

**Public Comments on Proposed Group Living Code Amendments
Feb. 4 to Feb. 8, 2021**

Note: This document contains written comments provided to CPD between 12 p.m. Feb 4 (the due date For the City Council staff report) and 3 p.m. Monday, Feb. 8.

From: [Haley Jordahl](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I support Group Living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:18:41 PM

Andrew Webb,

Hello all -

I'm writing in support of the proposed group living amendments.

Denver is in the midst of an affordability crisis that impacts much of our community. I have benefited from group living at various points and wanted to share the value it has brought to my life here:

- As a college and grad student, I lived cooperatively in houses shared by up to 12 unrelated people. We split the cost of home-cooked food, rented rooms for around \$400 per person, and enjoyed a strong community. Because we were close to neighborhood amenities, none of us needed to own cars. The low cost of living helped support me as a young adult. I also don't think that I have lived more environmentally sustainably at any other point in my life.
- I recently purchased my first home. I am privileged to be able to purchase a home in the Denver market. However, purchasing in Denver wouldn't have been feasible without renting space in my home to others. Having roommates makes continuing to live here possible for young people.
- A family member of mine spent several months living in a halfway house that was centrally located in a major city. In that location, they were able to access employment, amenities, and transit to see family. Halfway houses and residential care are an important part of our community.

Group living helps to keep Denver accessible. It's one tool in our toolbox to keep our community housed. I strongly support this amendment.

Thanks,
Haley

Haley Jordahl
haley.jordahl@gmail.com
4524 Alcott Street
Denver, Colorado 80211

From: [Kieran Purce](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In support of group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:04:36 PM

Andrew,

Hope you support the group living amendment. I am letting you know that I do. And I hope you vote in favor of letting consenting adults live with eachother. Along with supporting more common sense legislation that protects working people of denver. Colorado is a terrible state for the poor and working class people. Rent control is illegal here. The state is number one in lost wages. And it is a "right to work" state that prevents people from organizing and collective bargaining. So I hope you support the group living amendment and start helping people find stable housing in denver.

Kieran

From: [Donna Krentz](#)
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](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Feb 8th City Council Meeting Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:58:27 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

The Group Living Zoning Amendment is a massive, unproven, urban, social experiment that the Mayor, CPD, GLAC, and a few Council Members want to impose on all of Denver and in spite of the growing opposition.

A policy that cannot withstand public scrutiny does not merit adoption.

The pledge a public servant takes should be defined by the Hippocratic oath, "***first do no harm***".

The amendment is the Mayor's and a few Council Members way of shifting major burdens of the city to the shoulders of residents into stabile single-family neighborhoods.

CPD and the stacked and biased GLAC failed to derive creative solutions for the problems that face Denver. Rather they chose to copy and mirror the mistakes other cities are making.

The **GLAC Charter states Zoning will not resolve affordability.**

Simply put, the amendment will **not make** purchasing a home more affordable and instead promotes renting, not owning. Renters do not build the wealth.

The most current changes to the amendment are insufficient and do **not** go far enough to protect law abiding citizens who have made significant sacrifices to live in safe, stable neighborhoods, and who have invested a lifetime in their homes and communities.

Without further changes to the amendment, and should it pass, the City should prepare for people to flee to safer refuge as the city decays - similar to the flight from cities to the suburbs in the 50's & 60's.

Look no further than what happened in the last sixty years to the cities of Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Chicago, and the like.

People with the means to do so, fled to the suburbs, while the criminal element stayed, and those with less could not escape.

These cities have been plagued with crime for decades, overrun with drugs, gangs, and turf wars.

However, this time fleeing urbanites will not return to Denver to live. There will be little need to do so because of technology and the rise of telecommuting. It is happening across the country now prompted by Covid-19 impacts. Urbanites are moving to the suburbs and leaving the growing issues of cities behind them. And there is no going back.

Overall, the amendment will serve to de-stabilize, existing, stabile neighborhoods. Denver will evolve into a landlord's paradise (just like NY City) and where only the wealthy will be able to afford to own property, as the middle and lower-income classes are squeezed out. The remaining population will be the struggling renters that cannot escape and the criminals that prey on them.

I urge responsible Council Members to show political courage and resolve in the face of adversity and **VOTE NO** on this amendment.

Save our beautiful Denver with its unique residential neighborhoods from following the mistakes of other troubled cities.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Donna Krentz

District 7

The facts and the numbers do not lie.

I oppose the Group Living Amendment for the following (not all inclusive).

- Group Living Amendment is too extreme. It is a massive, complicated, unproven, urban, social experiment that should be de-bundled. Community corrections facilities, homeless shelters, and number of unrelated adults per household all need to be separated.
- GLAC committee stacked with vested financial interests who will benefit and/or profit.
- Mayor blocks freedom of information requests until sued and the truth revealed hidden priorities.
- Biased process from the beginning and an imbalance of RNOs and the public at the GLAC table.
- Planning Board and LUTI ignore petition of opposing in the thousands.
- CPD's Record of Public Comments - 92% Opposed including INC and numerous RNOs.
- Covid-19 impact and its restrictions have greatly suppressed public involvement.
- Majority of Denverites remain un-informed about the amendment and/or do not understand its negative impacts.

- Chapter 59 areas (since 2010) **Two Zoning Codes = Inequity** with NO plan and NO budget to remedy. Three City Council members and the Mayor reside in Chapter 59 neighborhoods.
- Lame duck Mayor supports GLA in his last term, 'ducking' political fallout.
- CPD's continued distortions, and fact twisting, have misled the City Council and the public.
 - Truth = Unlimited vehicles per Dwelling Unit - Current code §10.9.3 and Revised code §10.9.3
 - Truth = Homeless shelters allowed in every neighborhood - Current code §11.2.11.1.B and Revised code § 3.4.4
 - Truth = School buffer zones from half-way houses have been eliminated. Current code 11.12.1.C and Revised Denver Zoning Code §11.2.16
- Children should be safe and protected when they attend school, from unstable mental illness, addiction behaviors, and criminal rehab and the amendment strips protections away.
- Inspections Services is severely under-staffed. Current code violation enforcement is dismal. Denver budget cuts will exacerbate this further if the amendment is passed. Montbello. 200+ code violations will become the norm.
- Denver's population has grown but its police force remains understaffed based on population.
- Only 5 of 21 (23%) change requests from by City Council were made by CPD. (Not a compromise.)
- The number of unrelated adults should be scaled to the size of the house and permits should be required for greater than 2 unrelated adults. The current legal limit of two unrelated individuals with a required permit for three – five unrelated individuals should be maintained. Necessary to track, monitor, and prevent negative community and neighborhood impacts. **Denver cannot manage what it cannot proactively track and measure.**
- Criminals (for any crime and from anywhere in CO) can be placed in Denver's half-way houses – the amendment increases halfway houses in more parts of Denver.
 - Denver's recidivism rate was 41%. (Denverite, 8/2019)
 - Colorado 50% recidivism rate (convicted criminal re-offense); 10 points higher than the national (CPR, 2/2019).
 - 2/3 of Denver's halfway house population are felons exiting prison. 1/3 have been deferred from state prison. (CPR, 2/2019)
- City shows Bias / Favoritism – Spends Taxpayer's Dollars to Create Video for Queen City Cooperative, a private business that will benefit/profit from the approval of the

proposed Group Living Amendment zoning code.

- **Denver Metro** single family housing is **Supply and Demand** issue unresolved since 2008. Denver alone cannot and should not be expected to solve the entire metro's housing problem. The changes the Group Living Amendment threaten home ownership and leaves Denver ripe for further commercialization. Boarding rooms are **NOT** the sole way a neighborhood or city gets commercialized.
- According to the 2017 American Community Survey, investors own and rent out about 18.2 million one-unit homes, including detached homes, townhomes, and duplexes, providing housing for about **42 percent** of the nation's 43 million renter households.
- 'The Surge of Investors in Single-Family Homes Raises Three Concerns'
 - <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/surge-investors-single-family-homes-raises-three-concerns#:~:text=According%20to%20the%202017%20American,nation's%2043%20million%20renter%20households>. **Aug 27, 2019**

From: [Erik Maulbetsch](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: In support of the Group Living Text Amendment
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:58:56 PM

Mr. Webb, I just saw your email address at the bottom of the draft amendment so I'm sending this comment for the record to you as well. If I should send it to someone else please let me know.

Thanks,
- J. Erik Maulbetsch

Begin forwarded message:

From: Erik Maulbetsch <emaulbetsch@gmail.com>
Subject: In support of the Group Living Text Amendment
Date: February 8, 2021 at 2:51:56 PM MST
To: denc@denvergov.org

Hello,

I'm writing in support of the Group Living code updates. We need to make it easier for people who need the services and support provided by group living facilities to be able to find housing, especially in central city neighborhoods where they can more easily get to jobs, services and public transportation.

I've lived across the street from such a facility at 11th & Pearl for almost eight years now. The residents are polite and even function as an informal neighborhood watch as they are frequently sitting outside talking and observing the intersection. Several years ago one informed my neighbors about a hit and run parking incident involving her car that he witnessed.

Thanks for your time,

J. Erik Maulbetsch
1068 Pearl St. in Capitol Hill.
My council member is Chris Hinds.

From: [Elizabeth Madej](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:49:18 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Elizabeth Madej
libbymadej@gmail.com
4601 E Girard Ave
Denver, Colorado 80222

From: [Charlie Brennan](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:34:06 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods. If a use is good enough for someone else's neighborhood (read: a black or brown neighborhood), it should be good enough for all neighborhoods (including those that are predominantly white!).

This effort is also an opportunity for Denver's elected officials to push back against negative, unjustified stereotypes about some of our neighbors. The idea that these changes will lead to a flood of rapists, drug addicts and pedophiles in our neighborhoods is a ridiculous lie that is being pushed by well organized groups, including my own RNO (West Wash Park). It is disgusting, and shows how much further we have to go as a city to truly be equitable.

As a homeowner and constituent, I urge you to do what is right and not what the loudest, most organized voices at the table are saying. These groups do not speak for all Denver residents (or even Denver homeowners, as I myself am). Please do what is best for our city and pass the Group Living amendments without any changes.

Thank you,

Charlie Brennan

Charlie Brennan
cbrennan@cclponline.org
337 S Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado 80209

From: [Reynolds Family](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [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](#); [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](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote NO-200 Page Group Living Amendment
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 3:20:47 PM

Mayor Hancock and Members of Denver City Council,

While I support the revision of the outdated residential zoning, allowing additional un-related adults to live economically, the process by which this amendment was initiated, developed and promoted is counter to inclusivism, transparency and honesty. I am disheartened and saddened to see the degradation in process and character watching this amendment work its way through the process-mostly behind the scenes since 2018. I am asking your "NO" vote this evening for the following reasons:

- Mayor's legislative liaison, key City employees, and two at-large council members involved in the formation of the powerful Group Living Advisory Committee (GLAC) in 2017 at the direction of Mayor Hancock; Denver residents had no knowledge of this Committee or its objectives.
- Information not disclosed to Denver residents became available per a ruling by Judge Michael Vallejos on January 11, 2021 arising from a denied request to the Mayor's office under the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA). The records request that the Mayor's office denied pertained to the formation of the influential Group Living Advisory Committee, which drafted the Group Living Amendment.
- Denver residents were not at the table for the first three years to the development of what now is the Residential Care and Congregate Living Amendment. There was no authentic input by Denver residents. A petition of thousands objecting to the amendment was dismissed by Planning Board.
- Residents of Denver neighborhood communities were not equally represented at the table for the first two years developing the Group Living Amendment. It was after word got out and residents began questioning their Council representatives and growing the petition, that LUTI paused the train and made some, but not enough, modifications.
- Communication and community engagement from March 2020 to present has been very challenging due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Many Denver residents are still unaware of this Amendment, yet CPD and Denver City Council allowed it to continue to move forward.
- The length and complexities of this proposal obstructs basic communication, understanding and clear understanding downstream impact by Denver residents.

Many of you have worked to "amend" to original proposal but have left Denver residents subject to halfway houses for the homeless, convicted felons, addicts, and high-density housing in Denver's unique residential neighborhoods under the guise of equitable housing. You have removed "safe zones" for our children's schools with this proposed amendment. There is no funding available to support the increased infrastructure and change in service paradigm and utilization this Amendment creates. In fact, Denver City revenues dropped as Denver unemployment rises and businesses close due to the COVID-19 pandemic and wage stagnation resulting in a shrinking tax base and decreased budget for Denver for 2021 and beyond.

Denver has decreased basic services (e.g., large item pick-up, 311 availability) to mitigate budget deficits and maintain basic services, so increasing or changing the model for service delivery in the near future will negatively impact and overburden an already taxed system.

Please bear in mind, for the exception of Mr. Webb, you are all elected officials, and the outcome is on all of you. Are you representing your constituents or working for Mayor Hancock? Are you representing Denver's neighborhoods or allowing developers to line their pockets with cash? Denver City Council will ultimately be responsible and held accountable for the outcomes of these individuals and the neighborhoods in which they are placed.

Even with the most current amendments the GLP remains insufficient and inadequate; I know you don't want to hear that, but it's true. It does not go far enough to protect law abiding citizens who have made significant sacrifice (personally, financially, or professionally) to be able to live in a safe, stable neighborhood, and how have invested a lifetime in their homes and neighborhoods.

Please do not pass this 200-page mess at tonight's Denver City Council meeting. It is not in the best interest of Denver.

Respectfully,

Amy Reynolds
District 2

From: [mjermance](#)
To: [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Kniech, Robin L. - CC Member At Large Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GROUP LIVING - NO TO HOUSEHOLD SIZE OF 5
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:17:41 PM

Dear Denver City Council Members and Mr. Andrew Webb,

Regarding the Group Living Amendment, I am opposed to raising the number of unrelated adults plus any minor children, allowed in a single family home, from 2 to 5.

Questions about how city infrastructure, services, safety, schools etc. would accommodate this enormous density increase have been either ignored or the planning department outright admitted the amendment does not address them. Denver's neighborhoods along with their quality of life will simply, and rapidly, deteriorate.

But the city will be able to tout that these changes further "equity" and solve the "housing crisis" in Denver. Both are fictitious and merely politically expedient catch phrases designed to further political agendas and to solidify and appease a certain voter base. The city knows well that this amendment will do little, if anything, to actually help that voter base, except those who will monetarily profit from it (profit being a key component).

And coming along right behind this amendment are efforts to eliminate single family zoning altogether, incentivize developers to higher density, etc. which will only build upon the harmful effects of Group Living, which is obviously "phase one". The city is chipping away at existing zoning regulations to enable unfettered development under the pretense of helping people. It is shameful.

Sincerely,

Mary Jermance
3860 W. Union Ave.
Denver, CO 80236

| [311](#) | [pocketgov.com](#) | [denvergov.org](#) | [Denver 8 TV](#) | [Facebook](#)

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/landmark.

From: Idelle Fisher <idelle@ijdesign.com>

Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:46 AM

To: Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council <Amanda.Sawyer@denvergov.org>; Upton, Curt C. - CPD City Planner Principal <Curt.Upton@denvergov.org>; Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun <Christopher.Herndon@denvergov.org>; denc - City Council <denc@denvergov.org>; Weigle, Elizabeth K. - CPD City Planner Senior <Elizabeth.Weigle@denvergov.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote No on Group Living Zoning Code Amendment

Hi City Council & City Planners,

Please Vote No on Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.

As a resident of South Park Hill, our house is along the corridor of Colfax. We have one of the most

affordable homes in the area, luckily, nobody bought it to develop it into a McMansion or a multi-unit box before we were able to purchase it about 8 years ago. Prior to that we owned a house at Colfax and Cherry for 10 years. We have worked hard to take care of our properties, taking care of the trees, landscape, and home maintenance. We purchased our small home in this area as we wanted to live in a quiet, single-family neighborhood. I am very upset that the zoning that we invested in is getting changed against the approval of the residents who own property here. Every neighbor I've spoke to is against changing our zoning, and I've seen and read thousands of comments from those who've signed petitions that are opposed to this amendment.

The reasons that I am 100% opposed about the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment include:

Commercializing of our Neighborhood:

This amendment will undoubtedly turn our neighborhood into a commodity and developers and investors will buy up our smallest affordable historic homes and turn them into money-making properties. Instead of single families like ourselves being able to purchase on the small historic homes in the neighborhood, we will be outbid by developers who's plan is to make money from our properties. Many of our smallest, most affordable historic homes will be destroyed to put up poorly-built multi-unit box structures that steal the sun from their Northern neighbors, and cover up as much land as allowed. Additionally, backyard homes (ADUs) will be built, turning a former water-permeable landscapes into heat islands covered in buildings and concrete. These ADUs will not be "affordable housing" – they will just increase our mid-to-high housing density and exasperate our already overtaxed infrastructure (schools, medical offices, roads, stores, utilities, etc). Instead of property owners, our neighborhood will start to fill up with renters with slum-lords, and trash, dog feces, parking and other issues will be a cause of constant neighborhood strife. Instead of knowing our neighbors, we'll have strangers moving in and out without a chance to get to know them, and the wonderful sense of community that we have will be eroded away. Our affordable housing stock will disappear and rather than being able to live in a tree-filled family neighborhood, it will be an area filled with struggling people trying to pay high priced rents, and it will become a loud, polluted noisy place devoid of greenspaces and peace.

Tree Loss & Heat Islands:

Our mature tree canopy, which is already at peril from the massive amount of existing development, will continue to be removed to build multi-unit homes, garages, and parking. Denver already has some of the worst air pollution in the country (in the top 10!!), and our continued loss of our trees and green spaces to be covered with buildings and concrete has only contributed to the growing issue. I'm glad that the Denver Post has brought to light the short-sightedness of our city planners by allowing so many of our greenspaces to be destroyed:

<https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/03/denver-tree-planting-greenspace-heat-islands/>

We need to preserve any trees and greenspaces that we have left to help combat heat islands and pollution, and provide wildlife habitat in Denver.

Flooding:

Our historic neighborhood was designed with large landscapes with permeable ground to absorb water from storms. As Denver has permitted development to pave over our permeable ground, flooding has increased during storms as water has nowhere to go. Unlike planned developments

such as Stapleton and Lowry, where they build in drainage areas to collect water from the new developments, Park Hill, Mayfair, Montclair and other surrounding neighborhoods are not able to “build” or add in water-catching areas to accommodate the extra water draining from the ever-increasing impervious surfaces created by development. When a McMansion or ADU is built on a formerly small affordable home property, it causes additional flooding and drainage issues for surrounding neighbors as the water is no longer absorbed on the property. I’m appalled at the amount of development I’ve seen Denver allow where all of our permeable ground on former landscaped lots disappears under building. We need to think about the future, and make sure we are not creating a flood zone by allowing unchecked development without providing adequate planning and drainage.

I’m not alone in my concerns and opposition. I’ve also seen that over 10,000 people have signed the petition that asks that we vote no on this amendment: <https://www.change.org/p/denver-mayor-and-city-council-members-no-to-denver-s-group-living-zoning-code-amendment>

**I ask my City Council members to vote Vote No on Group Living Zoning Code Amendment.
None of the residents who live here want this, and it will destroy our neighborhood.**

Thank you for listening to your constituents!

Idelle Fisher
South Park Hill Resident
720.260.3541

From: [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#)
To: [Holm, Greg @ Denver](#)
Cc: [Thompson, Maggie M. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 7](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Comments to City Council
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 1:29:25 PM

Thanks Greg, looping in Andrew who I believe is the official keeper of the official record on this to make sure it gets recorded.

JOLON CLARK

Denver City Council District 7

Phone:(720) 337-7777

Email: jolon.clark@denvergov.org

Sign up for the LD7 e-newsletter [here](#)

Keep up-to-date through our Facebook Page [here](#)

Dial 3-1-1 for City Services
Hablamos Espanol

Correspondence with this office is an open record under the Colorado Open Records Act and must be made available to anyone requesting it unless the correspondence clearly states or implies a request for confidentiality.

On Feb 2, 2021, at 7:55 PM, Holm, Greg @ Denver <Greg.Holm@cbre.com> wrote:

Jolon / Maggie,

Below are my comments on the Group Living ordinance which I appreciate you including in the City Council package. Thanks!

As all members of City Council know well, we have a severe housing crisis in Denver that will take years to address. This crisis has its roots in explicit and deliberate racist housing policies implemented by Federal, State and Local governments starting in the 1930's and continuing through at least the 1960's. While current zoning policies are no longer explicitly racist, Denver remains strongly segregated and the cost of housing is out of reach for far too many Denverites, both of which evidence the ongoing inequities and racist impacts caused by our zoning policies.

Changing Denver's group living policy is one of several zoning policy changes needed to create housing equity in Denver. The originally proposed group living changes would add flexibility in how existing housing can be occupied so that more individuals can be housed within our existing housing stock. With thousands of evictions expected this

winter as a result of job losses resulting from COVID 19 the group living changes originally proposed would provide opportunities for individuals to share housing to reduce costs and will reduce the number of people made homeless as a result of evictions. The proposed policies would also permit more social services to be provided in group living situations, including rehabilitation services in community corrections settings. Please remember that nearly all prisoners will be released eventually and that our communities are made safer when we provide services that allow former prisoners to receive services and gain skills needed to successfully re-enter society

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise."

The zoning code, as currently written, is a tool privileged groups use to maintain and expand discrimination in our neighborhoods, particularly in higher income neighborhoods, which are the worst offenders.

In view of Denver's long term housing crisis, which has been made suddenly and dramatically worse by unemployment resulting from COVID-19, continuing with the proposed changes to the group living ordinance is the right thing to do.

Please undo the LUTI changes and allow up to ten residents in large homes as well as ensuring residential care facilities can operate in Denver.

Regards,

Greg Holm
1325 S. Downing St.
Denver, CO 80210

From: [Susan Young](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [District 1 Comments](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 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](#); [District 9](#); [City Council District 10](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] AFFORDABILITY
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 8:56:39 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

The following items are specifically excluded from the committee's scope of work:

- General issues around affordable housing or affordability of housing options – While these issues are important and related, they cannot be resolved in the zoning code.

This was just brought to my attention and copied from Februrary 2018 "Group Living Zone Code Update Advisory Committee Charter".

This after cries that the new zoning will make residences more affordable.

WOW!!

Susan Young

District 8

From: louraders@gmail.com
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [St. Peter, Teresa A. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 10](#)
Cc: ["Annette Woodward"](#); ["Linda Barker"](#); ["Doug Haeussner"](#); ["John Albers"](#); ["Jeff Bernard"](#); ["Wayne and/or Leslie New"](#); ["Richard Cohen"](#); mshellenbarger@alumni.nd.edu; ["Ingrid Glancy"](#); ["Kate Taucher"](#); ["Dale Rudolph"](#); ["Kevin Landon"](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] CCNNA Opposition Statement to GLAC
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 6:31:55 PM
Attachments: [CCNNA - GLAC Responses.pdf](#)
[CCNNA GLAC Letter.pdf](#)
[CCNNA GLAC Opposition Statement with Summary.pdf](#)
[CCNNA GLAC Opposition FLYER.pdf](#)

Dear Councilman Hinds, City Council Members and Mr. Webb:

Please find attached (i) Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association (CCNNA), the official RNO for our neighborhood, letter of opposition to the GLAC proposal, (ii) CCNNA table with residents' responses to outreach, (iii) outreach flyer delivered throughout the Cherry Creek North neighborhood, and (iv) CCNNA opposition statement with GLAC summary. You will notice that the majority of CCNNA residents who responded approve the compromise to 5 unrelated adults and minor children reached for the definition of Household. However, they oppose the rest of the GLAC, for the reasons stated in the attached materials. Please note that we all appreciate the efforts Mr. Webb and City staff put forth in this legislation, but the vast majority of residents do not think that the final proposal is satisfactory and that too many issues remain to be addressed.

Thank you.

Lou Raders, President CCNNA

Copied to the Board of CCNNA and its zoning committee

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

1	I agree with your position statement. Housing density should not be increased primarily because traffic and parking are already issues. Let's hold onto what remains of the neighborhood/village feeling.	Angie Leach Pizzichini 351 Milwaukee Street
2	I agree with the CCNNA position on group housing.	Sheila Lyons 138 Monroe St
3	I agree with the CCNNA position against the Group Living amendment.	Marilynn Hitchens 427 Detroit St.
4	I agree with the CCNNA position objecting to the enactment of the proposed Denver Group Living zoning change.	473 Josephine St. Sheryl Josephson
5	I agree with the CCNNA position on opposing the group living amendment proposal before City Council	John Backlund 287 Harrison St.
6	I am against	Susie Calmes
7 2	We agree with the CCNA position on group living	Alison and Tom Greengard 335 Detroit St
8	I agree with the CCNNA position against the Group Living amendment.	Marilynn Hitchens 427 Detroit St.
9 2	My husband and I agree with the CCNNA position against the proposed group living zoning text amendment - Against the proposal	Julie and Saul Schwarz 214 Monroe st
10	My Cherry Creek North Neighborhood has a clear and dominant residential character that both reflects its historical past and celebrates its delightful presence in this area of Denver. That sense of community, coupled with our proximity to downtown Denver and our access to the Mountains, is what make our Cherry Creek North "home town" so very special. It is imperative that my Cherry Creek North N'hood RH-3 zoning designation receive the SAME EXEMPTIONS from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as those in Denver's other	Chris Murata 459 Clayton Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>predominantly residential neighborhoods!!!</p> <p>This is a historic zoning decision that MUST be decided with the good of everyone considered.</p>	
11 2	We agree with CCNNA and the position against the Group Living zoning. Thank you,	Denise and Dean McDavid 374 Fillmore St.
12	I support. Thank you for working on this issue.	Evelinda Urman 215 Monroe Street
13 2	My Wife and I agree with the position that the association has taken.	Doug & Heather Macnaught 246 Jackson St
14	I am opposed to the new group living zoning text. I fully support the position of CCNNA. I can be reached at 303-520-5228	My name is William Piper, I am the owner of 137 Jackson st. 554 Milwaukee st. 562 Steele St.
15 2	New to area. We strongly oppose the Group Living zoning amendment proposal. Please add our names in support of the CCNNA position.	Mark & Sue Pennington 483 Columbine
16	I fully support the Cherry Creek Neighborhood Association's opposition to the proposed group living amendment and concur with CCN's reasoning behind opposing the amendment. I am a homeowner and appreciate your efforts!	Pat McKern My address is 216 Jackson Street, Denver, CO 80206.
17	We agree with the CCNA STAND on the zoning proposal.	Pam Mathews 420 Adams, Unit D
18	I fully agree with the CCNNA position statement. We should receive the same exemption in CCN as the other residential neighborhoods. Thank you!	Nathalie Dani 222 Cook ST, Denver 80206 813 546 6067
19 2	We agree with your position.	Anne and David Myers, 490 Cook St. 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

20 2	As residents of Cherry Creek North, we are opposed to the proposed group living zoning.	Cindy and Rob Piggott 214 Garfield Street 80206
21	I am against the group living amendment.	Julie Silver
22	<u>I agree</u> with the CCNNA position statement on this issue!	Marty Linder I live at: 335 Detroit Street, Unit 301, I also own: 335 Detroit Street, Unit 506
23	I strongly support the CCNNA position relative to the Group Living Amendment.	Morris H. Susman 280 Madison St.
24 2	I completely agree with the position of Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association AGAINST the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment. We live at 338 Fillmore Street, right in the heart of Cherry Creek shopping district and feel that this amendment would negatively and greatly affect the character of the neighborhood and impact safety. Please vote no.	Kathy and Kirk Riedinger 338 Fillmore Street
25	I agree with your view on opposing the proposed Group Living amendment. I live in Cherry Creek east at	Randall Hunter 56 South Monroe
26	I agree with the CCNNA position statement, I am strongly opposed to an increase in unrelated people occupying a single residence, especially when none of the occupants are owners of the residence. We have seen first hand with a half-way house being run out of 9000+ sq. foot home behind us the issues that have been outlined in the position statement – overflowing garbage, excessive need for on street parking, no ongoing upkeep of the multi-million valued	Jason Stout 515 Harrison St.

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	property, excessive noise in the summer time when windows are open and multiple tenants are congregating (including smoking and swearing), and even destruction of property (one tenant hit our neighbors garage and did not follow-up to correct it, only to be caught later). While I wish these people the best in their recovery efforts, we have invested a significant amount of money into our property during the almost 15 years we have lived in our home, these new rules will only detract from property values and the investment of my hard earned income. CCN has some of the highest property values in Denver and should not be punished for people who cannot afford to live in the neighborhood without piling into a single residence. There are plenty of other options for them.	
27	I oppose the proposed Group Living Amendment	Geoffrey Cullen 440 Adams Street Denver, CO 80206
28 2	My husband and I agree with the CCNNA position statement	Lindsay Hickel We live at 301 Harrison Street, 105, Denver, CO 80206
29	I wish to state my agreement with the Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association position against the proposed Group Living Zoning Amendment. This proposed amendment would destroy the very nature of this highly desirable residential neighborhood.	Terence Stephens 245 Cook Street,
30	Yes – (agree with the CCNNA position)	Hallie Loeb 180 Cook St. Apt. 106
31	I agree with CCNNA position statement on the Group Living Amendment. Thank you for always sending updates on our neighborhood	Nancy Deifik 370 Clayton St. Denver, CO 80206
32	I agree with the CCNNA position on group housing.	Len Lyons 138 Monroe St.

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

33 2	We agree and support the CCNNA position against approval of the Group Living Amendment.	Louis and Theresa Dupart 537 Steele St.
34	I totally sign on to the CCNNA Position which I am assuming is they are against it.	Sally Gauditz 192 Monroe St.
35 2	agree with CCNNA on their position regarding group living.	Mark Schor and Susanne Schor 229 Cook Street
36 2	We strongly support the CCNNA position against group living in the Cherry Creek North neighborhood.	Norman and Linda Benedict
37	Agree with position!	Richard Cohen 234 Garfield St.
38	I agree with the CCNNA position statement against the proposed Group Living zoning.	Marc Pasquariello-Williams 549 Cook St
39 2	We agree with CCN position opposing the Group Living Amendment.	Steve Coburn and Mary Tierney 445 Monroe St Monroe St
40	I agree with the CCNNA position.	Kate Taucher 317 Madison
41 2	My wife and I categorically, without hesitation or qualification, oppose group housing as proposed.	John Darcy 155 Monroe Street
42	We agree with the CCNNA position statement and certainly share many of the same concerns around maintaining residential character, safety, parking, enforcement and lack of any real input.	Lauren Victor 133 Garfield
43	We are opposed to the proposed change in the zoning amendment related to group living. Please include us in your petition the City Council and if that does not work we will be happy to join in a recall effort of our Council person. If you need funds to fight this we would be happy to contribute to the effort as well.	William N. Lindsay 125 Harrison Street
44	I absolutely disagree with allowing group living in Cherry Creek North. I agree with the CCNNA position statement.	Julie Mansfield 227 Garfield

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

45	WE OPPOSE GROUP LIVING TEXT AMMENDMENT-	Stephanie Costonis 561 STEELE ST DENVER, CO 80206
46	I agree with Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Group Living proposal.	Cheryl Casey 310 Jackson St.
47	I am OPPOSED to the proposed Group Living Amendment. If adopted there is no way to enforce or monitor compliance.	Margaret S. Cottrell 236 Cook Street
48	Please know that I am very much against the proposed group living amendment for my Cherry Creek neighborhood. DO NOT PASS THIS. Thank you	Lisanne Hendricks
49 2	We agree with the CCNNA position statement on the proposed Group Living Amendment.	Ken and Trish Green 400 Cook Street, Denver, CO 80206
50	I am a resident in Cherry Creek North. I concur with CCNNA opposition of the Group Home Zoning Amendment.	Mary A Rovetta (Angie) 501 Madison St. Denver CO. 80206 303-589-4892
51	I agree with your position to <u>oppose</u> the Group Living legislation	Mike Miller MMillerDeisgn.com 521 Fillmore St. Denver, CO 80206 Mobile 303-907-4209
52	I oppose the proposed group living amendment	Diane Jones 200 Monroe St. Denver, CO 80206
53	I have read all the information regarding this change. I completely agree with the Board's position. I do not want this change to happen.	Linda Roller 544 Adams St, Denver CO 80206
54	We agree with the CCNNA. We oppose the group living amendment.	Sonia Van Ostrand 448 Columbine Street, Denver CO
55	I agree with the CCNNA position statement	Vernon M. Schreiner 137 Garfield Street Denver, CO 80206 303.618.2107
56	I am a resident in Cherry Creek North. I concur with CCNNA opposition of the Group Home Zoning Amendment.	Torie Vandeven 501 Madison Street Denver 80206 720-220-8705

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

57	I agree with the CCNNA position on proposed Group Living Amendment .	Carolyn Kemp 425 Clayton Street
58	I concur and support the CCNNA Position Statement regarding Denver's proposed Group Living Amendment.	John T. Kelly 434 Clayton St Denver 80206
59	I agree with the CCNNA Position Statement.	Chris Klapp 512 Fillmore St. Denver, CO 80206
60 2	We agree with the CCNNA position opposing the current draft of the Group Living Amendment.	Illene Neff Manny Neff 417 Adams St.
61	I don't agree with CCNNA's position on this amendment. We do need to allow denser living arrangements in our city, as housing has gotten very expensive in Denver. Our neighborhood also needs to become more diverse. We live in an area that has good public transportation (for Denver) and is close to services - let's share it with others. Some of the points in the CCNNA position make sense, such as the concern about enforcement of the new rules, potential for increased traffic and parking conflicts, but we should be able to deal with them.	Pauline P. Reetz 470 Clayton St.
62 2	We agree with CCNNA's position.	Tom Moore and Mike Horak 285 Garfield St, Denver, CO 80206
63	We agree with the CCNNA position statement – we do not support group homes in CCN. We live at 515 Harrison Street and have a group home now located behind us. Raising kids with a group home / shelter for recovering alcoholics directly behind us is certainly not desirable. We have	Jennifer Stout 515 Harrison

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	been in the CCN neighborhood for 13+ years now.	
64	I do not want this housing project	Linda Miller
65 2	We support CCNNA position against the proposed group living zoning changes . Please add our names to the petition.	Brian and Margaret Harris . 467 Steele Street, Denver 80206
66 2	We support the CCNNA Board of Directors' position AGAINST the contemplated group living amendment being considered by the City of Denver.	Terri and Bob Birdsong 349 Adams Street
67	I am against the proposed Group Living zoning text Amendment.	Kelley Beaudoin 194 Monroe Street.
68	I am against the group living proposal.	George Tezak 333 Garfield St Denver, 80206
69	I am a CCNNA member and I agree with the Board's position statement.	Gregory James Smith gjsmithjd@gmail.com 255 Adams Street Denver, CO 80206-5213
70	I oppose the group living arrangement as written given that exempted communities are largely the same as CCN, and only semantics allow the inclusion of CCN.	Address: 567 Harrison St
71	I agree with CCNNA's position and am against the proposed Group Living zoning text.	Cindy Mikles 138 Garfield Street
72 2	We are strongly opposed to the proposed Group Living Amendment. We don't agree with CCNN that 5 unrelated adults is an acceptable compromise. 3 is reasonable and 4 unrelated adults is a stretch. The rest of the amendment as you say is unacceptable. Thank you for your efforts.	Chip and Kristal Duval 360 Madison Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

73	Agree	Francis Gottlieb 420 Adams St. F Denver, CO 80206
74	Totally agree with your position on this.	Mary Kitchen 537 Monroe Street
75	I agree with the CCNNA statement.	Patty Figel 525 Saint Paul Street.
76	Agree with CCNN position	George Pardos 200 Adams Street
77	I support the opposition statement and wish to thank all of the CCN residents who have done all of the research.	Sandy Berhenke 285 Jackson Street
78	I object to the proposed residency proposal as defined by the documentation. My position is a firm "No." CCNNA is not prepared for such a large transition now or in the future	Thomas Holland 335 Detroit St, Unit 201
79	Agree with CCNNA's position of opposing group living amendment.	Debra Nelson 544 Garfield St.
80 2	We agree with the CCNNA opposition statement. Thanks.	Martin & Kathy Cozyn 315 Adams St Denver, CO 80206
81	I have read the CCNNA position statement. I agree with the CCNNA position statement. I think CCNNA should oppose the proposed group living amendment.	Deborah Evans 529 Harrison Street
82	I am Opposed to this Amendment and I Support the CCNNA Position Statement.	Pam Parker 2902 E Third Ave, Denver, CO 802096 m 303.875.7117
83	I totally disagree with this proposal. I recently fill in a "survey monkey" re: this issue from city council I believe. I was negative on all questions. The wording is very poor and information is lacking. I felt it was written the way the Mayor wanted it written..... to be confusing.	Gwen Ross

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

84	I agree with the CCNNA position to oppose GLAC.	Linda Barker
85	I agree with the statement.	Karen Davidovic 155 Steele Street Apt 515
86	I heartedly agree with the CCNA position. You have my vote. Thank you for your hard work.	Carol OHare 470 Monroe St.
87	I agree with CCNNA's position statement	Elizabeth Stokka 128 Garfield St Denver 80206
88	I have read the CCNNA position statement. I agree with the CCNNA position statement. I think CCNNA should oppose the proposed group living amendment.	Deborah Evans 529 Harrison Street
89	Zoning issues to cram people together during any time, but during a pandemic just makes for more issues than it will serve. Stop crumbing under developer pressure to pack large numbers of people into small congested areas with no adequate parking now for the existing residents.	Pam Lester 111 Harrison St
90 2	My wife and I strongly oppose the City of Denver's proposed amendment to allow an increase in the number of unrelated persons to occupy a residence. We fully and completely support the position of out homeowners association CCNNA. This proposal will allow too many people to live in to compressed of an area and Cherry Creek North does not have sufficient parking to accommodate this increase in density.	John and Brenda Franklin 446 Jackson St.
91	I agree with the CCNA position on the Group Living Amendment.	Pamela Guiry 399 Madison Street Denver 80206
92	Unfortunately, those of us who have already replied in the past AGAINST (80%) the proposal.....this public opinion has not stopped Mayor	Suzanne Larrick 231 Adams Street Denver cO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	Hancock nor his committee pushing through their endeavors despite the will of the people! But I'll vote again!	
93	I strongly oppose the Group Living Proposal.	Lynn Sullivan
94	I am opposed to the Proposed Group Living Amendment	Gary Mobell 301 Garfield St 1-w
95 2	Agree with CCNA position statement.	Babs and Mike Gerber 335 Clayton St Denver CO 80206
96	I am in support of CCNNA's position opposing the Group Living Amendment.	Ellen Retchin 57 Garfield St
97	As a homeowner, I have read and totally support the CCNNA position statement against the Group Living amendment. Thank you for representing my views,	Karen Arnett 11 Monroe St, apt. 101 Denver, CO 80206
98	I agree 100 percent that group living should not be allowed in Cherry Creek North	Karen Contino
99 2	Please add my name to the list of residents that support the CCNA statement and thank you! If I can add my rental property as well please do!	1. Dana Busch 273 Adams St 2. Joy Busch 273 Adams St 3. My rental: 303 Madison St
100	agree with the CCNNA position statement	Kit Leventhal 560 Columbine St Denver CO 80206
101	I agree with CCNNA position statement.	Patty Coughlon 542 Adams Street.
102 2	Please use this as my position on the group Living zoning in Cherry Creek North. We live in a single family home in CCN. Please do not allow the neighborhood to become a community Corrections and Shelter use in our neighborhood. We are an adult community that shares life here with Seniors, many single women and professionals who	Marty and Alaxandar Josephs 464 Garfield Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	cannot ever benefit from allowing a community corrections/Shelter adjusting the values of our homes. Good luck with the meeting in February 8 th. We are hopeful for your success in opposing this zoning position.	
103	I definitely support the CCNNA position statement against the approval of the Group Living Amendment.	Leslie New 443 Adams Street
104	I absolutely 100% agree with the stated CCNNA position on the proposed rezoning.	Paula Spruell 221 Madison St.
105	I definitely support the CCNNA position statement against the approval of the Group Living Amendment.	Wayne New 443 Adams Street
106	I support CCNNA position	Marq Cummings
107	I support the Board's position against the GLAC.	Dale Rudolph 551 Steele St, Denver, CO 80206.
108 2	We agree with the position of the CCNNA regarding the above amendment.	Chris and Mary Giblin 397 Madison St
109 2	We are against the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment and would like to join the CCNNA in their opposition presented to City Council on February 8th, 2021. The residential character in CCN similar to areas that have received an exemption. This email serves as a signed petition against the zoning change.	John Sims & Brad Nolan 330 Saint Paul St
110	I fully support the CCNA position. As a parent of 3 young children and a property owner and am very concerned about the possible quality of life and economical impacts of the proposed Group Living amendment.	Alexander Giladi 563 Clayton St., Denver CO
111	I agree with CCNNA opposition.	Georgia Bedwell 262 Harrison St., Denver, CO.
112	I agree with the CCNNA position regarding group house.	Patti Marks 200 Madison Street
113 2	I agree with the CCNNA Position Statement Opposing the Proposed	D'Lea and Mark Martens 550 Cook Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>Group Living Amendment. Cherry Creek North is a residential neighborhood currently dominated by two-unit duplexes and single family homes. My block, 500 block, Cook Street is do different. Of 18 structures on this block only 2 are 3-story and both of these are two-unit duplexes. We have no row homes. It's the same to our east, west and south.</p> <p>I have sent Councilman Chris Hinds an email stating the same.</p> <p>thank you</p>	Denver, CO 80206
114	I agree with the CCNA position statement.	Maggie King 220 Adams
115	<p>I'm responding to the position statement. It seems complicated but in reading the forward I agree the CCN position.</p> <p>Let me know if there are further questions or actions to take.</p> <p>Thanks, Cindy Brody</p>	Cindy Brody 257 Adams street
116	Hi – I completely agree with the CCNNA position statement. I do not want the proposed group living zoning in CCN.	Debi Brandt 512 Cook St, Denver C
117	<p>I agree with CCNNA position Statement.</p> <p>Please note that we are considering leaving CCN after living here for well over 20 years now – 3 years in CC East before that. The crime has skyrocketed the last few years and the quality of life has fallen drastically. We no longer feel safe to walk two blocks to the restaurants and shops. Everyday, something is stolen from a neighbor and posted on Next Door. We used to feel blessed to live here; now, it is feeling like a curse.</p> <p>We should be spending energy to bring back the vibrancy and safety of CCN; not pushing it further in the wrong direction with this incredibly ignorant policies that 80 percent of the people are against.</p>	Scott C. 502 Fillmore Street Denver, Colorado 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	We have decided that if this passes in Denver, we will be leaving – enough is enough. Thanks for all your efforts to help try to save CCN.	
118 2	We oppose the Group Living Amendment.	Tim and Bev David 420 Saint Paul Street
119	We agree with the CCNNA position statement.	Jacqueline Kienzle 500 Monroe Street Denver, CO 80206
120	To whom it may concern, After serious consideration and research, I am adamantly opposed to this proposal. I just moved into the neighborhood and if I knew that this was a possibility, I would of never considered purchasing my duplex. I travel a ton and I would not have considered this unique and special place because of the safety of my wife as I travel. I also believe that our taxes will provide support for this community, but I also believe that the city has lower cost of land, and is better served in a location outside of our neighborhood.	Michael S McDonald 538 St Paul St, Denver
121	Please be advised that I am a resident of Cherry Creek North and support CCNNA's position against the approval of the Group Living Amendment	John Weslar 265 Jackson St
122 2	Agree with the position!!!!	Phil and Shelley Tamminga 477 Adams St
123	I agree!	Alan Lipner 322 Adams st,
124	I agree with the CCNNA position	Nan Spencer 2720 E Fourth Avenue
125	Please be advised that I am a resident of Cherry Creek North and support CCNNA's position against the approval of the Group Living Amendment	Karen Weslar 265 Jackson St
126 2	We live in Cherry Creek North, and totally agree that Cherry Creek North RH -3 Zoning designation should receive the same exemption	Patty and Pete Rickershauser 545 Adams St.

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as these other predominately residential neighborhoods! Why is Cherry Creek North being singled out?!	
127	<p>I am writing to support and discuss the CCNA position against the proposed 'Group Living zoning text amendment'.</p> <p>In my capacity as President of the Catalonian HOA Board (180 Cook Street) located in the heart of Cherry Creek North, it is very important that I (we) do all within our powers to ensure a safe, economically viable and friendly growing community within Cherry Creek North. You have my commitment to roll-up my sleeves to help defeat this illogical amendment.</p>	<p>Mark Goodman, as President of Catalonia HOA 180 Cook St</p>
128 2	We support your position against the proposed Group living zoning.	<p>Ilia and Inga Gurevich 175 Harrison street, Denver</p>
129	<p>Hi - I am in total agreement with the well documented CCNNS position statement regarding approval of Group Living Amendment.</p> <p>My specific concern is the 4.4.3.3 (notice and decision making provision) section because I would like neighbors who are impacted by zoning and/or code provisions be given an opportunity to attend a public hearing AND formally voice and capture objections or concerns and present or provide to Zoning Administrator to use in making final decision on zoning applications.</p>	<p>Micaela Gibson 2980 E 4th Ave Denver CO 80206</p>
130 2	My wife Jan and I support the CNNA's position in opposition to the proposed Group Living amendment	<p>Jan and Don Smith 251 Adams St., Denver, 80206</p>
131	I am opposed to all in Denvers' proposal for group living.	<p>Gwen Ross 471 Columbine St, Denver CO 80206</p>
132	I agree with the CCNNA Position Statement Against The Group Living Amendment	<p>Daniel Hagan 338 Clayton St, Unit # 4</p>
133	I disagree with Denver city government's proposed Group Living	<p>Kay Pride 335 Cook St.</p>

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	zoning text amendment. Cherry Creek North is primarily a residential area and should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as other predominantly residential neighborhoods, and the business areas are too compact for those uses.	.Denver, CO 80206
134	To Whom It May Concern, I am the owner of this residence. For the record, I am adamantly <u>opposed</u> to the Group Living Zoning Text Amendment that will be heard by City Council. Furthermore, I support the CCNNA's position of being against the proposed zoning amendment.	Reynolds G. Cannon 520 Steele Street Denver, CO 80206
135	I Agree with the CCNNA position statement	John Moriarty 352 Garfield Street Denver, CO 80206
136 2	Jennifer & I both agree with the CCNNA position on this	John and Jennifer Mackie 318 Adams Street.
137	Hello, I agree with the position of Cherry Creek north. The residential character of the Cherry Creek neighborhood is similar to areas where single family and duplex units are located. I feel the Cherry Creek North RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as these other predominantly residential neighborhoods.	Susan Ragno 451 Garfield Street Denver, CO 80206
138	I AGREE with the CCNNA position statement	Mary Moriarty 352 Garfield Street, Denver 80206
139	I AGREE!!!!	Peggy Thompson 395 Madison Street Denver, CO 80206
140	I agree with the CCNNA Position Statement regarding the Group Living Amendment.	Joyce Brady 255 Saint Paul St Apt 219 Denver 80206
141 2	Lynn Plummer and Harvey Plummer reside at. Agree with	Lynn and Harvey Plummer 329 Madison

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>CCNA's position statement on this matter.</p> <p>Our only addition input is that CCNA and its members have objected to this and previous proposals and our Council representative seems to be advocating for individuals who did not elect him.</p> <p>Thank you for adding us to your list.</p>	
142	I agree with the CCNNA position on Group Living	Ruth McIntyre 490 Monroe St Denver, CO 80206
143	I am against approval of the Group Living amendment	Monique Lathrop 318 Jackson Street Denver, CO 80206
144 2	<p>We are against approval of the Group Living amendment and support CCNNA's position statement.</p> <p>Please keep us informed and advise if there is anything more we should consider.</p>	Heather and Gary Hawkins 520 Milwaukee Street Denver, CO
145	I support the Board's position against the zoning plan called GLAC.	Bill Rudolph 551 Steele Street
146	I, Thomas O'Connor, agree with the CCNNA position statement regarding the proposed group living amendment. I am a Cherry Creek North homeowner	Thomas O'Connor 234 Monroe Street Denver, Colorado 80206
147	<p>Thanks for the communication regarding the proposed group living amendment. The flyer left at our door was helpful, the information on the website much more helpful.</p> <p>I agree with the CCNNA position to oppose this amendment. In addition, I believe Cherry Creek North's RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption as other predominantly residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>This is my introduction to CCNNA. I had been had been traveling to Denver, and specifically Cherry Creek North, for business from the late 1990s. Six years ago I was</p>	Bob Kneeley 310 Jackson Street Denver, CO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	offered a job that involved relocating to Denver. The decision about the neighborhood was an easy one: Cherry Creek North. For most of that time I continued to travel extensively. With travel curtailed and my planned retirement last month, we have been able to enjoy this neighborhood. This is a unique community; one that must be protected and maintained.	
148	We disagree with the proposal.	Dennis Lacey 511 Clayton St.
149	I agree with the CCNNA position AGAINST the proposed group living zoning. I am a CCN resident and have lived here off and on over 35 years. Most recently (the past four years) at 375 Adams street. The changes in this neighborhood have been astronomical but the last few years have been particularly disheartening. Over development helps no one!!	Sandy Capps 375 Adams St
150 2	We oppose the changes to the Group Living Zoning Amendment.	Scott and Therese Campbell 255 Garfield Street 80206
151	We agree with your position.	Marzano 467 Adams st.
152 2	Hello I live at 449 Garfield and would agree with CCNNA's position, I oppose Group Living in Cherry Creek North	Afsoon & John Kelly 449 Garfield
153 2	This is to confirm that we are opposed to the proposed group living arrangement. Increasing the density of the neighborhood would change the character of a really perfect place to live!	Sarah and Thomas Kaesemeyer 363 Garfield St Denver, CO 80206
154	I AGREE with CCNNA group living proposal and feel it will impact all of Cherry Creek North.	Phyllis Coffman 359 Cook Street Denver, CO 80206
155 2	We agree with CCNNA position.	Mark and Michele Hellerstein 478 St. Paul St.
156	Strongly agree.	Bev Skinner 287 Jackson Street Denver, CO 80206

157	<p>Dear Mayor Hancock, Denver City Council Members, Planning Board Members, et al:</p> <p>I am opposed to the Group Living Zoning Code amendment, and I am asking you to vote NO on this measure. The amended proposal does not address the many concerns homeowners and residents have and the issues that will result from it. Trying to solve Denver's homeless population and housing affordability issues using this proposal will merely exchange one set of problems for a host of other long-lasting negative implications, while destroying our neighborhoods in the process. <i>Broad Community Input was not Solicited from Homeowners & Residents.</i> This proposal is backed by planners and organizations who are vested in their own PERSONAL Interests and NOT the interests of the people. The proposal would create unbelievable over-crowding and parking issues and would further increase density and congestion. The proposed 'convenient' rewording of the definition of a single-family home unit for the sole purpose of circumventing the current zoning code in our neighborhoods, and which hundreds of homeowners spent hundreds of hours to help craft, is alarming and deeply troubling to say the least. Passing this proposal would send the signal to the Denver's residential single family home owners-residents, that the mayor, city planners, and City Council did not want to solve the homeless population and housing affordability issue by further creating and encouraging affordable housing and using</p>	<p>Stacy Robinson Denver 80206</p>
-----	---	--

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>other viable solutions. It would send the signal the rezoning efforts participated in by the hundreds is to be ignored by the few. 90% + 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.</p>	
158	<p>I am very much against this amendment.</p> <p>Although I believe Denver has a problem with homelessness and housing, I believe this is the wrong approach. I have lived at 3055 East 5th Ave Denver Co 80206 for 10 years, in a duplex. Its unfair to me to have bought a property years ago believing it was one type of housing and to change it to a property where I could have a group living situations sharing a wall with 5 unrelated adults, cars, noise, etc living there. I wouldn't buy the property knowing that. This change WILL have a negative effect on property values, will decrease people that want to live next door to a group living situation. Its unfair to current homeowners to change it when they have no recourse. Also, the reverse.....Investors buy a property on the market with the sole intension of renting to groups of people/cars without notifying neighbors... that's just not right. The investor doesn't live anywhere near, but just collects rent without consideration for how it effects neighbors. Think about Congress Park, there are many duplexes. How would you like it if you bought and lived in one</p>	<p>Susan Miesen 303-521-2133</p>

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>side and all of a sudden, there are 5 adults, 5 cars and everything that goes with it moving in. You, the homeowner have no remedy. This is not fair to all of us that bought a property with knowledge at the time of zoning. I am a real estate agent. If I show a property to a client and say "the next door neighbor is a group living situation", in my opinion it will decrease greatly the people that would consider buying it, thereby decreasing values.</p> <p>Does Denver have a problem, yes! Do we need some ideas of what to do, yes! But to make this change is just bringing on a new set of problems for current homeowners. Its just unfair. To think that 311 can monitor and address issues is just not possible, lets be honest, they are already overburdened. Happy to discuss further with anyone</p>	
159	I am in favor of the CCNA position on the proposed zoning change in CCN and oppose this change.	Bruce Craig 536 Milwaukee St Denver, CO 80206
160	I oppose	Jay Frazee 443 Garfield St. Denver, 80206
161 2	I agree with the CCN position on the above.	Rand Zimmerman, Cindy Zimmerman 384 Milwaukee St Denver, CO 80206
162	Agree with the CCNNA position	Scott Bice 150 Harrison St, Denver, CO 80206
163 2	We agree with the CCNNA position statement	Blake Austin and Ashley Delamarter 432 Cook St.
164	I agree with CCN's position.	Leslie Stratton 400 Columbine St.
165	I fully support CCNNA's opposition to the proposed Zoning Amendment. If there is anything that I can do to help our neighborhood take action against	Sara A. Henry 555 Jackson St. Denver, CO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	this Amendment, please let me know.	
166 2	We support the CCNNA position that Community Corrections and Shelters not be allowed in CCNorth and should receive the same exemption as other predominantly residential neighborhood.	Holly Sollod and John Chanin 132 Garfield St.
167	<p>CCNNA Member,</p> <p>I am writing today regarding the upcoming changes to the Group Living Text Amendment and your position against these changes.</p> <p>I believe that allowing these changes to proceed can have a major positive impact in our community because CCN's unique properties make it an ideal candidate for community housing. CCN is centrally located and has plentiful access to public infrastructure like public transportation, hospitals, schools/university, shopping, green spaces and pedestrian/bicycle access. By allowing additional housing for families units and care facilities we can improve access and equity for the most vulnerable population, while gleaning other benefits like reducing the number of cars on the road and reducing CO2 by decreasing the amount of energy required to heat smaller individual dwellings. This also provides access to more affordable housing for many essential employees like healthcare workers, transit workers, skilled laborers, teachers and family care providers (the workforce behind the workforce). Many of these people could very well be employed in the neighborhood at local schools or hospitals and would greatly benefit from affordable housing more central to</p>	<p>Julius Waintrub</p> <p>3900 E. 6th Ave</p> <p>Denver, CO. 80206</p>

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>their employment. Additionally, if they don't work centrally or are unable to drive, they can rely on several bus routes that pass through or near CCN to get them almost anywhere in Denver. As a rider and former employee of Denver Transit Operators, there is no hesitation to say that CCN may be one of the Best locations in the state of Colorado for public transit usability.</p> <p>I believe that each one of us would benefit by allowing community housing and that we should allow this amendment to move forward because of the exceptional impact that these changes would have, specifically unique to CCN because of its access to fundamental services.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts in keeping the residents of the neighborhood informed of local affairs.</p>	
168	I support CCNNA position statement	Jay Frazee
169	<p>I too oppose the amendment for the group living proposal. I do not want groups of unrelated people living together. As few as possible! I found the amendment a little confusing. I hope you understand my vote</p>	<p>Arlene Perry 300 Cook</p>
170	<p>I received the pink flyer and I vote against the Group Living Amendment.</p>	<p>Noelle Kerimes 415 Steele</p>
171	<p>I am been in the real estate business for over 50 years, and have resided at my current address for over 20 years.</p> <p>I can see the negative impact this would have on our neighborhood. I am absolutely against the CCNNA position statement and any further attempts to push through the Group Living Amendment.</p>	<p>Judi Phillips 350 Detroit Street #209</p>

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

172	I support the CCNNA position regarding the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment.	Howard Zucker 224 Garfield St
173	I am against the proposed group living zoning text amendment.	Christa Chase 360 Adams St
174 2	We object to the proposal.	John and Joan Feek 272 Monroe street
175	I agree with the CCNNA position	Sheri Raders 424 Columbine
176	I agree with the CCNNA position against the Group Living Amendment.	Kathy Staiano 166 Jackson St., Denver, CO. 80206
177	I agree with the CCNNA position statement opposing this amendment	Nancy Tucker 441 Garfield St
178	Agree with the CCNNA position against the amendment	Joyce Grego 533 Cook St.
179	I agree with CCN neighbors position <u>against</u> the proposed group living zoning	Dennis Oswald 353 Harrison St, Denver, CO
180 2	I oppose the group living Amendment. I support the CCNNA position. This Amendment is not well thought out and will likely harm the neighborhood.	David and Linda Fogel Denver, 80206
181	sign the petition against this zoning amendment? This is a terrible idea. Let me know what I can do to help defeat this amendment	Jeanne Phillips 430 Steele St
182 2	We are writing to indicate that we agree with the CCNNA official position statement. We are against the Group Living amendment.	Ward and Eugenia McNeilly 334 Monroe St.
183	I agree completely with the CCNNA position on the Group Living Proposal. I am a residential contractor and it should be obvious that whatever applies to SU and TU should also apply to RH3	Cody Phifer 223 Cook
184	I'm submitting my support for the CCNNA position statement regarding the city's proposed group living amendments. Please include me on the support list	Michael Gosline 444 Madison Street
185	I support the CCNNA position statement on the Group Living Amendment. I am AGAINST the Group living amendment.	Ellen Susman 280 Madison St.

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

186	I agree with the CCNNA position statement on the Group Living proposal.	Larry Martin 445 Saint Paul St.
187 2	We AGREE with the CCNNA position statement against the group living zoning	Michelle Myers and Craig Myer 270 Adams St., Denver, CO. 80206
188	I strongly agree with the CCNNA position on the proposed zoning changes. This would radically change the neighborhood the residents and businesses are heavily invested in. This needs to be stopped.	J. Nicholas Napoli 315 Monroe Street
189	I support the CCNNA position statement.	Valerie Blackburn 150 Jackson Street
190	I agree with the CCCNA position Statement.	Renee Duncan 317 Garfield St
191	We agree with the CCNNA position statement, particularly with respect to the exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as other predominantly residential neighborhoods.	Monique Tuttle 540 Steele St
192	I wholeheartedly agree with your position statement.	Ed Roberson 211 Madison
193 2	We endorse the CCNNA position against the proposed Group Living Amendment. We are in full agreement with the facts and reasons set forth by the CCNNA against modifying the Group Living proposal in the Cherry Creek North area. Please notify us if there is anything else you need	Marie A. Buckley and Jerome M. Buckley, residents at 301 Adams Street, Denver, CO, 80206
194	I am opposed to the proposed Group Living Amendment Changes which will be heard by City Council on February 8, 2021. I believe that Cherry Creek North's RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as those other predominantly residential neighborhoods.	Madeleine Roberson 211 Madison Street
195 2	We are in favor of the CCNNA position on the group living zone amendment	Richard and Laura Dowd 140 Garfield Street, Denver, CO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

196	I strongly agree with the CCNNA position on the proposed zoning changes. This would radically change the neighborhood the residents and businesses are heavily invested in. This needs to be stopped	J. Nicholas Napoli 315 Monroe Street
197 2	We agree with and fully support the Cherry Creek North neighborhood association's position against the proposed Group Living Zoning amendment. If allowed to pass, we think it would destroy some of the uniqueness of our little part of the city of Denver. Please vote NO	Richard Blue and my wife's name is Deborah Blue. 300 Adams St
198	I want to express my position on the proposed transformation that can happen in our neighborhood, Cheery Creek North. We have seen what this has done to neighborhoods in Denver. Crime has exploded, unsanitary conditions amongst the homeless are not just unpleasant but dangerous, property values have gone down, drug and alcohol abuse are out-of-control, noise levels are unbearable, the parking spots in those neighborhoods have been nearly impossible to get. I do not want this to happen in Cherry Creek North. Not only will residents suffer, but business will also be impacted. Shoplifting will become a problem and clients will avoid these businesses where they do not feel safe. Having the homeless camping out on the old site of Racines has negatively impacted some of the businesses there. Is this the best solution to the plight of the homeless? Do we not have a city administration that can come up with a better plan than destroying entire neighborhoods? The expense of cleaning up after the homeless is out-of-control. What do the city	Elizabeth Ward 442 Fillmore Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>planners do? What happened the proposed tent cities and all the other proposals to house the homeless? I understood that they were offered housing in the Coliseum but that they didn't want to be there. Why didn't they offer them free bus passes so that they could hang-out where they wanted to be rather than camping out on downtown streets?</p> <p>Moving the homeless into yet another neighborhood thus destroying the lifestyle is not a solution. DPS owns many vacant buildings, some closer to downtown. Why aren't these facilities used to house them? The mayor has done many land exchanges that have changed the structures of some of our parks. What has happened to those pieces of land that the mayor "traded"? If the city administration can do that, just think what they will do to our neighborhood.</p> <p>Please, do not allow this to happen in our neighborhood.</p>	
199	Agree. I am opposed.	Ann Gillis 503 Madison St. 80206
200 2	Agree with CCNNA Position	Lee and Micki Belstock Agree with CCNNA position
201 2	Hello, I am writing to express our support of CCNNA's official position against the Group Living amendment. We believe this amendment would be extremely detrimental to the Cherry Creek North neighborhood in which we reside	Bruce & Michelle Werner 452 Jackson Street Denver, CO 80206
202	Dear Group I am adamantly opposed to this Group Living Proposal for our CCN neighborhood	Dianne Walker Howell 450 Detroit Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

203	Received your flyer, reviewed position of CCNNA. I am in agreement with the position of the Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association (CCNNA) - against the proposed group living zoning amendment.	Ann Jodway 180 Cook Street #110 Denver 80206
204	I AGREE with the CCNNA position statement.	Brenda Lujan 525 Detroit Street
205	I am a homeowner in cherry creek north. I agree with the ccna position	Caroline Quanbeck 350 Detroit st, Unit 103
206	I wanted to let you know that I oppose this Proposal as written.	Charles Berkey 450 Josephine St #A Denver 80206
207 2	My wife and I wholeheartedly AGREE with the Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association position	David and Sonia Franzel 560 Josephine St.
208	We want to sign in against the group living proposal. Your website does not allow for it. How can we sign?	Jessica Obenchain
209 2	My wife and I live at 465 Monroe Street and have for over 20 years. We treasure our neighborhood as it is and are opposed to a group living facility being located here. This is a residential neighborhood and we don't want to change the character of the neighborhood to accommodate such a facility	My wife and I live at Kevin E Somerville 465 Monroe
210	I would like to attend the Meeting, do I need to register?	David Franzel 560 Josephine St.
211 2	My wife and I agree with the CCNNA position statement regarding the above.	My wife and I Gary Connell 405 Detroit St., Denver CO 80206
212 2	We "Agree" with the CCNNA position statement against the proposed Group Living Zoning Text Amendment	Pat & Kathy Howell 536 Monroe Street
213	I am writing to inform you that I strongly agree with the CCNNA Position Statement on the group living amendment.	John Skinner 287 Jackson St
214	I agree with your opposition to the proposed changes to group living in CCN.	My name is John McKowen. I live at 335 A Josephine St. Denver, cO 80206
215	After review of the CCNA position and consideration of the benefits	Deborah K Spiers 427 Garfield Street

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	versus negatives of the proposed zoning amendment which will be heard by City Council on February 8, 2021, I am in full support of the CCNA position against this amendment	Denver, CO 80206
216	I agree with the CCNNA position statement	John Faught Detroit St
217	I agree with the CCNNA position statement on the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment.	Ernestine Gormsen 527 Clayton St
218 2	We are against group living in Ccn.	Suni Devitt and husband Josephine
219 2	With the CCNNA position statement against the Group Living amendment.	Bill and Sarah Brown 469 Josephine St
220	I agree with the CCNNA position statement.	Matthew Cort 472 Josephine St., Denver, CO 80206
221	I support CCNNA position against the proposed group living zoning.	Jeanie Curley 335 Detroit St. Unit 204
222	I agree with your position	Shar Martin 566 Monroe Street, Denver, CO 80206
223	We got a flyer yesterday so I wanted to let you know my thoughts. I was unsure how to sign on to the position statement so I thought an email would do it for now First of all, I would agree with the CCNNA position statement. We can not afford to have further negative impacts on our once vibrant neighborhood. We used to love living here and we enjoyed having everything in walking distance . Now with the crime on the rise not only are break-ins on the rise and package stealing . We even had a catalytic converter stolen from a car across the street and then just a couple of weeks ago a car was stolen as well. Crime is on the uptake and it is getting out of control and this preposition will not benefit our neighborhood but be detrimental . Not long ago, we found that we had a homeless person in front of our garage at night . He was smoking	Alexandra 502 Fillmore Street, Denver Colorado, 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>pot as well as smoking drugs out of crack pipe. We called the police and they where unable to help. The police officer told me , they will try to come by but never had the time or resources I would assume to do so, and he also told me that if he starts to be aggressive to call 911. We had to install a bights light to deter him from using our driveway has a drug den and after a couple of nights , he did not come back as of yet . Now we feel unsafe going out of our garage .</p> <p>So we need to make sure to stop the crime that is happening here, we need to ensure that we are safe in the place we lived in for over 15 years and if this proportion passes there is no way that this will happen and we most likely have to move out of our house which we love .</p> <p>Who would want to come and live here, if this preposition passes ? How will it effect our property value and why would we then still have to pay the large amount of property tax , if we get anything in return ?</p>	
224	I agree!	Bob Jones 124Garfield st.
225	I am writing today in support of CCNNA's position and strongly oppose the Proposed Group Living Amendment. Thank you,	Julie Bonicelli-Oliva 348 Steele Street
226	agree with the Cherry Creek Neighbors position against Group Living proposal.	Michael James 206 Cook Street
227	I am a resident in Cherry Creek North, and I totally support the Cherry Creek North neighborhood association and I vehemently oppose the proposed group living amendment.	Richard Kelly I'm a property owner at: 400 University Blvd
228	I AGREE with the CCNNA position statement.	Raymond Norman 415 Josephine St Denver, CO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

229	I agree with the CCNA Position paper as I strongly oppose the proposed Group Living Zoning amendment	Judy Fahrenkrog 333 Josephine St #4 Denver, CO 80206
230	Dear Councilpersons: I heartily support the CCNNA's position statement. Thank you for your detailed information regarding the issues involved with their potential to affect all of us who reside in this area.	Anne Tennant 411 Steele St.
231	I am in support of your position on this issue.	Diane Stone 122 Jackson Street
232	I agree with the CCNNA position statement. Thank you!	Ginny Klapp 512 Fillmore St.
233	I have read the full position statement and explanation of the Group Living proposal and I am in full support of the CCNNA's position AGAINST the proposed Group Living zoning amendment proposal. In unity with the CCNNA's position	Peggy Finley and I own my home @ 490 Columbine Street
234 2	We oppose the amendment in its entirety as detailed by CCNNA	Richard and Irene Woodbury 196 Monroe Street
235 2	We completely support CCNNA's position to block the Group Living Amendment in its entirety. We all have worked—and continue to work—so hard to get to live in this special, safe, beautiful neighborhood. It was not a gift. Inviting Community Corrections and Shelters into Cherry Creek North is truly inviting the serpent into the garden. Please keep us posted on what else we should do to support CCNNA's efforts. We are both seniors (75 and 80) and work full-time so we don't have much time or money to support the cause but we'll do whatever we can. Thank you for taking on this important fight on our behalf.	Peter and Marne Kellogg 485 Josephine Street Denver 80206
236 2	We agree with the CCNNA position statement against the Group Living amendment.	Mark & Nancy Patteson 2700 E 4 th Ave Denver, CO 80206

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

237	I am confirming my support to the CCNNA position re: the Group Living Proposal. Thanks,	Eunice Kim 435 Detroit Street
238 2	My husband and I agree with the CCNNA Position.	Lou Raders 444 Clayton St.
239	I support the CCNNA position OPPOSING the Group Living Amendment	Colleen Scanlon 335-D Josephine Street
240	I agree with the CCNNA position statement opposing the group living proposal	Deborah Lamb 530 Milwaukee
241	I agree with CCNNA's position statement regarding group living.	Goerge Vago 444 Steele Street, Denver,
242	I agree with CCNNA's position statement regarding group living.	Barbara Vago 444 Steele Street, Denver,
243	<p>I am in agreement with the Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association position AGAINST the proposed group living zoning text amendment</p> <p>Cherry Creek North's RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and shelter uses as these other predominantly residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>I am also opposed to the change in the number of unrelated adults and their minor children allowed as tenants. The lack of regulations, as well as problems with health and safety, no less parking are of great concern in a small area such as Cherry Creek.</p>	Cynthia Berland 568 Josephine Street
244 2	<p>Hello and thank you for bringing this concern to our attention.</p> <p>We agree with the CCNNA position; we oppose the group living zoning amendment proposal</p>	John Garrett and Donna Seligman 461 Josephine Street
245 2	<p>Dear Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association Board:</p> <p>We have been residents of the neighborhood for 25 years. We AGREE with the CCNNA POSITION STATEMENT against the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment.</p>	Susan Conaway and Paul Conaway 401 Detroit St

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	<p>We love Cherry Creek North for the diversity and mix of residential and commercial development. Our neighbors are wonderful and the area is a very convenient and walkable. We have seen a lot of growth and development over the years and are open to the changes that have occurred. We think the neighborhood is stronger and more vibrant as a result of those changes. Cherry Creek North is a very unique area and a highly desirable area to live in.</p> <p>We live one block north of 3rd Ave. It is pretty quiet with single family homes, duplexes, and many townhomes. It is a nice residential mix but the residential character of the neighborhood is much like a single family area.</p> <p>If the Group Living zoning text amendment is approved and the change applies to the RH-3 zoning, then Community Corrections and Shelter facilities could be allowed in our neighborhood! That could negatively impact the character of our neighborhood. We don't want that to happen!! We don't want our neighborhood wrecked!!</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposed amendment!</p>	
246	I agree with CCNNA position against the proposed Group Living Zoning texts amendment will be heard by City Counsel on February 8, 2021.	Greg Cooley My address is 335 Detroit Street, Unit 105 Denver, Colo.80206
247 2	We both agree with the CCNNA on their position against the proposed Group Living zoning amendment	Chris and Kathy Williams 488 Columbine Street
248	I am against the proposed group living zone text amendment	Shereen Pollak 460 Monroe St
249	I agree with CCNNA position on the Group Living proposal.	Tim 176 Jackson Street
250	To whom it may concern,	Lynn Rosdal 556 ST. Paul St

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

	I am in alignment with the CCNNA position against the proposed Group living zoning.	
251	I am strongly opposed to the Group Living Amendment and I concur with the position taken by the CCNNA to protect our quality of life in Cherry Creek North and in Denver in general.	Sandra Levine 148 Jackson St., Denver 80206
252	I, Diane O'Connor, agree with the CCNNA position statement regarding the proposed group living amendment. I am a Cherry Creek North homeowner.	Diane O'Conner 234 Monroe Street, Denver, 80206
253 2	To Whom It May Concern: We agree with the CCNNA position statement.	John and Shaaron Parker 546 Cook Street
254	I support the CCNA position opposing group living in Cherry Creek North.	Steven C. Demby 2539 E 5th Av,
255 2	We absolutely oppose the group living changes and support the position statement. Please let us know what else we can do.	Dewey & Megan Burke We live at 2805 E 4th Avenue, and I also own 536 Cook Street here in Cherry Creek North.
256	I am against the proposed group living zoning text amendment. Best Regards	Michael Pollak 460 Monroe St
257	I'm horrified at this proposal and 100% agree with the position of the CCNNA. Thank you so very much for all your efforts.	Joyce M Brown 385 Clayton Street
258 2	We agree with CCNNA's position regarding the group living proposal. We believe Cherry Creek North's RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption as other residential neighborhoods	Tom and Diane Rooney 516 University Blvd, Denver, CO
259	Dear CCNNA: I totally agree with the position you hold on this ill-advised amendment	Richard N Brown 385 Clayton Street
260 2	We strongly support CCNNA's position on the group living amendment	Annette Woodward David Howson 253 Adams St
261 2	We support CCNNA in opposition to the proposed Group Living Zoning amendment.	Tim and Leise Tetherow 431 Josephine St
262	I am against the proposal.	Julia Werner

GLAC CCNNA RESPONSES

[illegible]



February 4, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Councilman Chris Hinds, District 10

All other City Council Members

Andrew Webb, Senior Planner, Denver Community Planning and Development

Re: Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association OPPOSITION Position on Group
Living Text Amendment (the “Proposed Amendment”)

Dear Councilman Hinds, City Council members and Mr. Webb:

This letter is written on behalf of Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association (“CCNNA”) in connection with the Proposed Amendment. We acknowledge the long and arduous task undertaken by the City to address the many issues Denver is facing as one of the fastest growing cities in the country. We acknowledge the problem of the high cost and overall shortage of housing in Denver, which has only been exacerbated by the economic problems resulting from the pandemic.

We have followed the Proposed Amendment since its wider roll-out to the neighborhoods, which for us coincided with the pandemic in early 2020. Even under the difficult pandemic circumstances, CCNNA strived to be educated about the Proposed Amendment and sought to educate our residents. We welcomed the presentations made by Mr. Webb at our CCNNA residents meeting, sent written comments before the Planning Board and Land Use, Transportation and Infrastructure committee and participated with INC in the resolution seeking to de-bundle the provisions and address the issues included the Proposed Amendment differently. CCNNA sent blast emails to the residents and included information on the CCNNA website, with connecting links to the City Group Living website and to other presentations being made by Mr. Webb. We also participated with Councilman Hinds in his Group Living Zoom session for District 10.

While the Proposed Amendment has been modified several times (some of which changes were favorably received), the modifications overall are not sufficient to garner the support of the residents of Cherry Creek North. Our opposition is based on input received from residents given at our meetings and from comments many individuals in the neighborhood have expressed in comments to board members and to committee and group coordinators that were then communicated to the Board.

CCNNA also prepared an extensive summary of how the Proposed Amendment would impact Cherry Creek North and an outline of the opposition statement, copies of which are attached to this letter. This CCN summary which was then posted to our CCNNA website (www.ccnneighbors.com), blast emails were sent to those in the neighborhood for whom we have email addresses and flyers containing the hearing date and asking residents for their voice regarding the CCNNA position was delivered to almost all of the residential units in Cherry Creek North.

Based on this extensive outreach to the CCNNA neighborhood, we received 339 email responses (see attached summary of comments) as of the writing of this letter, some of which show two persons (both spouses, for example) on one email response. Additional responses are expected and we will endeavor to update Council prior to the hearing on February 8, 2021. The responses can be summarized as follows:

- 290 were expressly in support of the CCNNA position statement,
- 49 were not in favor of the Proposed Amendment (and likely not in favor of the increase to 5 unrelated adults either), and
- 2 persons were in favor of the Proposed Amendment.

This shows that the vast majority of the responses agreed with the CCNNA position which supports the compromised position allowing no more than five (5) unrelated adults living in a household (along with their minor children). However, bundling that provision with the Residential Care and Congregate Living provisions requires CCNNA to oppose the entirety of this Proposed legislation. Therefore, CCNNA sends this letter to strongly oppose the majority of the Proposed Amendment in its current form.

We therefore respectfully request that Councilman Hinds and the rest of City Council members vote to OPPOSE the Proposed Amendment at the City Council meeting on February 8, 2021 in its current format. We urge City Council and staff to continue to work on this legislation and to address the remaining questions and concerns raised by CCNNA and many other City of Denver neighborhoods.

Thank you for considering our position as you proceed.

CHERRY CREEK NORTH NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Lou Raders, President, on behalf of, and after a unanimous vote of the Board following receipt of CCNNA neighborhood residents' input



DEAR CHERRY CREEK NORTH NEIGHBOR:

You are receiving this flyer to bring you up to date on the Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association (“CCNNA”) position against the proposed Group Living zoning text amendment which will be heard by City Council on February 8, 2021. Please go to www.ccnneighbors.com to see an analysis of the final Group Living zoning amendment proposal, exactly how it will impact the Cherry Creek North neighborhood and the reasons why it is being opposed by CCNNA.

For example, the Group Living proposal was modified to remove Community Corrections and Shelters from SU (single family/unit) and TU (two unit/duplex) and RH-2.5 (row-house 2 1/2 stories) zoned neighborhoods, BUT LEFT THEM IN CHERRY CREEK NORTH. The Cherry Creek North residential area is predominantly zoned RH-3 (row house 3 stories) but includes more single family and duplex units than it does 3 story units. The residential character of the Cherry Creek neighborhood is substantially similar to areas where single family and duplex units are located. CCNNA believe that Cherry Creek North’s RH-3 zoning designation should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as these other predominantly residential neighborhoods.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

PLEASE GO TO www.ccnneighbors.com for the full position statement and explanation of how the Group Living proposal will impact ALL of Cherry Creek North, including residential, the business district and adjacent areas. THEN SIGN ON TO THE CCNNA POSITION.

CCNNA NEEDS YOUR INPUT AND SUPPORT BEFORE FEBRUARY 5TH so that we can present a united front to City Council.



**OPPOSITION STATEMENT by Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association
("CCNNA") to Amendment Group Living Text Amendment**

Since late 2019, CCNNA has strived to educate our residents about the Proposed Group Living Text Amendment which makes changes to the to the Denver zoning code. Please see the attached Summary of Comments to the Proposed Amendment which outlines in more detail how the changes will impact Cherry Creek North.

WHAT CHANGES ARE BEING PROPOSED:

- Increases the number of unrelated adults who can living in a household from the current 2 adults to 5 adults (with their minor children). WE NOTE THAT CCNNA BELIEVES THE COMPROMISE TO 5 UNRELATED ADULTS WITH ONLY MINOR CHILDREN IS AN ACCEPTABLE COMPROMISE, BUT THERE IS NO WAY TO APPROVE THIS ONE PROVISION AND REJECT THE REST OF THE AMENDMENT. THEREFORE, THE ENTIRE AMENDMENT MUST BE OPPOSED.
- Combines types of 'Residential Care' uses (where residency requires some type of treatment, oversight or other care) into one large category separated by the number of persons allowed (Type 1: 1 – 10; Type 2: 11-40; Type 3:41-100 and Type 4: 100+), which 'Residential Care' uses include, but are not limited to:
 1. Shelters
 2. Community correction facilities and halfway houses
 3. Recovery residences, where a guest's participation in a program of supervision, treatment, or care is required
 4. Rehabilitation facilities
 5. Assisted living facilities
 6. Nursing homes or hospices
- Combines other types of group living arrangement (which do not require any 'care' as a condition of living therein) as 'Congregate Living' including the following type of uses:
 1. Rent-by-the-room configurations, such as rooming and boarding houses or student housing
 2. Dormitories that house students of a primary Education use located on or off the same zone lot as the primary Education use, including a building used for members of a fraternity or houses officially recognized by a college/university, or seminary.
 3. Permanent Tiny home villages.

WHAT IS THE OPPOSITION BASED UPON:

Residents throughout the City have opposed the proposed Group Living Amendment changes for many reasons including, without limitation, concerns related to increased density, increased trash, limited available parking, safety, lack of enforcement and the process itself. The following summarizes the points of opposition:

1. Opposition is widespread. Comments from citizens across the City have been received. The vast majority (approximately 80%) have expressed concern and opposition to the proposed amendment. The comments (including opposition comments from CCNNA) have been archived and can be viewed under the 'Community Feedback' tab at www.Denvergov.org/groupliving. With the majority of the City opposed to this Amendment proposal, it should not pass.
2. After comments were received at LUTI, the proposal was modified to remove Community Corrections and Shelters from SU (single family/unit) and TU (two unit/duplex) and RH-2.5 (row-house 2.5 stories) zoned neighborhoods. Cherry Creek residential area is predominantly zoned RH-3 (row house 3 stories) but includes more single family and duplex units than it does 3 story units. The residential character of Cherry Creek is substantially similar to areas where single family and duplex units are located and we believe that RH-3 should receive the same exemption from Community Corrections and Shelter uses as these other predominantly residential neighborhoods.
3. Emergency Provisions would allow a much larger number of residents in Residential Care facilities for many different reasons, including when it is too cold (below 32 degrees) or too hot (above 90 degrees) or during a pandemic. This means that the allowable numbers can be 125% of the otherwise allowable numbers for much of the year. Many other emergency situations also allow increased numbers and operations. The Zoning Administrator makes the decision about what constitutes an emergency situation that threatens public health.
4. The business areas in Cherry Creek are allowed all Residential Care and Congregate Living uses without many exceptions and without many density limitations. This seems inappropriate in a shopping area that is not a large area mass. The CCN area is a small neighborhood shopping area and should not be considered appropriate for large scale Community Corrections or Shelter uses. The business district in Cherry Creek has been identified in the Cherry Creek Area plans and CCN zoning as a boutique shopping area that is focused on small, independent business operators. Planning efforts have long strived to help maintain the character of Cherry Creek North by encouraging small and locally owned businesses to thrive. While many of the small businesses that give Cherry Creek its unique flavor have struggled, it is a major concern that any large scale residential care use (especially Community Corrections or Shelter uses) would negatively impact the pedestrian scale and character of the area.
5. Many of the previous permitting process requirements and ongoing oversight protections have been removed, including provisions that would have required operators to give neighbors contact information to address concerns and requirements for implementing a plan to safeguard the public. Please see the last page of the attached Summary of Comments to see the types of requirements being removed. These requirements and protections should be maintained.

6. The decision making and notice requirements for these types of uses have been materially altered such that the City is no longer required to give notice of permit applications for such the majority of Residential Care uses. And where any notice is required, it only requires the owner/operator applicant to let neighbors or surrounding business owners know about the intended use and host a community information meeting. There is no ability of neighborhoods or business owners to have any real input on what is built and operated in the neighborhood. The City is not required to give notice to neighborhoods, the Zoning Administrator makes the decisions and there is no right of neighborhoods who oppose the use to have any input into the decision. Only the generic appeal process applicable to any administrative action is available to disgruntled neighbors.
7. Enforcement is completely lacking in the amendment, meaning that neighbors are the sole enforcers. Problematic operators or residents must be reported by neighbors using the 3-1-1 system, a system which is already over-loaded. There should be licensing and reporting requirements for Residential Care and Congregate Living uses so that neighbors are not saddled with the sole responsibility for enforcement.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SUMMARY OF GLAC AMENDMENT FOR CCN

JANUARY 2021 GLAC HOUSEHOLD, RESIDENTIAL CARE AND CONGREGATE LIVING PROVISIONS

The following are the key provisions from the proposed Denver Zoning Code Amendment (which does not currently include Chapter 59 zoned areas) as they relate to ‘Household’, Residential Care and Congregate Living provisions in G-RH-3, C-MX and CCN Districts. Many of the provisions are spread throughout the Code and, therefore, the attempt here is to summarize and outline the key provisions that affect the areas of Cherry Creek zoned as G-RH-3 (which are the residential areas of Cherry Creek North and Cherry Creek East not including any existing PUDs) and those areas zoned C-MX-3 and C-MX-5 and C-CCN (these areas include the Cherry Creek Shopping Area in the C-CCN district and the mixed use 3 and 5 story areas east thereof and along First Avenue). The goal of this summary is to EDUCATE residents about the changes and to IDENTIFY areas where there are perceived problems and concerns with the proposal, as communicated by those residents who have expressed concerns at meetings and in other venues.

Key: The reader will notice portions of the text that have been highlighted in various areas intended to help guide the reader to the provisions of material interest:

Green highlighting shows the main areas being addressed as new provisions/definitions and includes limitations and restrictions applicable to the uses so identified.

Yellow highlighting helps focus the reader to key provisions in yellow – which are the new provisions applicable to the neighborhood area focus and which will help guide the reader to the key provisions.

Blue highlighting areas are NOT IN THE TEXT AMENDMENT and include editorial comments and summaries of the anticipated effect of the Code changes and also included those provisions that used to be in the Code but which were removed; these are highlighted in blue to identify provisions that may be of interest and even helpful in mitigating remaining concerns regarding the proposed revisions on Residential Care and Congregate Living. Not all ‘comments’ are in blue, so please read for context.

IMPORTANT POINTS OF CLARIFICATION: It is important to note that (i) older PUDs (Planned Unit Developments under Ch. 59) are not subject to the revisions and there are many PUDs in Cherry Creek, especially in Cherry Creek East, although there will likely be a subsequent bridge amendment to at least make the Household definition applicable to PUDs, (ii) many of the provisions and subjects being addressed in this summary were ALREADY ADDRESSED IN MUCH THE SAME WAY in the Code before these amendments. However, the residential care use categories are now being lumped together which does not allow addressing issues surrounding the specific uses (like Community Corrections and Shelters) to be dealt with separately.

EQUITY: It is also important to point out that we acknowledge and support the City’s efforts to reverse the effects of historic exclusionary zoning provisions and implement changes to remove disparate impacts on people of color and/or those experiencing poverty, homelessness and those with limited resources. The needs of all Denver residents must be balanced and proposed zoning changes must be considered with this goal in mind. Equity is a lens that we all must use to this end; this summary of comments should be reviewed with an open mind to finding equitable solutions for all Denver residents. We honor the efforts to help in the continued quest for equity and justice for all of Denver’s citizens.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: Please stay involved – this is your City and your Councilpersons want to know what you think. Cherry Creek North Neighborhood Association, Cherry Creek East Association, Country Club Historic District, Hilltop and other neighborhoods are listening to residents and helping to give a platform for those voices. Check in with your RNO to see if and how they are taking a position. Help them help you have a voice.

Contents Directory – Discussion Points/Page numbers:

- New Definitions of ‘Household’, ‘Residential Care’ and ‘Congregate Living’: Pgs. 3-4
- Summary of How Changes (Residential Care and Congregate Living Uses) Impact Cherry Creek: Pgs. (including Notice and Decision Making and what is missing): Pgs. 5 – 7
- Enforcement: Pg. 8
- Parking: Pg. 9
- Residential Care Uses (Types 1, 2, 3 and 4 based on numbers of people served): Pgs. 10-13
- Emergency Provisions: Pgs. 14 – 15
- What is Missing from the Former Provisions For Residential Care Facilities including those on Community Corrections and Shelters; Pg.16

DEFINITIONS FROM THE NEW/PROPOSED PROVISIONS: The following are exact text provisions and include the key definitions of “Household”, “Congregate Living” and “Residential Care”, all of which are defined as follows:

11.12.2.2 **Definition of Congregate Living** Use Category

A. A structure or structures providing Residential Occupancy for Persons who do not live in a Household according to Section 11.12.2.1.B.2., Household. A Congregate Living use may occur within a self-contained Dwelling Unit. A Congregate Living use may also, such as with a tiny home village, occur within multiple structures where no one or not all structures contain a self-contained Dwelling Unit, but all structures comprising the use together provide residents with facilities for sleeping, bathing, cooking and preparing food. This use category includes groups of Persons who each have separate contracts or agreements with property owners, who do not jointly occupy the entirety of a dwelling unit, or who jointly occupy the entirety of a dwelling unit but who exceed the maximum number of adults permitted in a household as defined in Section 11.12.2.1.B.2., Household. Tenancy is arranged on a month-to-month or longer basis. Residents of a Congregate Living use may share sleeping units, and may have shared cooking, bathroom and common areas, or some combination of personal and shared facilities. Residents in a Congregate Living use are not required to seek services or care of any type as a condition of residency. This use does not include Residential Care. This use includes, but is not limited to; the following uses:

1. Rent-by-the-room configurations, such as rooming and boarding houses or student housing
2. Dormitories that house students of a primary Education use located on or off the same zone lot as the primary Education use, including a building used for members of a fraternity or houses officially recognized by a college/university, or seminary.
3. Permanent Tiny home villages.

11.12.2.3 **Definition of Residential Care** Use Category

A. A Residential Structure or structures where guests receive treatment, supervision, emergency shelter, personal care, protective oversight, or other similar care or services, from staff on-site as a condition of the guests' residency. This definition excludes care provided by domestic employees or care workers in a private home that meets this Code's definition of Household Living or Congregate Living. For purposes of this definition, a “guest” is a person who stays overnight, regardless of total length of stay. For purposes of this definition, staff and volunteers who regularly return to another place of primary residence, but who stay overnight while working or volunteering, shall not be considered “guests.” Tenancy may range from overnight to 30 days or longer. This use category includes, but is not limited to:

1. Shelters
2. Community correction facilities and halfway houses
3. Recovery residences, where a guest's participation in a program of supervision, treatment, or care is required
4. Rehabilitation facilities
5. Assisted living facilities
6. Nursing homes or hospices

B. Specific Residential Care Use Types: Residential Care uses are further defined and distinguished by number of guests as follows:

1. Residential Care Use, Type 1: up to 10 guests year-round, or up to 100 guests for a maximum of 130 days per calendar year.
2. Residential Care Use, Type 2: 11 to 40 guests

3. Residential Care Use, Type 3: 41 to 100 guests

4. Residential Care Use, Type 4: 101 or more guests

11.12.2.1 Definition of Household Living Use Category

A. Definition of Category

1. Household Living is defined as residential occupancy of a “dwelling unit” by a single “household”. Tenancy is arranged on a month-to-month or longer basis.

B. Definitions of Related Terms

1. **Dwelling Unit** One or more habitable rooms constituting a unit for permanent occupancy, having but one kitchen together with facilities for sleeping, bathing, and which unit occupies a structure or a portion of a structure.

2. **Non-Profit Housekeeping Unit.** A household comprised of persons who live together as a family or as the functional equivalent of a family, and who share household activities and responsibilities, such as meals, chores, rent, and expenses. The choice of specific adults comprising the single nonprofit housekeeping unit is determined by the members of such housekeeping unit rather than by a landlord, property manager, or other third party. Members of a single non-profit housekeeping unit are not required to seek services or care of any type as a condition of residency. All members of the non-profit housekeeping unit jointly occupy the entire premises of the dwelling unit.

3. **Household**

a. A “household” is either:

i. A single person occupying a dwelling unit, plus any permitted domestic employees; or

ii. Any number of persons related to each other by blood, marriage, civil union, committed partnership, adoption, or documented responsibility (such as foster care or guardianship), plus any permitted domestic employees, who all occupy a dwelling unit as a single non-profit housekeeping unit; or

iii. Up to 5 adults of any relationship, plus any minor children related by blood, adoption or documented responsibility, plus any permitted domestic employees, who all occupy a dwelling unit as a single non-profit housekeeping unit; or

iv. Up to 8 adults of any relationship with a “handicap” according to the definition in the Federal Fair Housing Act, and who do not meet this Code’s definition of a Congregate Living or Residential Care use; or

v. Up to 8 older adults (individuals 55 or more years of age) who occupy a dwelling unit as a single, non-profit housekeeping unit, and who do not meet this Code’s definition of a Congregate Living or Residential Care Use.

b. A household excludes any use that meets the definition of a Congregate Living use.

The definition of household includes much of what was already allowed. For example, it has always been the case that unlimited family members could live together as is outlined above. However, the proposal in (iii) above has been reduced from an initial proposed 8 unrelated adults and all family members (with increased numbers up to 13 unrelated adults for larger units) to 5 unrelated adults and their minor children. This reduction was seen as a compromise following the comments received from residents.

SUMMARY OF HOW CHANGES APPLY TO RESIDENTIAL CARE AND CONGREGATE LIVING USES IN CHERRY CREEK AND WHAT IS THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS:

WHAT USES CAN BE LOCATED IN ZONE DISTRICTS LOCATED IN CHERRY CREEK: The following summary shows what Residential Care and Congregate Living uses can be located in Cherry Creek. The majority of Cherry Creek residential areas are zoned G-RH-3. The business improvement district is zoned C-CCN and areas to the immediate east of the business district in Cherry Creek North are C-MX.

1. **G-RH-3:** Page 6.4-3: Shows that Residential Care **Type 1** is allowed with zoning permit review but no neighborhood informational meeting (ZPCIM – defined below) and **Type 2** is permitted with ZPCIM. **ALL types of Congregate Living** are permitted with zoning permit review (but no ZPCIM notice to neighborhoods). Tiny Home Villages are allowed with informational notice (ZPCIM) on a temporary basis (See pg. 6.4-12 of the text amendment).
2. **C-MX and CNN Districts:** Pg. 7.4-3: **Residential Care Types 1 and 2** and **all Congregate Living** are permitted with exceptions (see sections 11.2.7 and .8 and .9 for Type 2) and zoning permit review (but no ZPCIM notice to neighborhoods). Residential Care **Type 3** are permitted with exceptions (see sections 11.2.7 and .10 for Type 3) in these districts with ZPCIM. Residential Care **Type 4** is permitted in these districts with exceptions (see sections 11.2.7 and .11 for Type 4) and ZPCIM. Temporary Tiny Home Villages are allowed on a temporary basis with ZPCIM (see Section 11.11.17 of the text amendment), which is consistent with changes adopted in 2019.

WHAT ARE THE NOTICE AND DECISION MAKING PROVISIONS: The new Code provisions require notice and a Community Information Meeting as described below

4.4.3.3 (and other sections with same language on approval) provides “**Use Subject to Zoning Permit Review with Community Information Meeting (“ZPCIM”)** “ZPCIM” in a table cell indicates that the use is permitted in the respective zone district only if reviewed and approved according to the public notice and procedural requirements in Section 12.4.1, Zoning Permit Review. Prior to formal application, an applicant shall schedule a community information meeting and provide public notice of the community information meeting according to Section 12.3.4.6., Community Information Meeting”. Question is what does “reviewed and approved” mean– can a permit be approved if the meeting was held and the residents so notified object to the use? The answer appears to be yes; there is no requirement to consider or address neighborhood concerns. If an applicant seeking a permit meets the use requirements (including the pre-application neighborhood notice), then the permit will be issued regardless of objections raised by neighbors and business owners. The information meeting is intended to provide for some type of opportunity for relationship-building between the applicant and the neighborhood/business owners in the site vicinity, but none is required and the use can proceed regardless of buy-in or objections expressed by surrounding owners.

WHO DECIDES:

12.2.9 provides a chart in which **the Zoning Administrator is the sole decision maker** on zoning applications for these uses. **There are NO public hearings or City Council approvals, meaning these uses are ‘by right’ and can be constructed and operated with Zoning Administrator’s approval.** However, there is a requirement for SOME uses (as identified above) for a ZPCIM “INFORMATIONAL MEETING”, which is identified in the chart only as “Written and Posted Notice of Community Information Meeting” as outlined above.

The applicable Code provisions provide:

12.3.5 (E) 3. Final Decision

a. The Zoning Administrator shall make a final decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the zoning permit application, taking into consideration relevant agency or other party comments.

b. The Zoning Administrator may attach conditions to the zoning permit approval reasonably necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of the community and to minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties, as authorized by this Code.

12.4.2.5 Review Criteria: The Zoning Administrator shall consider all public comment and the following criteria in making a decision on an application for zoning permit with informational notice review:

A. The zoning permit is consistent with all prior approvals that are regulatory and controlling for the subject property, as applicable. For example, all zoning permits shall be consistent with a previously approved Large Development Framework, Infrastructure Master Plan, General Development Plan, Regulating Plan, or Site Development Plan.

B. The zoning permit complies with all applicable regulations in this Code.

C. The proposal will not substantially or permanently injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties, taking into consideration all proposals for mitigation of such impacts.

INFORMATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DETAILS:

Under the old Code, permits for some of these Residential Care uses were subject to Zoning Permit Review with Informational Notice, which allowed residents to provide written comments to the Zoning Administrator. Under the new provisions, there is no right to provide written comments to the Zoning Administrator or for the Zoning Administrator to consider any neighborhood concerns in connection with its decision. And note that is the OPERATOR (not the City) who is required to notify neighbors and hold a 'Community Informational Meeting' to inform neighbors surrounding the facility that a permit has been applied for. No input is required to be provided to the Zoning Administrator, and the Zoning Administrator is not required to take into account any feedback during the meeting. The following are the provisions from the proposed Code :

12.3.4.6 Community Information Meeting

A. Timing of Community Information Meeting: When required prior to submitting an application, the applicant shall schedule a community information meeting (in-person or remotely) and provide public notice of the community information meeting according to the following standards.

1. Large Development Review. The applicant shall schedule a community information meeting following the DRC's preliminary determination of the LDR scope according to Section 12.4.12.6, and prior to application for Large Development Review according to Section 12.4.12.8.

2. Residential Care. The applicant shall schedule a community information meeting prior to application for a zoning permit.

3. Temporary Tiny Home Village The applicant shall schedule a community information meeting following a pre-application meeting (see Section 11.11.17.2.C.1) and prior to application for a zoning permit.

B. Required Public Notice

1. Written Notice of Community Information Meeting. The applicant shall send written notice at least 21 days prior to the date of the community information meeting in compliance with the following standards:

a. The written notice of the community information meeting shall be sent to:

- i. Owners and tenants (if the latter is different from owners) of the subject site and any real property located within 400 feet of the subject site;
 - ii. The City Council members in whose districts the subject site is located, and the at-large City Council members;
 - iii. Any neighborhood organizations registered according to D.R.M.C. Section 12- 94, whose boundaries encompass or are within 400 feet of the subject site;
 - iv. Other community organizations that are not registered neighborhood organizations and are either located within 400 feet of the subject site or operate within the statistical neighborhood or neighborhoods that contain the subject site or district boundary. Applicants shall use reasonable efforts to identify such organizations, examples of which may include schools, religious assemblies, and other community-based nonprofit organizations.
- b. In addition to the written notice required by Section 12.3.4.6.A.1, above, written notice for a Large Development Review shall also be sent to:
- i. Any neighboring municipality or county that is contiguous to any boundary of the LDR area;
 - ii. Denver Public Schools if the LDR area anticipates residential development; and
 - iii. Any special district of which any part of the district's boundaries is included in the LDR area.
- c. The written notice shall be sent via U.S. mail first class or by electronic mail if the recipient has indicated their acceptance of notice by electronic mail.
- d. Notification shall include the location and general description of the proposed application, the location (in-person or remotely), time and date of the community information meeting, and, if applicable, the process to be followed, including date, time and place of any related public meeting or hearing, if such has been scheduled.
- e. The failure of any real property owner, tenant, registered neighborhood organization, or non-RNO organization, for whatever reason, to receive a notification required hereunder shall not invalidate any final action by the city.

2. Posted Notice of Community Information Meeting: Posted notice of the community information meeting shall be provided in compliance with the following standards:

- a. No later than 21 days prior to the date of the required community information meeting, the applicant shall be responsible for posting one or more signs on the subject property providing public notice thereof.
- b. Posted notice shall be in number, size, location, and content as prescribed by the Manager and shall indicate the time and place (in-person or remotely) of the community information meeting, and any other information prescribed by the Zoning Administrator.
- c. The applicant shall take all reasonable efforts to assure that posted signs remain on the site in the number and location prescribed by the Manager, and in good condition to maintain legibility, during the posting period.
- d. Posted notices shall be removed by the applicant from the subject property no later than 15 days after the community information meeting has been held. Failure to do so shall constitute a violation of this Code.

3. Conduct of Community Information Meeting, General. The Manager shall publish guidelines for the conduct of community information meetings specific to the application types for which such meetings are required.

WHAT WAS REMOVED FROM NEIGHBORHOOD NOTICE INFORMATION? The following provisions/requirements were removed from the existing Code sections in connection with what

information is required to be given to residents in an informational meeting (ZPCIM) for proposed larger Residential Care uses. Comments received show that it would be helpful to residents to KEEP THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS to have this type of information in any public presentation/informational meeting on the proposed use:¹

- include a packet including a copy of the completed application; a detailed explanation of applicant's and operator's experience;
- the facility's operational plan as set forth by the operator;
- the name, address and telephone number of a staff member of the applicant and operator designated as the contact person; and
- a summary of licensing procedures required for the proposed facility.

This means that neighborhoods won't have critical information on a facility proposed to be in a neighborhood. Ongoing oversight and enforcement will be made harder by not having any contact person operating a facility. Instead, the Zoning Administrator will have the authority to approve a use so long as the use is licensed and the facility meets the minimum requirements and the neighborhood has had an informational meeting prior to the application by the Operator.

ENFORCEMENT: There are concerns that requiring citizens to be the enforcers of Code requirements is not the proper mechanism for ensuring Code compliance.

Enforcement is not a part of the Code amendment provisions. The GLAC information provided to neighborhoods confirms that the sole enforcement mechanism remains in the 3-1-1 Denver Complaint Reporting System. Mr. Webb has confirmed that the Building and Fire Codes remain unchanged and will further limit what can be done with the specific Unit under consideration. For example, sprinklers are required for larger number of people in a living unit, and those requirements will not change. However, there are no licensing or other requirements that would confirm compliance with these code provisions. In additions, there is no formal way for neighbors to be in contact with Residential Care Operators or any owners about concerns for Residential Care facilities. It would be helpful to have contact information for licensed Operators. Instead, neighbors are required to deliver complaints to the existing City communication system (3-1-1), which will then trigger Inspection Services, as and when they have time to do so. Licensure and other options may be ways to mitigate these concerns.

¹ Mr. Webb has indicated that, while not required in the Code, this information will be given in connection with the Community Information Meeting and directs us to the requirements Guide located at www.denver.gov/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/696/documents/Other_Forms_guides/Community-Information-Meeting-Guide.pdf

PARKING.

Parking has been a large concern for changes in the Code provisions, since increased numbers of people in Household Units, Residential Care and Congregate Living uses. The following summarizes the provisions relating to parking:

From 10.4(C) on page 10-4: **“Unit”** for Purposes of Calculating Parking Amounts For the purposes of complying with minimum and maximum parking requirements, the term “unit” shall mean, as applicable, either: 1. A dwelling unit in a household living use, as “dwelling unit” is defined in Article 11, Use Limitations and Definitions; or 2. **A habitable room, which may or may not contain kitchen or bathing facilities, intended for occupancy by a resident or guest in a group living Residential Care or Congregate Living use.**

From 10.4.5.2(B) on page 10-4.9:

B. Alternative Minimum Vehicle Parking Ratios Allowed: The Zoning Administrator shall allow an applicant to apply an alternative minimum vehicle parking ratio upon finding that the additional requirements and special review process stated in the following table have been met:

[The table then shows that for Shelters as a primary use: “Residential Care Uses that provide temporary housing or shelter primarily to guests who are at risk of homelessness or are experiencing homelessness.” Alternative minimum vehicle parking ratio of 0.125 vehicle parking spaces per 1,000 sf GFA.” **The result is that the parking requirements for shelters is extremely low given the number of people who can be served, the staff that supports the shelter, the volunteers that serve, and provision of supplies.** Parking for all Residential Care uses is much lower in CCN, reducing requirements of 1/unit for residential uses in CCN, to only .25/1,000 sq. ft. for any Residential Care use (for ALL Types 1 – 4) and only .50/1,000 sq. ft. for Congregate Living uses.

10.4.9.1 categorizes parking and changes the earlier categories for uses **such that ALL Residential Care (Types 1 – 4) are now categorized as ‘residential low’ and ALL Congregate Living are now categorized as ‘residential medium’.** This is a change to such uses which were separated by the actual use, such as student housing (which was previously designated as ‘muti-unit’), assisted living (which was previously categorized as ‘commercial-medium’), shelters for the homeless (which were previously categorized as ‘commercial low’) and boarding houses (which were previously categorized as ‘commercial-high’) and residential care, whether small or large (which were previously categorized as ‘residential-low’). **One result is that there are NO bicycle parking requirements for any of the Residential Care uses and only 1/20,000 sq. ft for Congregate Living uses (See 10.4.9.2).**

10.9.3.1 **Number of Motor Vehicles Accessory** to a Dwelling Unit: On any zone lot occupied by one or more dwelling units in single-unit (SU), two-unit (TU) and row house (RH) zone districts, there **shall be, in total, parked and/or stored no more than 1 motor vehicle per licensed driver residing in each dwelling unit plus 1 additional motor vehicle per dwelling unit, to a maximum of 6 motor vehicles per dwelling unit, except as specifically allowed by this Code.** ~~on any public right-of-way bordering or within the same block on which the dwelling unit is located, or on any public right-of-way bordering or within all adjoining blocks, there shall be, in total, parked and/or stored no more than 1 motor vehicle per licensed driver residing in the dwelling unit plus 1 additional motor vehicle per dwelling unit, except as specifically allowed by this Code.~~ **This means that a ROOM in a Congregate Living use is entitled to one car for each driver residing in that one unit – there is not a maximum number of vehicles allowed for the building in which the unit [room] is located and, therefore the number of cars cannot be**

predicted. This appears to be true notwithstanding the minimum parking required for Congregate Living uses in CNN and MX zone districts is .50/1,000 square feet and in G-RH districts is 1/1,000 sq. ft.

Residential Care Use Category

Section 11.2.7 ALL RESIDENTIAL CARE USES

11.2.7.1 All Zone Districts: In all zone districts, where permitted with limitations:

A. Intent: The intent of these limitations for Residential Care uses is:

1. To support and reinforce the viability and socioeconomic diversity of neighborhoods and communities that provide healthy environments for all their residents;
2. To encourage distribution of Residential Care facilities throughout the city and prevent concentration of larger facilities to ensure all neighborhood residents can reap the benefits of residential surroundings and equitable access to community resources such as transit and employment opportunities;
3. To increase location opportunities for critically needed Residential Care facilities;
4. To comply with the principles, policies and regulations of federal and state fair housing legislation;
5. To establish an ongoing, effective process of communication between local neighborhood residents, the operators of Residential Care facilities and city agencies that regulate such facilities;

B. Limitations Applicable To All Residential Care Uses

1. The applicant and the owner have obtained or will obtain any license or certification required by the state and/or the City, where applicable.

~~2. A Residential Care use housing non-paroled individuals under correctional supervision shall be operated by the Denver Manager of Safety, or according to an executed agreement with the Denver Manager of Safety.~~ **[THIS LANGUAGE DELETED FROM AN EARLIER DRAFT MEANS THAT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CAN BE OPERATED BY THIRD PARTIES WITHOUT AN AGREEMENT WITH THE DENVER MANAGER OF SAFETY – WHAT IS THE PROTECTION ON UNIFORM MANAGEMENT?** The only requirement is in Section 12.4.1.4.D, which requires the the Zoning Administrator to **refer all zoning permit applications** to the Manager of the Denver Department of Public Safety for **review and comments** before making a final decision to approve the permit application. This review provides the **opportunity** to ensure that facilities are meeting city and state operational standards and requirements, but there are no specific REQUIREMENTS for such conclusion.

3. A Structure which provides a primary residence for more than one non-paroled persons who have been placed in a program of correctional supervision by the judicial or correctional departments of the city, state or federal government, including a supervised correctional program to facilitate transition to a less-structured or independent residential arrangement, shall be considered a Residential Care Use. In accordance with Section 12.4.1.4.D, Zoning Permit Review Process, the Zoning Administrator shall refer all zoning permit applications to establish such use to the Manager of the Denver Department of Public Safety for review and comments before making a final decision.

4. A Residential Care use that is operated less than 24 hours per day (such as a facility providing only **overnight emergency shelter**) **shall comply with the following standards:**

- a. Waiting areas shall be placed and supervised so that the operation of the Residential Care use will not

create **obstructions in adjacent public rights-of-way.**

b. A Residential Care use that is closed during the day (such as an overnight **shelters**) **shall make restroom facilities available during hours when the Residential Care use is closed. Such facilities may include temporary or mobile restroom facilities provided by the City.**

C. Continuation of Certain Existing Residential Care Uses

1. A Residential Care use that was legally established and Continuously Maintained as a Residential Care use as that term was defined prior to February 11, 2021 is considered a Conforming Use, subject to the following limitations

- a. The Zone Lot may be enlarged or reduced in size in compliance with the building form standards of at least one primary building form allowed in the zone district.
- b. A structure containing such use may be expanded, modified, or demolished and rebuilt in compliance with the building form standards of a primary building form allowed in the zone district.
- c. The number of permitted guests shall not be increased.

2. In zone districts that allow more than one primary use on a single zone lot, new primary uses can be established where permitted in conformance with Section 11.2.7, All Residential Care Uses, even when an existing Residential Care use located on the same Zone Lot is limited by this Section 11.2.7.1.C, Continuation of Certain Existing Residential Care Uses.

3. The number of guests permitted in a Residential Care use subject to this Section 11.2.7.1.C, Continuation of Certain Existing Residential Care Uses may be increased for up to 10 consecutive calendar days, or 10 consecutive overnight stays due to emergencies according to Section 11.2.12.1, Short-term Emergency Expansion of the a Residential Care Use.

D. Measurement of Distance for Spacing Limitations.

1. Where required for a specific Residential Care use by Sections 11.2.8, 11.2.9, 11.2.10 and 11.2.11 below, distance shall be measured from the proposed Residential Care use, according to the rule of measurement in Section 13.1.11.1, Measurement of Separation or Distance Between Uses.

Section 11.2.8 TYPE 1 RESIDENTIAL CARE USES

11.2.8.1 Type 1 Residential Care Use Operated by a Religious Assembly Use: **In all zone districts, where permitted with limitations, Type 1 Residential Care uses operated by a Religious Assembly use (a "Religious Assembly" use is defined in Article 11) shall be operated according to provisions of Section 11.2.7.1.B, Limitations. Applicable to All Residential Care Uses, without the requirement for a zoning permit. Any change in operation or expansion that exceeds the permitted number of guests or limit on days of operation set forth in Section 11.12.2.3.B.1, Specific Residential Care Use Types, Type 1, shall require a zoning permit** and compliance with all the requirements of the applicable provisions of Section 11.2.9, 11.2.10 and 11.2.11 for Type 2, Type 3, or Type 4 Residential Care Use.

11.2.8.2 All SU, TU and RH-2.5 [NOT RH-3] Zone Districts: In all SU, TU and RH-2.5 zone districts, where permitted with limitations, all Type 1 Residential Care uses shall comply with the following limitations:

A. Correctional Supervision Programs Prohibited: **Type 1 Residential Care uses serving non-paroled persons** who have been placed in a program of correctional supervision by the judicial or correctional departments of the city, the state or the federal government **are prohibited**.

B. Density Limitation: A proposed **Type 1** Residential Care use **shall not be located within a one-mile radius of more than three other Residential Care uses of any type**.

[This means that, as for the residential G-RH-3 ZONE DISTRICTS in Cherry Creek, there is no limitation for Community Corrections for Type 1 sized operations and they are allowed as a use-by-right without notice to neighbors.]

Section 11.2.9 **TYPE 2 RESIDENTIAL CARE USES**

11.2.9.1 All SU, TU and RH Zone [This includes G-RH-3] Districts: In all SU, TU and RH zone districts, where permitted with limitations, **all Type 2 Residential Care uses shall comply with the following limitations:**

A. ~~A proposed Type 2 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 1,200 feet from any other Residential Care use, when the proposed Residential Care use is located on a zone lot that was not previously permitted for a Civic, Public or Institutional Primary Use.~~

B. Permitted Locations: A proposed **Type 2** Residential Care **use shall only be permitted on a zone lot where the most recent Primary Use was a Residential Care use, or a Civic, Public or Institutional use.** For the purpose of this provision, prior use may be evidenced by a zoning use permit, or by categorization of the subject property by the Denver County Assessor as the equivalent of a Civic, Public or Institutional use defined by this Code. The Zoning Administrator shall make all final determinations of prior primary use.

C. Facility Size Limitation: A proposed **Type 2** Residential Care use **shall be limited to a maximum of 20 guests.**

D. Minimum Lot Size: **The Zone Lot Size shall be a minimum of 12,000 square feet.**

11.2.9.2 All SU, TU and RH-2.5 Zone Districts: In all SU, TU and RH-2.5 zone districts, where permitted with limitations, Type 2 Residential Care uses serving non-paroled persons who have been placed in a program of correctional supervision by the judicial or correctional departments of the city, the state or the federal government are prohibited.

11.2.9.3 All RH-3 and RH-3A Zone Districts: In all RH-3 and RH-3A zone districts, **where permitted with limitations, Type 2 Residential Care uses serving non-paroled persons who have been placed in a program of correctional supervision by the judicial or correctional departments of the city, the state or the federal government are subject to Zoning Permit Review with Community Information Meeting (ZPCIM).**

THIS MEANS THAT while there are limitations and restrictions for Type 2 Residential Care in G-RH-3 residential areas, the Types 1 and 2 Residential Care uses are allowed in C-MX and C-CCN Districts

without restriction. As noted below, Types 3 and 4 are also allowed in these districts with very few restrictions.

Section 11.2.10 TYPE 3 RESIDENTIAL CARE USES

11.2.10.1 All Zone Districts: In all zone districts, where permitted with limitations, additional Residential Care uses are permitted on the same zone lot as a Type 3 Residential Care use.

11.2.10.2 All MU, RO, and RX Zone Districts: In all MU, RO, and RX zone districts, where permitted with limitations, a proposed Type 3 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 1,200 feet from any other Type 3 and Type 4 Residential Care uses.

11.2.10.3 All CC, MX, MS, and C-CCN-3, -4, -5, -7, -8 Zone Districts: In all CC, MX, MS, and C-CCN-3, -4, -5, -7, and -8 zone districts, where permitted with limitations, **a proposed Type 3 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 600 feet from any other Type 3 or Type 4 Residential Care uses.**

11.2.10.4 All D-AS, D-AS-12+, D-AS-20+, and D-GT Zone Districts: In all D-AS, D-AS-12+, D-AS-20+, and D-GT zone districts, where permitted with limitations, a proposed Type 3 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 400 feet from any other Type 3 or Type 4 Residential Care uses.

Section 11.2.11 TYPE 4 RESIDENTIAL CARE USES

11.2.11.1 All Zone Districts: In all zone districts, where permitted with limitations, a Type 4 Residential Care use shall comply with the following limitations:

A. Additional Residential Care uses are permitted on the same zone lot as a Type 4 Residential Care use.

B. **A proposed Type 4 Residential Care use shall not be located within a one-mile radius of more than three other Type 3 or Type 4 Residential Care uses.**

11.2.11.2 All MU, RO and RX Zone Districts: In all MU, RO and RX zone districts, where permitted with limitations, a proposed Type 4 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 1,200 feet from any other Type 3 and Type 4 Residential Care uses.

11.2.11.3 All CC, MX, MS, and C-CCN-3, -4, -5, -7, -8 Zone Districts: In all CC, MX, MS, and C-CCN-3, -4, -5, -7, and -8 zone districts, where permitted with limitations, **a proposed Type 4 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 600 feet from any other Type 3 or Type 4 Residential Care uses.**

11.2.11.4 All D-AS, D-AS-12+, D-AS-20+, and D-GT Zone Districts: In all D-AS, D-AS-12+, D-AS-20+, and D-GT zone districts, where permitted with limitations, a proposed Type 4 Residential Care use shall be located a minimum of 400 feet from any other Type 3 or Type 4 Residential Care uses.

Section 11.2.12 **EMERGENCY PROVISIONS**

11.2.12.1 Short-term Emergency Expansion of a Residential Care Use:

A. During an emergency that threatens public health, as determined by the Zoning Administrator in consultation with other applicable City departments and agencies, a Residential Care use may expand to serve a number of guests not to exceed 125% of the maximum number of guests otherwise permitted, rounded up to the nearest whole number, for a period not to exceed 10 consecutive calendar days, or 10 consecutive overnight stays. For example, a Type 3 Residential Care use with a zoning permit allowing up to 50 guests may provide care for up to 63 guests for a 10-day period (or 10 overnight stays).

Similarly, a Residential Care Type 4 use permitted to serve up to 200 guests may provide care for up to 250 guests for a 10-day period (or 10 overnight stays) in an emergency situation.

B. Prior to taking advantage of this emergency allowance, a Residential Care use must provide written notice to the Zoning Administrator describing the nature of the emergency and its threat to public health, the need for additional services, the number of additional guests to be served during the emergency, and the dates the expansion of services will begin and end. At the end of the 10-day period, the Residential Care use shall return to the number of guests originally permitted. Any additional request for expansion made within 120 days of the Residential Care use's return to its permitted number of guests will be reviewed according to Section 11.2.12.2, Emergency Suspension of Limitations. The Zoning Administrator shall keep a written record of short-term emergency expansion notices.

C. Qualifying public health emergencies for the purposes of administering this regulation include, but are not limited to:

1. Extreme heat or cold
2. Other severe weather events
3. Flooding
4. Pandemic
5. Large-scale attack
6. Hazardous materials incidents
7. Fire
8. Business closures that affect the continued provision of housing

11.2.12.2 Emergency Suspension of Zoning Code Standards and Procedures:

A. Applicability: **During emergencies that threaten public health or life, the Zoning Administrator may suspend certain requirements of the Zoning Code applicable to Residential Care uses serving people who are at risk of homelessness or are experiencing homelessness.**

B. Qualifying Emergencies: Qualifying emergencies include any one of the following scenarios:

1. A local disaster or emergency declared by the Mayor, City Council or a public health order issued by the Executive Director of the Denver Department² of Public Health and Environment;
2. A shortage of capacity for guests when temperatures are projected to be below 32 degrees Fahrenheit or exceed 90 degrees Fahrenheit for an extended period of time; or

² Typo in text – missing 't' in department

3. Other situations that clearly threaten public health or life that are described in a written request to the Zoning Administrator made by the manager or executive director of a City department or agency, or their designee.

C. Applicable Zoning Code Standards and Procedures: The following use limitations, definitions and other requirements may be suspended during an emergency according to this Section 11.2.12.2, Emergency Suspension of Zoning Code Standards and Procedures:

1. Maximum permitted number of guests in a Residential Care use that serves people who are at risk of homelessness or are experiencing homelessness.
2. Spacing and density limitations for Residential Care Uses opened specifically in response to the emergency (such as a temporary shelter).
3. The 10-day or 10 overnight stay limit for short-term expansion of an existing Residential Care use according to Section 11.2.12.1.A above.
4. The 120-day period after a short-term expansion of an existing Residential Care use, during which that use typically may not request an additional expansion according to Section 11.2.12.1.B above.
5. The requirement for a zoning use permit for a temporary shelter in a structure owned by a non-profit organization or government entity.

D. Duration of Suspension of Zoning Code Standards and Procedures: Suspension of limitations according to this Section 11.2.12.2, Emergency Suspension of Zoning Code Standards and Procedures shall last for the duration of the emergency, as determined by the Zoning Administrator in consultation with the requesting City department or agency. The Zoning Administrator shall keep a record of emergency suspension of Zoning Code requirements granted under this section.

WHAT IS MISSING – WHAT WAS REMOVED FROM THE FORMER PROVISIONS REGARDING SOME USES SUCH AS COMMUNITY CORRECTION AND SHELTERS:

The following provisions were removed from current Code provisions. Some of these removed provisions would be helpful to maintain and, if maintained and included, would provide more accountability and oversight of some of the Residential Care uses as now proposed.

Former 11.2.15.1(B): Designation of Contact Person. The applicant or operator of a Residential Care use shall designate a staff member who shall be available on a continuous basis to receive questions and concerns from interested neighbors. Any issues not satisfactorily resolved through the applicant and facility staff shall be reported to the Zoning Administrator.

Former 11.2.15.1(D)(1)(d): The applicant and the operator will provide adequate measures for safeguarding the public and the facility residents. Such measures shall be appropriate to the special population including intake screening, supervision and security.

Former 11.2.15.1(D)(2): Property and building limitations: (a.) The size and architectural style of new structures or additions to existing structures located in a residential zone shall not be substantially dissimilar from other structures in the surrounding residential neighborhood and shall comply with all other requirements of the zone district in which they are located. (b.) The applicant and the operator will adequately maintain the building and grounds.

Former: 11.2.15.1(G): Approvals Personal to Applicant/Operator: The permit for an approved Residential Care use shall automatically expire at such time as the operator specified in the permit no longer operates the Residential Care use at the subject property.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS: Former 11.2.16.1 (B) required Community Corrections Facility not be located within 1500 feet from a school OR a residential district,³ and (D) required “Government Supervision Required for Transition Programs in a Community Corrections Facility: Any program to facilitate transition to a less-structured or independent residential arrangement in a community corrections facility shall be supervised directly or indirectly by an agency of the city, the state or the federal government.”

HOMELESS SHELTERS: 11.2.17.2:

D. Operations:

1. Overnight sleeping accommodations shall be in undivided sleeping space, offered for little or no financial compensation, and shall be operated in a manner that encourages short term occupancy by residents.

2. Such facility may include accessory support services but shall not be operated in such a manner that changes its primary function to a use classified as follows: community corrections facility, hospital, assisted living facility, nursing home, rehabilitation center for the handicapped, or residence for older adults.

³ Concerns continue to exist regarding where Community Corrections can be located. The draft now limits and restricts Community Corrections so that those uses will not be in SU, TU and RH2.5, but many think there is little difference between these protected areas from the many RH-3 districts (and likely other residential areas) which are residential to the same extent as most SU, TU and RH2.5 districts. Also, many people still desire some buffer for schools with Community Corrections care and shelter uses.

11.2.17.2(E). Spacing Required From a School: Proposed shelters for the homeless shall be located more than 500 feet from a school meeting all the requirements of the compulsory education laws of the state.

From: [Catherine Blair](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council must pass the group living proposal
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:37:06 AM

Andrew Webb,

We are in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

I am a former city planner who know works with cities all over the country. Denver continues to be behind the times by continually perpetuating single family zoning. We have an opportunity to rise to the times and put our values in place to be an equitable city for all. it's time we adopt group living rules that allow folks to live to live together affordably and in community.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

We are appealing to you city council to align your stated values with action. Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

- Catherine Cox Blair
catherinecoxblair@yahoo.com
303-881-3858

Catherine Blair
Catherinecoxblair@yahoo.com
4120 Raleigh Street
Denver, Colorado 80212

From: [M.L](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Denver Group Living Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:23:42 PM

Dear City Council Member,

I beseech you to vote "No" on the Group Living Amendment. The safety and well being of Denver's neighborhoods should be held in high regard. This proposal is not acceptable.

As Council Members and Mayor, your role is to represent the people of your District and City. If passed, this proposal will be a detriment to Denver. Even with the new revisions.

Please vote "No" on the Group Living Amendment.

Respectfully,

Michelle LaCrue
City and County of Denver resident and voter

From: [Niles Walker](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GLAC is a Bad Idea, Don't Pass
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:38:00 AM

Andrew Webb,

There are many problems with this amendment.

First, people appointed by the Mayor were not residents. And, a number of them had business interests in this passing. That is enough to direct the results so they don't reflect the needs of residents. And it was rammed through by CPD, not as a result of citizen ideas or initiatives.

Second, rents have dropped substantially, so you really don't need to do this. And it doesn't change affordability, it simply creates more revenue for the landlord. Please refer to Seattle and San Francisco for how this has not worked.

Third, this is projected to create more gentrification in neighborhoods like Montbello.

Fourth, this will create significant safety issues in neighborhoods and by schools with convicted felons with basically no supervision. Are you going to double the police budget to take care of these problems?

In short, the GLAC sounds like a great idea but has disastrous consequences.

Please do not pass, especially with public sentiment measured at 12:1 against this!

Niles Walker
golwalker25@gmail.com
1685 S. Colorado Blvd
Denver, Colorado 80222

From: [Linda Wells](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [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](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GROUP LIVING PROPOSAL
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:15:56 PM

My husband and I have been residents of Denver since the 1960's. We have lived in and worked in Denver Metro for all this time. We live in the same home in which we raised our children (44 years). They still live in Denver with their young families. **WE ALL CHALLENGE YOU TO READ THIS EMAIL TO ITS END AND CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING BEFORE YOU VOTE MONDAY.**

1) A Global Pandemic is an impossible time to make sweeping changes that affect the everyday life of citizens--their homes, neighborhoods, and well-being. Many of your ideas, plans, and eventually proposals were put together without proper transparency and community involvement. We now know that the Committee that drafted this proposal was filled with individuals who stand to PROFIT from this Group Living Proposal. Developers, Realtors, Group Living Businesses, to name a few. Other members didn't even live in Denver!

2) Voting members who don't live in Denver or live in a Chapter 59 neighborhood (that protects them from living with the results of the Group Living Proposal) should NOT be able to vote!

3) The density allowed by this Proposal will result in increased problems and tensions regarding traffic, noise, parking, sanitation, trash--all of which are problematic even now!

4) Homeless Shelters DO NOT belong in single-family home neighborhoods. PERIOD. There are too many risks involving families with young children. Think tainted needles, excess trash, lack of sanitation, lack of backyard peace & quiet, no pride in their home, multiple smokers at a time in back-yard, loud/late-night gatherings. And WHO are going to become LIVE-IN CAREGIVERS of these residences/shelters? ESPECIALLY DURING COVID? Which Budget will pay for all these additional costs? What Budget will pay for extra 311/911 calls/visits?

5) Who will oversee the live-in-resident caregiver of the Homeless Shelters & Group Homes? Which Budget will pay for these costs?

6) Even Multi-family, Multi-person homes (converted from single-family homes) that are packed with more people than reasonable is just plain RECKLESS! Again, think backyard noise, multiple dogs barking, excess trash, parking problems, loud/late-night parties. 311/911 Services will be busier than ever.

7) What businesses will want to move to Denver if this Group Living Proposal passes? The healthy and desirable attributes of Denver will disappear.

We ask that you vote NO to this proposal. This is a very complex issue that needs a different solution. We should have had complete transparency and proper representation all along. Not being able to meet in person kept our voices from being heard. The City and its Residents must JOINTLY find solutions to our housing problems. FORCING Group Living into single-family neighborhoods is not the answer.

*Sincerely,
Linda Wells*

From: [Mary Jo](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Housing
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:56:40 PM

Vote NO.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lauren Bloomquist](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:05:09 PM

Dear Mr. Webb,

I am writing as a resident of the Boulevard One neighborhood. Based on the Group Living Code Amendment January 2021 Overview PowerPoint provided by the city, it is my understanding that Community Corrections facilities may be placed in our neighborhood.

Boulevard One offers a mix of apartments, condos, row houses, and single-family homes; part of the reason I bought in this neighborhood was to support the city's efforts to create and promote mixed use communities. It is therefore highly unfortunate that residents of Boulevard One are being forced to take this a big step further via the new zoning to allow Community Correctional facilities.

While Boulevard One was developed to ease some of the housing issues in the city, it was also designed as a family neighborhood with community spaces, parks and retail. Rezoning this plan to accommodate the Community Correctional facilities materially "changes the game", and compromises the designed intent on which all Boulevard One residents based their decision to live here.

I do appreciate the City of Denver's need to address issues within the housing code. However, these issues should be supported by the entire community and not limited to those who have already shown support for mixed-use density living. At a minimum, Community Corrections decisions should be made outside of these massive changes to the City's code.

I would like to note my opposition to the plan as presented in the January 2021 Overview.

Lauren Bloomquist

From: [Hilarie Portell](#)
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](#); [City Council District 10](#); stacie.gillmore@denvergov.org; [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Letter of Support
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:37:47 PM
Attachments: [Group Living letter of support 2.4.21.pdf](#)

Thank you for your consideration,

Hilarie Portell

February 4, 2021

Dear Denver City Council:

I'm writing to you in support of the Group Living text amendment.

Please do not be unduly influenced by groups with the time and resources to create multimedia opposition campaigns and hire lawyers to advance their own narrow interests. Many other groups in town do not have these resources and are desperately in need of affordable housing—now more than ever, when so many people have lost jobs, health and loved ones in this pandemic.

The reality is that housing, education and healthcare costs have increased exponentially in the last 10 years, while wages have remained stagnant. During that same time period, Denver rezoned its neighborhoods, banning many smaller home options. The condos, rental duplexes, cottage homes, boarding houses and other home types where people used to live, become more self-sufficient and grow wealth—just don't exist across Denver's neighborhoods the way they used to. The result is that our most vulnerable community members, our front-line workers, our students, young professionals, seniors and communities of color are being pushed out.

This is simply not the lived experience of the largely—not entirely, but largely--affluent, white and older single-unit homeowners in Denver, who were able to buy a home when wages were increasing in time with other costs. And now those homes are appreciating in the double digits year after year, demand is increasing with population growth, and we have failed to meet the housing needs of our community.

We know more clearly than ever that deliberate city policies have in the past, and today, have segregated neighborhoods and increased inequity in our community. And secure housing is related to almost every other metric of well-being—health, school success, job opportunities and the accumulation of family wealth, to name a few.

Protecting the interests of the most privileged at the expense of everyone else will continue to exacerbate these injustices.

I know these principles—equity, justice, opportunity, and supporting Denverites whose lives have been disrupted by the pandemic and our city's often punishing economics—matter to you. Please make your decision Monday night based on a greater goal, to truly make Denver an inclusive, diverse city where everyone can prosper.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Hilarie Portell".

Hilarie Portell
1124 South Milwaukee StreetDenver

From: [Chris West](#)
To: [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Text Amendments - Opposition to Community Corrections Amendments
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 2:43:58 PM

Dear Councilwoman Sawyer, Mr. Webb and City Council Members,

I am writing to you today to voice our opposition to the proposed Community Corrections Amendments in the Group Living Text Amendments to be voted on at the February 8th, 2021 City Council Meeting.

We think that the Community Corrections section should be removed from the amendments and considered separately and in conjunction with additional options that will more appropriately address the many issues facing Denver related to Community Corrections, Transitional Housing and Homelessness. Based on the materials that the City of Denver has provided online, we support the Amendments for Household Regulations and feel that those should be considered separately from the Residential Care and Community Corrections Amendments. We have also seen testimony from those who are involved in solving issues around halfway houses that re-zoning residential properties will not meet the needs for these facilities because single family residences and townhomes are too small. Councilwoman Ortega stated "For any of these facilities to work, you have to have economies of scale. You are not going to see a lot of places in neighborhoods with small numbers because the numbers don't work."

In short, it appears that the Amendments will not address the core issues around Community Corrections, so what is the point of re-zoning these properties other than to potentially impact property values and introduce uncertainty into our neighborhoods?

The materials provided to the residents of Denver on these issues were not clear, and the maps provided are not labeled in a manner that allows a property owner to know how our zoning will change. Furthermore, there is a large new purple layer that is included in the map that is not labeled at all.

From what we can determine, properties zoned RH 2.5 will be exempted from the Community Corrections Amendments, but those zoned RH 3 are subject to it. We live in the Boulevard One portion of Lowry and apparently we are zoned RH 3 and are therefore subject to the Amendments. We cannot find any explanation for why RH 2.5 was exempted and the very similar RH 3 was included.

Please keep working on these difficult issues, but do so in a way that is more transparent and which support our vibrant city neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Chris West

Chris West
72 Oneida Ct
Denver, CO 80230

Chris.west@comcast.net

From: [Sharon Johnson](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living Zoning Code Amendment - VOTE NO
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:00:56 PM

Dear Mr Webb,

I am asking that this Group Living Zoning Code amendment NOT BE PASSED. It's a massive overreach that is not acceptable.

And my address is Denver!

--

Sharon Johnson
7900 W Layton Ave, Unit 848
Denver, CO 80123-1323
303-979-5301
303-884-3981 cell
sljdenver74@gmail.com

From: [Gene McGuire](#)
To: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [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 Amendment
Date: Saturday, February 6, 2021 12:52:57 PM

Dear Mayor and Denver City Council,

As an officer in the Denver Police Department for 35 years, assigned to special units for 27 of those years and spending the last 5 within the City Attorneys and District Attorneys Offices, I had an opportunity to observe the operation of a major city. I did everything from searching the interior of a garbage truck for evidence to assisting Federal agencies in the protection of every VIP that visited the city. I was not too surprised to learn that the latest purposed zoning changes were formulated over a few years and were purposely hidden from the general public. I am aware that you, Kendra, grew up here in Southmoor Park. Since the early 90's, I have observed an aging original family neighborhood change hands and welcome new families with young children as the original owners moved on. Light Rail could have been very destructive to the neighborhood had not a proposed entrance to the local station been turned down by homeowners. This new Group Living Zoning Code Amendment is another bad idea floated by the same deep thinkers who have decided to remove police resource officers from our schools. It is obvious that this proposal is in the interest of business and some special interest groups, and not in the interest of affected neighborhoods. If Councilwoman Sandoval can bypass zoning to allow Accessory Dwelling Units in her district with constituent's approval, then this idea should be totally revisited with neighborhood input and only established after a trial period in those districts that approve the changes.

Gene McGuire
Council District Four

From: [Manuel Martine](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living hurts Latinos
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:48:14 AM

Andrew Webb,

I can't believe you are thinking about passing this as there was no Latino representation on the committee about this.

Even worse, is many of the people, appointed by the Mayor don't live in Denver and have some business interest in this passing. How is that helping the Latino residents? Not!

And, I don't want that much traffic in my neighborhood. Also, no felons close to the school. You have already cut back on the Police, who is going to take care of problems? With felons? Definitely not the license plate enforcement dude.

The effect of this will make everything worse in the Latino neighborhoods.

And, I just read that in polls, this is only 3% for the GLACC and 97% against. That should be a clue that people don't want this.

Manuel Martine
physicalgolf@yahoo.com
2145 South Dahlia Street
Denver, Colorado 80222

From: [Neil Wolkodoff](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living is a bad idea
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:29:44 AM

Andrew Webb,

Because of covid, the housing issues in Denver are almost non-existent.

And, with the BLM protests and destruction downtown, tax revenue from those closed businesses is at an all time low. Who is going to pay for monitoring and increased costs?

Please don't pass these neighborhood destroying ideas.

And, from what I have read, comments against the GLAC is 10 times greater than those in support.

Neil Wolkodoff
neil@cochss.com

Gdańsk, Pomerania 80222

From: carlamcconnell@comcast.net
To: [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living proposed ordinance
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 10:42:42 AM
Attachments: [Group Living ordinance comments.docx](#)

Councilwoman Sawyer

Please find attached my comments about the proposed Group Living ordinance for your consideration.

Thank you!

Carla McConnell

February 6, 2021

Councilwoman Sawyer

I have the following comments about the proposed Group Living Ordinance, and urge a no vote on Feb. 8th, 2021.

- **The ordinance is too complicated.** The components should be considered separately, Household Living, Congregate Living and Residential Care. I have attended several presentations by Andrew Webb and despite his best efforts there is always confusion, and this is after at least 18 months of public meetings.
- **Enforcement has not been adequately addressed.** As one example, Andrew Webb commented at the January 26 LUN Townhall the change in allowable occupancy in Household Living from 2 to 5 would free up Neighborhood Inspectors who may not have to respond when the household contains fewer than 5 unrelated adult residents. That change will leave neighbors with fewer enforcement options when problems occur.
- **Periodic Ordinance Reviews.** A requirement for periodic review and reports to Council of ordinance impacts should be added. This should be done annually for at least 5 years and be available for public review. The public should have on-going opportunity to weigh-in on how the various components are working in their communities.

I would like to say that I appreciate the outstanding job Andrew Webb has been doing to present this very complex set of issues. His patience and good humor is incredible!

Thank you.

Carla McConnell

662 Ulster Way

Denver, 80230

Cc:

From: [Llew Haden](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group Living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:45:04 PM

Please do what you can to stop the Group Living effort as it is currently structured. Given that the Mayor was trying to hide documents, one can reasonably conclude this effort was not made in the light of day and the citizens are being misled.

Thank you

Llewellyn Haden
520 Jackson Street, Denver CO 80206
llewhaden@earthlink.net
404.697.2463

From: Rey, Roberto <RRey@aarp.org>

Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 11:43 AM

To: 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 Council <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>

Cc: Montano, Dana D. - CC YA3153 Administrator II <Dana.Montano@denvergov.org>; Chavez, Benjamin J. - CC YA2245 City Council Aide <Benjamin.Chavez@denvergov.org>; Gile, Kathleen O. - CC YA2246 City Council Aide Senior <kathy.gile@denvergov.org>; Fry, Logan M. - CC YA2245 City Council Aide <Logan.Fry@denvergov.org>; Fahrberger, Brent J. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 6 <Brent.Fahrberger@denvergov.org>; Carpenter, Tate E. - CC YA2246 City Council Aide Senior <Tate.Carpenter@denvergov.org>; Schoultz, Amanda M. - CC Senior City Council Aide <Amanda.Schoultz@denvergov.org>; Calderon, Lisa - CC Senior City Council Aide <Lisa.Calderon@denvergov.org>; St. Peter, Teresa A. - CC Senior City Council Aide District 10 <Teresa.St.Peter@denvergov.org>; Elenz, Magen M. - CC Senior City Council Aide <Magen.Elenz@denvergov.org>; Kyle, Polly A. - CC Senior City Council Aide At Large <Polly.Kyle@denvergov.org>; Murphy, Robert D - RDMurphy <rdmurphy@aarp.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] AARP Supports Denver Group Living Zoning Change

Good morning,

Please see the attached letter from AARP Colorado supporting the passage of the proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code regarding Group Living up for consideration at the Feb. 8, 2021 City Council session.

AARP views the proposed changes to the Group Living Zoning Code as a positive step towards resolving Denver's shortage of affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Roberto Rey

Associate State Director, Multicultural Outreach

AARP Colorado

303 E. 17th Ave Suite 510

Denver, CO 80206

303-318-6763 Office

866-554-5376 Toll Free



Colorado

303 E. 17th Avenue, #510 | Denver, CO 80203
1-866-554-5376 | Fax: 303-764-5999 | TTY: 1-877-434-7598
aarp.org/co | coaarp@aarp.org | twitter: @ColoradoAARP
facebook.com/aarp.colorado

February 2, 2021

TO: Honorable Members of the Denver City Council
RE: AARP Colorado Support for Group Living Text Amendment

AARP Colorado supports the passage of the current proposed text amendments to the Denver Zoning Code regarding Group Living up for consideration at the Feb. 8, 2021 City Council session. As an age 50-plus membership organization that advocates for the interests of our over 670,000 Colorado members, including 75,000 in Denver, AARP feels the amendments to the Denver Zoning Code would increase the availability of affordable housing benefiting many of our members who struggle with rising housing costs.

Many of our members live on fixed income and a significant portion are renters. AARP is a strong proponent of age friendly livable communities where residents of all backgrounds can thrive. The AARP Network of Age Friendly States and Communities, in which Denver is an early member, recognizes affordable and varied housing as a foundation for a diverse and welcoming community. Denver had an affordable housing crisis before COVID-19 but now faces the potential of 100,000 evictions by this winter as the pandemic's economic fallout deepens.

AARP values the rights of Denver residents to live in families or groups of their choosing, and to gain access to affordable housing and transportation options. Denver currently prohibits more than two unrelated people from sharing a house. Group living changes will increase this up to five, bringing Denver in line with the accepted regulations in peer communities. This will legalize cooperative living arrangements and house sharing that provide alternatives for older residents on fixed income looking for affordable housing. The shift also allows more people to live near Denver's transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure that gives people the opportunity to reduce their reliance on automobiles.

The Group Living Amendments are a thoughtful compromise that addresses concerns around parking, crowding, and commercialization. Peer cities like Seattle do not have issues in neighborhoods due to group living.

AARP Colorado supports the proposed changes in the Group Living Code Amendment as unanimously approved by the Planning Board and urges their approval by the Denver City Council.

Thank you for your consideration,

State Director, AARP Colorado

AARP
Real Possibilities

From: [Michelle Prokocki](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Group living amendment
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 1:50:30 PM

Should the group living amendment pass? As with most rules, it's not a question of whether but how.

If we're going to pack people like sardines into smaller and smaller and smaller boxes at the edges of town for the benefit of a few large developers and rent-seekers, then no it shouldn't pass.

If equilibrium rent and housing prices are just going to adjust to prices that are barely lower for a quarter of the space (and that space is shared) then no it probably shouldn't pass.

If we're going to have regulators knocking on doors, counting the number of people in the place and making sure they're sharing a kitchen, forcing their idea of a specific new but still narrow idea of a "family" model then no it probably shouldn't pass (even if this new model is more in line with the times and what a lot of people want, still shouldn't be "pushed" onto them like the old nuclear family was before).

If we're going to combine this effort with support for new types of ownership/ co-ownership, financing and insurance models that make housing accessible to more people, then yes it should pass.

[Out with the model of 1 landlord for every 2... or 3.... or 4... or 5... or more and more and more and more tenants to where almost nobody can ever get out of the trap. "I was able to afford my house by buying more space than I needed and renting out 2 rooms" is a model that can only work for 1 out of 3 people, if renting 1/3 of a house is at current market rates that leave almost no room for saving].

****The intent is for this option to become MORE affordable THAN the norm, not the norm itself. People who choose this option should be benefiting from it, either because they truly enjoy living with others, or are making a temporary sacrifice to get to what they might consider a better option, but not to normalize a situation for everyone that might not be ideal for everyone (those with social anxiety, sensory sensitivities, etc).**

If we're going to combine this effort with new solutions for parking, other modes of transportation (not fully dependent on a few companies), infrastructure challenges, noise and design externalities, then it should pass.

If this is going to be combined with objectives to increase the amount of total living space to meet demand while preserving certain aspects of Denver's culture and architecture that made this city worth living in and this conversation worth having in the first place, then it should pass.

If we're going to choose a city that works for all residents (including my generation, including future generations, including those who have specific challenges most of us may not ever have the capacity to understand), then it should pass.

Overall, I'm not concerned about whether this will pass - Denver is a city that cares about all of its residents. But there's still work to be done to make it successful.

Thank you,

Michelle

From: [Crocker, Shawna](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I AM EXTREMELY SADDENED BY THIS AMENDMENT AND THE WAY IT HAS BEEN SOLD TO US. UNETHICAL, NOT WITH MY TAXES.
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:37:16 PM

I AM SHOCKED. This can't be legal or ethical. YOU ARE RUINING THE NEIGHBORHOOD I'VE WORKED SO HARD TO LIVE IN FOR THE PAST MANY YEARS. I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS INITIATIVE.

City's PR Team Lobbys for Group Living Amendment
The Office of Storytelling Spins Tales

Just three days after the Mayor's Office lost in district court and was ordered to release documents about the origins of the Group Living Advisory Committee (GLAC), the **City tweeted a promotional video for two [Group Living Advisory Committee](#) members and their for-profit business.** The business was established in 2016 and the featured resident is a teacher with the Adams 12 school district.

The City's tweet also promoted the Group Living Amendment.

Why is the City's PR team using tax dollars to promote a business that will profit from the Amendment?

Why is the City's PR team lobbying with OUR tax dollars?

"On March 21, 2019 Mayor Michael Hancock launched Denver's Office of Storytelling, headed by the city's new Chief Storyteller, **who just happens to be a former Hancock aide.**" [\[Westword, March 25, 2019\]](#)

Court-ordered documents, obtained from the Mayor's office, confirmed

the Amendment originated in the Mayor's office.

According to the [webpage](#): "I Am Denver **recognizes the individuals who have made this city**.....by recording and archiving in video, audio and photo the faces and voices of the people who make Denver."

Why is the Office of Storytelling telling just one side of this legislative issue? Where are the voices of Denver residents who have "made this city" with decades of daily efforts to support themselves, help their neighbors, and who oppose this Amendment?

The Office of the Storyteller was contacted multiple times and requests were made for a video of Denver neighbors expressing a different point of view. Their response:

"Thank you for reaching out and apologies for not replying earlier, but we were having some issues with this email address that have now been resolved. We've received your messages and will be looking into your request. The I Am Denver Team"

**Ethics isn't something you say; it's something you do.
We expect better from the Mayor and his administration.**

Shawna

shawna.crocker@gmail.com

scrocker@colostate.edu

303-877-7585

Life is not measured by the breaths you take, but by the moments that take your breath away.

From: [Joe Halpern](#)
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](#)
Cc: [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I Urge You to Vote Against the Group Living Amendment in its Current Form
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 5:12:49 PM

Dear Council Members:

I urge you to vote against the Group Living Amendment (GLA) in its current form for the reasons stated below. By way of background, my name is Joe Halpern. I am a 42-year resident of Capitol Hill, first in a small apartment on Logan Street, then in a small bungalow on Ogden Street, and now in a larger Tudor on Emerson Street. I am a founder of the Alamo Placita Neighbors Association (location of my bungalow), and served as its zoning and land use chair for 29 years.

The GLA is seriously flawed for the following four reasons:

Broken Process Dominated by Commercial Interests

First, the process was broken. Despite Community Planning and Development's (CPD) claim of adequate outreach and meetings, it was a top-down process dominated by the very commercial interests that will benefit financially from the GLA. I contrast this with the much more robust multi-year outreach and numerous small community meetings when the current 2010 Zoning Code was developed, where city planners met with individual neighborhoods to review and revise the Zoning Code on a micro-level, with the unique characteristics of each neighborhood articulated and often taken into account. We had the opportunity to review detailed draft maps that allowed comment virtually on a block-by-block basis. Community members like myself felt this was a model of meaningful community engagement. Not so the GLA process; I've watched the on-line videos of many of the sessions hosted by CPD, in which a small number of city- and self-selected speakers and participants implicitly purported to speak for every resident of every neighborhood in the city. They did not do so.

"Five Unrelated Adults" Provision is Fatally Flawed Because of the Unenforceable "Household" Standard

Second, as a concept, I do not oppose five unrelated adults and their relatives living in a single-family house (although adding a cap on the maximum total number of persons, adults and children, allowed would allay a frequently expressed concern). Capitol Hill is a microcosm of different family configurations, and that diversity is a positive aspect of the neighborhood. However, as drafted, there is a shockingly inadequate mechanism to prevent commercial landlords from buying up single-family houses and converting them to rentals. The GLA states that the five unrelated residents must form a "Household," which is defined as a group of people who

choose to live together and “share household activities and responsibilities.” (Full definition at proposed Code section 11.12.2.1.B.2.) While it states that the “choice of specific adults” must be made by the household group and not by the landlord, that is laughably unenforceable. **Landlords will simply insert a provision into leases stating that “The Tenant under this Lease chooses to live with [specific named individuals who are already tenants] and form a Household with them.” A clever landlord will also draft standard “Bylaws” for the “Household,” which each new tenant will be required to sign, further signifying that the new tenant has chosen to live with the other tenants as a Household as defined in the Code.**

The unenforceable “Household” standard will result in commercial interests buying up single family houses and converting them to de facto multi-family rentals, at a time when inventory of homes for sale is at an historic low. This added competition will drive up purchase prices, pricing many families out of Denver’s for-sale housing market. Landlords can almost always outbid individuals, and pass on the costs to the “Household.” This defeats CPD’s stated GLA goal of facilitating home ownership by people who have been relegated to the world of rentals by high housing costs.

The only way to avoid this outcome is to create a mechanism such as exists for short-term rentals in Denver: **Require that the single family house must be the primary residence of the owner(s) of the house in order to use it for “Household” living. This would allow one or all of the five adults to jointly purchase a single-family house and form a “Household” as envisioned by the GLA.** This would also create objective evidence for enforcement purposes, as it has with the short-term rental ordinance; the City need only prove that a house is not the primary residence of the party renting it out in order to shut down the illegal operation. It would also achieve CPD’s goal of making housing purchases more affordable to a greater number of people.

Residential Care Facilities Placed in Low-Density Residential Neighborhoods are Incompatible and Should Not Be Permitted.

Third, I strenuously oppose this part of the GLA above all others, because it will fundamentally degrade the quality of life in low-density residential neighborhoods.

Let me use my 42 years in Capitol Hill as an example. Capitol Hill is the most diverse neighborhood in the City. Because it was built out significantly before Denver adopted its first zoning code in 1925, it developed both organically and chaotically. Thus, the established development pattern (preserved to some extent in later-adopted zoning codes) has a mélange of single-family, duplex, and multi-family housing in close proximity, often on the same block with commercial uses that arose not from thoughtful zoning, but from the pre-1925 location of the city’s old trolley lines.

People do not only choose a neighborhood; they choose a block. Choosing to buy a house in Capitol Hill, a dense, multi-use area, requires a careful weighing of many factors before selecting a block. My current single family house in the 700

block of Emerson is near the southern end of the block among a group of similar houses; two large apartment buildings sit at the northern end of the block (42 units and 28 units). After considering traffic and parking issues, “checking out” my prospective neighbors, and other quality of life factors, I decided to buy in this block. My calculus would be vastly different if there were a residential group home next door or across the street. **Uses such as sober houses and homeless shelters plopped down on a primarily low-density residential block will drive out those of us who seek a reasonable degree of peace and quiet and safety—quality of life—in an already dense part of the city.** These uses are probably appropriate on commercial streets (e.g., Colfax Avenue 8 blocks north of me) or perhaps the highest-density multi-family housing areas.

The Law of Unintended Consequences Will Haunt Citizens and Council for Years to Come if GLA is Adopted.

Denver City Council has a long history of making zoning and land use decisions that end up having disastrous, unplanned impacts. Perhaps the most notable example is the 1955 Zoning Code, in which our city fathers (there were no “city mothers” on Council at the time) decided that large swaths of Capitol Hill should be upzoned to encourage high-rise residential buildings, replacing grand mansions and charming Victorians alike in order to “modernize” Denver and make it a true metropolis. But the market for those high-rises did not exist, so those now-cleared lots became massive parking lots that only have been built upon in the last 10 to 20 years. Thus, for more than 40 years, much of Capitol Hill was a barren, unsafe landscape.

Fast forward to the 2010 Zoning Code for another example of the “law of unintended consequences”: the slot homes shoehorned onto small city lots. This is recent enough history that I need not describe it in more detail.

The overly long, complex, and mind-numbing GLA (yes, I’ve attempted to read through the entire danged thing more than once) is a recipe for unintended, unplanned, disastrous consequences. It should be broken into smaller parts and reconsidered to address the genuine, valid concerns expressed by me and others. There are better solutions available, some of which I’ve suggested above.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Joseph W. Halpern

From: [SarahDawn Haynes](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Legalize residents
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:41:31 PM

Andrew Webb,

I fought with City of Boulder for four years on co-ops/group living. I heard all the same fears from opponents and none of them have come true- not even close. All the data is in, we have less kids, marriage, higher housing costs and too low pay. It's rooted in racism and discrimination. Time to allow higher density for non related people.

SarahDawn Haynes
dawnofsarah@gmail.com
1210 Lehigh st
Boulder, Colorado 80305

From: [Eva Dyer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter address issues
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:55:12 PM

Regarding: **allow new 1-10 person 24/7 homeless shelters** in all neighborhoods, with expansion to 100 guests for 130 days, and no buffer from schools:

I am a licensed therapist trained in urban planning, marriage and family therapy, and clinical psychology. Among other certifications, I'm trained to deal with marginalized populations, drug additions, trauma (both PTSD and developmental). I've worked with the homeless population and have visited homeless shelters throughout the years to help them receive help. There is actually, as Major Hancock has stated, hundred of unused beds.

When I asked the homeless why they don't want to stay in shelters they state the following reasons: 1) they have severe mental health problems and prefer living outdoors, 2) they have long-term drug addictions and cannot use drugs in the shelters and therefore would rather live in tents; furthermore they have failed to benefit from multiple drug programs and wish to use illegal drugs away from surveillance, 3) they have developed a homeless culture that doesn't fit into affluent neighborhoods, 4) some have documented pedophile records and cannot be around children in families that are sheltered in homes, 5) shelters don't accommodate irregular work hours, particularly night hours, 6) shelters require they be quiet and asleep by certain hours when they would rather be up and around, 7) they were unable to comply with staff rules.

The problem is that unless addiction is solved, mental health workers cannot treat the often many other mental illnesses. Addiction obstructs help with the other areas.

Rather than create more shelters and again see those who need to use them sleeping in our neighborhoods and throughout the city in unsheltered ways, we need to help existing shelters better accommodate and provide treatment for the homeless. At some point, the homeless are human beings who are choosing a way of life. I don't believe that creating more shelters when existing ones are not being used is the answer. Instead, we need to allocate tax funds for properly supervised psychological and medical treatment programs, allowing the homeless continuous engagement with professionals.

In regard to allow up to 3 homeless shelters within a 1 mile radius in single family residential neighborhoods:

I owned an office building at 7th and Grant behind the Governor's mansion, a mixed residential and office area. Whether it be office workers or residents, we were literally attacked by the homeless who created sleeping nests in back yards. They attacked us with long knives and syringe needles, and one knocked me unconscious with a board. Such conduct is dangerous and illegal. They trespassed repeatedly, sleeping on front porches and under bushes. We'd arrive at work and have to step over

sleeping bodies in sleeping bags. They urinated and defecated on the proper, in flower pots, and throughout the yard areas. We couldn't meet with clients that way but would have to schedule only during mid day and only after calling the politics to remove the sleeping homeless from our premises. The police were trained to deal with the homeless in caring ways but I witnessed myself repeatedly that the homeless attacked the police without provocation, in one case stabbing the policeman's eye with a syringe needle. While we might say it's not the fault of the homeless with mental illnesses and drug addictions, some were identified criminals who were sought after. There is no way to screen who is dangerous and who is not. And in more cases than not, we found ourselves dealing with highly dangerous and illegal behavior and treatment. We would have to pay extra fees for special cleanup of thousands of syringe needs throughout the grassy areas, under bushes, throughout the property.

Because so many of the hard-core, long-term homeless have untreated conditions and repeatedly resist treatment provided, they are not safe within a mile of residences in my opinion and based on years of seeking to help them. The residents will move away and the neighborhood will become degraded. I sold my work/residential property because it was so dangerous to work there and my clients refused to visit the facilities that were beautifully fixed up and otherwise maintained. All the residents moved away. The property became devalued, was sold, buildings original to the city were torn down, and new densely-occupied apartments built in stead.

Eva Dyer
685 Humboldt Street
Denver, CO 80218
720 373-3404

From: [Christine O'Connor](#)
To: [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter re Group Living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 9:38:37 AM
Attachments: [Council President Gilmore and Council Members.docx](#)

Council President Gilmore and Council Members,

Thank you for grappling with the proposed changes to group living regulations; I appreciate the hard work done at LUTI. I also appreciate Andrew Webb, who was always willing to take a stab at answering my questions.

I am writing today as an individual, and not as INC or INC ZAP. INC's two resolutions July 17, 2020 and Aug. 8, 2020 urging de-bundling and separate adoption of these amendments represent the latest "position" of INC. Since the publication of the latest official Text Amendment 8 on Jan. 7, 2021, INC has not gone through the ZAP and delegate process to address the revisions.

I have read the most recent (Jan. 7, 2021) version of the text amendment (along with earlier versions) and understand the effort that went into revising the proposal while leaving opportunities for providers of all types of care to purchase land and permit it for residential care uses. Whether there is too much deregulation and whether the land uses granted are consistent with Blueprint and the Code's Contexts is still a question I am struggling with. I understand the land and financial pressures on the City, and I understand some of the strong pressure on the City from those with land interests in various areas of the city, e.g. in the AS area. We will have to see how this unfolds and who the real beneficiaries are.

I understand this is framed as simply updating group living "rules" such as how many people can live in a dwelling unit. But the amendment isn't only about that rule change, and updates to other out-of-date language in Article 11; it is a citywide change of land use reflected in changes in every Context/Article. This is a citywide legislative zoning change that impacts 80% of the city but started out as "tweaking" Article 11.

Impact on housing affordability. The amendment is not about the pandemic, it won't create jobs or get rents lowered, it will do nothing for those struggling to avoid eviction, it doesn't address Blueprint's equity goals of preserving affordable housing stock and reducing risk of displacement. The percentage of Blacks living in Denver continues to drop, the exodus of Latinx persons/families¹ continues as families look for housing outside Denver, and the code changes before us will not address the wealth disparities. Denver has no guardrails in place to ensure that landlord/investors do not decide to rent to 5 renters at \$500 each per month instead of extending the lease to a family of 5 for \$2200/month? This "number change" will have no real benefit for the most rent-burdened or for the families at greatest risk of displacement. And, we know that a high household number does not correspond to affordable rent or reduced homelessness. Seattle for example, allows 8 unrelated people to live together; yet rents are far from affordable.

The Amendments Did Not Result in Regulations that are Clear to Administer and Enforce or Uniform:

The Group Living Advisory Committee's own decision-making criteria required that the proposal be clear to administer and enforce. CPD presents these code changes as "[c]onsolidating residential care uses into a single system regulated by number of guests, rather than by population served." But, despite purporting to regulate only by size, the amendment in fact regulates by type of guests or type of facility. This failure to regulate solely by size within the residential care category results in regulations that are not uniform as required in the rezoning criteria. Some specific problems:

- Spacing and density regulations are difficult to understand and will be difficult apply (I have raised several specific questions with CPD)

¹ [Denver Leads the Nation in Hispanic Displacement from Gentrification](#), Westword 10.28.2020

- **Type 2 has no spacing or density limitation.** CPD believes it is unnecessary to place spacing or density limitation on Type 2 facilities (1-40). The reasoning (as I understand it) is that in SU TU RH districts, Type 2 has defacto density constraints because of the limitations of (1) <20 guests, (2) 12,000 sq. ft. lot, and (3) prior use requirement. This may function as a natural limit in SU TU RH, but may not. Additionally, who has looked at impacts in other zone districts such as MU, MS, MX?
- **A new Type 1 cannot be located w/in one mile radius of more than three other residential care uses of any type. Type 1 is the only type that requires taking into account residential care facilities of all other types when a new application is filed.** Where Type 1 facilities are not in the mix, concentrations of Type 2 facilities can create the very problem of concentration of facilities that the City set out to address, Types 3 just have spacing requirement, and Types 4 has spacing and density with regard to other Type 4, and Type 3.
- **All the density and spacing sections need to be revisited**
- Including “up to 100 guests for 130 days/year” in the very small (Type 1) category is inconsistent with neighborhood context in most neighborhoods, defies common sense, and should be removed. (Having worked the overnight shift at church shelters, I knew shelters fell under the small category, but I was surprised to learn that the 100 for 130 days would apply for any provider running a Type 1. This still makes no sense to me.)
- Definitions of “Residential Care” and “Congregate Living” are open ended, including only examples of what might fit in each category in the future and leaving this to the discretion of the Zoning Administrator

Denver’s Adopted Plans

Denver’s adopted plans include numerous goals and strategies calling for a variety of housing options, from sheltering people to missing middle. However, those same plans include numerous other goals such as halting displacement, strengthening and maintaining strong neighborhoods, increasing amenities and services to neighborhoods that have been left behind. Any grant of a use by right must be consistent with the Contexts relied on by Denver residents. During Denveright (same time frame as GLAC) CPD failed to raise these policy issues in the planning for the Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint 2040.

Household Number

Changing the outdated household number is seen as a problem when it reminds residents that external impacts under the current Code are not dealt with by the City and calls to 311 go unheeded. I know this has been raised over and over by neighbors from all corners of the city and it has not been resolved.

The household number was a red herring from the start, added to the scope GLAC for the most part because of requests from Co-op members -- not requests from renters getting turned in to NIS....

- Only a fraction of complaints (.6% of 30,000 over 3 years) are about too many people in a unit and co-op requests could have been addressed early on through licensing
- CPD’s chart suggests a much lower actual household number than the allowed number
- Messaging that this amendment was needed to lift restrictions on those unrelated by blood or marriage living together despite knowing that this was changed in 1989.
- Renters look for a place to rent and the cost – not the occupancy number. 99% of residents likely didn’t know or care about the “number” until CPD pushed going to 8. Who was living next door simply was not the issue. But it created a storyline! And of course, everyone has anecdotes about living “in violation” when they moved to Denver or their family was evicted! They are not that meaningful when it is so rarely an issue to begin with! We will probably hear these stories all night.

- People double up when they have to but doubling up is not everything it is cracked up to be in many cases and, as has been pointed out, raises risks to children’s health and educational success.²

Notice Process: The proposal also shifts the City’s obligation to provide formal notice when applicants of residential care apply for a permit, or seek to rebuild or expand, to the owner/operator of the proposed residential care facility. Why not a Special Exception process? Were more tailored processes considered to make sure the uses are consistent with the purpose and objective of the zone district it is in and will not be detrimental to the health safety welfare of the community. While I support several concrete changes such as Co-location to provide continuum from shelter to supportive housing, the removal of all ZP-IN processes for facilities re expanding floor area, demolishing and rebuilding and more should be re-examined.

Chapter 59. This is a problem of CPD’s own making. For an entire decade we have been asking to finish what we started. We objected during the Denveright process again. To those in Ch. 59 areas, the amendment is basically Greek until this Ch. 59 work is done, which makes it difficult for residents to know how they will be impacted or whether to support it.

In conclusion, I saw many important community issues ZAP raised in March of 2020 in a long letter of concerns/questions factored into the compromise work over the past year. I appreciate the hard work, and only wish Council had been able to separate the issues for voting as well as for discussion. Given its current status as one package, I cannot support the entire amendment at this time.

Thank you for considering my thoughts over the past year as well as this letter.

Christine O’Connor
Denver Resident
303 906-6627

² “Studies have linked crowded housing to diseases such as asthma. Children in crowded housing are seen as especially at risk of illness and their academic performance and behavior also has been shown to be affected by poor living conditions.” [Denverite](#)

From: [Gale Pennington](#)
To: [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:35:32 AM

Councilwoman Black, Mayor Hancock, Mr. Webb:

I disagree with the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. Single family homes should remain so. The residential areas are not designed for these proposed increases to number of individuals living in each home, number of vehicles on the streets, or the overburdening of the infrastructure.

I ask that you vote NO to this amendment.

Thank you.

--

Gale L. Pennington
Cell: 303-883-7833
galebiz2016@gmail.com

From: [Edward Scott Forbes](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 5:21:45 PM

I have lived in five major American cities in my life—Minneapolis, Detroit, Chicago, Washington, and Denver—and have been here since 1995. My time in Denver has seen me dig into the city in a way I never expected when I was hired by a company based in Golden. The sporting venues, the restaurants, the bars, the DCPA, the festivals have all been so much fun and being a part of making Denver such a vibrant urban setting has been thrilling.

Until recently.

You and your compatriots in local government have allowed this city to become a gigantic tent city. The homelessness and crime crises made the city more and more difficult to enjoy long before COVID-19 came along. The fact that you and others wish to bring these problems to the neighborhoods will only serve to hollow out the city. All of Detroit and major parts of Chicago and Washington should serve as a warning to you as you approach this vote.

There is no way, as I recall my time in these cities, that a yes vote would do anything other than put Denver on the fast track to people moving out and turning this metro area into a gigantic donut with nothing in the middle. I implore you to encourage the entire city council to vote NO.

—Edward Scott Forbes

From: [Maricela](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 5:27:19 PM

Dear Mr. Webb,

My name is Maricela Cherveney and I have read the changes made to the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. I do not support the Amendment as currently written.

I currently live near a homeless shelter, where the City and County failed to obtain community input. In the short time that the shelter has been in operation, we have had to deal with the influx of more people passing through or camping and creating safety issues, e.g. more trash/waste, drugs and public urination/defecation.

As such, I am greatly concerned about allowing:

- density in all single-family homes to increase a minimum of 150% -- from 2 to 5 unrelated adults plus unlimited minor children -- in any size home(**except select neighborhood communities**)
- new 1-10 person 24/7 homeless shelters in all neighborhoods (**except select neighborhood communities**), with expansion to 100 guests for 130 days, and no buffer from schools
- up to 3 homeless shelters within a 1 mile radius in single family residential neighborhoods(**except select neighborhood communities**)

I ask that you **vote “no”** on this Amendment as written.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Maricela Cherveney

From: [Teresa Lynne](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 10:28:35 PM

Vote NO! Please don't ruin our city !

Teresa Stoffel

From: [David Rogers](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Cc: contact@sanadenver.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:07:17 PM

February 4, 2021

City and County of Denver
Denver City Council

Subject: Statement in Opposition to the Group Living Amendment

Dear Council members:

We are Denver residents and voters, and we are writing to you today requesting that you vote to reject the Group Living Amendment (GLA) on February 8, 2021.

As residents represented by the Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association (SANA) Registered Neighborhood Organization (RNO), we are aligned to SANA's explicit opposition to the GLA. SANA believes that the City must reevaluate the plan and its approach to increasing density and changing the distribution of Residential Care facilities throughout the City. The GLA was written before COVID-19 drastically changed the future landscape of urbanization across the country and, specifically, in Denver. Planning for increased density and changing the distribution of Residential Care facilities without taking into account lessons we've learned since the pandemic began (and in the middle of the pandemic) is a losing proposition for the City and for our neighborhood.

SANA and our neighboring RNOs have consistently voiced opposition to myriad elements of the GLA. SANA highlights the following general areas of concern:

- Increasing the number of unrelated adults permitted to live in the same house from 2 to 5 (with an unlimited number of relatives). The increase would be made irrespective of the size/square footage of the house.
- Changing the distribution of Residential Care facilities (including shelters, community corrections or "halfway houses", sober living, rehabilitation facilities, assisted living facilities, nursing homes and hospice care) throughout the City.

The following are more specific issues related to the general areas of concern:

- City Council does not have the moral authority or a mandate to make this change. The GLA will have a huge impact on our city. The changes contemplated by the GLA were not debated in our last election. If this Council seeks to make these wholesale changes, for which they do not have a mandate, they should seek one via a referendum on the contemplated changes
- The GLA will create a burden on city services. The City has insufficient infrastructure to accommodate changes that will result from GLA, from schools to water and water treatment to parking on our neighborhood streets
- The GLA will encourage landlords to convert single family residences to 5+ resident properties
- GLA proponents claim that the proposal will improve affordable living - but

affordability will only improve for those seeking to rent a room in a house. For those seeking a single-family living environment - i.e. couples, families, etc. - the GLA would reduce affordability of single family homes within the City of Denver.

For the reasons outlined above we sincerely hope that the City Council will not approve the Group Living Amendment on February 8, 2021.

Thank you,
David and Pamela Rogers
675 N. Humboldt St.
Denver, CO 80218

From: [Marc Spear](#)
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](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on Group Living Text Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 2:08:41 PM

Dear Council Member:

I am writing to urge you to vote "no" on the Group Living Text Amendment ("GLA").

Among the reasons you should reject GLA are the following:

1. the economic impacts and equity considerations of GLA has not been fully considered or properly conveyed to Council and the public;
2. the "problems" that GLA proposes to solve are ill-defined and better addressed through other approaches;
3. GLA has been inconsistently presented and deceptively packaged;
4. GLA confounds only tangentially related issues; and,
5. your constituents are overwhelmingly opposed to it.

Economic Impact of Group Homes:

Denver Community Planning and Development ("DCPD") has argued that property values will not be negatively impacted and cites that *"a large body of academic research that has found that property value impacts of formal group homes nearby--including shelters and halfway houses--is negligible, especially when compared to other uses in close proximity like shopping centers and even busy roadways,"* but then DCPD does not limit the placement of "shelters and halfway houses" to be near properties that have already been negatively impacted by their "close proximity" to shopping centers and busy roadways.

- Referencing the same body of academic research cited by DCPD, GLA will harm existing property that is not already in "in close proximity" to value-impairing site amenities like shopping centers and busy roadways.
- In fact, the Denver Assessor's Office flags close proximity to such site amenities as these to be "inferior" and in Capitol Hill applies a 15-27% reduced value to an otherwise identical lot in for such "inferior" amenities as a busy road.
- Using the metrics presented by DCPD and data from the Denver Assessor's Office, the negative impact of new "formal group homes nearby" should be anticipated in the range of 15-27% of the lot's value. This should not be ignored. DCPD should not be misrepresenting these data in this manner.

Congregate Living and Affordability:

1. GLA will decrease the affordability of single-family home ownership because it will increase the economic options available for their use. When single-family homes can be rented to more income-earning individuals, there will be a larger pool of prospective

tenants; demand will increase. This is basic economics and finance. The greater the rent, the higher their value, and the more expensive they become to prospective buyers.

2. Issues of "affordability" are not clearly being defined, perhaps because by the City's definitions, "affordability" is no longer an issue for renters? Consider the following:

- Denver's minimum wage is now \$14.77/hr, which is approximately \$30,000/yr for full-time work. Two adults earning the minimum legal wage in Denver would earn \$60,000 without working overtime or a second job.
- Dr. Amy K. Glasmeier's, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Living Wage Calculator suggests the living wage of 2 adults with no children in Denver County is \$46,059; with 1 child is \$56,591, and with 2 children is \$62,078.
- According to ApartmentList.com the median rent (50% more and 50% less expensive) on a 2-bedroom apartment in Denver in November was \$1,664/mo or \$19,968/yr, which is just under one-third of the minimum wage of two adults.
- That is to say, City Council has already addressed the problem of rental affordability with its minimum wage of \$14.77/hr--two unrelated adults earning the minimum wage can "afford" the median rent of a 2-bedroom apartment, per the definition of Denver's Department of Housing Stability, the median rent. Great job on this.

3. Denver City Council has repeatedly failed in creating affordable housing with new development, and is instead being asked to impose potential costs of "affordable rent" on existing, stable neighborhoods with a high level of home ownership, despite the issues of "affordability" not being clearly laid out.

For example, Denver City Council recently declared victory in its negotiations over 3225 Denargo St, granting the developer millions of dollars of vertical property rights for a 325-unit, 16-story redevelopment that will permanently alter Five Points by "requiring" that 49 units are "affordable" (no more than 1/3 of income spent on rent) to someone making 80% of the AMI.

- The Area Median Income (AMI) for a 2-person household in 2020 was \$80,000 and for a 3-person household was \$90,000.
- For a 3-person household in 2020 this limits rent on these "affordable units" to \$2,000/mo ($1/3 * 80\% * \$90,000 / 12$).
- According to ApartmentList.com the median rent on a 2-bedroom apartment in Denver in November was \$1664.
- That is, rent on these 49 "affordable units" for which City Council traded the soul of Five Points is allowed to be 20% higher than the median.
- The developer's YIMBYs surely cheered the results of that vote, as Council did a poor job negotiating on the behalf of affordability.

City Council is transforming neighborhoods and gifting millions of dollars of new property rights to developers in exchange for "limiting" rent on just 15% of the new units to a whopping 120% of the current median rent, which appears to be a "burden" in name only.

GLA then asks City Council to "increase affordability" for renters by imposing true negative externalities on existing stable neighborhoods and in a tradeoff of decreasing affordability for ownership. City Council should instead be putting the burden of

affordability on the profiteers who are receiving these new extremely valuable development rights.

Instead of accepting GLA as a means to achieve "greater rental affordability", please stop granting millions of dollars to developers without receiving anything of real value in exchange.

Equity Considerations with Group Homes:

While the current distribution of Group Homes may not be equitable, as asserted by GLA's proponents, there are two major issues with GLA that this assertion raises:

1. This means that DCPD is acknowledging that Group Homes are a burden to their immediate community, yet DCPD has marketed an "alternate reality" to this in promoting GLA, stating that they are not. If they are not a burden, then are there equity considerations in their current distribution?
2. GLA does not impose the redistribution of this burden across the entire city, meaning that DCPD's "solution" to the current inequitable distribution is itself inequitable.

Inconsistent Statements from DCPD/Denver:

- DCPD has simultaneously argued that the increased limit on unrelated adults will increase affordability because more people will be able to live together and share the rent burden, yet more recently in the face of opposition states that "our average household size across the city will likely remain close to what it is today (2.3 residents/household)." Which is it? DCPD's misleading marketing is downright disingenuous.
- Andrew Webb has been telling people, "Revisions made at the recommendation of City Council members late last year mean that if all adults in a household are not related, no more than 5 total adults are permitted. This means that unlimited relatives would not be able to live in houses where not all residents are related." However, DCPD's February 2021 overview of GLA states that GLT will "preserve existing allowance for unlimited related adults to live together." This latter position is consistent with court rulings that affirm the right of an unlimited related adults to live together. Statements that revisions have been made to prevent unlimited relatives is false; this *cannot* be prevented.
- Whether this is the result of carelessness, or darker motives is irrelevant. What matters is that City Council members should not vote to approve GLA while people are simultaneously being told that it does opposing things.

Both affordability and equity in affordability are better addressed with policies that focus on the root causes of the problems: disparate economic opportunities.

City Council's recent increase in Denver's minimum wage will help. But issues of equity and economic opportunity can be further and more directly addressed through the creation and expansion of job training programs, apprenticeship programs and entrepreneurship programs that can focus on groups who are being left behind by today's economy and who are at risk being pushed out of Denver by Denver's rapid redevelopment practices. Focus on lifting people up, not harming people who have achieved their dream of homeownership.

In general, the ill-conceived assault on single-family homes, and presumably their owners, by some politicians runs counter to not only the goals, hopes and dreams of so many, but it also to the efforts of many government programs to increase home ownership, including Denver's Department of Housing Stability and its Affordable Home Ownership Program. This is a City program and agency working to increase home ownership and encourage the ensuing neighborhood stability that brings, while DCPD is introducing the GLA text amendment that will decrease neighborhood stability, and increase the rental value of single-family homes, moving them further out of reach of many.

Denver's adoption of bad public policy has left numerous scars throughout the city, culminating in the abandoned and bulldozed stretches of downtown into the 1980's. Actively damaging the remaining family-friendly, single-family neighborhoods in the city may reinforce the potentially disastrous reversal of the 3-decade-long trend of "back-to-the-city" that COVID has already started. This "back-to-the-city" trend has benefited Denver economically in many ways:

- more residents,
- new businesses,
- increased jobs,
- more children,
- increased school funding and better schools, and
- a higher tax base.

City Council should not be implementing policies that encourage the suburban and rural relocation of the affluent that COVID has spurred; policies that drive people out of and economically harm the city are not victories.

Finally, we need honesty from our government. Please insist that the City's departments stop engaging in "alternative facts" just because the practice would support a hidden agenda--even if you view that as a worthy agenda. The ends do not justify the means. Government should be transparent, or it risks further losing the confidence of the electorate which recent history has shown can have devastating consequences.

Sincerely,

Marc Spear
720 Race St
Denver, CO 80206

From: [Linda Nebel Moery](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on the Group Living Amendment - February 8th
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:13:07 AM

Dear Mr. Webb,

I OBJECT to the Group Living Amendment. There are so many unfounded mandates and liabilities that are created by this proposed amendment. It will create many impacts to existing neighborhoods including trash pick up, parking, potential noise levels, schools and so many other community services that are already stressed.

Given the turmoil of Covid this past year, the public is not aware or informed of the details of the amendment or the impact of the amendment.

Linda Moery

Sent from my iPad

From: [Mary Coddington](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Cc: [Jonathan Cappelli](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Neighborhood Development Collaborative Response to Group Living Amendments
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:33:28 PM
Attachments: [NDC Group Living 2021.02.pdf](#)

Good Afternoon City Council and Andrew,

Please see the Neighborhood Development Collaborative's response to the proposed Group Living Amendments attached below.

Thank you for all of the hard work that has gone into this issue.

Kindly,

--

Mary Coddington
Program Manager, Cappelli Consulting

Denver City Council
1437 Bannock St. #451
Denver, CO 80202

RE: Feedback on the Group Living Amendment

Dear Andrew Webb and Denver City Council,

The Neighborhood Development Collaborative (NDC), representing non-profit affordable housing providers, strongly encourages you to support the proposed Group Living Amendments.

Increasing the number of unrelated adults allowed to live together from 2 to 5 increases affordability and allows members of the community the basic freedom to determine the composition of their households.

This change will not result in the density spike that some fear; rather, it will simply formalize a living choice that many people have *already* engaged in during a decade when the cost of housing has risen irrespective of wages. NDC applauds this step and encourages the further step of expunging from the code distinctions between related and unrelated household members.

The amendments also propose expanding areas where community corrections facilities can be sited. These facilities are intended to allow people who have committed a crime to get on their feet and reconnect with society. The core of this ideal is undercut if community corrections facilities are only allowed in places that are segregated from most communities and segregated from access to transit and jobs.

While the expansion of areas available to site community corrections facilities will make a difference in transit and jobs access, distinguishing community corrections from other residential care facilities unfortunately still represents a segregationist mentality. NDC supports the expansion of allowed locations for community corrections facilities and looks forward to a future in which Denver bases zoning choices on characteristics of the built environment and not characteristics of its residents.

NDC would like to thank CPD and City Council for putting in the work to make Denver a more equitable city and for seeking ways to make the city liveable for a variety of income levels. While the proposed amendments will not be a panacea for Denver's affordable housing challenges, they will make an impact. Thus, NDC strongly encourages City Council members to vote yes on these changes.

Thank You,



Jonathan Cappelli

Executive Director
Neighborhood Development Collaborative

NDC Members



Archway Housing and Services



Aurora Housing Authority



Boulder Housing Partners



Brothers Redevelopment, Inc.

Brothers Redevelopment



Colorado Coalition for the Homeless



Colorado Community Land Trust



Colorado Housing Assistance Corp



*Community Resources and
Housing Development Corp.*



Del Norte Neighborhood Development Corp.



Denver Housing Authority



Denver Urban Renewal Authority



Elevation Community Land Trust



Habitat for Humanity



Mental Health Center of Denver



Mercy Housing



NEWSED Community Development Corp.



Northeast Denver Housing Center Inc.



Rocky Mountain Communities



Urban Land Conservancy

From: teyeoman@gmail.com
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No Group Living Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 1:29:12 PM

Andrew,

I am strongly opposed to the Group Living Zoning Amendment. I take issue with allowing homeless shelters in all neighborhoods and up to three shelters within a one mile radius of single family residential neighborhoods. I urge you not to vote to move forward with this amendment and to seek additional solutions to the city's homeless problem.

Thank you,

Tom Yeoman
735 Adams Street
Denver, 80206
720-243-1712

From: [Peggy Richter](#)
To: [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#); [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge, Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Flynn, Kevin J. - CC Member District 2 Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Kashmann, Paul J. - CC Member District 6 Denver City Council](#); [Black, Kendra A. - CC Member District 4 Denver City Council](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [Torres, Jamie C. - CC Member District 3 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Alan Ogden](#); [Russ Hofer](#); [Kathy Anderson](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Proposed Zoning Code Amendment
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 5:28:15 PM

Council President Gilmore and Council Members:

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed amendment to the Denver Zoning Code. We live in the Orion Development in the Boulevard One community in Lowry and our zoning designation is RH-3. Our development is comprised of two- to three-story townhomes. There are no apartment buildings or commercial properties within our immediate neighborhood.

While correctional facilities are prohibited and will continue to be prohibited in areas designated as RH-2.5, they would be permitted in our immediate neighborhood under the proposed amendment. Since the Orion development is not significantly different than areas designated RH-2.5, they should not be permitted here simply because our development has been classified as RH-3.

We object to the proposed amendment for other reasons as well.

To pass such a drastic amendment in one fell swoop, without significant education of, and input and approval from, Denver residents, and without thoughtful consideration of its impact on our community, is inappropriate. The amendment itself is voluminous, confusing and extremely difficult to decipher. We wonder how many people actually understand it, let alone have read it. A far better approach would be to unbundle the significant amendment provisions so each can be fairly and adequately considered and separately acted upon, taking into account specific community concerns.

While the number of residents in a single residence might need to be raised, we are concerned about such a large increase from the previous restriction, without knowing how this will impact our community. We certainly understand the tremendous problems facing Denver, including homelessness and lack of affordable housing, and wholeheartedly agree that more needs to be done to address them. Surely, however, there are better ways to address these problems and related equity issues, and to find narrower and innovative solutions in corrections and other programs, rather than the “shotgun approach” that the proposed amendment delivers.

We also object to the proposed amendment because there have been no studies or analyses of the proposed amendment’s impact on the affected neighborhoods, nor are the residents being given a proper voice in this proposal. Without such studies, there is great potential for unintended consequences if the amendment is adopted in its current form. Ideally, this proposal should be voted upon by the Denver residents; at a minimum, there should be more studies conducted and outreach to residents prior to its adoption. As taxpayers who significantly contribute to Denver’s revenue, we strongly believe that we should be given a

voice concerning the proposed amendment, especially since it has the potential to significantly affect our community and property values.

For the reasons set forth above, we urge you to vote against the amendment, as currently proposed, on February 8th.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy Richter and Alan Ogden

6988 E. 1st Avenue

Denver, CO 80230

From: [Kelly Eigenberger](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass Group Living, Please
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:31:06 PM

Andrew Webb,

To Whom it May Concern:

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

As an educator this is only one thing that appalls me. Do better.

Kelly Eigenberger
keigenbe@gmail.com
3001 fox St
Denver, Colorado 80202

From: [Katherine Cornwell](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:29:52 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Katherine Cornwell
kkcornwell@hotmail.com
4457 Beach Ct
Denver, Colorado 80211

From: [Erin Trickey](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 9:23:37 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Erin Trickey
erin_trickey@msn.com
8433 Tabor Cir
Arvada, Colorado 80005

From: [Malorie Torrey](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 12:32:03 PM

Andrew Webb,

Hello,

I'm writing to urge you to pass the Group Living reforms in Denver. We must begin to address equity in our city through direct action, not platitudes. This action will not solve all housing inequality in our city, but it will help families live easier lives without the burden of living in a situation where they could be punished simply for finding a solution that keeps a roof over their head. Please pass these reforms, they are a vital step towards a more equitable and housed Denver. The following is a form letter from Denver YIMBY, a group which has my full support as a citizen.

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Thank you for reading,
Malorie K Torrey

Malorie Torrey
malorietorrey@gmail.com
2101 N Franklin St, Apt 303
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Andrew Mabe](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 4:07:24 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Andrew Mabe
linguisticness@gmail.com
1275 Josephine St Apt 2
Denver , Colorado 80206

From: [Aishwarya Krishnamoorthy](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Saturday, February 6, 2021 11:43:56 AM

Andrew Webb,

Dear Councilmembers,

When I was freshly out of college in another state, I lived with 2 other housemates for years in small houses. I am shocked that is not allowed by code here in Denver. Allowing even five unrelated individuals to live in a house together would make housing costs more affordable for so many more people in the city; cost of rent could be distributed and renters could seek out homes that were more comfortable for them and still affordable. It would help largely lower-income and sometimes undocumented community members who know they are doing something against code but don't have another choice if they are going to live a reasonable distance from where they do, often, essential work.

Additionally, there is a moral imperative to support people trying to improve their lives after experiencing incarceration or addiction. Community support is proven to be more effective at preventing recidivism, as is access to work and housing.

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Please pass these reforms.

Aishwarya Krishnamoorthy
aish.krishnamoorthy@gmail.com
625 N Pennsylvania Street, Apt 402
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [David Porter](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 10:16:14 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

In many places, including Denver, it is typical for people, especially young people and working families, to live with multiple unrelated people sharing an apartment. This is a result of the housing affordability crisis which necessitates that people come together to help each other afford housing.

I have personally lived in homes with up to 5 unrelated people, in another city. It is shocking to me that this is illegal in Denver. Please pass these overdue reforms and change the outdated housing rules in Denver that worsen the affordable housing crisis.

Please also consider the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

David Porter
dporter802@gmail.com
625 Pennsylvania Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [Aaron Pott](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 7:52:58 AM

Andrew Webb,

Tonight is the vote. I implore your rejection of fearmongering opponents and encourage you to support the group living amendments.

I know many many households in Denver that are technically "illegal" due to having housemates. It's a brilliant, integrated and supportive way to live in this city. I have lived in Denver in shared houses for the past 13 years and it has been phenomenal way to live. Finding equitable ways to share resources is the only way this city will survive in the long term. Thank you!

Aaron Pott
pott.aaron@gmail.com
3554 Marion St.
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Emma Whitehead](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:20:33 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Emma Whitehead
emma.a.whitehead@gmail.com
5710 East 11th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80220

From: [Evan Orth](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:22:21 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Evan Orth
orthe90@gmail.com
98 South Emerson Street
Denver, Colorado 80209

From: [Macon Fessenden](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:22:32 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Macon Fessenden
maconfessenden@gmail.com
1412 Steele street
Denver, Colorado 80206

From: [Mariana Diaz](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:23:20 AM

Andrew Webb,

As a resident of Denver who's landlord has decided to not renew their lease I know first hand how difficult it is to find housing that is safe and affordable.

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Please vote to pass the group living reforms as a small step forward for residents of Denver and continue to work for additional reforms.

Sincerely,

Mariana Diaz
Resident of District 10

Mariana Diaz
diazmari13@gmail.com
1975 Grant Street UNIT 409
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [Helen Holmes](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 1:32:24 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Helen Holmes
hholmesco@gmail.com
2417 Jay Street
Edgewater, CO 80214

From: [Jonathan Oswald](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:26:36 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Jonathan Oswald
jwoswald1008@gmail.com
1050 Sherman Street, 111
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [Paul Jacobs](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:27:11 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Paul Jacobs
pauljacobs117@yahoo.com
1600 Glenarm Place, APT 604
Denver, Colorado 80202

From: [Alex Miller](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:28:04 AM

Andrew Webb,

Dear City Council,

You all have a chance to alter the course of history in Denver for the better. With a yes vote on this proposal, you will ensure that Denver can be a city where newcomers and longtime residents alike can build a new city culture while respecting what came before. Additionally, ensuring the laws restricting group living are a thing of the past can help us build denser housing that will help combat the causes of climate change.

As a new resident myself, I do not want to live or raise my children in a city that isn't forward thinking, modern, and looking towards a sustainable future. Take action to pass group living reform now and make Denver a more inclusive city.

Alex Miller
alex.miller.973@gmail.com
3203 N Saint Paul Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Jerry Tinnow](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:27:59 AM

Andrew Webb,

I fully support the group living proposal now before Council. In my own neighborhood (Wash Park West) houses with more communal arrangements would be assets. They would bring greater diversity to the neighborhood and also reduce the cost of living here. In doing so they would facilitate de-gentrification, which is just as important as preventing gentrification-related displacement in other neighborhoods. All Denver neighborhoods should be open to everyone.

Jerry Tinnow
Jerry@WestUrb.com
864 S. Corona St.
Denver, Colorado

From: [Brittany Ballard](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:30:06 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Brittany Ballard
brittany.ballard@gmail.com
6227 East 35th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80207

From: [Luke Teater](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:35:27 AM

Andrew Webb,

Dear City Council,

You all know how housing prices have risen dramatically in Denver, making the city increasingly unaffordable for anyone who makes less than the median income.

Until we reprioritize our zoning code to make it easier to build all kinds of housing, Denver will continue to become a city that's increasingly only accessible to the wealthy.

I don't want to live in that city. I want Denver to be a city that's welcoming and affordable to everyone.

One of the few options available to low-income workers to make their housing more affordable is to live with more people. Please pass the group living reforms to make this option more viable, to make Denver more affordable to everyone.

Thanks,
Luke Teater

Luke Teater
luke.teater@gmail.com
3328 N Williams St.
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Steven Bassett](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:36:34 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Steven Bassett
steven.j.bassett@gmail.com
1286 Raleigh St
Denver, Colorado 80204

From: [Megan Johnson](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:37:15 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Megan Johnson
emailmeganjohnson@gmail.com
2858 Jasmine Street
Denver, Colorado 80207

From: [Robert Queen](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:40:16 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis? Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Robert Queen
queenrw6@gmail.com
1180 Clermont St, Unit 301
DENVER, Colorado 80220

From: [Luke Wachter](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:46:55 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Luke Wachter
luke.wachter@gmail.com
1264 Grant ST. #304
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [Mary Beth Wells](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 2:17:18 PM

Andrew Webb,

I live in Park Hill and am retired. I have lived in co housing communities in other cities in the past and I find them an innovative solution to so many aspects of the housing crisis that we face. What constitutes a family has changed a lot in the last 50 years.

Updating the zoning code to reflect these changes will provide a more accurate definition of what is a family.

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Changing the zoning laws to allow unrelated people to share a house gives folks a chance at living affordably in our cities. It benefits the very people we want to have in our communities. The teachers, artists writers, public service folks, health care workers and entry level professionals are exactly the kinds of people we want in our neighborhoods. Most of these young are not able to enter the housing market and build equity. Shared housing makes that possible.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods. objection there is a reasonable solution. Please pass these common sense reforms.

Mary Beth Wells
pdxwells@gmail.com
1535 Ivanhoe Street
Denver, Colorado 80220

From: [Amanda Groziak](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:47:29 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Amanda Groziak
amanda.groziak@gmail.com
3333 Oneal Pkwy, Apt 3
Boulder, Colorado 80301

From: [John Hersey](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:48:25 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms.

John Hersey
john.hersey@gmail.com
1750 North Gaylord Street, C
Denver, Colorado 80206

From: [Elyse Appelgate](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:52:56 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

If the city does not feel it is appropriate to regulate the number of family members sharing a home, then it should take the same approach to people who are not related. Household composition has changed drastically in the last 50 years and our housing stock no longer matches it. Allowing people to make independent decision about who they live with should standard, not a debated provision of this ordinance.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Elyse Appelgate
elyse.appelgate@gmail.com
1241 N Pennsylvania St
Denver, Colorado 80203

From: [Linda Hsieh](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:09:23 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities. The laws are outdated and these reforms are overdue.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, and analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do this minimal action. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis? Can you do more to meet this moment?

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing of your decisions.

Linda Hsieh
hsiehchilin@gmail.com
2658 w 1st Ave
Denver, Colorado 80219

From: [Leah Chsrney](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:14:06 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Leah Chsrney
leahcharney@gmail.com
3628 Humboldt Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Stephen Benchik](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:15:48 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Stephen Benchik
stevebenchik@gmail.com
1974 S University Blvd #7
Denver, Colorado 80210

From: [Kellie Thompson](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:41:05 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Kellie Thompson
kknthomp@gmail.com
2823 West 28th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80211

From: [Sunni Benoit](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:44:53 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

As a college student I could not have survived if I did not have multiple roommates. Currently, in the midst of a pandemic when many people are out of work and cannot afford their housing, accommodations need to be made. Have more than 2 unrelated adults living together is commonplace and will not create any type of public safety hazard.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Sunni Benoit
sunnis99@gmail.com
1255 North Ogden Street, 502
Denver, Colorado 80218

From: [Annie Rice](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:47:02 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Annie Rice
arice194@gmail.com
1901 E 13th Ave APT 2L
Denver, Colorado 80206

From: [Logan Meyer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:47:19 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Logan Meyer
logan.t.meyer@gmail.com
847 N Ogden St
Denver, CO, Colorado 80218

From: [Leslie Smith](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 4:43:07 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Leslie Smith
leslie.roberts21@gmail.com
7126 Frying Pan Dr.
Frederick , Colorado 80530

From: [Sydney Burke](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:54:18 PM

Andrew Webb,

Collective living is nothing to be frowned upon, it is to be embraced and only helps those living this way/those in the surrounding community.

The crisis we have been in necessitates the ability to share rent among many people. This in no way infringes upon the ability of folks outside of these communities, nor causes any harm to property value, parking opportunity, or noise level.

Please vote to help the many people who seek alternative living. Make this option available. It has served and completely revolutionized the lives of so many in so many different places all over the country and world.

-Sydney Burke
Park Hill, Denver

Sydney Burke
sydburke24@gmail.com
3660 Holly Street
Denver, Colorado 80207

From: [Avery Stahl](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:04:30 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

As someone who has lived in intentional co-op and community living situations for the majority of my adult life, I was shocked at the lack of availability for this type of household when I first moved to Denver. It was through an incredible group effort that my wife and I were able to create a community house in Denver, and I want it to be easier for those who come after me to choose to live this way.

Thank you for your consideration.

Avery

Avery Stahl
averystahl101@gmail.com
8140 East Fairmount Drive
Denver, Colorado 80230

From: [Dagny Wise](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:10:37 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Dagny Wise
wise.dagny@gmail.com
8140 E Fairmount Dr
Denver, Colorado 80230

From: [Lisa Escarcega](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:37:16 PM

Andrew Webb,

Dear City Council,

I have written very few letters to the city. The issue of group living however has moved me to do so.

Below is a form letter that does capture the essence of my thoughts. I myself experienced homelessness on several occasions both when I was very young and as a young adult. We were eventually able to find housing - exactly what is NOT available to the extent we need here in Denver. I have particular concern about the student homeless population and the need for expanded group living options. Thank you for your time.

The letter:

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Lisa Escarcega
laescarcega@gmail.com
5068 Yosemite Court, Valentia
Denver, Colorado 80238

From: [timothy kunin](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:38:49 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver housing has become unaffordable for many. While Denver has tried to make housing affordable for many by raising taxes to pay down rents for a few lucky individuals, it doesn't help the overall market. What we need is a plentiful, instant, and available supply of rental housing that comes at the simple action of allowing group housing. Please pass this reform!

Thanks,
Timothy Kunin

timothy kunin
tkunin@gmail.com
252 Inca Street
Denver, Colorado 80223

From: [Sam Liman](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:55:31 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Sam Liman
myohygiene@gmail.com
2550 North Washington Street, Apt 404
Denver, Colorado 80205

From: [Crystal Middlestadt](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:59:50 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Crystal Middlestadt
crystlnm@gmail.com
400 South Decatur Street
Denver, Colorado 80219

From: [Jordan Bell](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 6:18:31 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Jordan Bell
belljorsan08@gmail.com
5903 Pierce St Apt 302
Arvada, Colorado 80003

From: [Anthony Robinson](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 3:56:12 AM

Andrew Webb,

Hello Denver City Officials:

I am writing to note that I am in full agreement with the sentiments expressed in the letter regarding group living drafted by YIMBYDenver, and pasted below. Please pass meaningful legislation supportive of group living, which not only helps address Denver's housing crisis, but also fosters a culture of creativity, diversity, and humanity in our city. Denver is definitely a big and bold enough community to embrace group living. -- Tony Robinson

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Anthony Robinson
tony.robinson@ucdenver.edu
3008 South Grape Way
Denver, Colorado 80222

From: [Amy Burrow](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 12:38:56 AM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Amy Burrow
amburrow15@yahoo.com
3201 Brighton Blvd
Denver, Colorado 80216

From: [Sarah Shields](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 11:20:18 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Sarah Shields
sarhanshie@gmail.com
4598 Wyandot st
Denver, Colorado 80211

From: [Benjamin Hand-Bender](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 10:26:31 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Benjamin Hand-Bender
Bhandbender@gmail.com
1375 Poplar st
Denver, Colorado 80220

From: [Christina Walley](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:29:31 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Christina Walley
cwalley12@gmail.com
1111 Ash St APT 701
Denver , Colorado 80220

From: [Scott Cutler](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Pass Group Living Changes!
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:27:49 AM

Andrew Webb,

Council,

Please support the Group Living Changes being presented this evening. Denver's housing crisis is unprecedented and the limit on 2 unrelated adults per household is extremely limiting. Peer cities like Seattle have much larger caps on the number of unrelated adults being able to live together, and have not experienced the problems being presented by the opposition to this ordinance.

The overpolicing of low income people, students, LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, people of color, and people readjusting to life after incarceration needs to end. Passing the Group Living Changes will allow those individuals, and anyone desiring to live with roommates or in co-ops, the peace of mind to live in peace without fear of eviction or legal action.

The arguments of those opposed to the changes are rooted in discrimination and privilege. Denver's current limits are overly restrictive and a shameful relic of past discriminatory efforts. If someone has a 4 bedroom home, then those rooms should be able to be filled and not sit empty.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. I would highly encourage you to consider increasing the proposed new minimum from 5 to 8, or base it on the number of bedrooms in the home.

Thanks.

Scott Cutler
scottrcutler@gmail.com
1690 Detroit Street, Apt #1
Denver, Colorado 80206

From: [Casey Cupp](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Pass group Living
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 12:14:02 PM

Andrew Webb,

Please support the marginalized in our society. We need to give opportunity people the opportunity to live without putting so much of their income into housing. Please pass group living.

Casey Cupp
gcaseycupp@gmail.com
791 Madison Street
Denver, Colorado 80206

From: [Jennifer Hoffman](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please allow group living!
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 9:38:24 PM

Andrew Webb,

Dear City Council members,

The housing reform question is particularly acute given the large number of people in Denver who are struggling with jobs and rent due to COVID. The pandemic has only worsened the housing crisis and put vulnerable communities further at risk.

Please pass these reforms without compromise. We need real change that will move Denver toward its environmental and equity goals. Giving in to the whims of privileged groups will only further entrench discrimination and energy inefficiency in our neighborhoods.

Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing. Your decision should prioritize their needs rather than those of residents who are only concerned about their property values.

Thank you for your service, and please pass the strongest measure you can to relieve housing pressure on vulnerable constituents.

Jennifer Hoffman

Jennifer Hoffman
tyq4hw7zqa40@opayq.com
3901 E. Yale Ave.
Denver, Colorado 80210

From: [Deena Larsen](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please modernize our residential requirements
Date: Saturday, February 6, 2021 9:02:44 AM

Dear Mr. Webb,

Please support the well thought out plan for modernizing residential requirements and raising the number of non-related people who can live in the same house.

I think this is important for our future. We need to let people rent out rooms and work as a community. Kids may have to be online for school or need care--and it would be much easier for people to share a house and child-rearing so everyone could work. Or people may need a small amount of assistance informally --so someone who can't do x but can do y can live with someone who can't do y but can do x. (I garden, you cook kind of deal).

Also consider the savings to the state by preventing people from living in paid nursing homes or groups. For example, I need help with some basic tasks due to my disability--and I rent the second house on my property to someone who can help with those tasks. I can then help her with the few basic tasks she needs that I can do. Without this type of arrangement, I might not be able to live independently and I would cost the state Medicaid money as I might be forced to live in a nursing home. There are many others in a similar situation--so allowing people to live in a house in an informal arrangement that does not rise to the level of state care or a group home will help save money and allow people to live independently.

I understand that there may be objections but we can maintain quality neighborhoods by using other flexible solutions than arbitrary limits on households.

Thank you
Deena Larsen
3205 West Kentucky Ave
Denver Colorado 80219

From: [Bryan Blakely](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please pass group living
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:30:21 AM

Andrew Webb,

We're in the middle of a housing crisis that's impacting service providers, renters, and vulnerable communities.

Please don't give in to arguments based on prejudice. Please don't give-up on environmental and equity goals. That's not compromising, that's giving in to fear and allowing zoning to be used as a tool for privileged groups to enforce discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but also take a close look at the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Does this passing even come close to matching the gravity of this crisis?

Bryan Blakely
bryan@turncorps.com
510 GRAPE ST
Denver, North Karelia 80220

From: [JOYCE REDWILLOW](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RESPONSIBILITY OF CITY COUNCIL
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 12:45:03 PM

The unfortunate role of City Council.

In my opinion, the mayor is opportunistically using city council to forward his own agenda to join the other major city mayors in a national crusade based on the concept of systemic discrimination. The Mayor may eventually be remembered as a positive or destructive force to the well being of the city, but it is the City Council membership that will be remembered as the agents of change.

Seattle is an excellent example of this. A mayor who is now reviled for allowing the destruction within the city, but in the end, it is his city council that enabled the results. Possibly in recognition of this fact, following the public introduction of the Amendment and its public opposition, Mayor Hancock has largely been absent in both the advocacy and support of his vision. Like Seattle, our City Council alone will be remembered for its role and resulting legacy.

The traditional authority granting City Council to approve massive irrevocable changes on the property rights of the residents is equally as obsolete as the zoning code it seeks to change.

It is also opportunistic that the Mayor and City Council have chosen to base the decision and authority to change the zoning code on traditional legislative codes and case law. I would challenge this based on fact that the pre-existing unilateral statutory authority is also obsolete. Why? Because it grants unilateral power to the Council to make massive permanent changes without equal representation of the residents whose property interests will be radically changed.

The Amendment was neither introduced nor discussed prior to the election, therefore depriving residents of full disclosure regarding the intent of candidates.

The plan was not widely discussed before the election. Although it is now evident the Amendment had been in the planning, development and promotional stages for months, it was not formally introduced to the public until **after** the election. A debate prior to the election would have provided residents an opportunity to evaluate both the plan and the individuals supporting it. Given the magnitude of present public opposition, I believe we have to ask if the current council members would have been elected? Most likely not.

All of the above conditions mandate that a "No" vote by City Council is both appropriate and necessary.

From: [DEAN F FLANDERS](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] REZONING
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 1:12:34 PM

I live in SW Denver

The results of this rezoning are as follows, this will result in More Crime, Anxiety, Fear and more Traffic.

Knowing some of you people do not live in the rezoning area, i can readily realize your opposite attitude.

Why are you not volunteering to participate, given your attitude ?

Your attitude provides my no to the rezoning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Doug Heaton](#)
To: [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Coun](#)
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](#); [District 9](#); [City Council District 10](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Vote No on Group Living Text Amendment Unless Further Revised
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:44:38 PM

Dear District 8 Council Member Herndon and all other City Council Members,

After a clarifying discussion with Andrew Web, I'd like to refocus my comments to you:

My hope is that you all can understand that 5 unrelated adults living together will behave differently than a family. That in a family, shared cars are a commonality, but when there's 5 unrelated adults who are all working towards their own private homeownership, each adult will have their own car. Single family homes and their neighborhoods were never designed to sustain 6 cars to one lot. Historic neighborhoods like district 8 have many old garages where no cars are parked on the lot due to substandard parking conditions and garage sizes. On top of that, to remodel a garage means the sewer lines are required to be replaced if they're clay in material. So, many homeowners are parking on the street in our area.

Different from my previous understanding, the new limitations on parking are for parking allowed on the house lot for a household (related and unrelated). So, max 6 cars could technically be allowed/ parked on a lot barring they meet all other requirements of zoning. There is no limit or proposal to limit how many cars a household can park on the street, and it appears the only avenue to prevent overparking on streets is by seeking, as a neighborhood, to obtain permit parking only. This is a drastic measure and may be difficult to obtain. The fear lies in that unrelated adult households will pose a problem if there's no means to mitigate overparking the streets.

I've also been told that because there wouldn't be any permitting requirements for allowing multiple unrelated individuals to live in a house there wouldn't be a trigger to verify or require that property owners maintain a minimum number of on-site parking spaces.

So, my suggestion is that this amendment be revised to require an online permit be filed annually by a household of unrelated adults in one house that also acts as an affidavit that requires and commits that the property owner has and will maintain two parking spaces are accessible and utilized on the lot. It would act as a promise by the homeowner. If they cannot truthfully say yes, then they would be required to provide the parking before being allowed a larger number of unrelated adults over 2 to live there. Then, if surrounding neighbors find parking becomes an issue because a group of unrelated individuals in a household are parking all their cars on the street, they have some immediate recourse to alleviate the burden.

There is also no need to have the 1 extra car per household beyond 5 for a group of unrelated individuals. Instead, this requirement should be worded as 1 car per adult + 1 extra car per household up to a maximum of 5 cars. Then, even with 5 individuals in a home only 5 cars will be allowed on the lot. However, if there's two adults living in a house they could have 3 cars per their household.

My other previous concerns about residential care appear to be unavoidable since apparently (as I was told) alcohol and drug abuser are considered handicapped and so they have some rights protected by federal law to create facilities to care for these individuals anywhere. I'm uncertain why residential care is not considered a business (which honestly it should be considered a healthcare business), and it should not have the right to exist in a low-density residential zoned neighborhood. All other business endeavors that would otherwise be required to accommodate a person with a handicap would not be allowed in a residential area just because of who they care for. Likewise, a wellness center (yoga, chiropractic, etc) that says they help

rehabilitate people with handicapping injuries would be prohibited from caring for patients out of a house. So, what is the difference? I continue to be against any consideration of drug and alcohol residential care facilities existing within single family home neighborhoods.

To sum it up, I'm for the approval of this amendment only if it includes:

- A permitting process that records the house is being inhabited by unrelated adults and requires an affidavit of sort that commits the homeowner to providing two onsite parking spaces always to be used for the parking of two vehicles.
- Wording for maximum parking spaces on the lot to be 1 car per adult + 1 extra car per household up to a maximum of 5 cars, with exceptions being made for particularly very large lots.
- Provisions to exclude residential care facilities whose purpose is the rehabilitation of alcohol and drug abusers on the premise that they are a commercial use and not a residential one, therefore have they no place in a single-family home neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Doug Heaton AIA

2349 Clermont St

Denver, CO 80207

District 8

Previous message below for reference

From: Doug Heaton

Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 3:48 PM

To: christopher.herndon@denvergov.org <christopher.herndon@denvergov.org>

Cc: districtone@denvergov.org <districtone@denvergov.org>; kevin.flynn@denvergov.org <kevin.flynn@denvergov.org>; Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org <Jamie.Torres@denvergov.org>; kendra.black@denvergov.org <kendra.black@denvergov.org>; DenverCouncil5@denvergov.org <DenverCouncil5@denvergov.org>; paul.kashmann@denvergov.org <paul.kashmann@denvergov.org>; jolon.clark@denvergov.org <jolon.clark@denvergov.org>; district9@denvergov.org <district9@denvergov.org>; district10@denvergov.org <district10@denvergov.org>; kniechatlarge@denvergov.org <kniechatlarge@denvergov.org>; ortegaatlarge@denvergov.org <ortegaatlarge@denvergov.org>

Subject: Vote No on Group Living Text Amendment Unless Further Revised

Dear District 8 Council Member Herndon and all other City Council Members,

I urge you to vote NO on the Group Living Text Amendment unless they add the additional revisions below:

Particularly, the allowance of 6 cars to a single family home is unacceptable and would overburden our streets especially for homes that do not have any on-site parking provided. I live in District 8 in an older neighborhood where many of the houses have garages that were not designed to fit modern size cars. That results in typically all cars on the streets. Also, as a household we share cars

and make due with sharing rather than each of us having our own. Thus we have less cars on street and do not impact the rest of the neighbors and their visitors. Allowing 5 adults each to have a car and even one extra will burden our streets and impact the convenience of finding parking for my family and our guests, especially when parking restrictions or trash days are in effect. 6 cars for one house parked on the street is just plain unacceptable for unrelated or related adults.

The parking requirement should be altered to reflect a transit oriented attitude, and limit the number of allowable cars and reflect a real household that shares a couple cars and rides transit. Specifically, the one additional car for each household is not necessary and should be removed. Also, for those property owners seeking to have 5 unrelated adults living together (since it is likely they will each have a car), they should be required to modernize their existing onsite parking to provide and utilize a minimum two-car space enclosed garage so their impact would be only 3 vehicles on the street. Often 2-3 parked cars can fit directly in front of one individual lot, thereby, not placing an undue burden on other neighbors.

Separately, I want to ensure that all residential care facilities, even if 10 occupant and smaller, must be required to notify all surrounding residences when applying for a permit. We should all be made aware when these types of services are entering our neighborhood. If a home is to be altered to suit the needs of these individuals they also should be limited by similar parking restrictions as those noted above. Inevitably they will have adults who work there, and some people in transition who drive cars. We cannot have or support more than 3 on street car spaces + 2 onsite garage spaces in our single family home neighborhoods without negatively impacting the rest of us who have only one household living together.

More importantly, community corrections and rehabilitation for drug and alcohol addictions have no place in a single family residential neighborhood. People facing these rehabilitations should be in a more commercial zone so they do not negatively impact the safety of our children and the residential neighborhood we live in. This type of care is clearly a healthcare service and which technically is not an allowable in a single family home; just like yoga and wellness classes are not allowed to be operated out a single family home. Rehabilitating drug and alcohol addicts are not appropriate in our family oriented neighborhood.

It is not clear to me that any of these concerns for small residential care facilities have been addressed.

Please do not approve this amendment unless it incorporates the below items:

- Limit number of allowable cars to 1 per each of the 5 unrelated individuals, remove the language allowing one additional car for each household, and require that a 20x20 clear min size 2-car garage onsite shall be required and be maintained and utilized as parking during any unrelated adult household scenario.
- Require that all residential care facilities regardless of size (even if 10 and under) shall be required to notify all surround residences when applying for a permit.
- Require parking limitations consistent with those denoted directly above for small residential care facilities that may appear in our single family home neighborhoods. Any ratio that would allow more than three cars on our neighborhood streets and two on the lot is unacceptable.
- Prohibit facilities whose purpose is drug and alcohol rehabilitation from being allowed in single family residential neighborhoods. These are not compatible uses to families with small kids.

Sincerely,

Doug Heaton, AIA

2349 Clermont St
Denver, CO 80207
District 8

From: [Seventh Ave Neighborhood Association](#)
To: [dencc - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#)
Cc: [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](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association RNO OPPOSES the Group Living Zoning Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:43:12 PM
Attachments: [1454446612440.png](#)
[SANA Letter in Opposition to Group Living Amendment.docx](#)

February 4, 2021

Denver City Council Members and Mr. Webb:

This communication is being sent by the Board of the Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association (SANA) on behalf of the Members of the organization. This letter is in response and opposition to the proposed Group Living Amendment (GLA) and Denver City Council's scheduled final public hearing and vote on the GLA at its meeting next week on Monday, February 8th.

At our January SANA General Membership Meeting the Membership overwhelmingly supported a list of concerns with the proposed GLA and the SANA Board officially adopted the list of concerns. In addition, SANA Membership unanimously approved SANA opposing adoption of GLA, and the SANA board was authorized to formally oppose the GLA and to participate in any measures necessary to ensure adoption of it in its current form is not approved by Council.

Although we have previously provided a more detailed list of concerns to Councilman Hinds and we are informed that you have been further contacted in opposition by our neighboring RNO's and an immense number of other constituents, we wish to highlight some of the more serious, high-level issues that SANA sees with the GLA. Among other concerns, our membership identified these issues as being of the greatest concern:

- Issue 1: The planning and drafting processes have lacked thorough public notification, transparency, and engagement.
- Issue 2: allowing density in all single-family homes to increase by a minimum of 150% -- from 2 to 5 unrelated adults plus unlimited minor children -- in any size home, during a time of COVID-19 leads to crowding concerns that will inevitably result in increased school densities, trash, noise, parking, and infrastructure problems.
- Issue 3: allowing new 1-10 person, 24/7 homeless shelters, possibly operated by entities other than churches or other non-profits, with expansion to 100 guests for 130 days, and correctional-facility "halfway houses" in our neighborhoods, with no buffer from schools, is of grave concern.
- Issue 4: GLA prohibits the ability of neighbors to object to homeless shelters being placed in their neighborhood, or even next door to them; notification only.
- Issue 5: GLA appears to be a veiled effort by the city to commercialize single-family neighborhoods as service providers and investors will inevitably buy up what limited, existing single-family housing stock exists, having the reverse effect on affordability and accessibility of these neighborhoods to individuals and families who are not seeking to live with roommates or in City or State ordered correctional housing.
- Issue 6: Current Denver residents are being asked to sacrifice the quality of life created by their existing neighborhoods to allow for increased density in exchange for

the hope that affordable housing will happen at some point in the future.

To be clear, while SANA supports the planning process and will always strive to support efforts to diversify our community and Denver citywide, sacrificing our safety and quiet enjoyment of our neighborhoods to accommodate the GLA's ill-conceived arguments relying on issues of race and social justice does not accomplish that goal. That is why SANA residents voted unanimously to oppose the GLA at our January 2021 General Membership Meeting, and we strongly urge you to vote in opposition to its adoption on February 8.

Instead of racing to the finish line on this fatally flawed and permanent zoning change, let's take the time we need to fully discuss and align the community on a new plan that takes into account the lessons we've learned over the last year. The Mayor's office claims that, "This is about making housing options available for everyone, including adding more flexibility for those who are struggling, and ensuring that our policies reflect our values as a city," but from the immense opposition to the GLA it should be evident to them (and you) that the GLA is *not* representative of the City's values or priorities.

City Council does not have the moral authority or a mandate to make this change. The GLA will have a huge impact on our city, and the public hearing process does not drive the type of engagement that City Council would need to have engaged in to pass the GLA in good faith. The GLA was not proposed before the last election therefore voters did not give City Council the mandate needed to enact such a major change to our city. I hope you will not abuse the public trust by leveraging the power of your vote to support such a radical initiative without allowing voters the power to weigh in properly.

Despite the City not having followed a more inclusive and appropriate procedure for engaging with constituents regarding the GLA, we believe voters in Denver *have* found ways to educate themselves and engage, and the result is overwhelming and shouldn't be ignored. Voters in Denver, through their RNO's, contact with their Council people, letters and calls to CPD, and otherwise have shown undeniable *opposition* to the GLA, and Council needs to listen and respond accordingly.

A plan to address housing issues that is responsive to and prioritizes the input of RNOs and residents over that of developers and other special interests is sure to gain the support of both residents and business - let's make that our goal, not what is being presented through the GLA now.

Thank you for your consideration,
Board of Directors, Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association

SANA Denver
contact@sanadenver.org





Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association

SANA Board
Seventh Avenue Neighborhood
SANA Denver
contact@sanadenver.org

Denver City Council, and
Community Planning & Development
Sent via email to:
andrew.webb@denvergov.org
dencc@denvergov.org

October 5, 2020

Denver City Council Members and Mr. Webb,

This communication is being sent by the Board of the Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association (SANA) on behalf of the Members of the organization. This letter is in response and opposition to the proposed Group Living Amendment (GLA) and Denver City Council's scheduled final public hearing and vote on the GLA at its meeting next week on Monday, February 8th.

At our January SANA General Membership Meeting the Membership overwhelmingly supported a list of concerns with the proposed GLA and the SANA Board officially adopted the list of concerns. In addition, SANA Membership unanimously approved SANA opposing adoption of GLA, and the SANA board was authorized to formally oppose the GLA and to participate in any measures necessary to ensure adoption of it in its current form is not approved by Council.

Although we have previously provided a more detailed list of concerns to Councilman Hinds and we are informed that you have been further contacted in opposition by our neighboring RNO's and an immense number of other constituents, we wish to highlight some of the more serious, high-level issues that SANA sees with the GLA. Among other concerns, our membership identified these issues as being of the greatest concern:

Issue 1: The planning and drafting processes have lacked thorough public notification, transparency, and engagement.

Issue 2: allowing density in all single-family homes to increase by a minimum of 150% -- from 2 to 5 unrelated adults plus unlimited minor children -- in any size home, during a time of COVID-19 leads to crowding concerns that will inevitably result in increased school densities, trash, noise, parking, and infrastructure problems.

Issue 3: allowing new 1-10 person, 24/7 homeless shelters, possibly operated by entities other than churches or other non-profits, with expansion to 100 guests for 130 days, and correctional-facility "halfway houses" in our neighborhoods, with no buffer from schools, is of grave concern.

Issue 4: GLA prohibits the ability of neighbors to object to homeless shelters being placed in their neighborhood, or even next door to them; notification only.

Issue 5: GLA appears to be a veiled effort by the city to commercialize single-family neighborhoods as service providers and investors will inevitably buy up what limited, existing single-family housing stock exists, having the reverse effect on affordability and accessibility of these neighborhoods to individuals and families who are not seeking to live with roommates or in City or State ordered correctional housing.

Issue 6: Current Denver residents are being asked to sacrifice the quality of life created by their existing neighborhoods to allow for increased density in exchange for the hope that affordable housing will happen at some point in the future.

To be clear, while SANA supports the planning process and will always strive to support efforts to diversify our community and Denver citywide, sacrificing our safety and quiet enjoyment of our neighborhoods to accommodate the GLA's ill-conceived arguments relying on issues of race and social justice does not accomplish that goal. That is why SANA residents voted unanimously to oppose the GLA at our January 2021 General Membership Meeting, and we strongly urge you to vote in opposition to its adoption on February 8.

Instead of racing to the finish line on this fatally flawed and permanent zoning change, let's take the time we need to fully discuss and align the community on a new plan that takes into account the lessons we've learned over the last year. The Mayor's office claims that, "This is about making housing options available for everyone, including adding more flexibility for those who are struggling, and ensuring that our policies reflect our values as a city," but from the immense opposition to the GLA it should be evident to them (and you) that the GLA is *not* representative of the City's values or priorities.

City Council does not have the moral authority or a mandate to make this change. The GLA will have a huge impact on our city, and the public hearing process does not drive the type of engagement that City Council would need to have engaged in to pass the GLA in good faith. The GLA was not proposed before the last election therefore voters did not give City Council the mandate needed to enact such a major change to our city. I hope you will not abuse the public trust by leveraging the power of your vote to support such a radical initiative without allowing voters the power to weigh in properly.

Despite the City not having followed a more inclusive and appropriate procedure for engaging with constituents regarding the GLA, we believe voters in Denver *have* found ways to educate themselves and engage, and the result is overwhelming and shouldn't be ignored. Voters in Denver, through their RNO's, contact with their Council people, letters and calls to CPD, and otherwise have shown undeniable *opposition* to the GLA, and Council needs to listen and respond accordingly.

A plan to address housing issues that is responsive to and prioritizes the input of RNOs and residents over that of developers and other special interests is sure to gain the support of both residents and business - let's make that our goal, not what is being presented through the GLA now.

Thank you for your consideration,

Board of Directors, **Seventh Avenue Neighborhood Association**

SANA Denver

contact@sanadenver.org

From: [Sandi Petti](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] TODAY'S VOTE
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:50:00 PM

MORE THAN 10,500 DENVER TAX PAYERS HAVE SIGNED THE PETITION
AGAINST THE GROUP LIVING ZONING CODE AMENDMENT.

**LISTEN TO THE INDIVIDUALS THAT VOTED FOR YOU AND PAY YOUR
SALARY - VOTE NO !!!!!**

SANDRA PETTI



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: [DiscoverTheSelf](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The Group Living Amendment
Date: Saturday, February 6, 2021 12:12:57 PM

Dear Persons,

I am a Bear Valley home owner. Property taxes are \$2000+/year.

You are my elected representatives.

I do not wish to have corrections and homeless facilities in my neighborhood.

I'm asking you to vote NO!

I'm sure you will do as politicians do, and do what I ask.

David Hoefer

From: [Carol Nelson-Douglas](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VOTE NO GROUP LIVING AMENDMENT
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 2:18:17 PM

Feb. 7, 2021

Dear Project Manager, Andrew Webb:

This letter is to protest the Proposed Group Living Code Amendment that most Denver's City Council are in favor of passing.

I have lived in my home, 3946 S. Jersey St. for almost 36 years. I have raised my family here and hope to remain in my home for the remainder of my life. We have had a happy life here; the neighbors are considerate and friendly, the homes are maintained, the streets are safe with light residential traffic, and there is very little crime.

In 2017, a home on 3888 S. Jersey St. was proposed by developer Vincent Ku to become an Assisted Living Residence (amended to A Small Residential Care Facility). I attended the standing room only meeting and remember him explaining that he intended to refit the house with 7 bedrooms for 8 residents charging each \$4,000 a month. That is revenue of \$32,000 a month, \$384,000 a year. Kendra Black, the Council representative for our neighborhood, seemed absolutely bewildered that our neighborhood was united and very vocally against turning this single-family home into a nursing facility and obviously lucrative business for developer Ku. No one, and I mean, no one wanted this business in our neighborhood.

I receive offers to buy my house in the mail and on the phone every week. The calls come from 'investment groups.' Well, why is that I wonder.... Let me guess, turn my home into a group living residence for up to five unrelated adults, charging each up to \$2,000 a month or more, whatever the market will bear, after all, this is a very desirable neighborhood; that is at least \$10,000 a month and \$120,000 a year revenue. My Southmoor Park neighborhood has around 200 homes... do the math.

I understand from news articles that this Group Living Housing Proposal is being driven by developers. As a Denver resident for over 35 years, I have seen every inch of available land plus many office buildings being torn down and turned into high-rise apartments. With all available land gone, the developers are now wanting to consume our neighborhood for commercial purposes under the pretense of expanding single family-owned homes into multiple owned; when in reality, the homes will be owed by a landlord/developer and become expensive rental or commercial housing.

Single family homes are expensive in Denver. It was expensive when my husband and I bought this house in 1985 and out of our reach for us financially. We had a hefty mortgage and luckily the owner agreed to give us second mortgage. I do not believe for one minute that carving up this neighborhood and turning it into profitable businesses and multiple housing units for unrelated adults is about making more available housing; it's about greed.

Sincerely,

Carol Nelson-Douglas

From: [Ron Dreher](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#)
Cc: [district3](#); [district5](#); [District 9](#); [Blynn, 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, John 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; [Kniechallarger, Deborah Ortega](#) - Councilwoman At Large; [Webb, Andrew](#) - CPO City Planner Senior; [Hancock, Michael B.](#) - MO Mayor
Subject: [EXTERNAL] VOTE NO ON THIS GROUP LIVING THING
Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021 11:47:08 AM

THIS POSTER EXPLAINS WHY THE MAJORITY OF THE CITIZENS OF DENVER ARE
OPPOSED TO THE MAYOR AND HIS STAFFERS' DESIRE TO IMPOSE UPON US WHAT
WE DO NOT WANT IN OUR LIVES AND OUR NEIGHBORHOODS. **VOTE NO**
AGAINST ALL OF IT



Ron Dreher

From: [Arroyo, Ashley E.](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [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](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote No-Group Living Amendment
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 5:27:37 PM

Dear Council:

I'm writing to express my vehement opposition to the "Group Living" zoning amendment. I understand there have been changes, but they are not enough. This zoning change goes too far and affects too much of the City. It is extremely disappointing that the City has continued down this road despite the vast opposition from the majority of its residents, and now has gone on a propaganda advertising campaign on social media. Pushing this through during a global pandemic--at a time when RNOs (and the City) can only do virtual outreach and meetings is appalling. I request a "no" vote.

Ashley

Ashley E. Arroyo

Partner

STINSON LLP

1050 17th Street, Suite 2400

Denver, CO 80265

Direct: 303.376.8423 \ [Bio](#)

Assistant: Amani Clinton \ 303.376.8417 \ amani.clinton@stinson.com

STINSON.COM

This communication (including any attachments) is from a law firm and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please contact the sender for instructions concerning return or destruction, and do not use or disclose the contents to others.

From: [Eva Dyer](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vote to Oppose the Group Living Amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:50:21 PM

Regarding: **allow new 1-10 person 24/7 homeless shelters** in all neighborhoods, with expansion to 100 guests for 130 days, and no buffer from schools:

I am a licensed therapist trained in urban planning, marriage and family therapy, and clinical psychology. Among other certifications, I'm trained to deal with marginalized populations, drug additions, trauma (both PTSD and developmental). I've worked with the homeless population and have visited homeless shelters throughout the years to help them receive help. There is actually, as Major Hancock has stated, hundred of unused beds. When I asked the homeless why they don't want to stay in shelters they state the following reasons: 1) they have severe mental health problems and prefer living outdoors, 2) they have long-term drug addictions and cannot use drugs in the shelters and therefore would rather live in tents; furthermore they have failed to benefit from multiple drug programs and wish to use illegal drugs away from surveillance, 3) they have developed a homeless culture that doesn't fit into affluent neighborhoods, 4) some have documented pedophile records and cannot be around children in families that are sheltered in homes, 5) shelters don't accommodate irregular work hours, particularly night hours, 6) shelters require they be quiet and asleep by certain hours when they would rather be up and around, 7) they were unable to comply with staff rules.

The problem is that unless addiction is solved, mental health workers cannot treat the often many other mental illnesses. Addiction obstructs help with the other areas.

Rather than create more shelters and again see those who need to use them sleeping in our neighborhoods and throughout the city in unsheltered ways, we need to help existing shelters better accommodate and provide treatment for the homeless. At some point, the homeless are human beings who are choosing a way of life. I don't believe that creating more shelters when existing ones are not being used is the answer. Instead, we need to allocate tax funds for properly supervised psychological and medical treatment programs, allowing the homeless continuous engagement with professionals.

In regard to allow up to 3 homeless shelters within a 1 mile radius in single family residential neighborhoods:

I owned an office building at 7th and Grant behind the Governor's mansion, a mixed residential and office area. Whether it be office workers or residents, we were literally attacked by the homeless who created sleeping nests in back yards. They attacked us with long knives and syringe needles, and one knocked me unconscious with a board. Such conduct is dangerous and illegal. They trespassed repeatedly, sleeping on front porches and under bushes. We'd arrive at work and have to step over sleeping bodies in sleeping bags. They urinated and defecated on the proper, in flower pots, and throughout the yard areas. We couldn't meet with clients that way but

would have to schedule only during mid day and only after calling the politics to remove the sleeping homeless from our premises. The police were trained to deal with the homeless in caring ways but I witnessed myself repeatedly that the homeless attacked the police without provocation, in one case stabbing the policeman's eye with a syringe needle. While we might say it's not the fault of the homeless with mental illnesses and drug addictions, some were identified criminals who were sought after. There is no way to screen who is dangerous and who is not. And in more cases than not, we found ourselves dealing with highly dangerous and illegal behavior and treatment. We would have to pay extra fees for special cleanup of thousands of syringe needs throughout the grassy areas, under bushes, throughout the property.

Because so many of the hard-core, long-term homeless have untreated conditions and repeatedly resist treatment provided, they are not safe within a mile of residences in my opinion and based on years of seeking to help them. The residents will move away and the neighborhood will become degraded. I sold my work/residential property because it was so dangerous to work there and my clients refused to visit the facilities that were beautifully fixed up and otherwise maintained. All the residents moved away. The property became devalued, was sold, buildings original to the city were torn down, and new densely-occupied apartments built in stead.

Eva Dyer
685 Humboldt Street
Denver, CO 80218
720 373-3404

From: [Winston Downs Community Association](#)
To: [dence - City Council](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Planning Services - CPD](#)
Cc: [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Sandoval, Amanda P. - CC Member District 1 Denver City Council](#); [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](#); [Sawyer, Amanda - CC Member District 5 Denver City Council](#); [Clark, Jolon M. - CC Member District 7 Denver City Council](#); [CdeBaca, Candi - CC Member District 9 Denver City Council](#); [Herndon, Christopher J. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council](#); [Gillmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#); [Jimenez, Christian - MO Associate Administrator](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] WDCA/SHNA Opposition Letter to GLAC
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 7:28:20 PM
Attachments: [Final GLAC Response Feb 2021Rev1.pdf](#)

South Hilltop Neighborhood Association joined with Winston Downs Community Association to oppose the text amendments as they are currently written. See attached.

Although recognizing the Citywide need for affordable housing, WDCA and SHNA remain concerned with a number of things contained in Text Amendments which will have negative planning and economic impacts on Winston Downs and South Hilltop. We feel, as written, it is overall bad planning policy, bad timing for such changes and that it will not resolve homelessness or affordable housing issues the city faces.

Respectfully,

--

Stay safe, mask up
Winston Downs Community Association
South Hilltop Neighborhood Association

Winston Downs Community Association/South Hilltop Neighborhood Association

February 4, 2021

To: Denver City Council Members
Denver Planning Services
Mayor Michael Hancock

Re: WDCA/SHNA Opposition to Proposed Group Living Text Amendments (GLAC)

Winston Downs and South Hilltop neighborhood organizations respectfully submit the following comments, concerns and continued questions for Council consideration before you vote on this very serious change to zoning codes.

When one looks at the whole versus the sum of pieces, this massive zoning code change during this complicated and sobering time in our country (pandemic, economic crisis, high unemployment, unrest triggered by the George Floyd murder, etc.) not only feels mistimed, but also lacking in meaningful participation by RNO's.

Looking at Denver's growth from both an historical and broader view, it is not difficult to see that many of the more recent decision-making has been developed in silos – and often implemented by a small number of handpicked community members – without consideration of long-term effects on the city or unintended consequences.

Sadly, GLAC has become an extremely divisive and polarizing proposition among neighborhoods as well as among Council members. Furthermore, with all of the continued questions about GLAC, (some of which have not been answered fully), it should be apparent to Council that this plan is neither fully understood nor ready for implementation without causing any number of unintended consequences.

We ask that Council give adequate weight to testimonies made by residents (written and oral) across the city. We need to consider solutions to these critical infrastructure impacts, before such massive potential strains are implemented.

This document is confusing for us. Even if we have stated facts or context incorrectly, we ask that you please do not dismiss the intent of concerns because *we don't know what we don't know*. We are lay people trying to make sense of a very complex document.

Lastly, thank you for diligently working on the Group Living Text Amendments/GLAC as well as permitting our two RNOs to make feedback on the plan.

Winston Downs Community Association (RNO)
South Hilltop Neighborhood Association (RNO)

Winston Downs Community Association & South Hilltop Neighborhood Association Oppose the Group Living Text Amendments for the Following Reasons

Broad Concerns

- ***Broad-brushed, omnibus text amendments*** for the whole of Denver are not equitable in the long run. What works for Capitol Hill may not work for Sloan’s Lake or Southmoor Park. Please also consider areas within Chapter 59 which are exempted altogether—that translates to unfair advantage by certain areas –areas where people like Mayor Hancock reside.
- Group Living text amendments will **change the context of a residential neighborhood** according to the Denver Zoning Code decided upon and adopted in 2010, so to change what the buyer thought the neighborhood context and character was if purchased prior to GLAC changes (if approved) is like having the rug pulled out from under them.
- ***Lack of basic understanding***: The plan is written in unclear language; even those who have read it multiple times cannot fully follow its ultimate intent. For example, GLAC refers to items, that are not directly referenced, which then require a deeper search for pre-existing codes - often difficult to find online—and even then, are not clear.
- **A majority of residents know very little about the plan** except that “more people can live in one house”. Further, they know little or nothing about Residential Care or that larger lots could be converted to house up to 20 people, or other than a brief mention, much of anything about congregate living.
- ***The makeup of the workgroup*** did not have adequate neighborhood representation from the west, east, north or south. In fact, neighborhoods, HOA complexes who are not Registered Neighborhood Organizations may not have received notifications or updates.
- Who will be overseeing residential care homes? These amendments put most of the ***evaluation, monitoring and oversight burden onto RNO’s*** and communities - something that Denver seems to be doing more frequently. While we want to participate in making stronger communities, oversight is not our job as taxpayers.

Additionally

- We are concerned about Denver’s adoption of ***occupancy standards based solely on square feet of a unit or property size*** with no regard to the number of bedrooms, bathrooms and inhabitable space, the impact of crowded conditions on child and senior health along with the impact on school performance for youth.
- Owning a home is still a primary wealth-building tool for this state and our country but this ***plan’s intent seems to alter the context and character of all of Denver’s neighborhoods***. This actually has the potential to trigger an exodus of taxpayers which might trickle down to challenging the quality of city living, schools and so on.
- ***Burdens to our existing infrastructure***: The possibility of multiple 20-person households in a neighborhood could affect utility and service usage such as water, wastewater, electric, gas, police, postal, fire, etc. Residents could potentially be burdened by overcrowding in home units not designed for this increase in occupancy.

What's Missing

- GLAC still needs to **fulfill its Charter obligations to inform and gather feedback** from affected residents in all eleven (11) Council districts. There was not adequate neighborhood representation on GLAC; presentations to RNO's glossed over the details that truly matter, such as density requirements for Type 2 Residential Care and who is accountable.
- We, the public, **never saw the results of the work that was chartered to be published about untended consequences.**
- ***In our opinion, it does NOT solve affordable housing issues.*** Crowding people together doesn't reduce earnings to landlords; landlords could still raise rents to large groups of people, so the "affordable" intent may be lost with this plan. Nothing in this code, or otherwise, has been put forth as evidence this will help affordable housing.
- ***It does NOT realistically solve homelessness issues*** – homeless people in need of special services such as mental health facilities, drug addiction help is very different from people who have become homeless due to hardships who want to get back on their feet. And, those groups are different from those who simply prefer to not have a home. What incentives would reduce homelessness for ALL who experience it is a better question to start with.

WDCA and SHNA Ask CPD to Remove Homeless from the Residential Care Category

WDCA and SHNA request that the Homeless category be removed from the plan and for the City to address this independently. We have volunteers ready to serve on advisory committees. Here's why we ask this:

NO ONE at the City level was able to advise us how much money, in total, went towards homeless efforts in 2019 before numbers would have been inflated by Covid-19. The City can't tell us because there are so many different expenditures across different departments. Adding another layer via code changes is just adding another layer, not resolving deeper issues.

What We Suggest:

That the City develop a comprehensive view of what's being done now, how the homeless tax will play into the picture and then, and only then, work on a plan to address homelessness in Denver.

We recommend the City start with the 2019 total expenditures for every facet of homelessness, define categories of spending and then conduct a gap analysis of what's working, what's not working, and what's missing in order to develop a strategy that makes more sense long term. In fact, we all might benefit from this; Denver has been at this for over a decade and is not making ground.

In the meantime, the homeless could be offered temporary space in easily remodeled, empty office buildings, made vacant from the pandemic. Rather than using neighborhood homes, we could successfully utilize developers' commercial spaces for shelters, many of which are close to needed homeless social and medical services.

If GLAC passes: We, at minimum, recommend for residential zoning SU, TU, RH, etc. to follow a plan like Family Promise with homeless families staying in homes. We ask that neighborhoods not endure a change of populations each night, daily lines forming to get in, portable toilets for expansion, etc.

Issues with Homeless Provisions

- These amendments have loop holes such as an SU zoned home could become a Type 1 Residential Care (RC) use pretty easily. By that change from residential use coupled with the fact it might sit on a 12,000SF lot, means it could then become Type 2 RC use and without notice from the city to the neighborhood.
- Unfortunately, there are no density or spacing restrictions defined for properties with 12,000 SF lots (Type 2 and Type 1), so in neighborhoods where there are multiple lots there is no control over how many become shelters or other RC with up to 20 people living in a home unit. There are assumptions, but the loopholes make it a slippery slope.
- There is no apparent oversight for providers of homeless “shelters,” thus no enforcement other than 311 or 911 which is actually just citizen oversight. When you add that to the fact that 311 is complaint-driven, often with little resolution other than a series of citations, there is no remedy for residents to depend upon.
- Question: Why is the City relying on network of nonprofits to manage the reported 5,000 homeless instead of working on real solutions like requirements for all new residential buildings to provide a percentage of units that are affordable – perhaps smaller units with less “design” upgrading?
- Since most nonprofits cannot afford to buy homes in pricier neighborhoods with intent for using as homeless shelters, it again puts the burden of this “spreading out” onto lower income neighborhoods.
- If homeless get no cost housing, do they then fall under other housing placement organizations? Who pays the mortgages and associated fees? What might be the residents’ incentive to take on fiduciary and maintenance responsibility going forward?
- What would prevent investors from buying available housing stock (especially on larger properties) to develop for profit, thus reducing housing stock available for renters who might be attempting to purchase?
- Unclear definitions on “small”, “large” capacity as well as under what terms and who evaluates and monitors especially when capacity exceeds 20?

Overall Health & Safety

- Emphasized here again: since some residential care (i.e., homeless shelters) are not regulated, what regulatory steps will be implemented within this text amendment or along with others to ensure the health and safety of Denver residents? We are thinking of issues like portable toilets and tents as well as loitering, trash, etc.
- Impacts from over-crowding on safety, health and infrastructure.
- An increase in crime related to increased numbers of vehicles left on streets and subsequent increased insurance rates are potential unintended consequences, plus added vehicles on the street that add to traffic woes.
- Many neighborhoods are far from services that the homeless need with minimal transportation options in some parts of the city.

Number of Unrelated Living Together

We are unclear about who asked for this to be changed

- Frequently, there are problems when too many people are living or congregate at one property which has led to disturbances that drew police and subsequent NIS attention.
- Why five and not four – same as apartment rentals now?
- Why is this not aligned with HUD and United Nations standards?
- Over-crowding impacts are very real, especially on young minds.

Other Questions:

- Where would existing GNA's stand under new code? Or, MOU's?
- Can RNO's set up MOU's with shelters and larger facilities? Will the city pay for this?
- How does this change impact city budgets, staffing? Homeless dollars in budget? Income from homeless tax?
- Since Denver now has a homelessness sales tax, where does that fit into the overall budget assigned to those experiencing homelessness? What's the plan?
- How will 311 be beefed up to handle the myriad of new calls?
- Who will reimburse those who bought homes as investments for future well-being once homes get devalued when an unlicensed residential care (homeless shelter) goes up next door and runs off the buyers?
- Where do facilities like Pegasus Courtyards Senior Living fit in? Are they counted as a Type 2 or 3 facility when spacing and density are reviewed?

ADDENDUM

What Else Neighborhoods/Communities Are Facing

- NPI has not been visibly productive in developing unity or changes that make people feel safer or better off; it's just resulted in much time spent to an unknown end.
- Lots of talk about transportation improvements, but they are not visible other than more bike lanes which seemingly take priority over street maintenance, traffic calming and safer crossing for bikes and pedestrians. Transportation plans basically indicate "walk or bike" as transportation options for city dwellers.
- Denver Water taking 15 years to replace dangerous lead pipe service lines and struggling to keep up with outdated sewer lines and providing clean water for all.
- Affordable housing inventories reduced and continued replacement with luxury condos that exclude affordable ownership, and, what's puzzling is these developer-driven projects are still being approved by Council.
- Reduction of Open space and climate change directives – contradictions in sustainability.
- Revamped policing – most of us don't know what it means for our personal safety.
- Low staffing on NIS, 311 – lack of public confidence in this system of inspections, citation follow up, etc. (Example: 660 S Monaco Pkwy)
- Soon to come infill projects – who is that serving? Why was that not combined with NPI? And why was Group Living not addressed until after those were completed?
- Soon to come marijuana legislation that is governed by citizen oversight.

WDCA and SHNA understand the difficult tasks communities across the country face in trying to create fair and equitable housing for its residents; however, due to the pandemic, its effects on the economy, significant unemployment and monumental health concerns, this nexus of city complexities suggests a **pause is necessary** in the plan to change Denver zoning codes at this time.

It seems more prudent that we stand in place for a time and determine solutions that can be less egregious to residential communities while considering the welfare of all Denver residents.

Therefore, might we now instead want to concentrate and spend funds on solutions to ensure the health of our residents, repaired infrastructure, increased transportation and employment, rebuilding public education as well as facilitate different, community solutions to housing shortages?

Shouldn't we build a legacy that shows how Denver can shine in times of turmoil, rather than further this contentious zoning code change?

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our input and suggestions.

Respectfully,

Winston Downs Community Association
South Hilltop Neighborhood Association
Registered Neighborhood Organizations
Council Districts 5 and 6

WRITTEN COMMENTS WILL BE DISPERSED AS FOLLOWS:

Written comments received by CPD staff by 12 p.m. (noon) on the Thursday prior to the City Council public hearing will be included in the CPD staff report packet that is distributed to City Council. Written comments may be emailed to PlanningServices@denvergov.org. After 12 p.m. (noon) on the Thursday prior to the City Council public hearing and up until 3:00 p.m. on the day of the City Council public hearing, written comments should be emailed to dencc@denvergov.org. To submit written comments after 3 p.m. on the day of the City Council public hearing, bring copies of written comments to the public hearing and ask the Council Secretary to distribute the comments to the Council. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in order to provide Council members adequate time to review written comments, members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit their comments prior to the day of the public hearing.

From: [Rev. Dr. Craig Whitcher](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] When I was a single youth and young adult affording rent was always difficult and rentals sparse. Working summers on Cape Cod, living with my peers, was the only way to afford housing. In fact, when I graduated grad school and began making ...
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 1:07:11 PM

Andrew Webb,

Denver is in the midst of a housing crisis that has put a strain on service providers, renters of all incomes, and vulnerable communities.

Conceding to prejudices and giving up on environmental and equity goals is not "compromise." It's retreat, cowardice, and giving up.

The zoning code should regulate safety, not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods.

Please pass these reforms, but analyze the toxic culture that caused you to ask activists, service providers, and community members for thousands of hours of labor so you could do the very bare minimum. Tonight there are over 1000 homeless DPS students in our city and 1/3 of your constituents pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Do your actions match the gravity of this crisis?

Rev. Dr. Craig Whitcher
craigwhitcher@gmail.com
1200 Humboldt Street
Denver, Colorado 80218

From: [Ron Dreher](#)
To: [District 1 Comments](#)
Cc: [District 9](#); [district3](#); [district5](#); [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 Coun](#); [Hinds, Chris - CC Member District 10 Denver City Council](#); [Gilmore, Stacie M. - CC XA1405 President Denver City Council](#); [kniechatlarge](#); [Deborah Ortega - Councilwoman At Large](#); [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [Hancock, Michael B. - MO Mayor](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] article in Denver Post about Group living proposal
Date: Friday, February 5, 2021 10:06:27 AM

to the City of Denver Council Members,

I am attaching the article just in case you have not read it yet. It spells out briefly the concerns by Paige Burkeholder.

In her area as well as all that I know who live in the city of Denver we share the same opinion that this proposal being forced upon us by outside profiteers will not profit any of us in the city but those who put this proposal forward.

Are we citizens being washed down the drain as unimportant to the administration and our neighborhoods sold to the highest bidder so to speak? We get nothing from this. The group who proposed this gets all the money. They have no care for the people who live in the city, all we are is an opportunity for these profiteers to make money off our neighborhoods and the Denver citizens.

VOTE NO PERIOD TO ALL OF IT

A yes vote means you support the profiteers over the interests of your own Denver citizens. Your vote will tell us where you stand regards your constituents and their interests in their own homes, lives and neighborhoods.

Remember we are still allowed to vote unless the scanning machines for the ballots are fixed.

s frnbrt boyrt Ton Ftrhrt

--

Ron Dreher

From: [bob.bob](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] do not Pass group living
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 6:20:02 PM

Andrew Webb,

embrace the call for unity don't pass

bob bob

bob.bob124154235@gmail.com

818 Water St

denver, Colorado 80211

From: [stacy tichy](#)
To: [Webb, Andrew - CPD City Planner Senior](#); [dencc - City Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] group living zoning code amendment
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 9:09:13 PM

I became a resident of Denver over 30 years ago. I also established and owned an elderly group living home at 2177 S. Golden Court in Denver, so I understand the process of obtaining permits for group living.

That being said, I urge you to **vote NO** on the group living Amendment on Monday, Feb 8th. The reason being: each group living residence should be looked at INDIVIDUALLY by zoning to keep safety and integrity in the Denver neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods might need to have a group living home, with a restriction on the number of cars that would be allowed. Other neighborhoods might be able to have more vehicles parked in front of a house. If the home is on a bus route, maybe only 1 or 2 cars would need to be approved for that particular address. My point is that group living is **not "one size fits all"**.

Going through the process of obtaining a permit for group living, does not take an attorney or any special degree. I believe we had our permit in 3 months time. Opening up group living without a permit can damage a street and neighborhood, because there is no double checking on the number of group living homes and the number of residents in an area. If you have multiple group living homes side by side the density may be greater then the neighborhood can handle. I am not against group living...I think it is a fine living option. I am against not having a to obtain a permit to open a group living residence. As a community we need to keep our neighborhoods safe and the density of residents appropriate to each individual home and neighborhood. This is no different then issuing a liquor license, or opening a marijuana shop....we need regulation, so that group living homes are managed with the other homeowners and neighbors in mind. Please vote NO on this amendment.

--

thx-

Stacy Tichy
office: 303-798-8245