see that the attached letter from the Old San Rafael Registered Neighborhood Organization (OSRNO) comes to the attention of each member of the City Council. If this is not an effective way to get this letter to each member, please let me know. Thank you.

Reid T. Reynolds, President
Old San Rafael Neighborhood Organization

From: [Karyn Karlson](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayor's office](#); [Planning Services - CPD](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSED to Group Living Amendment
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 11:33:02 AM

I am **opposed** to the latest development for Group Housing Rules in Denver.

1. Allowing 5 unrelated adults and their unlimited family members to live in less than 1800 sf with up to 10 people to live in a 2,600 square foot home is way too dense for our the Hale Neighborhood. Not only would this change the character of our neighborhood but the parking would be insane, even with the recent plan revisions.
2. Group living and DOJ residential facilities are **two VERY distinct issues** which should be addressed individually and not lumped together. These two issues need to be **unbundled**.
3. Eliminating the 1500 foot requirement for **DOJ residential facilities** to stay away from schools, you are setting a dangerous precedent that will harm single-family neighborhoods.
4. Another concern with the current proposal allows as "use by right" for **DOJ residential facilities**. This means, as a use, they are automatically allowed. Instead of issuing permits as needed, use by right has very little accountability. **A permit can be revoked if the holder abuses the Code; use by right has no recourse.**
-
5. In the policy document for "Housing and Inclusive Denver", the neighborhood of **Hale** from Colorado Blvd to Elm Street is NOT to be developed as a type 4 neighborhood.

I implore you to vote AGAINST this harmful amendment and start over by separating these complex issues to address them individually. Additionally, I urge you to put these issues to a **city-wide vote**. Taxpayers should have a say in how their neighborhoods are treated.

Finally, I would ask that At-Large Councilmembers **Robin Kniech** and **Debbie Ortega** recuse themselves from the vote coming before City Council in October, 2020 due to the obvious conflict of interest of having worked on and developed this Amendment. For the sake of good and transparent government and on behalf of the taxpayers, either they must recuse themselves or the City Council and the Mayor must exclude them from voting on the Group Living Amendment.

Karyn Karlson
1315 Elm Street
Denver Native

Sent to: District 1 Amanda P. Sandoval District 2 Kevin Flynn District 3 Jamie Torres District 4
Kendra Black District 5 Amanda Sawyer District 6 Paul Kashmann District 7 Jolon Clark District
8 Christopher Herndon District 9 Candi CdeBaca District 10 Chris Hinds District 11 Stacie
Gilmore At-Large Robin Kniech At-Large Deborah "Debbie" Ortega Mayor Michael Hancock

From: [Lou Bucher](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment 7
Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 4:55:04 PM

Lodging formal opposition to Group Living Code Amendment 7.

As a resident of Denver, I oppose this Amendment and will be noting those that are for it in all upcoming elections.

Lou Bucher

From: [charles brouillette](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposing vote to GLAC plan
Date: Saturday, December 19, 2020 3:15:53 PM

Hi I am charles brouillette and I live in SE denver.

I am writing to state that I oppose the GLAC plan.

I have a group home next door to me and I am not happy with it and naturally I oppose additional such use in residential areas.

I live at 6500 E alaska drive denver 80224

From: [J Metzler](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Amendment #7
Date: Monday, September 28, 2020 5:05:21 PM

Hello, I am strongly opposed to the proposed Group Living Zoning Code. The congestion in the Washington Park area has reduced the quality of life over the years. Parking on our block is a premium even with all the scrape offs and new homes with large garages. The infrastructure has not improved with the growth, even with the massive development in the DU area.

As a member of the Residents Steering Committee for the Washington Park School appointed by Councilman Charlie Brown I understand the need for density and compromise. The solution was a win win for the developer, neighbors and community.

However, this proposal is extremely lacking in many ways. Please consider voting against this Amendment, and for quality and character of our different neighborhoods. I implore you to seek another solution.

Thank you,
Jan Metzler
1226 S. Race St.

From: [Caroline Carrico](#)
Cc: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov; brentfahrberger@denvergove.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT #7
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2020 11:28:59 AM

To Whom It May Concern -

Consider this my OPPOSITION to AMENDMENT #7. It is my belief that it would adversely affect my neighborhood.

Passing of this amendment will lower property values, increase traffic, noise, trash and congestion. It will strain an already aging infrastructure as well as create safety concerns for the existing residents. Additionally amendment #7 threatens to erase the integrity of our neighborhood, as well as destroy the cultures that make our neighborhood unique and desirable.

Since the opportunity for the persons living in these neighborhoods to vote on this issue has been removed from our control, as our elected representative it is your responsibility to listen to what the people who elected and trust you to vote their wishes.

Caroline Carrico

From: [Bruce Gmail](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Amendment #7
Date: Monday, September 28, 2020 5:12:59 PM

>

> Hello, I am strongly opposed to the proposed Group Living Zoning Code. The congestion in the Washington Park area has reduced the quality of life over the years. Parking on our block is a premium even with all the scrape offs and new homes with large garages. The infrastructure has not improved with the growth, even with the massive development in the DU area.

>

> However, this proposal is extremely lacking in many ways. Please consider voting against this Amendment, and for quality and character of our different neighborhoods. I implore you to seek another solution.

>

> Thank you,
> Bruce Burgess
> 1226 S. Race St.

From: [Winston Downs Community Association](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to GLAC
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 5:19:02 PM

16 December 2020

Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
Via Email

Mr. Webb, Members of the Denver Planning Board, Honorable Mayor Michael Hancock and Honorable City Council:

We, the Board Members of the Winston Downs Community Association, would like to reiterate our strong opposition to the proposed Group Living Amendment Changes/GLAC originally expressed in August 2020 (attached).

We request our former and current objections be included in the Public Record, in advance of the 12/22/20 L.U.T.I. Our objections are as follows:

There is an overall lack of clarity as to what constitutes a nuclear family (whether traditional or not) and how many of these family units can be feasibly housed into a single household.

The proposed Zoning Code Changes:

- Fails to consider the overall impact of added number of unrelated individuals living in the same home unit because it expands to include up to five (5) adults with any others related by commitment, blood, adoption, civil union and permitted domestic employees, in the absence of overall caps. The proposed increases to 5 unrelated adults and their families in a home of 1,600 square feet with up to 10 unrelated adults and their families in homes of 2,600 square feet are untenable.
- Increasing the number of residents in existing homes exacerbates issues with street parking, public schools and related transit, trash collection, sewer and water usage and aging electrical infrastructure. It also dilutes our enforcement and protection systems. (911, 311)

Many of our concerns also stem from what represents a fundamental departure from the zoning and planning code contained in Denveright, passed just two years ago.

- We received surveys; we had meetings where we gave input about what was important about our City and our Neighborhood. Applying a broad brush to all neighborhoods is not equitable, nor will it resolve the affordability issues this city faces.
- This plan, in fact, dissolves the context of residential areas we residents were asked to submit feedback for to support development of Blueprint Denver.

We repeat: Much more work and evaluation of adverse unintended consequences are required to develop a proposal that is likely to avoid the potential for severe economic and safety problems.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Derek Cocovinis, President
Winston Downs Community Association
Attch.

August 17, 2020

Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver
Wellington E. Webb Municipal Office Building
201 W. Colfax Ave.
Denver, CO 80202

ATTN: Andrew Webb, Senior Planner

Mr. Webb, Esteemed Members of the Denver Planning Board, Honorable Mayor Michael Hancock and Honorable City Council:

The Winston Downs Community Association (WDCA) strongly opposes the passage of the proposed text amendments to the Group Living regulations in the Denver Zoning Code.

WDCA, as a registered neighborhood organization (RNO), and as Denver residents, we urge you to consider the following concerns that we have related to the proposal

Many of our concerns stem from what represents a fundamental departure from the zoning and planning code contained in Denveright, passed just two years ago.

- We got surveys; we had meetings where we gave input about what was important about our City, and no one asked about changing the rules for community corrections, homeless recovery residences and numbers of people per home unit.
- This plan, in fact, dissolves the context of residential areas we residents were asked to submit to support Blueprint Denver.

These uses expressed for Any Neighborhood Location and without Limitation Beyond 600 to 1200 feet between structures are a concern.

- Shelters for homeless for year-round or if more, for 130 consecutive days per year
- Community correction facilities in addition to halfway houses
- Recovery residences, where “guest” participation is required

Comprehension

- The sheer impossibility of the average citizen getting through this or comprehending something that covers so many distinct uses
- The City presentation was sanitized to present a pretty picture that in actuality is not the whole scene.
- New terminology where “group living” has been removed and replaced with “congregate living”, residential care and nonresidential uses. Most RNO’s have only seen the original version of code proposed changes.
- Temporary tiny homes remains in this plan; we were told they were not to be included.

Increasing Numbers of Unrelated Adults- Negative Effects

There is an overall lack of clarity and ambiguity related to what constitutes a nuclear family and how many of these family units can be feasibly housed into a single household.

- Fails to consider the added number of unrelated individuals living in the same home unit because it expands to include up to five adults with any others related by commitment, blood, adoption, civil union and permitted domestic employees. The presentations and discussions publicly were not explicit enough for most to understand the reality of occupancy based on square feet and/or lot sizes.
- Increasing the number of residents in existing homes exacerbates issues with street parking, public schools and related transit, trash collection, sewer and water usage and aging electrical infrastructure.
- Increases the issues with traffic because Denver has failed to provide adequate, reliable public transportation
- Increases stress on the already taxed 911 and complaint-driven 311 enforcement capabilities.

Enforcement Concerns

- Ignores the impacts of an increase in Congregate Living homes without an adequate regulatory structure for their maintenance and oversight for neighborhood and resident safety.
- Homeless shelters managed by non-profits would operate without regulations other than this code which offers 311 or 911 as resolution for any problematic issues.

- Correction communities per neighborhood – these were explained as halfway houses and now we understand this includes “prisons” and halfway houses. While they are enforced by law, with budget reductions, there are major concerns as to how these actually will operate and recourse available for when things go wrong?
 - One director has the authority to increase any corrections or homeless shelter when deemed appropriate (weather, prisoners moved from adjacent counties, etc). This seems unreasonable to expect adequate management for such facilities.
 - P. 149 includes temporary or mobile restroom facilities for shelters and other residential care facilities. These options present public sanitation issues with undesired consequences by vandalism, unauthorized use, added levels of waste management, etc.
- Consider the impacts of virtually unmonitored proliferation of community corrections and homeless shelters on facility residents and the affected neighborhoods
 - Lack of provisions for oversight or enforcement create the potential for massive safety issues and poor outcomes for residents.
 - Lack of a residential or “per capita” per so many home units limit on the number of facilities creates a potential problem for high concentrations of largely unregulated facilities that will exacerbate equity issues, not build them

Overcrowding

- Permitting facilities of 11 to 40 people. and in emergencies up to 100. in 12,000 square foot lot sizes in all neighborhoods creates a burden for facility residents due to potential overcrowding and a mismatch in scale in residential neighborhoods.
- What if there are future pandemics; how would it be managed?
- This also fails to address the lack of adequate, reliable public transportation within the whole of Denver and how that might impact the success of any of these facilities.

Financial

- Funding for shelters for those experiencing homelessness and other at-risk populations is not defined
- City and County, nonprofit and private operator liabilities should a private “congregate” home unit “guest” harm a resident or if someone in corrections escape and harm someone outside Denver. What is the contingency for this?
- Availability of tax and other revenue streams required to cover rental subsidies and increased burdens on other areas of city operations is not guaranteed. The operational and fiscal impacts of the proposal are unclear and do not appear to have been fully vetted.

Intent

- This proposal does not appear to be part of a comprehensive strategy for addressing wage inequities, mental health, substance abuse and the myriad of other issues that must be dealt with to address our need for housing affordability and homelessness problem.
- Zoning cannot “fix” needed criminal justice reform. These changes will complicate current problems, not resolve them. We urge this City to remove any codes related to corrections communities and to consider with a re-imagined criminal justice system in Denver.
- It has not been analyzed in terms of Denver’s “sanctuary city” status, the increased numbers of homeless following introduction of recreational marijuana, or the homeless who are bused into Denver from other cities.

In short, a zoning code change of this magnitude should not be used as a short-run fix to a long-term problems. It is very short-sighted in scope. Denver should have considered all of these codes ten years ago and more recently, during the Blueprint Denver reviews in 2010 and Denverlight, more recently.

- We firmly stand together with the Virginia Village / Ellis Community Association, which represents nearly 20,000 households, in their opposition to the proposed text amendments to the

proposed Group Living Amendment Changes to overhaul Residential Care uses in the Denver Zoning Code (see attached letter of opposition).

- We also stand with Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation's Resolutions to, at minimum, un-bundle these amendments so that better study, public engagement and understanding are reached.
- We oppose the apparent effort to change the zoning codes adopted in 2010; ones that were planned by residents with the city

Much more work and evaluation of adverse unintended consequences are required to develop a proposal that is likely to avoid the potential for severe economic and safety problems.

WDCA urges you to vote NO on this proposal in its current form. We recommend Council to instead focus on public transit systems and policing reform-both long overdue issues.

Sincerely,

Tim Rooney,
President
Winston Downs Community Association
P.O. Box 22594, Denver, CO 80222
www.winstondowns.org

Enclosure (2) VVE letter, INC Resolution

cc: Denver Planning Board
Denver City Council Members
Denver Mayor Michael Hancock
Christian Jimenez, Office of Denver Mayor Michael Hancock
Zoning & Planning Committee, Inter-Neighborhood Cooperation

--

Stay safe
Winston Downs Community Association

From: [Lucy Chused \(DEN\)](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 12:22:26 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Denver City Council Members,

I am writing today as a concerned Denver resident. I would like to express my strong opposition to the Group Living Code Amendment that will soon be coming up for a vote. After researching this amendment, talking with my neighbors and considering the broader impacts on my community, I feel strongly that the amendment as it is written today, with a lack of proper vetting, is not the right way to help address Denver's housing issues.

How does the city plan to ensure enforcement and compliance? Several of your council members themselves stated that the city's ability to ensure the code is followed is hampered by the lack of sufficient resources to address complaints. We are already frustrated with the planning board's current lack of enforcement over violations including parking, weeds, trash, noise and snow shoveling. How can we feel assured that this would be any better?

This proposal requires separate discussions of the many components included therein, including consideration of different approaches that weren't previously considered, and more input from the public in communities in which this affects.

Please note this opinion of a concerned constituent as you consider your vote.

Thank you,
Lucy Chused
616 S Gaylord St.
Denver, CO 80209

ALTERRA
MOUNTAIN COMPANY



LUCY CHUSED
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES
ALTERRA MOUNTAIN COMPANY
P 303.981.7371
ALTERRAMTNCO.COM

From: [Carol Burt](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Group Living Proposal
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 4:27:08 PM
Attachments: [Group Living 2.docx](#)

Carol J. Burt

T: 303.393.0712 | C: 805.953.5213

caroljburt@comcast.net

THIS COMMUNICATION, INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, IS CONFIDENTIAL. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE OR E-MAIL, AND PERMANENTLY DELETE ALL COPIES, ELECTRONIC OR OTHER, YOU MAY HAVE. THE FOREGOING APPLIES TO THE MESSAGE ABOVE AS WELL AS TO ANY ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER MESSAGES FORWARDED OR OTHERWISE INCLUDED.

From: [Chris Lind](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 5:46:08 PM

Dear City Council members:

My wife and I have lived in the Hutchinson Hills Neighborhood (SE Denver) for 35 years. We write to express our strong opposition to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7 because proposal will radically change the character of Denver's single family home neighborhoods.

There is no reason that for this complex and far-reaching proposal to be rushed to approval during the time of Covid-19 when people opposing this measure will have difficulty getting together to express their views. Adding large numbers of unrelated and often transient people (sober living and halfway house residents) to single family neighborhoods will likely reduce property values, increase the need for zoning enforcement, increase congestion and traffic, and put added pressure on police services.

We suggest in the alternative that this proposal be implemented only as a 3 year pilot program in the council districts of those who support this measure. This will give Denver residents adequate time to assess the impacts of Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7 on neighborhoods and the feasibility of applying it to the City at large.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Lind and Julie Altmix

7864 East Hampden Circle

Denver CO 80237

julieandchris@comcast.net

From: [JAN SMART](#)
To: planningboard@denvergov.org; [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Group Living
Date: Monday, August 10, 2020 3:58:09 PM

August 10, 2020

To: Denver City Council Members, Mayor of Denver, and Denver Planning Board, Senior Planner, Andrew Webb

Subject: Proposed Denver Zoning Code Text Amendment 7: Group Living

This proposal should be completely REJECTED for the following reasons:

The proposed changes are too broad and far-reaching for one zoning change proposal. It appears that the zoning proposal intends to address many of Denver's problems and mistakes and put them on the backs of the taxpayer and single family neighborhoods. This would eliminate single-family neighborhoods and that is not acceptable.

The majority of Denver residents are unaware of the significant zoning changes as there has been little community outreach, a mismanaged attempt to have a few meetings, and limitations on discussion due to COVID 19. The two-year study, headed by Andrew Webb, was with a committee of 46 members that were largely comprised of pro-group living advocates. Four of the members were from the City Council or Planning Board and a meager 6 neighborhoods were represented. There are 90 neighborhoods in Denver. Many of the committee members do not live in Denver. The bias is obvious.

The number of families in a residential home is too high. The current proposal allows for 5-10 families in one home. This will result in the commercialization of residential neighborhoods.

Residential Care is changed significantly and will allow homeless shelters and community correction facilities in residential neighborhoods. Additionally, there should not be a need for residential care of up to 40 persons in single-family neighborhoods. There has been no discussion of crime-victims rights in this proposal. The homeless population and incarcerated population are not protected groups and do not belong in residential neighborhoods. The safety and peace of Denver residents has been completely ignored.

The GLAC committee did not adequately represent the over 131,000 residential Denver homes and was biased to for-profit and non-profit entities. Additionally, people of color were not represented on the committee.

Over 80% of the feedback to GLAC from residents was in opposition but the proposal is still being pushed ahead.

I encourage you all to reject this proposal.

Dr. J. Smart,

Southmoor Park West resident (35 years)

From: [Eugene de Jong](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 10:12:09 AM

Dear Madames and Sirs,

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to the Zoning Code through Amendment #7. The arguments against this have been well documented in the comments left by home-owners and other concerned citizens. Most difficult to take into consideration is the proposal to allow up to 8 unrelated individuals to live at the same address. This is plainly impractical, I think of my own home and how in the world it could accommodate 8 unrelated residents. I remember back in the 90's when many houses were divided up into squalid little rooming house cubicles, the effect on the surrounding neighborhood and the impact to housing values. Further, the arguments in favor of this plan based on availability of transportation is specious given the fine multi-mode public transportation system we have built in the last 20 years.

If the issue is providing space for housing for underprivileged people then I would suggest the city stop selling off every piece of newly available land to developers and start a program of building affordable housing. I would support a tax increase to see this happen rather than see our beautiful neighborhoods become like many were up until the mid 90's. The strides Denver has made in becoming one of the most livable urban centers in America should not be thrown away to restart the cycle of flight from the city center. As a final thought this program will cause the property values to plummet and with them the tax base.

Very truly yours,
Gene de Jong
800 Lafayette St
Denver, CO 80218
720-854-5594

From: jsphillips1837@comcast.net
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: ["Mary Phillips"](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Planning proposal
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 1:23:09 PM

To All Council Members,

Thank you to those council members who authored or endorsed the recent editorial in the Post.

As longtime Denver homeowners we are strongly opposed to the recommendations to make all of Denver residences available for up to 10 unrelated adults (Restricted HOA's like Polo Grounds South may remain untouched sanctuaries for the wealthy.).

Denver is a beautiful city in large part because of its well kept neighborhoods where individual owner's pride and efforts have maintained the grace of the properties. Many larger homes would become absentee owned or owned by multiple residents. Multiple residents would have little incentive to maintain property. Multiple residents would bring up to 5 times as many vehicles to the street. Multiple residents would bring up to 5 times as much discards and garbage. Multiple residents would bring up to 5 times as much noise. Multiple residents would bring up to 5 times as much wear and tear to the property, 5 times as fast.

Is it the vision of the planning commission (some of whom are not Denver residents) and/or the administration that Denver should merely become a city of boarding houses until the city develops slum characteristics and those with the means either retreat to "luxury" high-rises like NYC or move out of the city altogether. The editorial gave me encouragement that at least many members of the Council have a better view.

Thank you, Steve and Mary Phillips

From: [Kristin](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please do not ruin our lives
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 7:59:26 PM

Dear Denver City Council Members,

All Denver residents rely upon the City Council to represent them fairly. When citizens moved into residential neighborhoods, they paid for their homes at market prices that reflected the zoning of the area and the protections that that zoning provided. What you are doing by removing those protections is unfair at best and will have a significant negative impact on both home values and quality of life for neighborhood residents.

It is unfair that you are intentionally misleading the public about these impacts by failing to disclose the facts such as the crime statistics that occur with this zoning and that you are not fully informing the public before making these changes.

The City Council is no doubt aware that if these changes and their impacts were brought to a vote of Denver residents, that they would be strongly opposed. Making these extremely harmful changes to zoning that will bring crime and destruction to residential neighborhoods are a dereliction of your duty as City Council Representatives to protect the interests of your constituents.

Please do not ruin the lives of so many people with this unwise and unfair action.

Regards,

Kristin MacArthur
[569 E. Iliff Ave](#)
Denver, [80210](#)

Sent from my iPad

From: [Vickie Lenny](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please vote NO on the proposed group living amendment (GLA) to zoning
Date: Thursday, January 7, 2021 11:10:25 PM

All Council Members

I am writing to you to ask you to vote NO on the proposed group living amendment (GLA) to zoning.

I love Denver and have lived in the Cherry Creek East area over 30 years. And in those 30 years it has all been within three blocks. I started out on Bayaud and Madison, purchased a townhouse on Monroe and then sold my townhouse and purchased a duplex on Garfield. It is a neighborhood, single families that have chosen this neighborhood.

The friends that I have in Seattle, Portland and San Francisco are leaving. I do not want Denver to become like those cities. I do not want to leave my neighborhood and want it to remain the neighborhood I chose to live in.

Please vote NO.
Thank you
Vickie

--

Vickie D. Lenny
71 South Garfield Street
Denver

From: [Jessica Sanderson](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Planningboard - CPD](#); [Laura Aldrete](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10](#)
[Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 10](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] POSTPONE consideration of the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment Proposal
Date: Saturday, October 3, 2020 12:23:42 PM

Dear Mayor and Public Officials,

I am writing to urge you to simply **postpone** any further consideration, vote or passage of any law regarding the Group Living Proposal. I agree that we need affordable housing solutions in Denver, but you must prioritize the health and well-being of your citizens.

It seems incredibly reckless, inequitable, possibly unlawful and frankly hypocritical to authorize a significant increase in the number of unrelated people living together in a household, and to substantially increase urban density, during the Covid-19 pandemic. Many of your own offices are closed or restricted to prevent the spread of the virus among unrelated people (<https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/covid-19/recovery-guidance/city-services-facilities.html>), yet at the same time you would authorize a significant increase in the number of unrelated people allowed to live together in residential neighborhoods.

At a time when our government and our scientists are encouraging, and in most cases mandating, social distancing, the amendment would authorize and encourage the exact opposite. As you well know, the list of closures and our sacrifices is long: Our DPS schools continue to operate remotely (my daughter graduated East High School from our car last year), our performing arts venues are closed, our libraries are closed, our bars are closed, our restaurants are operating at significantly decreased capacity, we need to reserve limited spots at our gyms, recreational and fitness facilities (assuming they have even re-opened), many park roads and parking lots are closed (to discourage even outdoor crowds), we are wearing masks to go shopping, we are required to wear face coverings while inside city and county facilities (the Wellington E. Webb Municipal Office Building is only open for limited hours and services), our courthouses are operating with reduced staff and many trials have been postponed, and we are all personally doing our part to forgo social gatherings, even in our own homes. The CDC recommends that we limit the number of guests that we bring into our own homes and maintain at least 6 feet distance from our visitors, and Governor Polis issued and has repeatedly extended a state-wide mask order mandating the use of masks indoors. ***There is little to no chance that a group of unrelated people living together in a single-family dwelling will wear masks at all times while indoors in their own home.*** In fact, our homes are just about the only place that we can all safely and/or legally take off our masks off these days.

It is common knowledge by now that the worst outbreaks, infection risks, and/or Covid-related hospitalizations and deaths in Denver, the State of Colorado and our nation as a whole ***have all been centered around places where unrelated people live together.*** In our area, early on, Covid outbreaks were largely related to nursing homes and health care facilities. Now it has shifted to schools, and in fact CU Boulder recently moved to all remote learning. See <https://www.9news.com/article/news/health/coronavirus/colorado-covid-outbreaks-list-schools-restaurants-stores/73-60a53e94-85dd-471d-bf2a-624163de1b30>. Our country and our state are releasing prisoners and closing college dormitories and fraternity/sorority houses to avoid crowded-living facilities. Recently, New York, New Jersey and Connecticut even mandated that visitors from our State of Colorado quarantine for 14 days if we want or need to

visit because of our state's poor performance in containing the spread of the virus. <https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/covid-19-travel-advisory#:~:text=If you have traveled from,for requiring such quarantine>. It is simply incomprehensible to me how you, our public representatives, could possibly consider, let alone vote in favor of an amendment to allow and encourage group living homes in residential neighborhoods at a time like this.

In sum, the group living proposal risks causing additional Covid-19 outbreaks within the increased-capacity homes and community spread to their neighbors. I am certain that if the amendment passes during the Covid-19 pandemic, the city will face legal battles that will consume enormous and ever-precious taxpayer dollars in litigation costs that would be far better utilized to provide public services.

The Covid-19 pandemic is not under control, and unfortunately we cannot predict when it will be under control. But you certainly *can control* the timing of consideration and/or passage of the group living proposal. I urge you to consider simply waiting until we at least have more control and better information regarding Covid-19 before making any crucial decisions. Only then can you responsibly consider the actual merits of the proposal.

Sincerely,

Jessica Sanderson
Denver District 10 Resident

From: [linda p](#)
To: [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Gillmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to change zoning for single units
Date: Monday, September 7, 2020 9:45:58 AM

Re- new zoning proposal to expand number of adults allowed in single residences

We are opposed to the zoning changes proposed to allow virtually unlimited residents in single units now zoned for families or for two or more unrelated adults. We further oppose efforts by some on the planning committee in their new project to “infill” Denver and to effectively end all single unit zoning for housing in the city. At the meeting we attended regarding the current zoning proposal, those in attendance appeared to be vastly opposed to the zoning changes to allow up to 10 adults and unlimited relatives. Yet, it appears that will of these neighbors is being ignored.

Last week, I listened to public comments prior to the city council meeting which seemed to have been packed in favor of the proposal touting the virtues of group living. We are not opposed to group living in general or to expanding the number of adults to 4 or 5 but would like a cap on the number of allowable residents if relatives are also allowed. Halfway houses and homeless shelters should be allowed in residential areas only through a permitting process after widespread input from residents.

Also, we resent the implications of some that anyone trying to maintain single unit, limited occupancy housing is a bigot fighting to maintain inequity. No one should be labeled as evil for wanting to limit occupancy levels in the neighbors they love.

In a virtual meeting, some of the planning board members pointed to the large amount and percentage of opposition to the current proposal which had been received and ignored. Please do not accept this current proposal as written. Rather, limit group occupancy to no more than 4-5 adults, preferably with some sort of ceiling on additional residents.

Linda and Allen Powell, Denver District 4

303-757-1639

From: [Shna](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Group Home Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 6:25:32 PM
Attachments: [Letter to City Council against Group home ordinance.pdf](#)

Dear City Council Members,

Please find attached **Vote of NO** from our South Hilltop Neighborhood Association, and our reasons for concern.

We ask for the matter to not be approved.

Thank you for sincere consideration,

Re'uben Drebenstedt, President 303-619-6945

reuben@southhilltop.org



www.southhilltop.org

South Hilltop Neighborhood Association

From: [robin.mcdougal](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Zoning Changes: Please do not pass proposed zoning changes.
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 11:38:28 AM

Are you trying to destroy our beautiful city?

I don't want to see halfway houses for convicted felons in Denver!!!

I do not want to see Sober living homes in Denver!!!!

I do not want to see zoning which would allow 10 UNRELATED ADULTS living together.

I DO NOT agree that you would allow up to 6 vehicles per property

in addition to unlimited street parking!!

I was born and raised in Denver and I think your proposals would destroy our beautiful city and our property values!

Robin McDougal 659 High Street, Denver 80218

From: [Seery Maggio](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment - Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 12:28:12 PM

Dear Council Members, Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Webb,

Thank you for allowing me to express my thoughts regarding the proposed amendment to the Group Living. I own property in both District 5 and 6. I am strongly against the amendment for many reasons, but for brevity's sake, I'll only touch on four.

1. We are not Seattle or Austin – nor should we strive to be. Allowing up to 5 with a max of 10 unrelated persons to live in a single family home (and we all know that most homes in Denver are not mansions) is nothing but stuffing people into a box and call it affordable housing. You say you'll enforce the code, but right now you have code violations in the Montbello neighborhood that are 4 years old. If you can't enforce the current code, how can you possibly enforce the new one? So what number feels right to me? A max of four unrelated people with a cap of 6 people.
2. This issue is not about race or economic equality like some people like to say. I have a cousin who is a felon and another cousin who has been in and out of rehab and safe living homes more times than I can count. I don't want those two living near me or a school. By the way, both are white and had more opportunities than I did growing up. This isn't about race or privilege – it's about common sense.
3. The home I own with my husband is my biggest investment. We chose our neighborhood because of it's close proximity to major streets, schools, and parks. We specifically did NOT purchase a home near a correctional facility for a reason, and now you're changing the rules on us? I haven't chosen to break the law – why should someone who did, get to choose to live next to me before they've completed their sentence? How dare you put my biggest financial investment at risk. It should be noted that you don't allow liquor, gun, or marijuana stores near schools – why are you allowing criminals near schools? We need single-family neighborhoods to stay that way.
4. Lastly, the issues of **Group living and residential facilities are two VERY distinct issues which require very distinct solutions. They should be addressed individually and not lumped together into one amendment.**

I implore City Leaders to LEAD – and that means making the tough decisions and not pandering to the vocal “one-size-fits-all”.

Thank you.

Seery Fosbinder

From: [Florence Sebern](#)
To: [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for LUTI Committee 12-22-20 | Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 4:09:32 PM
Attachments: [Sebern Petition Signatures in Opposition 12-16-2020 LUTI w-attachments.pdf](#)

Please find attached 3,448 letters of opposition to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment to be included in the public record for the LUTI Committee meeting on December 22, 2020.

regards,
Florence Sebern

From: [Susan Young](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment to GLA
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 1:39:04 PM

Please vote NO on the GLA.

Vote to maintain our neighborhood's current zoning. The GLA is absconding with choice of neighborhood for many, and it is an ideology that is being forced upon us.

If the average number of people is two to three per dwelling in "peer cities" which allow many more numbers in those units, why is GLA being proposed? Merely to address classism? Do you really think you are going to rid society of classism? What about the HOA's, the chapter 59, those of better means who will avoid all of this. This is a capitalistic society and there will ALWAYS be classism. Modify the permitting process.

We did not buy in Capital Hill, we do not want to live in that sort of density, yet that is what is being proposed by GLA : streets lined with cars (1 per adult and 1 for the house = 6 cars for one home with five adults), the noise produced by five people plus their dogs, friends, family, deliveries. And to do this by right and not by permit. There is no turning back from this experiment with our lives.

Do you live in an overcrowded environment? I doubt it. All of the suggestions that have been proposed encourage overcrowding. It started with a ridiculous number of 8 plus unlimited relatives and now seem to have settled on 5 adults plus children per any sized dwelling. Living with five people and one or two bathrooms, get ready for the arguments. This is unhealthy physically and mentally for those in these living conditions and for those who are neighbors.

The process by which this all came about is shameful. A government entity who states they are about equity did not provide equity of process. My RNO did not hear about this until January 2020, I guess that would be two years after this whole process started and about when the first public meeting occurred. The meeting I attended was a sham. Plenty of time for presentation, minimal time for comments or

Q&A.

These points are just the starting point for me, there are plenty of other reasons I am opposed.

In protest,
Susan Young
Denver

From: [Arthur Alarcon](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Donald Kany](#); [Nancy Landauer](#); [Nate Bryant](#); [GoPattyB](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Denver Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 3:17:36 PM

Mayor, Denver City Council and my representative, Councilwoman Kendra Black

I am a strong NO on the changes to the SFR zoning code being studied and offered these past 2-3 years.

The lack of transparency by the Mayor, City Council, the modest reduction in the 10 adult per SFR home and unlimited children, the unmentioned exemption of areas with Covenants or prior exemptions including areas where our politicians live, and the moving of corrections facilities into residential areas all are unwise and the consequences are severe and adverse to the residential character of the established neighborhoods.

City Council should pursue this project in a transparent and public forum that includes representatives from all stakeholders and constituents.

Don't rush this poorly devised tool for more density.

Arthur R. Alarcon
Denver, CO 80231

From: [Donna Krentz](#)
To: [Paige Burkeholder](#); [Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); [andrewwebb@denvergov.org](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: A Response from Denver Neighbors Re: CW Kniech's Email 10/5/2020
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 10:54:25 AM

Paige,
Fantastic!

From: safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com <safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com> **On Behalf Of** Paige Burkeholder
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 7:17 PM
To: Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments <safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com>
Cc: dencc@denvergov.org; andrewwebb@denvergov.org; Michael B. - MO Mayor Hancock <michael.hancock@denvergov.org>
Subject: A Response from Denver Neighbors Re: CW Kniech's Email 10/5/2020

The following was forwarded to me by Denver neighbors concerned about the details for the City of Denver's proposed Group Living Zoning Amendment #7 as currently drafted:

Concerned Citizen Response to Councilwoman Kniech Email Posted on Safe and Sound Website

October 5, 2020

We appreciate Councilwoman Kniech's openness to "find more common ground" between the two opposing positions regarding the Group Living Text Amendment. We want to clarify several of the points raised by Councilwoman Kniech in her recent email to residents. Our clarifications below only address the points she raised with regard to the Definition of a Household. We will address Residential Care in another statement.

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"Because they didn't realize they couldn't share a 3 or 4 bedroom house with 3 or 4 roommates, a situation that would be legal in almost every one of Denver's peer Colorado cities or nationally."*

Denver studied 38 peer cities, the average number of allowed adults is only 4.4 in all the cities studied. **The average is only 3.9 for Colorado paper cities.** The question remains why is Denver then proposing between 5 and 10 unrelated adults plus unlimited number of relatives?

Furthermore, the city states that despite laws allowing for more occupants, many peer cities have average household sizes remaining between 2 and 3.1 people. If this is indeed the case, then again, why is Denver proposing between 5 and 10 when a much lower number seems to be the norm both in legislation and in practice in our peer cities?

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"Many components of this policy have changed to directly respond to feedback coming from single family homeowners"*.

The Group Living Advisory Committee consisted of 48 appointees, of which only 8 represented neighborhood organizations. Many neighborhood organizations have indicated that they either are opposed to the current legislation or did not receive adequate notice regarding the legislation. Therefore, any previous response from the city in drafting the current proposal still falls far short of addressing the concerns for a majority of residents.

Councilwoman Kniech states: It is important to listen to *"those who may not have as much representation in city conversations such as renters or low income residents or people of color"*.

The Group Living Advisory Committee consisted of 35 representatives of owners and operators for certain advocacy groups including advocacy groups for emerging uses/ tiny homes and cooperatives for renters. Councilman Flynn pointed out at a LUTI meeting that only one of the 8 neighborhood representatives on GLAC was a person of color, someone the Councilman had appointed from his

district, and that person gave up on the process early on. With regard to people of color, many opposed believe that there has not been sufficient outreach to neighborhoods with people of color. Councilwoman Gilmore specifically criticized the City's Planning Department for its lack of outreach to the communities of color in her district. Furthermore, both Montbello RNOs, representing these communities, have explicitly stated their objection to this legislation. We ask Councilwoman Kniech to whom is she referring since it seems that renters had representation and at least two RNOs representing people of color are against the proposal and others have not even been consulted?

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"On household size - reducing the number of related adults ... from the original proposal of 8 to 5"*.

This is a misrepresentation. The Group Living Text Amendment actually states that anywhere from 5 to 10 unrelated adults with an unlimited number of relatives may live together depending upon the square footage of the house.

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"Establishing a maximum cap of 10 in houses 2,600 feet or larger, where there was previously none."*

Since the proposal, as currently drafted, does not state a cap of any sort, we are unclear as to Councilwoman Kniech's statement. Rather the Amendment states 10 unrelated adults with an unlimited number of relatives. This could allow up to 30-40 people living in a house together. Many residents would be supportive of a maximum cap, but most likely at a number in line with Denver's peer cities, which is around 4 as previously noted. We ask Councilwoman Kniech if the push to have a number as large as 10 or more is a result of the desire of cooperative businesses, such as the Queen City Cooperative, which had two representatives on the advisory committee? As currently proposed, such businesses would fall under the household definition thereby avoiding any potential regulations or licensing requirements for such businesses.

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"Prohibiting rent-by the room models"*.

The proposed text amendment simply states that a household is defined by "not-for-profit" but we ask Councilwoman Kniech what does that really mean? Councilwoman Kniech is supportive of a rental registry or licensing program and she indicates that such a program is in the works, but how will this rental program ensure that all those living at a home share a common lease and are living as "one" household in a single family residential neighborhood? Many of Denver peer cities have rental license programs of which we are fully supportive, but they do not necessarily address single family homes being rented. If the licensing program being developed by Council is to apply only to cooperatives and commercial business ventures, then why allow them to operate under the Household Definition at all? Why not simply lower and cap the number of allowed adults? If the program is to apply to single family homes of any size that are used as rentals, then what assurances do we have that licensing will be implemented and adequately enforced after this legislation passes? What assurances do we have that investors will not take advantage of the new amendment and "buy up" the already limited housing stock in Denver leading to an even greater affordability problem?

Councilwoman Kniech states: *"Planning department will track concrete metrics on implementation" and "Neighborhood inspection"*.

The suggestion that metrics will be developed is not sufficient since it is all after the fact. As it currently stands, enforcement relies upon other building, fire and housing codes that no one is designated to check or certify and neighborhood inspection services regarding other unintended consequences are severely limited. Speaking of unintended consequences, the Charter Agreement that the GLAC signed mandated that the committee recommend strategies to address issues including the "consideration of potential unintended consequences". Councilwoman Kniech, why was such an analysis never produced? Also, given the budget constraints that Denver is facing, particularly given the pandemic, how can you ensure residents that neighborhood inspection services will be sufficiently funded particularly given the potential for a greater need for such services should this amendment pass?

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to safeandsounddenver+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/safeandsounddenver/5EBCB5F5-DD29-40BD-BCBD-AF53DDCC614E%40gmail.com>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to safeandsounddenver+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/safeandsounddenver/5EBCB5F5-DD29-40BD-BCBD-AF53DDCC614E%40gmail.com>.

From: [Jerry Doerksen](#)
To: [wbmahoney@gmail.com](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [denc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [b.baskette@comcast.net](#); [ktierney@livsothebysrealty.com](#); [judysgreenfield@gmail.com](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Group Living Amendment
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 11:55:54 AM

I just sent a letter to Andrew Webb for public comment on the GLA. Since the revised draft will not be available for public review until 12/18, as you said, Will, we can only respond based on the current version, which I did. Here's a copy of what I sent:

The Group Living Amendment is, by far, the most onerous legislation I have seen in my 49 years as a Denver resident. This amendment to the Denver Zoning Code should be defeated for the following reasons:

1. There has never been an answer given to the question as to the origins of the proposal. Who/what was behind it?
2. There was no consideration given to the opinion of Denver residential property owners prior to the formation of the Group Living Advisory Committee. Nobody I know was ever asked for their thoughts, or even informed, about this proposal. Not until this had been going on for over two years did it come to my attention. Many Denver residents are still unaware of this proposal which will dramatically affect their neighborhoods if left as currently drafted.
3. Public comment in the various phases of the progression of the amendment is at 80% to 90% in opposition. How can an amendment with that kind of opposition be given serious consideration?
4. There should be no place for correctional facilities or large residential care facilities in residential areas, other than those permitted by Federal law. Such facilities would seriously compromise the accepted ideas of what a single family residential area should be.
5. The GLAC membership was comprised of individuals primarily interested in promoting their own causes. It's evident from scrutiny of the member's affiliations that the GLA was representative of their various interests. The interests of the neighborhoods affected by the proposal were not properly represented. Only eight of the forty-eight members of the GLAC represented neighborhoods and only one of them attended more than four meetings. The others saw it as a waste of time because the outcome was predetermined.
6. This amendment, if adopted, would cause, over time, a dramatic change in demographics. Property owners will leave for other neighborhoods that offer a similar neighborhood environment to what they enjoy now. That void, in many cases, would be filled by rental homes, or co-op type arrangements, increasing density and accompanying related problems.
7. There never was an impact study. One would think any proposal of this magnitude would undergo an intensive review and investigation to assess what impact it would have on infrastructure, quality of life, schools, ordinance compliance, safety, and other related issues.
8. There is no funding allocated to deal with anticipated added costs such as trash pickup, staffing to investigate ordinance violations, demand on staff to administer building applications, etc.
9. Homes in residential areas were designed to accommodate single families, not a group of unrelated individuals living together. A single family of five, for instance, is not the same as a group of five unrelated individuals. As an example, a single family would, most likely not have more than 2-3 vehicles while an unrelated group of five would likely have five vehicles. A family unit is mostly a stable unit while a group of unrelated persons is much more volatile. Many other examples could be made.
10. A comparison of peer cities published on the Group Living site reflects an average of less

than three unrelated persons living together in cities where a larger number is allowed. That being the case, I propose that the number of unrelated occupants of a single family residence be increased from the current number of two to a maximum of three, certainly reasonable given the statistics provided by the study.

SUMMARY: Residents in single family zoned areas live where they do in order to avoid the very conditions the Group Living Amendment would create. Contrary to the suggestion by Andrew Webb, Senior City Planner and a few other Council members that current zoning was the product of racial motivations or other biases, whether true or not, simply has no bearing on why people live where they do at the present time. I have lived in my current home in SE Denver for 45 years and prior to that in the Park Hill neighborhood for 6 years. I was not advised prior to purchasing either of those homes that I was engaging in a racist activity nor have I been alerted to that possibility at any time since, until the GLAC concluded that, unbeknownst to me, my decision to live where I do must have indeed been racially motivated. What a bunch of garbage. People live where they do because the neighborhoods meet their personal preferences. To insinuate otherwise does a great disservice to those, like me, who feel that injustice of any type is wrong. This proposal was conceptually flawed from the onset, was developed without any meaningful public input, is opposed overwhelmingly by Denver residents, and deserves to be resoundingly DEFEATED. Please vote NO on this ill- conceived amendment.

-----Original Message-----

From: Will Mahoney <wbmahoney@gmail.com>

To: Andrew.Webb@denvergov.org; dencc@denvergov.org; Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor

<Michael.Hancock@denvergov.org>; Black, Kendra A. - City Council <kendra.black@denvergov.org>

Cc: H. Bruce Baskette <b.baskette@comcast.net>; Jerry Doerksen <jdmihicity@aol.com>; Kelly Tierney

<ktierney@livsothebysrealty.com>; Judy Greenfield <judysgreenfield@gmail.com>

Sent: Wed, Dec 16, 2020 9:44 am

Subject: Group Living Amendment

Ladies & gentlemen:

Comments on the group living amendment are due today (12/16) at 5:00PM. However, it is my understanding that the revised draft amendment will not be available to the public until this Friday, 12/18.

So how am I supposed to intelligently comment on the revised draft amendment today when the revisions will not be made public until Friday? This does not seem to me to meet the definition of transparency!

I submitted comments in the past about the group living amendment. However, it is my understanding that the details of the amendment have changed. I would like to have an opportunity to react to the changes.

Yours sincerely,
Will Mahoney, P.G.
Senior Environmental Scientist
8353 E. Kenyon Drive
Denver, CO 80237

From: [kara mckenna](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Public comment deadline group living
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 12:00:28 PM

Disgusting

On Sun, Dec 13, 2020, 9:43 AM kara mckenna <klmckenna8@gmail.com> wrote:

After listening to the live meeting last week regarding the group living ammendment our household is STILL 100% AGAINST moving forward with these changes. Denver is already a crap hole and changes need to begin there, cleaning up our streets and finding places for these homeless tents camps (this on is right outside my work at 5th / Lincoln. And moving these people into MY neighborhood in SE Denver or anyone else's neighborhood is not the answer, we don't want them!! We also don't want halfway houses, no matter what the rules or guidelines. Hancock had made a debauchery of our city and needs to go. Overcrowding, over building, and homeless camps everywhere. Disgusting.

From: [Bill Lysaught](#)
To: [Jerry Doerksen](#)
Cc: [City Council District 5](#); [dencc - City Council](#); safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Your comments on the Denver Group Living proposal
Date: Friday, August 7, 2020 12:30:13 PM

I would love for Council and City Zoning to explain how they can defend allowing one type of business in single family zoned neighborhoods but prohibit all others.

On Fri, Aug 7, 2020 at 10:48 AM 'Jerry Doerksen' via Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments <safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com> wrote:

I recently read your comments regarding your position on the Group Living proposed zoning changes. Although I do not live in your district I was favorably impressed by what you said. Your approach is one that all Council members should adopt, an approach that is thoughtful, objective, and realistic. This proposal was initiated without input or consultation with those most affected by it - the homeowners. I have lived in my SU zoned neighborhood for 45 years and chose to live here because of the desirable qualities this zoning offers - neighborhood interaction, a neighborhood that is quiet and safe, with residents who demonstrate pride in their property. The proposed zoning changes would destroy that. All my neighbors with whom I have discussed this are vehemently opposed to this proposal. Council might be well served by conducting a poll of constituents to assess the viability of this proposal. I did an evaluation of the comments posted to the Group Living website, all 183 pages, and found that 81.5% were OPPOSED to this proposal. With that kind of negative comment how can this proposal be given serious consideration? The stated purposes of the group living proposal dealing with alleviating the problems of the high cost of housing, homelessness, and criminal and drug dependency transitional housing can be addressed in other ways, not by attempting to fix perceived social and economic inequities by creating greater problems. Trying to turn limited occupancy homes into multiple occupancy dwellings is like trying to make a mini-Cooper into an SUV. Our homes were not designed for that. There are other solutions. For instance, why not work with developers to build housing specifically designed to meet the needs of high occupancy with suitable bedroom, kitchen, and leisure space. There are properties throughout Denver that could be used for this purpose. It seems to me that, if the Planning Board and City Council would be receptive to alternatives, a plan could be developed that would avoid all the pitfalls present in the current proposal. I realize that there some on the Planning Board and City Council for whom this proposal represents more of a "cause" than a practical solution but, hopefully, more reasoned thinking will prevail.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to

safeandsounddenver+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/safeandsounddenver/1558182594.1043652.1596818922295%40mail.yahoo.com>.

From: [Cynthia Kemper](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Requesting Response re: Critical Questions about Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 1:56:57 PM

Hello all:

This letter was sent to Andrew Webb at Denver's Planning Department earlier this morning. After further thought, it seems important to share this information with all City Council members and Mayor Hancock as well. Thank you for considering this information as you continue your discussions on the Group Living Amendment proposal.

Cynthia

Hi Andrew:

I hope you can provide a detailed answer to a series of questions/observations I've been pondering over the last few weeks. I know that along with my neighbors and our City Council member, Amanda Sawyer (who I have copied on this email), I would greatly appreciate your response as it relates to the controversial Group Living Amendment you have been advocating.

You have made off-the-cuff statements during recent interviews that other states/cities have or are pursuing similar initiatives to the Group Living Amendment, making it sound like Denver is behind the times. So I was initially interested in hearing how the citizens of these states/cities like the results of these changes to their single family zoning, and if the stated outcomes actually came true.

But, when I started to do my own research, I discovered that:

1. These initiatives are all very recent (within the last year as far as I can tell), and not all of them have even passed.
2. What their planning departments are advocating is not at all similar to the GLA you are proposing (the changes in other cities/states merely allow duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes to now be built on single family lots).
3. Most impacted citizens are very angry and are coming up with their own creative ways to either block these changes, or find ways around them if already passed.
4. There are no reliable precedents. These initiatives are in the very early stages, if they have passed at all, which is not nearly enough time to determine if these radical zoning changes do indeed accomplish what your planning departments suggest they will. In other words, there is no historic or reliable data to support moving forward with these initiatives more broadly in cities like Denver, making a strong case for waiting until the data starts to come in.

If there ARE indeed examples of zoning changes that abolish single family zoning which have been in effect for at least five years, and data to support the conclusion that these changes have had a net

POSITIVE outcome on affordability and the communities impacted, then I would like to see it. I'm sure Denver's City Council members would appreciate being copied on this information as well, but all of these initiatives seem to be far too new to know whether they will actually have a benevolent impact on our cities and communities, or not.

Further, none of the initiatives I've researched include anything about allowing group homes, rehabilitation centers, senior living centers, assisted living facilities, etc. to be allowed on single family lots within residential neighborhoods. This appears to be a completely original twist by Denver's Planning Department, no?

If that's the case, then there is definitely no historic data to show how this would impact our Denver communities, and no proof at all that the impact would be good.

So, your casual statement about how other cities are pursuing similar initiatives (I don't recall whether you added that these changes were actually successful), is in reality, missing the most important parts of the story. Most of these initiatives are merely allowing a duplex, triplex and/or fourplex on a single lot anywhere across the city, not apartment buildings, group homes, or up to 10 people plus relatives living in the same residence, etc.

Shouldn't you be more open and honest about this fact?

Unless I'm missing something, **this is a huge gamble that has the potential to severely impact the future of our city and our established neighborhoods in a negative way.**

Thus, I certainly hope our City Council members do more research before they vote this month, as the data is just not there. At least not yet. In my opinion, this vote should be delayed at least five years until there is solid proof that this wild experiment birthed in 2018/2019 in a few American cities actually accomplishes what you think it will.

Right now, no one has any idea if passing this Group Living Amendment will have unintended consequences, or malevolent impacts that have yet to be considered.

Thank you,
Cynthia

P.S. Below are just a few quotes from Mpls. and miscellaneous articles that tell the story in the three other cities/states working to abolish single family zoning that I'm aware of. Obviously, there are many more editorials about this topic, but most of what I can find references only these three states/cities – Minneapolis, CA, and OR. In other words, this is not at all widespread as was implied.

“What we’re selling here in Minneapolis — or what our planning department and our city council are selling — is that we’re new, we’re state of the art, we’re cutting-edge, we’re virtue signaling. In reality, Minneapolis is giving itself away to developers. They’ll build more market-rate housing. (But she doubts the city will get much more affordable housing — or less racism, more equity or a fairer society. Beware those promises, she warns other cities.)”

- Lisa McDonald, a former Minneapolis City Council member and part of a group opposing the city's plans <<https://minneapolisforeveryone.org/>>

"We've tried very hard to work with the city to say, 'Let's find a rational approach to this. And instead, what the city has basically done is say, 'If you're not for this plan, you're a racist and an elitist.'"

- Lisa McDonald, a former City Council member who worked with the group Minneapolis for Everyone <<https://minneapolisforeveryone.org/>> to oppose the plan.

"It could take years to know whether the changes to single-family neighborhoods in Minneapolis have been successful."

- Michael Lens, an associate professor of urban planning and public policy at the University of California, Los Angeles

Could Oregon Become the First State to Ban Single-Family Zoning? (Dec. 14, 2018)

Rep. Tina Kotek (D-Portland), speaker of the Oregon House, is drafting legislation that would end single-family zoning in cities of 10,000 or more: "The state's housing crisis requires a combination of bolder strategies."

<https://www.wweek.com/news/state/2018/12/14/could-oregon-become-the-first-state-to-ban-single-family-zoning/>

Single-Family Zoning Bill Faces Crucial Votes In Legislature's Last Days (June 17, 2019)

<https://www.opb.org/news/article/single-family-zoning-oregon-votes/>

Oregon House Bill 2001 Ended Single-Family Zoning Across the State. That's Causing Some Pushback. (Nov. 6, 2019)

West Linn isn't taking this well.

<https://www.wweek.com/news/2019/11/06/oregon-house-bill-2001-ended-single-family-zoning-across-the-state-thats-causing-some-pushback/>

The revenge of the suburbs: Why California's effort to build more in single-family-home neighborhoods failed (May 22, 2019)

<https://www.latimes.com/politics/la-pol-ca-california-sb50-failure-single-family-homes-suburbs-20190522-story.html>

Minneapolis, Tackling Housing Crisis and Inequity, Votes to End Single-Family Zoning (Dec. 13, 2018)

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/13/us/minneapolis-single-family-zoning.html>

From: [Patty Figel](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Residencial increase
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 5:10:13 PM

I am violently opposed to increasing individuals living in one residence from 2 to 5 or more. Please do not let this happen.

Patty Figel

Sent from my iPad

From: [Mary Jo Cummings](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Residential Lots in Denver Eligible for 11-40 Community Corrections Facilities Under GLACs Plans
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 4:57:47 PM

To whom it may concern:

This is a DISASTROUS initiative being pushed on Denver by Chris Webb!
I strongly **OPPOSE** this and I am **NOT** in favor of this proposed initiative!!!

Regards,

Mary Jo Cummings

Executive Director

Brokerage Services

720-220-6000 cell

Mcummings@sg-realty.com



SHELDON • GOLD REALTY INC.
commercial real estate services

9025 E. Kenyon Ave, Suite 100

Denver, CO 80237

www.sg-realty.com

From: [Larraine Givens](#)
To: [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council; City Council District 10; Zukowski, Liz S. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 10; St. Peter, Teresa A. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 10; Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council; Gidfar, Mansur M. - CC WW1111 Contingent Worker; Stalnaker, Liz - CC City Council Aide; Calderon, Lisa - CC Senior City Council Aide; District 9; Hartman, Leya - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; Guillen, Bonnie K. - CC City Council Aide; Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun; Schoultz, Amanda M. - CC Senior City Council Aide; Banuelos, Anita - CC City Council Aide District 7; Thompson, Maggie M. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 7; Carpenter, Tate E. - CC City Council Aide District 7; Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council; Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council; Visser, Sara - CC YC1500 Administrative Support Assistant III; Fry, Logan M. - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; City Council District 5; Cohn, Taylor - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; Kline, Genevieve M. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 4; Gile, Kathleen O. - CC YA2246 City Council Aide Senior; Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council; Rocha Vasquez, Daisy - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; Mejia, Melissa - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; Chavez, Benjamin J. - CC YA2245 City Council Aide; Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council; District 1 Comments; Lowell, Christopher - CC City Council Aide At Large; Kyle, Polly A. - CC Senior City Council Aide At Large; kniechatlarge; Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large; Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council; denc - City Council; Fahrberger, Brent J. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 6; Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior; 4 \(TV\) Channel; \[newstips@9news.com EOC Media Partner COVID19 Response\]\(#\); \[newstips@thedenverchannel.com EOC Media Partner COVID19 Response\]\(#\); \[BVIA Bear Valley Improvement Assoc.; Mayorsoffice; Shaul.Turner@KDVR.com EOC Media Partner COVID19 Response\]\(#\)](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Response to Group Living Project Proposals
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2020 5:56:24 PM
Attachments: [Response to proposed rezoning for Group Living.pdf](#)

Attention Denver City & County Representatives, News Media and other interested entities:

Attached is a PDF file with my opinions and OPPOSITION to the proposals that are being presented for zoning changes under the title of Group Living Project.

It is my hope that this may generate some additional time, more public involvement and notice, as well as a MAJOR re-evaluation of the current proposals.

Sincerely,
L. F. Givens

From: [Kristi Sweeney](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [mayorsoffice@denvegov.org](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] REVISE the Group Living Proposal
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 5:53:39 PM

To:

District 1: Amanda P. Sandoval

District2: Kevin Flynn

District3: Jamie Torres

District 4: Kendra Black

District 5: Amanda Sawyer

District 6: Paul Kashmann

District 7: Jolon Clark

District 8: Christopher Herndon

District9: Candi CdeBaca

District 10: Chris Hinds

District 11: Stacie Gilmore

At Large:

Robin Kniech

Debbie Ortega

Mayor Michael Hancock

Dear City Council Members and the Honorable Michael Hancock;

Please see my email below that was sent to Andrew Webb on 7/30/2020 regarding the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment proposal.

Besides the suggestions I have made below, I have 2 additional comments:

First, Why can't the residents of Denver vote on a final draft of a proposed amendment? The outcome will affect all of our lives, and yet, we are not able to vote on this. This is not Democratic.

Second, The Group Planning Committee did not fairly represent even a majority of the districts of the city and county of Denver. If they had represented all of the districts, I believe that the proposal would be more acceptable to the residents of more of the districts, including those with single family households. The planning committee seems to have decided on the proposal before they took feedback. It did not matter that the feedback was overwhelmingly negative. The residents' objections were not objectively considered, but, even so, the committee claims to have heard from the public and "compromised". This does not feel like Democracy.

Kristi Sweeney
4034 S Niagara Way
Denver, CO 80237

#303-773-0200

kristis@sweeneyassoc.net

From: Kristi Sweeney

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 5:34 PM

To: andrew.webb@denvergov.org

Subject: comments concerning the Group Living Proposal

To: Group Living Proposal Planning Committee

Attn: Andrew Webb

Date: 7/30/2020

While I understand that Denver needs to increase housing options, the committee has decided to do so by changing the zoning codes in the city to increase density. I have a concern that other options were apparently not considered (for instance, the opportunities presented by more numerous vacant shopping centers and vacant buildings). Considering the zoning changes as a solution, I think that a modified proposal that would still provide more options for housing, would be more acceptable to the single family residents of Denver. I am interested in preserving the residential diversity that we have in our great city. However, I share the concerns of many Denver residents that new zoning proposed may have difficult unintended consequences.

Here are some changes to consider that could be more acceptable:

1. Household size: Could you consider a maximum of 4 unrelated people plus their family members? 5 to 10 unrelated residents plus their family members in a typical single family home is overwhelming. People need space and (possibly less than) 200 square feet per person seems inadequate under any situation. I can see an investor looking for profits or even a non-profit on a budget now being able to pack in people without their permission or consideration for their wellbeing. Imagine seniors and people with developmental disabilities. It is also a recipe for neighborhood blight and I do not think anyone wants to see more blight created in Denver. It seems reasonable to change the zoning from 2 to 4 unrelated people plus their family members.
2. We have several small group homes in our neighborhood and low income housing in our community. Our Southeast Denver community is much more economically and racially diverse than it was only ten years ago which we enthusiastically welcome. Our neighborhood schools have children from many ethnicities and cultures and that is a wonderful thing. I support the very small residential care proposal, but I do not support community corrections or shelter in residential neighborhoods. When the cost of homes are high, that may not happen anyway, so by removing these types of housing from Very Small Residential Care, I do not think it will result in fewer possible locations for this housing need. Perhaps the numerous empty buildings and shopping centers could serve the temporary and transient needs of these populations. Unfortunately, due to Covid, it is possible that in the next year or two many retail stores will close their doors. These buildings should not remain empty when there is a need for residential facilities, shelters, halfway houses or rehab facilities.

3. I support the idea of adding new zone districts where residential facilities of any size, including community corrections and shelters are allowed. However, I am adverse to the proposal to have Small Residential Care in residential neighborhoods when they have 12000 square feet, or any size for that matter. A facility of this kind and size is a commercial endeavor and is not in character with residential neighborhoods. I do not think that would happen if the cost of a home in a neighborhood was too high, but I have concerns for homes in lower cost neighborhoods that happen to have a larger lot size. I am not only thinking of my neighborhood, but the flavor of Denver with lovely family neighborhoods that are available to people of many income levels.

Many Denverites with much at stake have expressed their objections and their fear to the proposed Group Living Proposal primarily because they felt that it is too extreme. They do not feel they will be considered. There are too many unknowns. How would the Group Living Proposal change their neighborhood? What are they being asked to sacrifice? The fear of unknown and trepidation about unwelcomed consequences makes it hard to accept the aggressive changes proposed. Hopefully, you will consider the more modest changes and ideas I have suggested so that we can meet the needs of those who are inadequately housed as well as the needs of the people who love Denver, love their neighborhood and their neighborhoods and would happily share them with new folks who want to be a part of their community. A compromise solution would help solve the issues, but make residents of Denver neighborhoods feel more comfortable.

Thank you,
Kristi Sweeney

From: [Ashley E. Arroyo](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [3PA Board](#)
Cc: [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Mayorsoffice](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RNO Opposition to Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 9:01:14 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

The Platt Park People's Association (3PA) is writing to express its objection to the Group Living Amendment as currently drafted. We understand it has undergone many revisions, but we remain concerned with the breadth of the amendment, the practical eradication of single family zoning within the entire City of Denver, the lack of Platt Park residents and 3PA opportunity for input and this zoning amendment which affects nearly every tax paying homeowner in Denver happening during a global pandemic. While 3PA has not been able to hold a public, in person meeting with its constituents since March (which is also part of the concern), we have received numerous emails from Platt Park residents who strongly oppose the Group Living Amendment. As a Board, we voted to oppose this zoning amendment and request that if City Council is forced to a vote--that you vote NO. We understand that some RNOs were involved in the process--Platt Park and its neighboring RNOs were not invited to be a part of that process and were not a part of that process. From what I understand, most of the RNOs that were a part of the process already contain zoning that allows for things like group living, community corrections facilities and halfway houses. The residents of those neighborhoods who spent money buying homes made a choice to live there. Likewise, the residents of areas like Platt Park that are largely zoned single family made a choice to stay in the City, but to invest in their largest purchase (a home) in a single family zoned neighborhood or street. It is beyond comprehension that City Council or the City of Denver Planning Department would take it upon themselves to now pull a bait and switch---without a vote of the people--on something that affects not only our day to day living, but for most people--our largest investment of money. We urge you to listen to the residents (and taxpaying homeowners) of Denver and vote no.

3PA Board,

Ashley Arroyo

From: [Steve Oltman](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ruining Denver neighborhoods
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2020 4:26:10 PM

Denver City Council members:

I have heard about the proposal to rezone all Denver single family neighborhoods to allow multiple unrelated people, their families and their cars in a single property. This is just insane. I can't believe you would actually consider this. This would eventually ruin our beautiful neighborhoods and the city for those of us who love peacefully living here and who pay our constantly rising taxes. This is Denver. This is Colorado. We are not Los Angeles, we are not New York, and we don't want to be.

These are discouraging times, and this proposal makes it even worse. Please, please don't vote for this monstrosity.

Thanks for your consideration.

Steve Oltman
58 year resident of Denver

From: [Michelle Workman](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Safe and Sound Denver
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 6:11:13 PM

Hi,

I am a Denver homeowner at: 2305 Quitman St. Denver, CO 80212 and I am writing to both the City Council members and the Mayor's office to express my opinion of the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. Our neighborhood has increased in property values in the last 5 years and the crime rate has decreased significantly from 5 plus years ago. We are a quiet neighborhood in close proximity to Sloans Lake Park. Many families walk their children around the neighborhood and park because they feel safe. Let's not put the safety of our neighbors in jeopardy for group living homes.

DO NOT PASS THE GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT #7!!!! PLEASE
DO NOT ERASE THE INTEGRITY OF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS, DEMOLISH
PROPERTY VALUES AND DESTROY THE CULTURES THAT MAKE OUR
NEIGHBORHOODS UNIQUE AND DESIRABLE!

Thank you,
Michelle Workman
303-929-5275

From: [Anita Grant](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Safe and Sound Denver
Date: Monday, September 28, 2020 3:03:45 PM

I am appalled by the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. I am an older adult and feel vulnerable as it is. I will certainly not vote for anyone who supports it!

Anita Grant
1758 Kearney St
Denver, CO 80220

From: [Ed Vieira](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Safe and Sound, Denver
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 4:06:41 PM

This note is to log our strong disagreement with the City council's consideration of this program. It will do nothing to enhance Denver neighborhood in terms of safety or property values. And, once word gets out this this kind of program is in place, interest in moving into Denver will be negatively impacted; dropping property valuations, property tax revenue, etc... Perhaps test the program with homes near your personal residences?? Let me know how that works out...

This would be a big mistake! We want to state our strong disagreement with this ill-advised consideration.

Thank you,
Ed and Laurie Vieira

From: [Rebecca Coplan](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Safe neighborhoods
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 7:54:36 AM

Mr. Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7. As a resident of the Wash Park area of Denver, I am deeply concerned about the impact on our property values, increased congestion, personal safety, and overall degradation of our neighborhood. Surely there are better solutions than kowtowing to developers and politicians who have a conflict of interest. Please vote to preserve our neighborhood, not debate it..

Thank You,
Rebecca Halligan
543 S Vine Street
Denver , Co 80209

Sent from my iPad

From: [Chris Hammond](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STOP - GL Amendment
Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 11:33:43 AM

I want to be sure council members who are supposed to represent me understand my STRONG OPPOSITION to this Group Living plan. I won't reiterate all the arguments you already know, and would agree with if it were happening IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD. I am currently investigating a move back to Lakewood to escape this lunacy. I've worked too long and hard to afford a home in a peaceful, safe, clean neighborhood that is not jammed full of rooming houses and parking nightmares, and more. Please don't let this go through in its current form. Leave us more time and space for discussion and adjusting the plan so it makes sense.

Chris Hammond

Accounts Manager
Office: 303.779.3000 x114



AdventureUnlimited.org

5201 South Quebec Street | Greenwood Village, CO 80111

From: [JOHN LIETZ](#)
To: [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - CC Member At Large Denver City Council](#); [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Cc: [Safe and Sound Denver-Opposed to Denver's Group Living Zoning Amendments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Fight for the Soul of Seattle | A KOMO News Documentary
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 1:04:03 PM

CM Flynn and Ms. Montano, and the rest of Denver CC

I received the below e-mail from another retired DPD Detective that moved to North Carolina to get away from the things the Denver City Council have been doing the last year or so. Just like more residents will do if the GLP passes. This plan is just the same type of things that the Seattle CC passed years ago and look at their city now. How can Denver want to pass stuff like this claiming they want to be more like their 'Peer City' of Seattle when the level of living in all of those cities has gone decidedly down! And to have the nerve to tell residents that these changes are being made to make life better here! We are not that stupid and that is why there is currently a 90% opposition rate to the GLP! Please WATCH THIS PROGRAM and think about how things got to be this way in Seattle. Don't do it to Denver, PLEASE vote no on the GLP.

I agree with Terry and yes, Denver's CC is trying to follow Seattle as a 'Peer City' in everything they are doing!

From: Terry Demmel

Never been to Seattle but they appear to have city council people that remind me of the Denver city council.

https://youtu.be/WijoL3Hy_Bw

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Lietz P79042

Denver Police Department Retired



From: [Linda Young](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Group Living Project Zoning
Date: Monday, June 29, 2020 4:27:27 PM

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

We are Denver residents who have three children and 6 grandchildren living in Denver. We are concerned about certain aspects of the zoning project presently under consideration. Apartment-sized dwellings are not appropriate in single family areas—increased traffic and vehicle parking are major concerns. We also fear for our safety and the safety of our families if group homes housing felons, drug addicts, the homeless, and convicted child predators become part of our neighborhoods. Single dwelling properties are a main feature of a vibrant Denver community. It is the duty of elected officials to protect law-abiding, tax-paying citizens and their properties. Thank you for taking time to evaluate our concerns. Sincerely, Gene and Linda Young

From: [Nancy Morgan](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote Against Group Living Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 1:41:04 PM

Dear City Council members,

As a resident of Denver for many decades, I'm incensed by what is happening to our city! I moved here in 1974 because it was so beautiful and I would describe it wonderfully as "an overgrown cow town." As someone who moved here from the east coast, I was so impressed that the city itself had wonderful family neighborhoods right in the city. Not everyone who wanted to raise a family had to move to the suburbs.

Now, it's just been turned over to developers. I live on a block in Washington Park where every single house (with the exception of maybe 3-4) has been razed to the ground and giant multi-million dollar mansions have been built in their stead. Long gone are the views, the southern exposures that I valued so much, the blue skies and green grass.

Each of these homes has at least 2-3 cars right now. I can just imagine what could happen if the zoning is changed and many people are allowed to live in one of these large homes. As it is, one can barely drive down the street safely, giant SUV's parked on either side on streets that were never meant to accommodate 4 lanes of traffic.

I see the same thing happening all over the city. I've been trying to move to another neighborhood, but I see the exact same thing being repeated everywhere. The fabric of our city is being changed so radically.

These moves are just meant to please planners and developers. Please save our city and vote against this amendment!!!!

Sincerely,
Nancy Morgan

From: [Peter Droege](#)
To: [Peter Droege](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote no on Denver group living Zoning Amendments - from former director of recovery program for men
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 11:25:01 AM

Dear Denver leaders,

While I support small common-sense zoning reforms, the group living proposals that would allow community corrections, homeless people (how did that work for Civic Center Park?), and unsupervised recovery programs would destroy the quality of life for Denver residents. We see people fleeing New York and California based on this type of social experiment. Let's be sure to maintain quality of life for people in our city.

I am the former executive director of Step Denver, a 60-bed residential recovery program that now has three highly-supervised sober living homes around the city. Each home has a manager who works closely with neighbors to ensure a positive relationship. This type of model is allowed under current zoning and limits the number of people in a home and how many homes are located nearby.

I am active supporter of a number of homeless programs and until recently ran the largest party for the homeless each Christmas. I also was the volunteer fundraiser for Centro San Juan Diego, which serves immigrants.

Until the group living homes are well-defined, I ask that you vote no.

With best regards,
Peter Droege
303-519-9533.

From: [Susan Young](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VOTE NO ON GROUP LIVING
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 12:22:41 PM

Dear City Council,

I am a 39 year resident of Park Hill, and am writing because of an abundance of concern regarding the proposed group living amendment.

1. There is no standard to be held accountable. There are TOO MANY people allowed in a home, no one wants to live next door to that, with the noise, increased trash, traffic, parking, etc. that come with people. We bought into a quiet neighborhood and here comes the ruination. Look at Montbello as an example of poor accountability.

2. The scattering of halfway houses throughout Denver is not a welcome change to our neighborhood fabric. It has changed from R-1 to R-2 and now a proposed free for all. Those with a commercial interest will be raking in the profits at our expense.

3. This will not change the homeless situation. You refer to peer cities, which have changed over time because of the poor outcomes in Portland, Seattle, San Francisco.

4. How is Denver going to pay for this increased use of infrastructure? Increased taxes and fees. Homes with 8 people can share in those costs while those of us who prefer to live with a traditional family will have an additional burden. How will you make that equitable?

This proposal is not the answer. Considerable compromise is needed, and that should be measured by the citizens, not a small self-interested committee.

Sincerely,
Susan Young

From: [Ted Douglass](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote No! on the proposed Denver Group Living Zoning Amendment
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 12:49:24 PM

City Council Members and Mayor Hancock,

I listened to Wednesday's presentation by Andrew Webb regarding the recommended changes to the Group Living Zoning Amendment, and I want to express my strong concerns and opposition to what is happening.

The Committee has lumped together so many major changes into this proposal that citizens cannot intelligently consider what the overall impact will be to our city.

The Committee says new zoning regulations will "simplify" the Zoning code for the city. I disagree. It will, in fact, create a quagmire for residents and make it impossible for us to address our neighborhood's needs.

The proposed zoning changes push enforcement and monitoring onto residents while absolving the city zoning agencies of any responsibility for the effects of the changes. Citizens have been told we can call 311 or the police for help with violations, but there is no planned increase in staffing Neighborhood Inspection Services, police or fire.

Neighborhood communities are rightfully concerned about overcrowding, homeless shelters, and community corrections facilities in our neighborhoods without clear and defined rules regarding density, proximity to schools, and adequate community gathering places.

I am respectfully requesting that you VOTE NO on this amendment.

*Edward Douglass
Denver, Colorado*

From: [E J Lorimer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Why are you tying GLAC to the pandemic? That's just wrong ethically
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 10:49:07 PM

This amendment began in 2017 and 2018. How can you tie a "forever" ordinance change to pandemic? This is simply ethically wrong. The two are mutually exclusive impacts.

About the Group Living Project

Denver has an immediate need for housing. With the evolving needs of our residents in mind, the challenges of the ongoing pandemic, the renewed push for addressing issues of race and equity, and changes to other housing regulations, city planners has been working with an advisory committee to evaluate the Denver Zoning Code's rules for "group living." This evaluation has included a review of land uses and definitions for: households, community corrections facilities, shelters for the homeless, residential care homes, new uses like tiny home villages, and more. Based on this evaluation, planners will recommend updates to the zoning code for some or all of these housing types.

From: [Jerry Doerksen](#)
To: [City Council District 5](#)
Cc: [dencc - City Council](#); safeandsounddenver@googlegroups.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Your comments on the Denver Group Living proposal
Date: Friday, August 7, 2020 10:48:49 AM

I recently read your comments regarding your position on the Group Living proposed zoning changes. Although I do not live in your district I was favorably impressed by what you said. Your approach is one that all Council members should adopt, an approach that is thoughtful, objective, and realistic. This proposal was initiated without input or consultation with those most affected by it - the homeowners. I have lived in my SU zoned neighborhood for 45 years and chose to live here because of the desirable qualities this zoning offers - neighborhood interaction, a neighborhood that is quiet and safe, with residents who demonstrate pride in their property. The proposed zoning changes would destroy that. All my neighbors with whom I have discussed this are vehemently opposed to this proposal. Council might be well served by conducting a poll of constituents to assess the viability of this proposal. I did an evaluation of the comments posted to the Group Living website, all 183 pages, and found that 81.5% were OPPOSED to this proposal. With that kind of negative comment how can this proposal be given serious consideration? The stated purposes of the group living proposal dealing with alleviating the problems of the high cost of housing, homelessness, and criminal and drug dependency transitional housing can be addressed in other ways, not by attempting to fix perceived social and economic inequities by creating greater problems. Trying to turn limited occupancy homes into multiple occupancy dwellings is like trying to make a mini-Cooper into an SUV. Our homes were not designed for that. There are other solutions. For instance, why not work with developers to build housing specifically designed to meet the needs of high occupancy with suitable bedroom, kitchen, and leisure space. There are properties throughout Denver that could be used for this purpose. It seems to me that, if the Planning Board and City Council would be receptive to alternatives, a plan could be developed that would avoid all the pitfalls present in the current proposal. I realize that there are some on the Planning Board and City Council for whom this proposal represents more of a "cause" than a practical solution but, hopefully, more reasoned thinking will prevail.

From: [Joni Dunn](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: mayorsoffice@denver.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning amendment
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 4:27:33 PM

I am writing to oppose the group living zoning code amendment #7. The part I most oppose is the allowance of 10 unrelated adults each per residence and up to 6 vehicles per property. Such zoning would diminished the quality and safety of our Denver neighborhoods. Do not let this amendment go forward with theses items in it.

Joni Dunn
Long time Denver resident

Sent from my iPad

From: [Anthony Seganti](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ZONING CHANGES
Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 8:18:33 PM

NO TO GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT.

From: [Anthony Seganti](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ZONING CHANGES
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 10:42:24 PM

NO to Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.

Denver Resident

Thank You.

AGS

From: [Sharon](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] zoning changes
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 9:50:05 PM

I am a resident of Bear Valley and wish to express my opposition to the proposed zoning changes that would allow more unrelated adults to live in houses, establish community corrections facilities, and develop homeless shelters. These proposals would destroy the character of neighborhoods in Denver, make neighborhoods unsafe, reduce property values, and devalue the family unit. Neighborhoods are meant to be family-oriented. It would force decent people who have lived in their homes for years to leave the homes they have worked hard to buy and maintain. It would prevent those who have family values that contribute to a healthy society from buying homes in Denver. My vote is NO!!



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: [Robert Tagmyer](#)
To: [denc - City Council](#)
Cc: [mayorsoffice@denver.gov](#); [Bob Tagmyer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 10:47:53 AM

I would like to be certain this communication reaches Councilman Kashmann directly. Can you please provide his email address? Thank you!

>

> Hello Denver City Council Members. I hope this finds you all & your families safe and well!

> I'm writing in "peaceful protest" of the proposed Zoning Code Amendment #7. I have been a supporter of the work this Council has done because our direction and values generally align.

> Please do NOT support this amendment. It is bad business for Denver for so many reasons.

> I am sympathetic to the homeless and understand the need for their shelter, but Amendment 7 poses grave safety concerns for our families, lowers our property values and will cause increased traffic in an already overloaded infrastructure.

> Amendment 7 begins a horrible "commercialization" of our "family" neighborhoods. I am absolutely adamant that this is the wrong path for Denver homeowners.

>

> The question I have for you all.....do you agree? Can I count on your help & support in defeating this Amendment?

> Please provide the courtesy of a response. Thank you very much. I appreciate the work you have done and will continue to do for our community. Thank you!

>

> Bob Tagmyer
2290 S. Adams St.
Denver CO 80210
> (C) 303.808.3500

From: [Robert Tagmyer](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [mayorsoffice@denver.gov](#); [Bob Tagmyer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Friday, September 18, 2020 1:16:27 PM

>

> Hello Denver City Council Members. I hope this finds you all & your families safe and well!

> I'm writing in "peaceful protest" of the proposed Zoning Code Amendment #7. I have been a supporter of the work this Council has done because our direction and values generally align.

> Please do NOT support this amendment. It is bad business for Denver for so many reasons.

> I am sympathetic to the homeless and understand the need for their shelter, but Amendment 7 poses grave safety concerns for our families, lowers our property values and will cause increased traffic in an already overloaded infrastructure.

> Amendment 7 begins a horrible "commercialization" of our "family" neighborhoods. I am absolutely adamant that this is the wrong path for Denver homeowners.

>

> The question I have for you all.....do you agree? Can I count on your help & support in defeating this Amendment?

> Please provide the courtesy of a response. Thank you very much. I appreciate the work you have done and will continue to do for our community. Thank you!

>

> Bob Tagmyer
2290 S. Adams St.
Denver CO 80210

> (C) 303.808.3500

>

>

From: [Dave Wright](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Code Amendment #7
Date: Sunday, September 27, 2020 6:21:52 PM

City Council,

I am a Denver resident and hate the idea of Amendment #7. I just have one question. Did the rioters and looters not do enough to mess up our great city? Now you have to pull this crap. You're ideas are ruining this great state and turning us into the gateway to San Francisco. I am entitled to why on earth you think this is right for Denver!

Dave Wright
719-338-9226

From: [J. F.](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] zoning
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 3:49:30 PM

Denver City Council

Hi

I am against the new zoning plan Denver is trying to push through to allow 10 unrelated people living in one house. My concerns are traffic, noise, parking and making my already dense neighborhood even denser. I can barely park outside of my house now I do not want to image the impact of this change on my day to day life. Please consider the communities wishes when looking at this change.

Julie Federico

From: [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#)
Cc: [Rothmier, Zachary M. - CC Senior Legislative Policy Analyst](#); [Stevens, Elle H. - CC Legislative Assistant](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Wellshire East HOA - Group Living Text Amendment Questions
Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 3:29:56 PM
Attachments: [Wellshire East HOA Group Living Amendment Response-Councilwoman Black 2020.08.31.pdf](#)

Please upload this correspondence into Granicus with the rest of the letters we have gotten.

From: Bernida Egging Chapman <bernida.egging@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 2:29 PM
To: Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council
<Amanda.Sandoval@denvergov.org>; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council
<Kevin.Flynn@denvergov.org>; Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council
<Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org>; Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council
<Amanda.Sawyer@denvergov.org>; Paul.kashman@denvergov.org
<Paul.kashman@denvergov.org>; Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council
<Jolon.Clark@denvergov.org>; Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council
<Christopher.Herndon@denvergov.org>; CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council
<Candi.CdeBaca@denvergov.org>; Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council
<Chris.Hinds@denvergov.org>; Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council
<Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org>; Robin.kneich@denvergov.org <Robin.kneich@denvergov.org>;
Ortega, Deborah L. - CC Member At Large Denver City Council <Deborah.Ortega@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Wellshire East HOA - Group Living Text Amendment Questions

Hello:

I have attached the Wellshire East HOA comments regarding the Group Living Text Amendment. We appreciate your thoughtful consideration of our questions.

Thank you,

--

Bernida E. Chapman
720-580-3630

From: [Lawrence Murray](#)
To: [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Ann White](#); [Pamela Jiner](#); [Elenz, Magen M. - CC Senior City Council Aide](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Paige Burkeholder](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [denc - City Council](#); [Sotelo, Melissa N. - CC YA2246 City Council Aide Senior](#); [Joni Caldwell](#); [Rodney Carr](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] GL Concerns and My Voice
Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 4:49:35 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Stacie,

Would you consider as a member of council to sponsor this proposal be put to a vote by the city and county citizens? I agree with Mr. Taurus position below and believe a fair solution would be as done with the pit bull initiative championed by Councilman Herndon. This change has become too big for the council to be the final arbiter in what is perceived to be lifestyle altering in our communities.

JUST MY OPINION: So, the idea of placing the GLA Final Proposal on a ballot currently is somewhat different to the pit bull initiative. The opponents of that issue were successful in having the council disapprove the introduction of putt bulls in the city and county of Denver. However, the main proponent of the issue was Councilman Chris Herndon. It appears he along with his supporters of the issue managed to get the subject onto the November ballot for the people of the city to decide. First, I would like to know if there is a council member (s) willing to sponsor such action prior to the council vote. Is there such an individual? My feelings tell me this would be the most direct and successful method in achieving that goal. Any candidates? Failing that, what are the other options?

L Murray

P.S. For those of us not in favor of this initiative, its main weakness is enforcement! The city's track record on enforcement and the ability to convince the public any new changes would be enforced any better is of course crucial for adaptation and the reduction in opposition. How to positively impact the quality of life of the residents with these changes with the shoddy history of zoning enforcement in the city? Montbello has felt neglected over the last few decades. We have been described as a food desert as well as prone to higher crime as compared to other parts of the city. This zoning change feels just like those two concerns and seems it would add to the severity of the two as well. This issue if considered must be placed on a ballot for the citizens of Denver to decide!

From: T <taurus_rod@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 3:03 PM
To: Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council <Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org>
Cc: Ann White <annladywhite63@gmail.com>; Larry Murray <lmurray007@hotmail.com>; Pamela Jiner <pamjiner@yahoo.com>; Elenz, Magen M. - CC Senior City Council Aide

<magen.elenz@denvergov.org>; Sotelo, Melissa N. - CC YA2246 City Council Aide Senior
<melissa.sotelo@denvergov.org>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] GL Concerns and My Voice

Stacie,

Thank you for responding, but nobody will answer why this was NOT PLACED ON THE BALLOT for voters to decide?

Rod Carr

On Wednesday, December 16, 2020, 01:13:49 PM MST, Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council <stacie.gilmore@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Carr,

Our council office was first briefed regarding the Group Living Ordinance from Community Planning and Development (CPD) late January 2020. Since then, Montbello 2020 has hosted the following meetings regarding Group Living to keep the community updated on the proposed changes:

- Thursday, February 6th 2020
- Tuesday, July 21st 2020
- Tuesday, November 10th 2020

In addition, our council office hosted a Town Hall meeting on Thursday, December 3rd 2020 and we have also continued to share information through our social media channels and newsletters as we received information to keep people updated.

During Montbello 2020's meeting and the District 11 Town Hall, we took the opportunity to listen to the communities comments. With over 90 people who attended our meeting on December 3rd, we wanted to give enough time to those who wanted to speak, in addition we read as many questions as we could.

During these meetings we heard a variety of concerns expressed. From Neighborhood Inspection to parking enforcement concerns. What was not appropriate during these meetings was targeting a racial/ethnicity group we represent in District 11. I acknowledge the lack of trust and enforcement the neighborhoods has seen from neighborhood inspections over the years regarding zoning violations, including parking issues, trash, etc. We understand these frustrations, as our office is often the one that calls ZNIS to help constituents with the enforcement cases. We are committed to finding solutions to these ongoing issues and it's clear we need a more robust process to handle the issues we are facing along with providing the needed

supports to our families who live in our communities as well.

The poll questions were designed to help gain a deeper understanding for what our community thought of regarding the components to the Group Living proposal. In looking at the results, the questions are as objective and based on fact as possible. A lot of the questions were split in the middle as to the responses.

With regards to the Group Living proposal, Community Planning and Development (CPD) is proposing the following alternatives to Residential Care Regulations, which are very scaled back from the original proposal they presented this summer. In Montbello specifically there are already 5 residential care facilities in operation. CPD is proposing an additional density limit that will further regulate any additional care facilities. I've included the proposed regulations below.

Please note that in the new proposal that was presented at the Dec. 3rd townhall, Community Corrections will be prohibited in single and two-use zone districts which is the majority of the Montbello community. Type 2 facilities would only be allowed in structures that have been built for a civic, public, or institutional use. Industrial warehouse space is not zoned to have people live within it. It doesn't have access to resources, bus lines, and services that folks need to begin to either transition back into society or have the support needed to overcome a substance / alcohol abuse issue.

Type 1: 10 or fewer guests, or up to 100 guests for no more than 130 days/year (an existing provision in the code)

- Density requirements in SU (Single Unit), TU (Two Unit) and RH
 - This would apply a proposed 1-mile density limit, which would prevent no more than 3 other residential care uses of any type within a 1-mile radius of a proposed subject site for a new Type 1 Residential Care use.
 - Montbello currently has 5 residential care facilities, this would put a limit on any additionally residential care facilities in the community.

Type 2: 11 to 20 guests

- In SU, TU and RH districts, may only be on a parcel previously used for a Civic, Public or Institutional use.

Type 3: 41 to 100 guests

- Allowed only in higher-intensity zone districts
- Spacing Requirements

Type 4: 101+ guests

- Allowed only in higher-intensity zone districts
- Spacing and Density Requirements
-

Community Corrections:

- Not permitted in Single Unit, Two Unit zone districts
- This includes Montbello

Sincerely,

Stacie



Stacie Gilmore

President, Denver City Council

she, her, hers

District 11 | 303.720.9139

Arie P. Taylor Building

4685 Peoria Street, Suite 215

Denver, CO 80239

Stacie.gilmore@denvergov.org |

[Dial 3-1-1 for City Services](#)



From: T <taurus_rod@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 3:32 PM

To: Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council <Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org>

Cc: Ann White <annladywhite63@gmail.com>; Larry Murray <lmurray007@hotmail.com>; Pamela Jiner <pamjiner@yahoo.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] GL Concerns and My Voice

Good afternoon Stacie,

I am taking time to express my feelings about the last Montbello Town Hall regarding proposed Group Living changes. I want to be as respectful as I can in saying this, but I was very disheartened to see how one sided this town hall really was. First of all, I know it may represent your personal connection to your family's future regarding affordable housing, but I felt that your comments were very inappropriate for this meeting. What about the voices of all the other residents of Montbello that you were elected by and to represent? The questions were so contrived and staged, that it really made me feel very disgusted to even be a part of such a slap in the face session.

As a privileged white member of the Montbello community for over 25 years, I have been very repulsed and disgusted at the meetings attended by the blatant lack of respect toward the Senior Black Members of the Montbello Community! These members have been active participants in this community for almost fifty years, since the planned inception of Montbello, one of the original suburban developments devoted to the Black population of Denver. You asked for and community members have attempted to make their voices heard, but like in the last meeting, one Montbello member spoke up, but was rudely shut down with, Oh, we need to move on! How is this reckless and blatant disregard for the long time Senior members of the Montbello community, not a form of reverse discrimination. WOW, Black and Senior Citizen constitutes two minority groups in my grounded understanding and perspective! But alas what do I know, since I am just a concerned community member trying to get my voice heard like all the others! You asked that concerned members to speak up, but only if it fits your and Mayor Hancock's agenda! Place yourself in their/our positions, and step back and start listening to Montbello and ALL of Denver Residents, the community members who put you, all of City Council, into office to represent our interests, not the interests of outside special groups and agendas.

I think Mayor Hancock and all of Denver City Council needs a reality check! First of all you work for us, we don't work for you! You were elected to represent ALL of Denver, not just a few who have their own agendas. Secondly, if this proposal was so important, WHY WAS IT NOT PLACED ON THE BALLOT THIS YEAR? If pit bulls can garner space on the ballot, why was something as important as these far

reaching changes not given room on the election year ballot? It should not be up to just a few, Mayor Hancock and City Council, to make changes that will negatively affect our quality of life, safety, and property values! Thirdly, we come to the very important issue of enforcement. I have reported over 250 violations, did you get that, over 250 violations to code enforcement in the last two months. Maybe we should be looking at revising the code violation policy of only thirty days into maybe a year, since enforcement is a complete FAILURE here in Montbello. Residents know the game and refuse to RESPECT their NEIGHBORS and OUR COMMUNITY! Really, if enforcement was working the way it was intended to, we would not have so many violations to address. But again what do I know, since I am just a privileged white member of the Montbello community! In these meetings, we have been promised our own code enforcement officer for the past two plus years, but it never happens. What is the common theme in these meetings regarding enforcement? In its current state, IT DOES NOT WORK! Please listen to their/our voices. Most of them as concerned residents have to take a stand and shut down these violations with their own personal fight. Why are we not being represented or taken seriously, when it comes to code enforcement and the violations? Fourthly, how did the failures of Mayor Hancock, City Council, and City Government Officials inability to address the affordable housing problem, and now crisis, become PUNISHMENT for all of us tax paying citizens? All of you were elected to address these concerns, but why are Denver Residents being made to suffer because of YOUR failures? The proposed Group Living changes are really unethical if you think about it. How are elected officials given so much abuse of power and control to negatively impact our standards of living and quality of life?

I can go down the path of how devastating the passage of these unethical changes will be to all areas of Denver, but will my and other concerned voices be heard? Probably not! The message we are given is SHUT UP and GO AWAY! I reported a house on Wheeling Street that is full of Cholo Mexican gang members who fired over forty rounds and hit four people in two separate incidents the end of May and first part of June. I even had a nice conversation with Chief of Police Pazen about this incident. So are group homes that congregate this type of violence okay? These changes will not only allow these upstanding and reputable residents a place to live, but foster and promote even more homes full of gang members, parolees, offenders, etc. Also, I find it very intriguing that this violent crime spree garnered no media attention. Maybe it has to do with Mayor Hancock's old neighborhood and the suppression of any negative publicity?

Let me share another example of why Code Enforcement does not work. Finally, after over eight months of reporting a rental house, yes slumlords abound here in Montbello, illegally selling food out of the residence on my block in the middle of the worst pandemic since 1918 (nobody wearing

masks), and by the way has twelve to fifteen residents, two weeks ago Denver Police showed up, after I threatened to call the Colorado State Health Department and also included Chief Pazen on my email response to our resource officer. Did I did mention earlier Stacie, how well reporting this to code enforcement worked! It takes concerned neighbors who are willing to take a stand and fight their own fight to make sure neighborhood issues get resolved, and not because of Code Enforcement and laws in their current state!

Noise violations and crowded parties are off the charts also. I called the non-emergency number for a noisy party at a house on Worchester in October. There was a huge crowd of partiers where nobody was wearing a mask and the loud music played until almost 2 a.m. Why do the same rules and restrictions not apply to all of us in the middle of this pandemic. But alas, when we have a mayor who tells us not to travel for Thanksgiving, but takes it upon himself to violate the same rules and guidelines that he himself put in place, no wonder that we have the out of control craziness going on here in the Montbello Community. Leaders are elected to lead by example, not apologize after the fact, just because they got caught!

Trash is also already an issue. Just drive down and look at the trash in the drainage canals off Andrews or 51st Street. It was nice that you secured grant monies to paint the canal next to Andrews and Peoria, but did you really take time to stop and see how much trash and pollution it holds at the bottom? It is reprehensible!

Both on and off street parking violations are already off the charts. Vehicles remain on the street for months and years with flat tires, abandoned, crashed, weeds as high as the vehicle and trash accumulated around them since street sweeping can't do their job, parked too close to stop signs and crosswalks, parked on unpaved surfaces, front yards poured with full concrete driveways with as many as ten cars parked in front of the residence (sold and resold in violation of code by realtors who could care less, other than making a profit), street sweeping inability to clean the paved street surfaces due to so many vehicles on the street, horse trailers and fifth wheel trailers, boats, jet skis, other recreational vehicles parked on dirt in front yards, commercial vehicles and trailers that litter the street like the weeds and trash that accumulates around them. Why are we wasting taxpayer dollars on street sweeping, when there are so many vehicles

illegally parked around the home that street sweeping is unable efficiently and effectively clean the street?

When you run a neighborhood into the ground and increase population density, what envelops that community is more crime, more violence, more gang shootings, more drugs, more despair for the residents who live in that neighborhood!

I could go on and on since the violations are so out of control. As a member of the Montbello Community, I am very saddened to see the degradation of this once beautiful community, and how the homes and community are being so unjustly disrespected. Montbello has some of the best Perl Mack built homes in all of Denver, and shame on Mayor Hancock and City Council for even considering such an unethical proposal that will only destroy what little sense of community and quality of life that we and other parts of Denver have left!

But alas, what do I know, since I am just a concerned member of the Montbello community trying to get my voice HEARD, along with many others!

With Great Concern and Trepidation,

Rod Carr

Orlando Boatner

25 Year Residents of Montbello

Fighting for Our Voices to Heard and Standing Up for Our Rights as
Concerned Homeowners!

From: [Florence Sebern](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: [denc - City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Laura Aldrete](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Missing Submission from Comment Logs | Group Living Amendment
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 2:55:45 PM
Attachments: [Comments Group Living to 8-28.pdf](#)
[Group living comments Aug28-Sept11 \(as of 12.13.2020\).pdf](#)

Andrew,

It's very disconcerting to read your answer.

2252 Denverites took the time to inform themselves about this massive 184-page zoning code amendment and then took action and submitted a comment to the custodian. The custodian removed those comments without notice, without reason, and without explanation. One wonders what would happen if a non-City employee didn't pay close attention.

Please see the two summaries, below, of the original comment log (attached) and the "revised" comment log (attached). CPD disenfranchised **both those who support and oppose** the Amendment.

Comment Log #3 | LUTI Briefing 8/19/20 – 9/11/2020 (as of 12/13/2020)

- 19 comments received
- 18 opposed
- 1 support
- 95% opposed
- 5% support

Comment Window #3 | LUTI Briefing 8/19/20 - 9/1/20 (original)

- 2271 comments received
- 2262 opposed
- 9 support
- 99% opposed
- 1% support

The lack of concern about the public process has been apparent in CPD's handling of the Amendment from the very beginning -- and sadly consistent.

Despite hundreds of CPD employees, including over 50 planners, and one dedicated consultant for this project, it's almost as if CPD didn't have to perform to standard...perhaps because this Amendment is destined to pass?

regards,
Florence Sebern

On Mon, Dec 14, 2020 at 8:31 AM Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior
<Andrew.Webb@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Florence – I do have your Aug. 27 e-mail and attachments in an e-mail folder of post-Planning Board input. I'm not sure why it was not included in the log that we posted online, but later this week I'll be going through and coalescing all of the input received to-date since Planning Board into a single file to provide to LUTI (and ultimately, the full City Council). I'll make sure your original letter and all of the attached form letters are included in that record.

Thanks,

Andrew

Andrew Webb | Senior City Planner

Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver

p: (720)865-2973 | andrew.webb@denvergov.org

Community Planning and Development is doing our part to support social distancing recommendations. Please help us in this effort by doing business with us online instead of in person: www.denvergov.org/cpd.

From: Florence Sebern <fsebern@gmail.com>
Date: Sunday, December 13, 2020 at 8:32 PM
To: "Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior" <Andrew.Webb@denvergov.org>
Cc: dencc - City Council <dencc@denvergov.org>, "Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor" <Michael.Hancock@denvergov.org>, District 1 Comments <DistrictOne@denvergov.org>, "Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council" <Kevin.Flynn@denvergov.org>, "Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council" <Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org>, "Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council" <Kendra.Black@denvergov.org>, City Council District 5 <DenverCouncil5@denvergov.org>, "Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council" <Paul.Kashmann@denvergov.org>, "Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council" <Jolon.Clark@denvergov.org>, "Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun" <Christopher.Herndon@denvergov.org>, District 9 <District9@denvergov.org>, "Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council" <Chris.Hinds@denvergov.org>, "Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council" <Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org>, kniechatlarge <kniechatlarge@denvergov.org>, Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large

<OrtegaAtLarge@Denvergov.org>, Laura Aldrete <Laura.Aldrete@denvergov.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Missing Submission from Comment Logs | Group Living Amendment

Andrew,

I reviewed the comment logs on the Group Living webpage and did not find my submission of August 27, 2020 in either of these comment logs:

- [Public comments Received between August 19 and September 11](#) (PDF)
- [Public comments received between September 12 and October 7](#) (PDF)

Attached please find the confirmation that was sent upon submission of 2,143 petition signatures, verified as Denver residents, and printed as form letters. The original submission is also attached.

Please let me know why it wasn't included in the comment log for August 19-September 11.

regards,

Florence Sebern

From: [linda p](#)
To: [kniechatlarge](#)
Cc: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [dencc - City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [District 9](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [City Council District 5](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to change zoning for single units
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 11:22:55 AM

Dear Citycouncilperson Kniech,

Thanks for your public service and your very long response. Just a few comments.

We are not opposed to single unit group housing limited to 4-5 adults for roommates or assisted care. We are opposed to a maximum of 10 adults in a single dwelling if more people are allowed in this proposal with extra space beyond a certain baseline which increases inhabitants to a virtually unlimited number when relatives can be added on. We also bristle every time the implication is made that anyone wanting to maintain single unit zoning is some kind of bigot or racist rooting for inequity. Screw that appraisal or type of pressure! Listening to a planning committee meeting, I heard one member say her personal goal was to eliminate all single residence zoning. Screw that too. All Denver citizens should have single residence neighborhoods as a choice, as well as other choices. No central planner should have the power to decide they know better. The will of a neighborhood should never be ignored by elected representatives. Any living situations of more than 5 adults and community corrections facilities could still come to a single residence neighborhood but only through a petition process to gain approval of neighbors and with city council approval. Watching the city council meetings, it is clear that much, very much, of what you do is geared toward affordable housing and caring for the homeless, important work. You obviously are concerned and serious about helping those with this type of need. However, you should also take care to govern for all citizens of the city, including those desiring the choice of living in single unit residence neighborhoods where zoning puts reasonable limits on occupancy. Whose streets? Our streets too!

Sincerely,
Linda (and Allen) Powell
District 4
(h) 303-757-1639

On Mon, Oct 5, 2020 at 10:03 AM kniechatlarge <kniechatlarge@denvergov.org> wrote:

Hi Linda and Allen,

Thank you for reaching out to our office. The Group Living amendments have brought out many voices in our community, both for and against. Our polarized times often make it feel like important decisions are all or nothing propositions. But we in fact share many important values in Denver, and COVID has reminded us that we are interconnected; our entire community can benefit when we protect those who are more vulnerable. I believe we can both modernize our zoning code to give more residents access to housing *and* maintain quality of life, we don't have to choose one or the other. It will take more work to find more common ground, but I'm confident we can. A few initial, frequent questions:

- *Does the current proposal have protections that people have been asking for?* **Yes, see below for examples.**
- *Can we add additional protections?* **Yes, we'll be talking about new ideas too, tune into a series of City Council [Land Use Committee Meetings](#) on October 6, November 10, November 17 and December 1**
- *Can you believe flyers, social media or other things you might be reading about this proposal?* **Not always**, please see this information from [Community Planning and Development](#) to fact check

I am committed to continuing to unpack the tensions and concerns that have surfaced throughout the conversation, while also staying focused on the urgent need to update the code. Some of our neighbors who struggled with high housing prices even before the pandemic, or with job losses during it, are facing risk of displacement under the current code, because they didn't realize they couldn't share a 3 or 4 bedroom house with 3 or 4 roommates, a situation that would be legal in almost every one of Denver's peer Colorado cities or nationally. We also have neighbors urgently in need of the extra services and support of residential care to help them get back on their feet, rather than living on the streets or without the medical care they need. **We owe it to these neighbors to keep working at this common ground as swiftly as we can.** Thanks for catching up on the questions below or the next phase of the dialogue.

* The Q&A below is based on the *current proposal*, which is going to change as the dialogue continues over the next couple months.

Why Do Residential Rules Need to be Updated?

Our city seems to agree we have a crisis in housing affordability and access, and too many people living on the streets. This proposal does not lower the price of a home, but it would legalize the sharing of those costs by those who come together to share expenses along with the other joys and obligations of maintaining a household. And it would help ensure access to residential care for those who are homeless, living with mental illness or disabilities, nearing the end of life, or transitioning out of jail or prison etc.

Denver's current rules create obstacles for residents who need flexible housing options and for providers who offer much-needed services to vulnerable populations. Current rules perpetuate inequity by making it harder for certain communities to live in residential neighborhoods and near jobs, transit or other services they need. The proposed changes aim to increase flexibility and housing options for residents, to standardize and clarify permitting processes for providers while fostering good relationships with neighbors, and to make it easier for those experiencing homelessness or who have other special needs to live and access services in our city with dignity. Previously, some residential care uses had no notice requirements or unclear standards, the update will require a more robust and consistent community notice and public meeting for larger residential care uses and community corrections uses of any size.

Is the City Listening to Any of the Concerns that Have Been Raised?

I believe our city shares a value of residents helping to shape policy, but also balancing different perspectives, including from those who may not have as much representation in city conversations, such as renters or low-income residents or people of color. While this proposal expands housing access for these populations, many components of this policy have changed to directly respond to feedback coming from single-family homeowners:

On household size:

- Reducing the number of unrelated adults that could live in any household together from the original proposal of 8 to 5 (this is the same number used by most of our peer cities).
- Establishing a maximum cap of 10 in houses 2,600 feet or larger, where there was previously none proposed.
- Prohibiting rent-by-the room models in more residential areas by requiring that people living there have jointly chosen to occupy the property, and prohibiting outside operators from controlling the makeup of a household, property access, etc.
- Adding off-street parking requirements for larger households.

On residential care:

- Limiting residential care uses larger than a typical household size to parcels that are at least 12,000 square feet (which make up only 6% of the city's parcels zoned for low-intensity residential uses, and are typically spread out)
- Additional spacing and density limits for these residential care facilities that further prevent over-concentration in any one area
- Requiring a community information meeting for any community corrections use in a residential zone district.

Overall:

- Planning department will track concrete metrics on implementation and report on those transparently to the community and the council so adjustments can be made if needed.

Race and Ethnic Inequality

I believe our city shares a value that people should have similar access to opportunity and quality of life regardless of their race. The proposal begins to address some of the historic race inequities that are perpetuated by our zoning code that have driven who is most in need of the housing access this proposal expands, such as:

- Nationally and in Denver, people of color are far more likely to live with multiple adults as an adaptation to complex, historical barriers, including income inequality and barriers to housing or elder/child care:
 - Black and brown households equal 30% of all households in Denver, but account for over half of households with 3 or more adults and 72% of households with 5 or more adults.

- People of color are also more likely to be negatively impacted by lack of access to homeless shelters or community corrections, or to the disadvantages of only being able to utilize those services in areas without access to transit, jobs, or health care.
 - Approximately 53% of those who are unsheltered are people of color.
 - Black residents experience homelessness at four times their percentage of the population; while Native American residents experience homelessness at twelve times their percentage of the population.
 - People of color are incarcerated at disproportionate rates in Colorado, and nearly six of ten people living in community corrections as an alternative to, or transition out of, incarceration are Black, Latinx, Native American, Asian or multi-racial.
- Residential care changes will also help alleviate the disparity between neighborhoods with historically more residents of color, which already host residential care facilities like community corrections and shelters, and other residential neighborhoods that have not hosted as many of these services that are essential to better meeting the needs of our city.

This topic was discussed during a [panel discussion on race and zoning](#) that my office hosted a few weeks ago and in an [op-ed published in the Denver Post](#).

Would These Changes Give an Opening to Unscrupulous Landlords?

Our city seems to share a value that we want to prevent exploitation of renters by renting each room out separately. This proposal is written to prohibit this. While renting out a single family home or duplex is allowed today (except where prohibited by an HOA), operation of a rooming house is and would remain prohibited in single family/two-unit residential areas. The proposal defines a “household” as a group of people living together as a non-profit housekeeping unit and who share all spaces, make decisions about the household together, and who have jointly chosen to live in the unit. Rent-by-the-room scenarios managed by non-residents would still be prohibited, as they are today.

How Can We Prevent External Impacts from Larger Houses?

Our city seems to share a value of accountability to maintaining properties, not negatively impacting neighbors. While there is no evidence that the relationship between people living in a home (related/not related) is connected to maintenance or other external impacts, this conversation has highlighted the importance of several related policies:

- 1) The need for a rental registry and license to hold landlords accountable for maintaining properties and addressing any concerns with tenants. This is among my highest priorities and is already being developed by council colleagues with my support.
- 2) The building code. As is currently the case, all houses will have to meet building code requirements to provide basic needs (bathing and toilet facilities, functional kitchens, etc.) as well as building code requirements for efficiency, safety and fire protection.
- 3) Neighborhood inspection
 - Fewer calls for households with unrelated adults would allow inspectors more resources to address concerns about trash, weeds or noise that originate from households of *any* size
 - This is a key area that could be linked to the landlord license

Closer scrutiny has already resulted in right-sizing some staffing where calls have been greater to improve follow-up to complaints.

- I am urging the city to convene a community task force to engage with this division to examine current practices and opportunities to improve the effectiveness, including using more best practices on education and prevention strategies and examining racial equity

4) Parking access

- As stated above, off-street parking requirements were added for households seeking to make use of additional square footage to go beyond 5 unrelated adults
- Limits on uses of yards for this kind of parking remain in place and can be enforced

Can't We Just Provide for These Uses Somewhere Else?

I believe our city shares a value that we should be helping those who are vulnerable with the care that they need. And the value that we should actively address the challenges people face to minimize the impacts on them or our community into the future. The tension is over where:

- Most residents experiencing homelessness have been in the Denver area for a long time. Many of those released from incarceration, or sentenced to community corrections as an alternative, came from Denver neighborhoods. Seniors or those with disabilities often have family in Denver who want to be near their loved ones. Longtime Denver residents of color are facing the greatest risk of displacement due to escalating housing costs, and now some of the highest rates of unemployment due to the pandemic. This proposal is about meeting the needs of Denver neighbors in the city where they already live and have ties.
- More than 75% of Denver's land is zoned for single family/two unit residential, which means there is limited land in the remainder of the city to address all our needs.
- Much of the remaining land is zoned for industrial uses, and not only less livable for the residents needing housing or residential care, but those who are vulnerable have less success when they are isolated from healthy neighborhoods with a mix of uses, transit and services to help them get back on their feet, which can impact our entire community if their care is not successful.
- The other portion of the remaining land is mixed use that also includes residential, which means the residents living in or adjacent to these areas are already living alongside these uses. Residential areas also already have numerous residential care uses even under the current code. Both raise the question of inequity when some residents live near some of these uses but not others.

Will Our Neighborhood Change to a Mostly-Institutional Environment?

Our city seems to share a value that household living should be more predominant than residential care in any given area. The reality on the ground and the proposal ensure this remains the case.

- There are 340,000 households in Denver and only about 75 smaller residential care facilities in the city, these uses are expensive to operate and rare

The proposal includes spacing and density limits that prevent over concentration in any one area

- Limiting the typical-sized residential care to larger lots further restricts these uses to a small percentage of residential lots

How Will Community Safety be Protected?

Our city seems to share a value that we all want to be safe. We've had less discussion of another value, but many would say, and it is enshrined in our laws, that those who make a mistake deserve a second chance after they have served their time.

Today, ~95% of those sentenced to jail or prison are released, after which they are free and can live anywhere. People with a variety of backgrounds live in every neighborhood in our city, today, regardless of whether this proposal passes or not. What the zoning code presents us is a choice between being released from incarceration with on-site supervision and support as required by state and local regulations to ease a transition to that freedom, or remaining incarcerated, at greater taxpayer expense, until they are released without on-site supervision or support.

Here are the many ways the community corrections approach promotes safety for both nearby neighbors and overall community:

- Community Corrections programs are staffed 24/7 and each client is assigned a case manager that coordinates their individualized reentry plan
- Clients must obtain prior approval from the case manager to be approved to leave the facility for approved activities
- Clients must be monitored and tested for substance use
- The Colorado Department of Corrections and the Court have responsibility over the clientele in halfway houses. The Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, in conjunction with the Denver Community Corrections Board, creates standards of operation. In addition, Denver's Department of Public Safety provides oversight, ensuring compliance with state regulations and local ordinances, and all clients placed in Denver facilities must be approved by the Denver Community Corrections Board and the local provider. Providers of specialized programs are licensed to provide residential treatment to offenders. Their status as licensed treatment programs also require them to comply with standards of the Colorado Division of Behavioral Health

[To learn more about Community Corrections, please see this FAQ.](#)

What Else are We Doing to Address Housing Access?

Our city seems to agree that we have a crisis in housing affordability and access, and too many people living on the streets.

This proposal doesn't lower the price of a home, that is beyond the power of government in our economic system, but it would legalize the sharing of those costs by those who come together to share expenses along with the other joys and obligations of maintaining a household. Other methods and efforts to expand affordable housing include:

- Exploring the incentivizing of affordable housing in exchange for density
- \$62 million spent since 2017

- \$52 million to build and renovate 2700 units
- \$4 million to build two projects with Supportive Housing units
- \$14 million for almost 900 units being built or renovated that includes units targeted for seniors, people with disabilities and special needs, veterans, and those transitioning out of homelessness
- Another \$34 million to build or renovate another 1500 units for rent or sale up to 80% area median income
- \$10 million to help 4,500+ households access and stabilize in housing

To get a real time look at development and preservation, you can use [the Housing Dashboard here](#).

- [Denver's Temporary Rental and Utility Assistance Program](#)
- [Community Planning and Development's emerging infill housing project](#)

The urgency of this particular value cuts directly against calls to delay adoption of any changes. While addressing as many concerns as possible is important, 100% consensus is not a realistic goal for any policy proposal in a city as diverse as Denver.

For lots more FAQs and detailed information on Denver's Group Living Proposal, please visit [Denver's Group Living Webpage](#).

Sincerely,
Councilwoman Kniech

From: linda p <lbahpowell@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 7, 2020 9:45 AM

To: kniechatlarge <kniechatlarge@denvergov.org>; Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large <OrtegaAtLarge@Denvergov.org>; Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council <Kendra.Black@denvergov.org>; Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council <Stacie.Gilmore@denvergov.org>; dencc - City Council <dencc@denvergov.org>; District 1 Comments <DistrictOne@denvergov.org>; Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council <Kevin.Flynn@denvergov.org>; Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council <Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposal to change zoning for single units

Re- new zoning proposal to expand number of adults allowed in single residences

We are opposed to the zoning changes proposed to allow virtually unlimited residents in single units now zoned for families or for two or more unrelated adults. We further oppose efforts by some on the planning committee in their new project to "infill" Denver and to effectively end all single unit zoning for housing in the city. At the meeting we attended regarding the current zoning proposal, those in attendance appeared to be vastly opposed to the zoning changes to allow up to 10 adults and unlimited relatives. Yet, it appears that will of these neighbors is being ignored.

Last week, I listened to public comments prior to the city council meeting which seemed to have been packed in favor of the proposal touting the virtues of group living. We are not opposed to group living in general or to expanding the number of adults to 4 or 5 but would like a cap on the number of allowable residents if relatives are also allowed. Halfway houses and homeless shelters should be allowed in residential areas only through a permitting process after widespread input from residents.

Also, we resent the implications of some that anyone trying to maintain single unit, limited occupancy housing is a bigot fighting to maintain inequity. No one should be labeled as evil for wanting to limit occupancy levels in the neighbors they love.

In a virtual meeting, some of the planning board members pointed to the large amount and percentage of opposition to the current proposal which had been received and ignored. Please do not accept this current proposal as written. Rather, limit group occupancy to no more than 4-5 adults, preferably with some sort of ceiling on additional residents.

Linda and Allen Powell, Denver District 4

303-757-1639

From: tsxerox@denvergov.org
To: [Stevens, Elle H. - CC Legislative Assistant](#)
Subject: Scanned from a Xerox MFD in Denver Showroom
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 12:18:44 PM
Attachments: [Scanned from a Xerox Multifunction Printer.pdf](#)

Please open the attached document. It was scanned and sent to you using a Xerox Multifunction Printer.

Attachment File Type: pdf, Multi-Page

Multifunction Printer Location: 1437 Bannock St. rm. 451

Device Name: CC_BAN_RM451

For more information on Xerox products and solutions, please visit <http://www.xerox.com>