









































































**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I wanted to voice my opposition to this proposed change. I am a home owner in the Cory Merrill neighborhood and have discussed this with many of my neighbors and no one is in favor of this as a 'solution' to the housing crisis. I will definitely remember the outcome of your decision when I go to the ballot box for the next City Council and Mayoral election.

You state that: "We need to address many of the concerns you and others have raised if we determine eight is the appropriate limit on the number of unrelated people in a home." I take issue with your statement "If we determine." And with Councilwoman Black's statement: "I agree with you and do not support increasing to 8+. I do think 2 is too few, so I'm supporting 4." Councilwoman Kniech has not bother to respond to my concerns. As City Council representatives your job is to represent your constituents. This is not supposed to be about what you want; it is supposed to be about what your constituents tell you they want! Is putting your desires and Councilwoman Black's desires above the desires of your constituents the first step toward Socialism? If you proceed with this proposal you will be ignoring the majority of your constituents.

I'd like to convey in no uncertain terms how strongly I oppose the Denver Group Living Code amendment zoning changes as written.

8 unrelated adults plus any children, in the example of a 1600 SF house, plus their 9 automobiles, and only requiring 1 bathroom, is beyond preposterous, as is allowing Community Corrections halfway houses virtually anywhere in the city.

The ripple effects of the dramatic increase in population to already crowded Denver are staggering to consider. A few that come to mind are added burden and strain on virtually all city services such as law enforcement/911 and fire stations. How about Denver public schools? Hospitals, emergency responders and myriad other service providers? Sanitation? Traffic? The DOT?

With the insanity of quadrupling cars trying to park in a neighborhood, how long before a child or bicyclist is hit by a car because drivers can't see them? How long before fire fighters cannot maneuver their equipment into to an area and people die? Before a halfway house resident does serious harm to someone, perhaps a child?

I asked a committee person some of these questions at one of the recent public meetings and their answer was some research had been done and you don't expect these problems to occur. "Willful Ignorance" is the most polite way I can think of to respond to that!

I'm also incensed at the damage to our property values that will result from the mess this will undoubtedly create, after decades of working very hard to keep my Denver property and neighborhood a safe and pleasant community in which to reside.

Just as constituents may opt to add things like permitting ADU's to their neighborhood, so should neighborhoods have an ability to vote to opt out of aspects of these Group Living changes being forced upon them by, let's face it, the city for its own political agendas and a minority of residents.

I have lived in the in the Hampden Hills Residential neighborhood for the past 10 years, and actually grew up here in the 70's 80's and 90's and have seen a number of proposals and changes affecting the neighborhood. This one is among the worst, certainly the one that would have the most negative impact. I chose to return to this neighborhood after living in Parker for several reasons: It was convenient to desired amenities, the neighborhood was predominantly family oriented, it was quiet and peaceful and neighbors interacted with each other. This proposal would permit up to eight unrelated individuals to live together in a residential home and would dramatically change the desirability of the neighborhood.

If you are not aware there are already several houses in our area where four or more unrelated individuals live together and the appearance of home and yard reflects the lack of personal interest. Four inhabitants, four cars. There is no enforcement of current code regulations, and it seems improbable that there would be any enforcement of regulations under the proposed plan. It doesn't take much imagination to visualize the detrimental effect this proposal would have on our neighborhoods. Imagine eight unrelated people living in a neighboring house, eight cars parked wherever, some in the garage, some in the driveway, and others on the street, not counting cars from visiting family, boyfriends, girlfriends, and other acquaintances. Single family neighborhoods were not established to have eight, possible more, cars lining the streets, causing more congested driving conditions in addition to more noise and safety concerns for families with children. This proposal is a disaster for residents who value neighborhood integrity. Yes, there is a problem with the high cost of housing in Denver but it's certainly not fair or appropriate to place the solution to the problem on the backs of homeowners who have chosen to live where they do in order to avert the very situations this proposal would create. I recall the exodus from Denver when mandatory school busing went into effect years ago when children were bused away from neighborhood schools to other schools miles away. While that was a Federally mandated program, a program like the one being proposed could create a similar scenario. I and others in my neighborhood will be watching this closely and you may be assured we'll do what we can to inform our neighbors and friends. Incidentally, the meeting leaders did not allow attendees to express their collective opinion of the proposal through a show of hands. Had they done so, it was apparent from comments made during the Q&A session that the overwhelming sentiment would have been in opposition. The effort by the Denver Group Living Project is a complete waste of time and money. To have spent two years of study, committee meetings, and numerous public meetings on a plan that should have been obvious from the start would have strong opposition is, to me, another example of bureaucratic involvement when it's not necessary or justified. This is a misguided effort to solve a problem caused by an accelerated increase in population and lack of a proportionate increase in available housing. Individuals who choose to enter the Denver metro area should be aware of the situation and make decisions accordingly. It's not up to single family residential neighborhoods to turn neighborhood homes into mini apartment complexes. It's time to shut down this ill-advised proposal. Sooner rather than later!

Please find attached a letter identifying concerns I have with the proposed amendment to Group Living rules. I would like this shared with the appropriate individuals making decisions regarding this amendment.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

1. The proposed changes will dramatically change the character of neighborhoods - there will be increased traffic, decrease in actually knowing neighbors.

2. Residential Care and Group Living could encompass many categories - Senior Care, Drug Rehab, Halfway Houses. All of these would require special licensing AND employees (increased traffic - and folks coming and going at different hours).

3. From a purely real estate perspective -this zoning change would adversely effect property values.

I understand there is a need for housing and that this is an attempt to solve the issue but I don't think it's the right solution.

I am Real Estate appraiser and have been in practice for almost 50 years. I am qualified as an expert witness in all of the surrounding District Co My experience includes diminution in value on residential properties.

As to the proposed zoning changes, I consulted a forensic land planner that I have worked with in the past. His comment on the changes is: This turn Denver into a third world country! There is no way in hell that "Code Enforcement" could manage this. My professional opinion is there will be a negative impact on property values. I can elaborate if necessary. Of significant concern would be the impact of street parking with no restriction on the number of vehicles per "housekeeping unit" The parking situation is already bad due to past changes in the Denver zoning code relating to parking requirements in higher density developments. Don't allow a bad situation to become even worse.

I strongly encourage you to oppose this outrageous proposal by Denver City planners.

I just became aware of these proposed zoning changes last night. My wife and I have been residents of West Washington Park for over 35 years and have seen many unwelcomed changes in the zoning laws take place over that time frame. However, this proposal is probably the most ill conceived we have seen. We strongly oppose it and request that you do also.

I think you got the tenor of the WWPNA meeting feeling that the group living proposal has had poor outreach, poor response to concerns, and is ill conceived. It may be important to add zoning purposed community buildings such as frats, assisted living, halfway housing and such, but extending to new rules on houses is not acceptable. Allowing unlimited numbers in a single house would encourage piling homeless into exploitative rentals that degrade especially the older houses to the point they invite scraping.

And I wonder how permissible it is (constitutionally) to specify anything about coinhabitants being related; this is undefinable and not the city's business, and shows the proponents' ethical laziness.

The new proposed changes to the zoning code concern me particularly the one that allows for many more unrelated people per square foot. I understand that we have an affordable housing crisis; however, I fear this change as outlined will have damaging consequences to our neighborhoods. Please reconsider and do not support. I really appreciate all your work for our city!

As a human, a sister of single mother on Welfare half the time, and a resident who cares about the people of Denver, I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing.

As a Washington Park West homeowner, who grew up poor, worked 60-80 hour weeks for 15 years to save up for a downpayment on a house, and finally made that dream come true a year and a half ago, I also care about my property values, safety, and peace of mind.

I get the challenges, but allowing 8 unrelated people to live in 1600 square feet is not an adequate solution. The people who will utilize that are struggling families, but kids just out of school and it will dramatically change the property values, safety and quality of life in the neighborhood.

I strongly advocate for alternative solutions that will instead serve and be geared towards families. For example, zoning for tiny homes for struggling families, elderly, etc. (Including Wash Park West - maybe where that school is or the church that hasn't been in use for ages). Space in RiNo for highrises comprised of studios would much better serve the youth just out of college that need housing.

Please, please consider alternatives to this matter.

Again, thank you so much for your service. I know you have a hard job balancing so many differing opinions.

Please vote no to rezoning

My neighbors and I are vehemently opposed to this change of unrelated people living in a dwelling. An awful lot of us have spent an awful lot of time and money to improve our neighborhood. Now the city wants to change the zoning to do just the opposite. People who don't have a place to live have rights, but People who have a place to live have rights too, and they pay taxes, those other people don't. it's ludicrous to suggest up to people and their children, that's insane.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I was hoping to attend the meeting tonight but will not be able to attend. I hope that public input is still open after tonight.

I think this is not well thought out regarding negative impact on both neighborhoods and renters. What is the goal?

If Denver had a robust transportation and mobility system outside of downtown it could work a bit better but we all know that is not the case. So many cars, trucks and trailers will be added to the streets. And Motor Homes. And with random bike lanes and no parking in front - they will be parking in the front yard.

I have noticed group living in single family homes on university Blvd which brings lots of company trucks - clearly small business operating from house. Who decides who lives there. It's like a hostel. Or air bnb. There is no control over what happens.

As a landlord I see some advantage to pack a house with 8 people but more disadvantage in having 8 leases and no one responsible for the property. Plus 8 dogs. I could charge each person \$700 or more which would be a good profit but the overall concern of too many people in one place which will go unmonitored is a bigger problem.

A better solution - Denver create affordable housing as a part of a plan

Don't use zoning to solve the lack of city vision and overall strategy to solve the uncontrolled growth and high rents.

I am writing to memorialize my support for the Group Living Rules Update. I am a Denver resident and homeowner living with my wife in the Clarendon neighborhood. Although we are fortunate enough to be able to afford a single family home, I know many who are not. I was not aware the current law only permits two unrelated adults to reside together and am for the proposed regulation of allowing up to eight unrelated adults to reside together. Community living, even amongst the more fortunate can have significant benefits and our society is shifting back to more community living situations, not only because the cost of living is rising, but because our generation is seeing the benefits of what used to be the norm.

Thanks for your consideration.

I just wanted to send in my support for changing the zoning for number of adults in shared housing. This has been a serious problem for the long time here, and doesn't reflect the needs of non-standard families like those with multiple generations living together, or those who are poly and have multiple loving adults in a home. Thank you for this work.

Dear Mr. Webb,

I have lived in this particular neighborhood for 40 years and cannot imagine 8, even 4 unrelated adults living in a home with an established family. This would change the look and feel of the neighborhood.....excessive automobiles, excessive trash, people coming & going.

I realize the city's need to address affordable housing challenges: however I feel the City Planners need to find a better approach. Why not focus on apartment complexes ? Get the apartment owners/managers to rally putting together package deals. That's where the surplus people can go without ruining neighborhoods.

There has to be a better solution than taking advantage of the innocent citizens of Denver County to make room for the influx.....invited or not.

I vote "no" on the proposal.

Your consideration is highly appreciated.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I appreciate that the majority of participants of the GLAC Committee tasked to address the affordability of housing in Denver Metro area are advocating for the needs of their clients. But only about 8 are speaking for the neighborhoods that could experience the major impact of their decisions. And GLAC has responded with a Zoning change proposal indicating they have minimal interest in sharing your core value of maintain safe and vibrant neighborhoods.

Who could possibly believe that ten unrelated people with unlimited #'s of children is a good idea in a 2000 sq. foot house? With 2 bathrooms?

I admit that I am ignorant about issues related to residential care facilities of all stripes and for all residents. But I do know about safe and vibrant neighborhoods to raise our families. At our Neighborhood Watch meetings we are always advised that the best way to keep our neighborhood safe from crime is to know your neighbors, become familiar with their coming and goings, and check out suspicious activities. We have 7 duplexes and single family homes on my block. At a minimum that's a possibility of 216 adults largely unrelated and who knows how many children to keep an eye on to keep our block safe. And with renters coming and going who knows who lives there and who doesn't. And let's see, unrelated people often have their own cars but in case they share, that's 108 cars on my street with about 60 spaces if everyone knows how to park correctly. I've been told that at a recent meeting when the parking issue was raised the City recommended getting a resident permit. Really, just how would that get 108 permits for 60 spaces?

All around us are enormous apartment buildings towering over our neighborhood at Logan and Speer, dwarfing Mancinelli's garage, and at Downing and Bayaud creating traffic jams and backups past Speer, and at both sides of Alameda at Bannock, which will cause untold backups entering I-25 and reducing light rail parking for neighbors, and so many others. The rationale for the burgeoning numbers of high-rise apartment complexes was the need for affordable housing. And now that is still not enough? You want like Pac Man to swallow up our stable community neighborhoods as well?

The City certainly understands that increased population requires increased police, fire, trash, transportation, meter maids, street sweeping etc, so any tax money is eaten up in services.

City fathers recognize Denver's horrific traffic problem and it seems ludicrous that their solution is to quadruple the number of people living in our neighborhoods, getting on the highway, grid-lock at lights, or fighting for parking spaces near the light rail.

Does addressing affordability have to ride on the backs of current residents or have to be done at the expense of traffic solutions, or at the risk of vibrant and safe neighborhood?

RTD wants and needs ridership and opened or plans train lines to Westminster, Aurora, Thornton, Broomfield. Doesn't it make more sense to "increase housing opportunities and flexibility" where light rail transit is available, and convenient, and where the footprint is not at capacity, necessitating people piling on one another to survive. Seems that the only people benefitting from 8 unrelated people paying rent in a 1600 sq,

I just want to write to say I support the proposed group living changes in terms of how many unrelated individuals can live together. Arguments against have seemed arbitrary and/or prejudiced in my opinion. I thank you in advance for supporting changes that will be more enforceable and could ease housing constraints. I will also add that re-zoning the neighborhood to allow ADUs would also help. These are issues on which the WWPNA has not aligned with my opinion at all. Let me know if you would like to discuss further.

I am writing in regard to the proposed new zoning laws for group homes.

On February 26th, I attended the town hall meeting to better learn about the proposed zoning changes for Denver as well as hear the answers to questions posed by the audience.

We have lived in our single family home in the Hutchinson Hills/Willow Point neighborhood for 26 years. After listening to the presentation on 2/26 and the answers to the audience's questions, I have taken time to consider the proposed changes and share my concerns about allowing a large number of unrelated people to share a single family home.

Renters don't usually have the same vested interest in a property as a homeowner. Renters often do not have the same vested interest in maintaining property and community relations that a homeowner might. I have heard from others about homes with unrelated renters who are loud, have numerous cars parked on the street, have a number of visitors, don't shovel snow, don't maintain the property etc. In fact, just this afternoon after returning from work, a neighbor asked for help with a loose dog who was bothering her own leashed dog. The dog has been barking numerous times – the dog's owner is a renter in the neighborhood. This is the third time I've witnessed the loose dog and I finally brought it to Dumb Friends League.

Not only is a lack of neighborliness and accountability for groups of unrelated renters a potential issue but if there's no or little enforcement now would order be enforced in the scenario of multiple adults (and "unlimited number" of minors) living together?

Eight adults plus an unlimited number of minors living in a 1600 square foot house (+ one adult and unlimited minors for each additional 200 square feet of living space) is too high a density. How would all the cars be accommodated? What about the impact on infrastructure (traffic, schools, etc), especially if property taxes on a single family home would not cover the impacts created by numerous adults and children sharing that home?

Corporations/investors could buy up houses. What is to prevent corporations/investors – again, with no vested interest in the neighborhoods – buying up and treating single family homes as cash cows or scraping modest homes and popping tops so that more people could be shoe-horned into a residence to maximize profits?

A limited number of people, say 3, cooperatively purchasing a single family home as their own residence would be acceptable. Eight people and unlimited minors in a single family home, whether they own the home cooperatively or rent, is unacceptable. Regarding renting to unrelated people the home owner must live on the premises and would have to answer to any City violations (e.g. sidewalks not shoveled). Regarding group homes there should be a limit of 6 per household with a requirement of one aide living full time in the residence for each 3 residents. Proposals for group housing (for the elderly, disabled, ex-cons, those with mental illness) should be presented to the surrounding community and those potentially impacted should have a say in whether or not the project proceeds and if so, how.

Everyone is acutely aware of the high cost of housing in Denver metro but the larger picture should be examined. Perhaps Denver metro has

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

As a resident of University Hills I am writing to tell you that I am completely against the proposed changes in zoning in our neighborhoods. It is too extreme. I would support a change of 4 unrelated adults in a 1600 square foot home. Your proposals would ruin the neighborhoods that we have invested in and cared for over the years. It would bring in more cars and more traffic. As a single older woman, I feel that you are putting my personal safety at risk. We have already had to deal with prostitution, drug dealing, and murder in my subdivision. The city does not have the staff or financial resources to regulate your proposals. I've been instrumental in getting squatters out of abandoned homes in this neighborhood. It took many man hours and countless phone calls because the city could not do it's job. I ran into the man who was beating up older women on the Highline Canal. He was there due to section eight housing.

I will fight these proposals every step of the way. Put it up for a vote for the citizens of Denver. You do not have a right to ruin our city.

Thank you for your presentation last night. I worked for Planning a long time ago and I can appreciate the long evening you and the other staff put in.

I believe the plan needs a bit more work/not ready to roll out - there were too many unanswered questions last night. I understand the need and agree its needed but I believe there are other options that are not being considered.

I also I feel like I'm ground zero for what is being proposed since I live next door to a home already housing several unrelated persons. The land of that home was previously running an Arbnb and Denver shut them down. So now he rents to several unrelated folks. The landlord next door needs to be held accountable as I believe he is currently not complying with current zoning.

I have lived in North Denver all life and have lived in my home for 30 years. I retired from the City and County of Denver, and I'm a single senior who is now considered low-moderate (closer to the lower end) due to rising health costs and property taxes. I have million dollar home being built behind me and one built a block away from me. I plan to age in place even if I have to go back to work. How will the proposed rezoning help senior women like me keep and stay in our homes?

I've read ADUs are being considered for low income areas of Denver but what about expanding that to low/moderate income homeowners instead of areas across Denver and expand partnership with Habitat for Humanity to build the ADUs so seniors are not taken advantage of? Homeowners like me would be able to live in ADU then rent home to a low/moderate income family or persons. I think this is a big opportunity to help senior gentrified neighborhoods to stay in their homes with rezoning for ADUs. ADUs could be built according to income and we could then rent according to struggling families?

Next is what I believe an issue of safety. The city is not dealing with the parking issue which I believe is a mistake especially in established neighborhoods. People have gotten killed because of parking issues here in Denver. I live on a "neighborhood" block where there are at least 3 single seniors, several families and duplexes. I live next door to a home that is currently rented I believe to 3 or 4? unrelated persons with cars. I asked them to move their cars so I have a parking spot; they've begrudgingly complied. And now I'm afraid to walk up to their door since a policeman came asking questions about who lives in that home. I believe they are running a business out of their home where they have people come in to Denver and they take them to the mountains for extended periods of time which means they leave cars parked for several days.

I'm writing about the proposal to allow 8 or even 4 unrelated persons to live in a single family home. Personally I oppose this and the city should not have ended their contract with private community corrections.

As a law enforcement professional for 24 years I can tell you that creating additional outlets and opportunities are not the solution. People don't need more opportunities they need to work within the opportunities which already exist. The increase in capacity taxes resources and reduces oversight and quite honestly I believe will increase crime.

I am a Denver native, having grown up in east Denver, so I have seen many changes, especially in recent years. For years, as a neighborhood association president, I fought massive "pop tops" that sometimes seemed to defy the open space rules in the municipal code, not allowing adequate space for lawns and trees and blocking sun from very close neighbors. We have seen a deterioration of green and open space in Denver. The current philosophy re: planning seems oriented to increase density, attempt to find more "affordable" housing (how's that working?), get rid of cars (while catering to bikes and scooters, trying to co-habitatate the same gateways, which is both an unsafe and unwise solution!). Meanwhile, infrastructure to support it all is taxed and not keeping up. This infrastructure certainly includes parking, water, sewer, the power grid, the engineering to provide for reasonable flow-through of traffic, and other areas. Quality of life has diminished, as we continue to have a pollution problem (from cars, lawnmowers, weed-eaters and blowers), cannot find a timed traffic light anywhere in the city as we are bogged down in ever increasing traffic, build dozens of multi-family units (i.e., apartments and condos) all over the city (many of which are eye-sores), which still have very high rents!

When I first read about the zoning proposal, I had to laugh. Given the rule to allow 8 adults, plus one more for every 200 s.f., we have a modest story home by today's standards (2300 s.f. plus a basement), and my calculation tells me that the city would now allow 16 unrelated people to live in it, plus unlimited related children! This is unbelievable! As I understand it, the code would apply across the entire city, all neighborhoods. It is focused on the newer higher-density-by-design neighborhoods (such as downtown). To me, this is another example of caving in to developers, landlords, and property managers. It causes more issues than it solves, and comes with huge risks. Even if we agree that the current code could use some revision, this is far too extreme! Have you thought about all the peripheral impacts? The numbers of cars, the parking, the utilization of city resources (trash, water, sewer), the increased traffic? This opens up a huge can of worms for what could potentially happen, with this many people potentially living in one residence. It would further lessen quality of life in Denver.

Please come up with a better solution, and preserve what's left of the quality of our neighborhoods and city!

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

From the Hills & Willows March Newsletter, page 3, 'A Letter From Councilwoman Kendra Black':

...While the Federal Fair Housing Act currently allows small group homes (for seniors or disabled people for example) in all neighborhoods, the Denver Zoning Code only allows two unrelated people to live in a home. There are no limits on family members. The proposal will increase the limit to 8 unrelated people (with unlimited family members) in homes up to 1,600 square feet. For every additional 200 square feet, an additional unrelated person can occupy the home. For example, 12 unrelated people (and unlimited family members) could live in a 2,400 square foot home. I do have concerns about this aspect of the proposal. ...

I have great concern about this part of the proposal and do NOT want this change implemented. Our single family home neighborhood should stay a single family home neighborhood. We moved her from a multi-family home complex to live in a single family home neighborhood. I can not imagine 11 people living in our 2200 square foot home (3916 S Wisteria Ct). Yikes!

Thank you for keeping us up-to-date through e-mails and newsletters-it's much appreciated. We worked with Jeanne Faatz over the years (my parents knew and loved her) and are very glad Dana is still working in your office as she's on top of everything and is always very helpful when we need her assistance.

As background, we're the original owners of our home, located in the Glenbrook neighborhood and have lived here for 38 years. We were part of the original homeowner's organization years ago and love our neighborhood. We've raised two children in this home and look forward to retirement at our home which we plan to fully own within 4 years. We have worked and continue to work incredibly hard to have and take care of our home. I purchased our home in Denver County in 1981 to comply with the Denver residency requirement as a City employee as I worked as an RN in the operating room at Denver Health (I probably was the only compliant nurse). From knowing our neighbors and neighborhood, I also know we're in the minority of folks who have lived in the "Blue Ghetto" (the police department also had a Denver residency requirement) this long.

We are aware of the proposed changes to Denver zoning allowing for expanded use of residential properties (homes) for senior living, correctional facility halfway houses and other zoning changes. I've reviewed the information and am unable to make the hearing tonight, but as we're still in the public comment process, I'd like to share some preliminary feedback with you.

Our concerns include the proposed changes to the Household Regulations that allow 8 unrelated adults with no restrictions on the number of residents or total number of people living in a 1600 square foot home. Let's say 8 single moms with 4 children each decide to live together. Under the new zoning, that could happen-32 people living in one house (at least I couldn't find anything that prevents this, so please point me to additional regulations that does). I don't think this situation is a stretch; housing is expensive and I'm sure close to this is happening now-zoning changes not.

Parking would be an issue under this change as well. I'm not sure where 8 more cars are going to park on my street and have seen nothing in the proposal to plan for parking, etc.

Once these changes are made, there's no turning back. Just with the lack of infrastructure planning for growth on our roads, our healthcare system and the handling of our homeless, there are going to be issues with the overall proposed changes where single family homes are turned into multi-family individual residences. We'd never anticipated that we would have any chance that a halfway house for correctional facility inmates would be next door to us in our neighborhood or halfway houses for those with behavioral health issues. As aging residents who will live in our neighborhood, we worry about the impact of these changes.

Please do not allow 8 people to live together in household living. While I agree that we could increase it a little from 2 to help housing affordability, I think 8 is going to far. This means every house could have up to 9 cars just for the adults. Eight adults could easily have 4 teenagers 16+ which would make it 13 cars just for one house. This will be disastrous for both parking and traffic. Please start with a smaller increase. We could make the increase to 4 adults per household which is already double the current standard. Lets see how that goes before we make such a drastic change.

Also, please do not remove residential care categories. Residents should have the right to zone out dangerous facilities such as halfway houses or correctional facilities and not be forced to live next door to them

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I recently learned about the Group Living Proposal meeting that occurred the other day (which I was not able to arrange attendance due to learn about it the day prior). I read about it in my neighborhood meeting minutes (which I was unable to attend 2 weeks ago) and another email from councilman's newsletter. My below input is based upon being a long term Denver resident on the 2200 block of S. Cherokee (24+years) and the I grew up in a very dense population - the borough of Queens in NYC. As a resident, I cannot support the current proposal as Denver needs to be stronger infrastructure before providing some blanket approvals in zoning to this magnitude.

I hope there was enough opposition at this week's meeting for the proposed increase to EIGHT unrelated individuals within a household to be set down. That is a HUGE jump (from 2 unrelated individuals) without a dedicated commitment by the City & County of Denver to enforce such. I understand that it is an outdated 1950's ordinance; however, there are MANY circumstances which the new proposal will create bigger issues with our older Denver neighborhoods. I would be willing to support up to FIVE unrelated individuals in a given household as long as specific restrictions were included, such as a tiered number allowance based upon square footage of a home, for example - 3 individuals for 850 square feet, 4 individuals up to 1000 square feet and 5 individuals up to 1600 square feet; otherwise, situations will occur where density on a neighborhood block are pushed beyond limits... just because people can. Not having perimeters in place can create hardships to neighborhoods as the current ordinance was NEVER enforced to my knowledge (I provided some historical examples below to support my reasoning). I can comment that there are MANY homes already within my community that have non-relative roommates which well exceed that "2", many violators are non-residing homeowners that rent out their properties for the highest gain as they don't have to experience it first hand since they don't live there - how will Denver enforce the "8" to protect the surrounding residents?

A parking plan needs to be developed to support having more individuals in a home as it was not designed when these old communities were built. Majority of the older homes have NO garages and NO curbs/driveways as it relies on street parking & alley access to homes. Parking is already at a premium, with little availability for current residents. For example, our block has 2 hour parking with residential permits for the past 10+ years in order to combat issues since we are near a light rail station. What's the plan when you add more people to the already existing structures? Corresponding to Denver officials, Denver is NO NYC or Chicago as we don't have the transportation infrastructure to support mass transit - the problems with storage are already apparent & needs to be factored. City officials commonly say we have residents without vehicles but that's the minority; not the majority. Eight unrelated individuals in a property will most likely have 3-5 vehicles versus the 2 related individuals who probably only have vehicles.

I am writing to express my opposition to this proposal for potential changes to Denver's zoning regarding "group living" which would allow 8 unrelated people to occupy an 1,800 square foot piece of property (that we'd like to continue to consider a "home" located in a "neighborhood" where we live in Virginia Vale having moved here as a family in 1976. After 25 years of mortgage payments, I am able to call this my home. When we moved here, we selected a neighborhood where we wanted to raise a family. The homes on our street are very nearly the same in square footage and were purchased by other families also desiring a neighborhood to raise their families. How is it that a city council would consider it to be fair and to juxtapose our expectations (based on zoning as well as our dreams) with a decision that disregards what we spent 25 years paying for and establishing friendships and a neighborhood community. Helter skelter growth in Denver driven by greed has been allowed and the result is a city that is unable to accommodate the influx - whether it be the executive positions and industry that we've welcomed (which also drove up housing prices) or the wanderlust of "urban dwellers" lured by the availability of marijuana (another mistake). So, we are apparently at a turning point and the City Council is finding it a viable option to load up the neighborhoods and turn what were our homes into extended stay motels. I feel Virginia Vale and Virginia Vale will be among the first victims. We own houses now considered reasonably priced in today's market and are a prime location for highway access, access to downtown, etc. They would make a particularly attractive purchase. Many of our homes have full finished basements, adding to the attractiveness of high occupancy. I don't need to mention the impact to traffic and parking issues when 8 occupants move in with 6-8 cars. (NO THEY WON'T BE RIDING BIKES, WALKING OR TAKING BUSES or LIGHT RAIL as many would have us think.) We have tolerated for years the violations that have occurred in our neighborhoods with more than 2 unrelated people living in these neighborhoods, knowing that they would never bite off enforcement. If it was not enforced over 2 unrelated occupants, we know what we can expect with 10-15 occupants under the new zoning code. There is currently a home at 1390 S. Holly that is obviously occupied by more than 2 unrelated occupants. They have a small circular driveway in the front yard that normally has 5-6 cars parked on weekends. Additionally, last weekend there were two more cars parked on the lawn and 3 more around the corner. So there were 10 cars involved. I believe I speak for my neighbors on South Ivy Street when I ask you to please respect the time and effort we have put into purchasing our homes, mowing our lawns, shoveling our walks, meeting our neighbors and making our street one that we want to continue to live on and love on as we have for years. If this is enacted, let's start with Crestmoor, Hilltop, Washington Park or Belcaro to be the first to welcome the extended stay motel. Somehow I don't see that happening. What about HOA bylaws that exempt themselves? I plan to attend one or more of the upcoming meetings and am doing my best to make my neighbors aware of the change that can be in the future for us. We are already dealing with large developments at Evans and Holly and Louisiana and Colorado Boulevards. Enough is enough, please. I notice that the information listed one bullet point in the communication we received as "require Community Information meetings for larger residential care uses to notify neighbors." I'm not sure I understand the wording "larger residential care" - and I certainly hope the meetings are more than information on a deal that City Council is already considering done. I would so appreciate it if your office would send me

**YOU ARE TREADING ON ME!**

So you are saying to me that my neighbor who owns and lives at the duplex next door (3022-3024 Osceola Street) with 3900 square feet (1800 square feet per duplex) one bathroom, two bedrooms per duplex can have 9 people in each duplex for a total of 19 PEOPLE? UNBELIEVABLE!!!! Forget the Corona Virus...hello plague! There were reasons for the "out dated zoning code"!!!! Yes, I would like to live in Manhattan but I and a bunch of other people can't afford it so they commute! That's life! Remember the USSR failed. I can't even try to be nice.....What a bunch of

P.S. This duplex owner was invaded by S.W.A.T. AND I will be calling 311 and the police every chance I get!

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

First off, thank you to the City, its employees, and elected representatives for hosting this series of Open Houses to discuss proposed changes to group living regulations. I very much appreciate you all and members of your staff taking time out of their personal schedules to facilitate these informative events at a time that is convenient for the residents of Denver to have their voices heard.

I've been a resident of Denver for 13 years, and a homeowner in Harvey Park for 10 years. As you all are aware living in the City of Denver has changed in many ways over the past decade, and as a city grows and changes so too is there a need for the rules a regulations that govern living the city. It is great that we are having a conversation on how to make the regulations that govern housing in the city more equitable as financial realities, living situations, and cultural norms evolve. In order to have a city that is vibrant and livable we need to have these conversations and nurture an environment in which the realities of the entire city population is taken into account, not just those who own property or exert influence an out-sized capacity.

My take-away from the conversation that occurred during Open House #2 is that there is an opportunity for a more balanced approach that take into consideration the experiences of current homeowners in the development of these Group Living regulations. For as long as I have owned my current home there has been a rental property next door in which has resided more people than the number of bedrooms in the house. As renters have moved in and out of the house there have been situations in which the renters were related and others when the occupants were not related. Some of the renters next to my home have been wonderful and considerate neighbors while others have been disrespectful and inconsiderate to those who lived around this rental property. There is no magic formula to ensure that neighbors will exist in harmony, and part of the responsibility to ensure a harmonious existence in these situations falls on the individuals living next to each other, including landlords, to manage situations as they arise.

With that being said, I do believe there are elements to the proposed Group Living regulations the city can implement to help create a balance between the expectations residents have for orderly living conditions and the need to address housing in an evolving city.

- Management of Trash and Recycling - My experience has been that for a house containing 4-6 adults the standard trash barrel allotted to each house is not enough. If there are 10 adults permitted to live in a 2,000 sq ft home, 1 standard trash barrel and recycling barrel will not be enough. The City should include changes to zoning that require households with more than 4 adults to have more than 1 trash and recycling barrel. Creation of these regulations that promotes recycling and composting over sending trash to the landfill should be a priority in these waste-related regulations.
- Landlord Registry - It was mentioned at the Open House #2 that the City Council is considering the creation of a registry for landlords of longer rental properties; I fully support this initiative. Having experienced a challenge in trying to track down the landlord of the rental property next to me in order to resolve a situation it would give homeowners who live next to rental properties where there might be a change in current arrangements brought on by updates to Group Living Rules a more direct way to address questions and situations that arise. The City, through these proposed

I have already attempted to communicate with this committee previously (last year). And I have been suggesting and lobbying for changes in the "2 unrelated adults per single family home" logic for longer than this committee has been working. I lived in such scenarios since shortly after coming out of college in the late '60s, and my son has lived with multiple roommates on a couple of occasions. I started out thinking that it's the number of bedrooms on the main floor (and above) that should be allowed to be occupied by unrelated adults (which would generally allow at least 3), but I have since expanded that to the number of bedrooms contained within the home on all levels (probably 3 to 5 minimum). My primary focus is on residential living environments: though my neighborhood was recently involved in a proposed small group home scenario. And probably would again if something poorly located would arise. I see two major problems with what's being discussed with regards to unrelated adults. The terms "square footage" and "dwelling unit size" are being used when the proper term should be "number of bedrooms". And "vehicle parking" is not being addressed adequately.

I have not yet come across the committee's definition of dwelling unit size. So I don't know if that's just the main floor size, or includes an upstairs if it also includes a finished basement. (I will keep poking around various online locations for that info before tonight's meeting.) But my just under 1200 SF single family ranch home has 2 bedrooms (originally 3) plus 3 more in the partially finished basement. So I don't know if my home would fall in the 0-1600 SF category or the 2000-2199 SF category. (My home recently housed my daughter's family of 6 while their newest one was being expanded and totally remodeled.) But otherwise this house should not be allowed to have more than 5 unrelated adults living in it. A "dwelling unit" is also made up of a kitchen, a dining room, bathrooms, closets: which cannot be counted as available sleeping space.

Unrelated adults and families have life-long experiences and alliances so as to allow for and tolerate close-in living and shared bedrooms. Unrelated adults don't have such with each other. And shouldn't be allowed to be "forced" together in shared bedrooms. The other big issue is that of vehicle parking. All resident vehicles should be required to fit within the 'footprint' of the property (garage, carport, & driveway) plus on-street in front of the property. And they of course can't block the sidewalk, or park on unpaved areas, and wouldn't be 'legal' parking across the street or around the corner. There could be situations where parking is more restrictive than bedroom counts. And would be and should be prima facie evidence of a need to contact 311 with an obvious visible violation. (The number of inspectors would need to grow.)

I noticed that the overwhelming majority of the committee represent various "group living" contingents. I'm curious just how many such "home scenarios" are envisioned among Denver's single family homes population? Though I sort of expect that at least most of those wouldn't be bringing the massive influx of vehicles that unrelated adults would. So the committee needs to drop "dwelling unit size" and go with "bedroom count" instead. With one unrelated adult per bedroom as the basic criteria. Related adults and related children (and even unrelated children) can share bedrooms as can, probably, unrelated adults in some group home situations. (Using bunk beds and twin beds.) The other thing that can come up is that unrelated people have unrelated guests and visitors: each one driving their own vehicles and needing to park. Then there are the inevitable parking















## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

Councilman – my name is Steve Hays, I live in your district at 2710 S High St. I have lived in my home for 18 years and have lived in South Denver since 1990. I wanted to reach out to you to discuss my concerns about the proposed zoning changes in the city that I believe will have a hugely negative impact on our neighborhoods and our quality of life. I have been angry at what I believe is an attempt by some city leadership and the supporters of this change to silence any discussion and transparency or any real input on the topic. I can assure you that the vast majority of my neighbors have no idea that this change is being proposed or what it might mean to them or their families.

I am very distressed at the proposition that, as I understand it, would allow for up to 8 unrelated individuals to live in what would currently be a family home. I'm sure I'm beating the same drum as many others when I voice my concerns about the related issues of having that many individuals in a 1600 sq ft home along with the multiple vehicles, noise, pollution, trash, traffic, crime, etc., that is inherently going to go along with that kind of added density. I can appreciate if the city wanted to propose a responsible change from 3 to 4 or something similar, but 8 is completely out of bounds in my opinion and is entirely unreasonable. What happens with the numerous duplexes that are being built in the area? All of them are easily over 1600 sq ft on each side, so is it possible that you could have 8 individuals on both sides along with their 16 cars? Maybe I have it wrong, I hope I do. But that's the message I believe I am reading.

I have some experience dealing with this type of situation at my home. About 6 or 7 years ago, my next door neighbor (a long time resident) passed away and moved out one weekend. No one on the block knew what was going on or why she left. A couple of weeks later, a woman moved in that she referred to herself as the 'House Manager'. She in turn started renting rooms in the house on a short term basis like a boarding house - sometimes it was for a couple of weeks, maybe 30 days; other times it was for 3 months or longer. It was a complete disaster area of people in and out of the house, cars all over the block and in my opinion, a security problem for the families on my street. You never had any idea who was there or why. Most of the time, it was 5 or 6 people there (along with the House Mom) and sometimes more. I had numerous people stop their cars on the street when I was in the front yard asking what was going on at the house next door as they were obviously concerned about the situation. My neighbor and I attempted to discuss the problems with the homeowner, but she refused to listen to our concerns and discounted any issues we presented to her and threatened us with lawsuits and other nonsense. We eventually reached out to the city and spoke to the Zoning Dept and they helped eliminate the problems. That wasn't the end, however. She later tried to rent the house to 6 individuals (and their 6 cars and friends) and then to another 4 individuals. Each time, we attempted to reason with her, but she refused and we in turn reached out to the city for help. The city was very good to work with, we had no issues there at all and greatly appreciated their support.

Please see attached the letter of opposition from my husband and me to the proposed Zoning Code Amendment for group living. As articulated in more detail in the attached letter:

1. Proposed Changes to Definition of Household Living. The existing number of 8 unrelated adults (and greater numbers for larger dwelling units) is excessive. More people likely would embrace this proposed change if the Planning Department pared this back to 3 (or perhaps 4), maximum regardless of the size of the dwelling unit. This is consistent with several other cities the City has identified as peer cities and is a reasonable requirement. The Code could simply state that the number of unrelated persons could be up to 8 to provide for the above-referenced protected classes. If there are concerns with the impact on large families, the age of minor children could be increased from 18 to 23 or 24.

Representatives of the Planning Department have indicated on several occasions that the reason they used the number 8 is in response to requirements of the Federal Fair Housing Act and Colorado Statutes addressing group living. However, these statutes address only four "protected classes: (A) people with developmental issues/disabilities; (B) people with behavioral/mental health issues/disabilities (subject to some limitations); (C) people who are age 60 and older; and (D) people who are rehabbing/recovering from substance addictions. In the case of people with either developmental or behavioral/mental issues, the Colorado statutes provide that they are to be state-licensed facilities. In each instance, the statutes provide that local zoning codes must permit facilities/residences for up to 8 people in these protected classes; in no instance do they contemplate more than 8 people living together.

I have found no state or federal laws providing for group living arrangements other than for the above-referenced protected classes. Apparently, the Planning Department hasn't either as their presentations only cite to these four discreet protected classes. The Planning Department's Proposal goes beyond federal and state statutory requirements, as it applies to everyone not just people in protected classes. In the February 26, 2020 public presentation, City Planner Andrew Webb appeared to state that because these protected groups can live in larger numbers in any dwelling unit, everyone else should be able to do this too. As an attorney, I believe this totally undercuts the rationale of protected classes in the first place. Moreover, it has the potential to change the fundamental character of many of our Denver neighborhoods.

2. Determining a Non-Profit "Housekeeping Unit". It would be difficult for a resident to try to determine if a neighboring property owner is complying with the requirements of a common non-profit housekeeping unit as defined in the Proposal. The Planning Department says they think proving a collective housekeeping unit exists would be easier than proving there is a familial relationship among residents in a dwelling unit. While this may be partially true, it also seems true that the proposed change to the Zoning Code to allow more so many more people to live in any dwelling unit would be detrimental to neighborhood integrity and safety.

I have lived in the Hutchinson Hills subdivision for 30+ years and have enjoyed raising our children and getting to know our neighbors. People in this neighborhood tend to stay and put down roots which helps develop the sense of community we enjoy. I do not agree with the proposed change to the Group Living code and do not see a need for allowing up to 8 unrelated people to live under one roof. The impact on our neighborhood and entire subdivision would be extremely detrimental to neighborhood integrity and safety. I do not believe that it is up to single family residential neighborhoods to accommodate the housing issues in Denver and I am opposed to changes that would allow this to happen.

I am hoping you will vote against such a proposal.





## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I didn't find in the proposed changes where a neighborhood could protest if a house or property could be zoned for "GROUP LIVING". I have been crime scenes where there were 20 plus beds laying all over the house. The street and neighborhood are SEVERLY affected by that type of house (traffic and crime) This concept may sound good to the politician but is VERY bad for the neighborhood. Please tell me I can protest the design of a GROUP LIVING house in my neighborhood.

I do not support the potential change to allow up to 8+ unrelated people living in single family zoning areas. I understand that additional inhabitation could be allowed if there is additional square footage in the property. I believe the city has plenty of properties with zoning that would allow this type of density.

I am writing in enthusiastic support of Denver's proposed group living code updates soon to be before city council. For clarification, I am only for the updates to the Group Living code, and not updates to the Residential Care code.

\* First and foremost, the status quo is a choice, and I believe it is better to move broadly in the direction of equity and opportunity than to maintain an unjust status quo of restrictive housing policies. The impacts of the status quo to our neighborhood are tangentially felt through higher housing prices, greater auto traffic, poor air quality, underutilized retail storefronts, and lower transit usage. However, the people living on the outskirts of Denver do not get a say, even though they are the most economically disadvantaged by the current rules.

The following article from Strong Towns explores how the status quo entrenches systematic inequality:

<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2019/7/17/the-status-quo-is-a-choice-too>

\* There are no limits on related people under the current code. The specter of 20 people in a house is entirely legal now under certain circumstances but seldom seen, as few families choose to live in such confined quarters. As anyone who has ever rented an apartment with roommates can attest to, an individual must personally be willing to share space with others, and they decide how many roommates they take on. As a council member, you will certainly expect to see arguments based on the extreme scenarios, but I believe that it is more important --- and more realistic --- to discuss the distribution of what is likely to happen. Many homes will not add residents. Some houses with multiple bedrooms will stay exactly as they are. Someone who downsizes would have the option to turn the house into a rental property to 3 or 4 people, offering more options and more affordability.

\* Because of Denver's current 2-unrelated-person limit, I have a hypothesis that developers will seldom build apartments or multi-unit properties with more than two bedrooms. Because the market for 3+ bedroom multi-unit properties is mostly constrained to families with multiple kids who don't have a long-term housing locked in, developers will naturally skip building to a smaller market. That means that families have fewer housing choices if they have kids. Zoning that is antagonistic to families is not unique to Denver, and empirically delays when and if couples choose to have children:

<https://www.citylab.com/perspective/2019/01/family-planning-day-care-costs-zoning-cities-children/580279/>

I'd like to give my feedback on the proposed changes to group living. Eight people is far too many and would be a detriment to the quality of life in West Washington Park/Denver. I live in the 200 block of S. Ogden and the two Country Club towers and other development in the area has already had significant negative impacts.

Please consider capping group living at no more than 4 unrelated adults.

I think your information and pursuit of helping RNOs and improving notification signs is great. Thank-you. I think the City has used RNOs as a poor excuse for public notification much of which does not occur. Example. Our RNO only has newsletters 3 times a year. Zoning and redevelopment proposals have tight schedules and RNO process cannot meet the same schedule. Other than signs posted at properties, I have no way of knowing my RNO is doing its job.

I have two very strong concerns about the 2 to 8 rezoning that tie to the above notification concerns.

The 2 to 8 rezoning is huge for the City, yet the pursuit of public participation is relatively light. Notification to all affected is very light. Developers have a larger burden for notification than the City is placing on itself for a city wide rezoning.

Second. As mentioned at our WPE RNO this week, the materials presented by the City to the public in regards to the 2 to 8 rezoning are very one-sided and self-serving. This is deeply wrong and City staff should be reprimanded for this by Council. The city demands a developer to present a thorough analysis, yet totally fails to do the same for the re-zoning of the entire City. The public and Council deserve a balanced and thorough analysis, and it should be independent to remove the conflict of interest that is evident to the public materials. This rezoning process should end NOW, and not recommence until the City produces a thorough analysis.

I am asking that City council request the rezoning process to stop due to city staff failing the public interest and beginning a process prematurely which makes ALL the public workshops invalid due to the failure to present adequate information to the public at the meetings.

I think the failure of the City to do a proper process with adequate materials opens the city to legal challenges should the City proceed with the current schedule and current self-serving one-sided materials. The issue is simple. Withholding information during public reviews and the follow-up regulatory and judicial process makes the process and any adoption invalid. I believe withholding for the purpose of achieving its choice rises to the level of perjury.

I am writing in opposition of the new group housing proposal. It's not healthy for 8 unrelated people to live together, especially in the age of global pandemics like COVID-19. We need less density, not more.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I am writing concerning the proposed zoning changes related to group living. First of all, I am disappointed that there were no meetings very convenient to Virginia Village residents, particularly those of us who are disabled elderly and do not drive.

I will also take the opportunity to voice my opposition for this proposal as it stands. While I understand the importance of increasing affordable housing, I am concerned with the logistics of what is being proposed.

We are currently in an intense national, state and city lockdown because of the Corona Virus. One can barely get a doctor's appointment with going through the litany of questions about recent contact, travel, symptoms etc. And, that is to see a doctor! I suppose if I were to get the virus I would be politely told to just stay home.

But, my point is that you are proposing to let as many as eight individuals live in one residence. No information about bathrooms, no restrictions anything other than numbers. The potential health hazards of such arrangements need to be thoroughly checked out before promoting something like this, in my opinion. I grew up the youngest of five children, with two parents. Seven related family members in our household. It was intended at best, with one restroom. And when one kid got sick, ... You get my point.

You would be setting up a potential germ-share that is or should be scary—even dangerous from a health standpoint. Right now, we are all being forced to avoid groups, (except where money prevails, such as ski resorts, bars and restaurants.) In those situations, one can go at one's own risk. But, I'm detecting a reaction that doesn't at all fit with your re-zoning proposal in terms of healthy living.

Another concern is vehicles. I currently live across from a family that has three or more generations living in one household. They have cars on the street, cars in the driveway, cars in the yard etc. (I'm blind. But, this is what I have been told.) This at best is a blight situation gone bad, and I think this is a Section Eight arrangement.

Now, put eight individuals in one residence, with a potential to have eight vehicles, and where, Oh Where do you put their vehicles? Also, what impact would this have on our residential streets?

The amount of trash generated in such a living situation could be staggering! As it is right now, we have DHA residents who simply drop their trash on the curb on occasion if their bin is full. Other people leave anything they want to discard on the curb or on the sidewalk, which then necessitates phone calls and more work for city service providers.

I'll stop there. But, have you really looked closely at these things and the potential mess of what you are proposing?

Please think beyond your compassion for those who are homeless, those with space who will rent to anyone, and those who need group housing that must be affordable. There are some very serious health risks, traffic tie-ups, parking nightmares, and the simple but important concern of neighborhood residents who have invested for all of their lives to live in a neighborhood of single family residences. They, (we) should not be

My family and I are Wash Park resident of approximately 35 years. My thoughts about group housing are this I don't want to see any increase in density or any change in the housing laws as far as increasing this density. Thank you.

I strongly object to the proposal to change the residential housing rules in Denver. The suggested change to housing rules has the potential of disrupting quite neighborhoods that people that have worked all their lives to afford. I totally understand that the city is addressing housing costs but permitting residential homes to essentially be converted to "apartment/dorm/condo living" is not the answer. I recently purchased my home for \$500,000 in a nice, established quiet community. I could have spent far less if I wanted to live in apartment/dorm/condo living that the zoning change will allow.

- At the very least, occupancy should be determined by available conforming bedrooms and bathrooms, not square footage. Please do not change this housing rule.

This is a crazy proposal! EVERYONE I've talked to is totally against this idea. This creates more problems than it solves! Over crowded neighborhoods, reduced property values, transient community and other issues of having essentially an apartment next door! Southmoor Park has a terrific "suburban light" feel. Our neighbors take pride in ownership and it shows when you drive through the community. The issue of high rent/high home prices cannot be solved by this proposal - People moving to Denver need to be aware of this and plan accordingly! Thanks,

I am dramatically opposed to the proposed changes regarding group living in Wash Park and Denver. I do not support increasing the number of unrelated people living in a residence to 8 individuals. Please consider capping group living at no more than 4 unrelated individuals. This is more in line with what surrounding communities are doing. I am worried about the impact this new rule will have on the quality of the neighborhood, as well as the impacted parking situation we would all face.

The proposed changes for zoning in residential areas is not good because it will create new problems for our neighborhoods and will be the death of the single family homes.

Our neighborhoods function reasonably well now but with 1 person per/200 sq ft in the residence we will see increased water consumption, sewage, and trash use. The traffic will multiply and the wear and tear on our already "pot holed" street and where do we park the new cars that come in? the neighborhood streets are already lined with cars.

This will ruin our property values make it a less desirable place to own a home. What about the tax base difference for these new ideas? How do you plan to handle this?

Several years ago in my neighborhood a ranch style home near Yosemite Street was bought and converted into a home for mentally challenged adults. The residents were difficult to control by the staff and they sat on the sidewalks near the street and played and even tried to cross the street. The idea and home was soon abandoned by the owners and sold to an individual who converted it back to a single family home. Their project failed and many more will, too.

Getting on to Yosemite from our neighborhood is almost impossible from Radcliff because there is no traffic light there and because of the traffic from DTC Blvd access lane. We even lost one of our pioneer neighbors, Bette Tunnell, who was killed while trying to get on Yosemite several years ago. There is a memorial sign up on the west side of Yosemite in her honor.

Added traffic in our neighborhood will be a nightmare and we have had to post 25 mph signs in the yard to try to control the speed of cars coming from Stony Brook residents who charge up our streets attempting to get on Yosemite.

In addition, there will be added demands to our school, hospitals, libraries, and first responders as well as shopping areas.

Your ideas for rezoning do not belong in suburban living that are already packed with residences. Go back to your drawing board and come up with something else like the K-Mart buildings that might be converted into living spaces. Do not destroy our Denver neighborhoods with this rezoning idea please.

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I have reviewed the proposed changes to group living and am strongly opposed to the proposal as written. While I understand the need to allow additional infill in neighborhoods, this proposal should be revised to only allow 4 unrelated adults.

To allow eight unrelated people to live in one single family dwelling is unreasonable and will result in detrimental impacts to our community. First, we already have issues with larger developments not providing sufficient parking to accommodate the units. This proposal will only increase this problem exponentially because there is not enough parking to accommodate eight people per single family dwelling. Second, this proposal will result in the significant change in character of the community to the detriment to the quality of life in the West Washington Park/Denver neighborhood. I live in the 400 block of S. Corona where the homes are designed for and occupied by single families and this creates a sense of community that would be negatively impacted by your proposal.

Please consider revising your proposal to allow no more than FOUR unrelated adults

I am opposed to this ordinance as I currently live and own a half newer duplex in the University area. This is an area with a number of rental homes with absentee landlords that violate the current code so they can charge excess rent. Many of these houses currently have more than the allowed number of young adults living in them and it results in loud parties, serious parking problems, excess trash and dumping, and illegal AirBNBs. These are issues the city currently does not address or enforce so I fail to see how they will monitor it in the future. These neighborhoods weren't designed to be row upon row of boarding houses. When and if Denver can work out its problems in these areas, enforce the current code as written, effectively police the community, and fill the many vacant high-density apartments it has allowed to be built, may be a better time to try to legally squeeze in more people. In the interim, Denver should step up and monitor what's happening now.

I would like to express my concern and opposition to allowing 8 or more unrelated individuals to live in a single home. Here are some reasons why this is a bad idea:

1. Allowing this many unrelated people to live in a single dwelling creates a less stable neighborhood with many people who do not have a real commitment to a community coming-and-going.
2. Living near DU, I can tell you that these homes have a lot going on – and it is not always good (hey – I had fun in college, too, but I would not want to live next to a party house!).
3. We will see higher crime rates.
4. Poor care of the property and surrounding public spaces.
5. Higher crime.
6. What about parking? Are we going to require off-street parking for the many vehicles that will be there? Once you have that many vehicles parked on the street, the neighborhood begins to look pretty bad. Think Capitol Hill neighborhood – parking is a mess and I don't know of anyone who lives there long-term.
7. This will certainly adversely affect property values.

Let's not let social justice concerns destroy the many beautiful neighborhoods that we have in this wonderful city. We should oppose this and prevent it from happening.

The proposed amendment to zoning to allow more unrelated persons to live together in a single family residential area is poor policy and should be shelved.

It was wonderful to see that our neighbors care for the neighborhoods who attended the Wednesday, February 26, 2020 meeting. Most who attended did not seem to agree that this will solve housing for homeless etc issues that the topic seemed to portray.

Group homes are not an issue. No one contests group homes, they have always been able to move into neighborhoods.

We now seem to be paying the price for the city problem of the homeless that was taken over and promoted by Hickenlooper administration. But the way no one

seems to know what happened to the monies and agency that was resolving the problem and now the city seems to want to solve it by passing it to neighborhoods. Furthermore, 439 million dollars over budgeting is another issue that the city administrators have presented to its citizens. \$439 million certainly would have been helpful toward the homeless population.

Finally, 8 or even 4 unrelated persons, plus unlimited numbers of their relatives in one home, parking on the streets and traffic issues due to increasing the population of 1 home will help destroy our neighborhoods.

One point that I forgot to add is that this becomes another way the City earns monies having taxpayers paying for a parking permit in their neighborhoods which is added revenue from the taxpayers to help the City's over budget of \$439 million.

I disagree with 4, 8, and 2 is fine plus their family members. I am 3 homes north of Hamilton Middle School and 2 blocks from Holm Elementary. During the school year, traffic before and after school because many parents/guardians pick up their children is now bumper to bumper and parking is abundant. This new ridiculous zoning plan of 8 or 4 will become a dangerous situation for all.

I am a long time resident of West Wash Park, and over the past 25 years we have made our neighborhood one of the most desired in Denver.

The proposal to rezone residential houses to accommodate up to 8 people is counter to everything we have worked for, and tried to achieve for community creation and comfort.

This proposal is just plain stupid. It will not alleviate problems with housing availability - it will just create more cars and parking problems, more stressed services, more problems between neighborhoods and destroy the fabric of our community.

And who will suffer for this? Not Cherry Creek, not the Country Club, not East Wash Park but the smaller less affluent communities that are already overcrowded.

Please, stop all of this nonsense and come up with real solutions to problems. This action discriminates against poor, minority and inflames already crowded areas.

I have contacted my councilman, Jolan Clark, and will next be writing to the mayor.

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I do not support the potential change to allow up to 8+ unrelated people living in single family zoning areas. I understand that additional inhabit could be allowed if there is additional square footage in the property. I believe the city has plenty of properties with zoning that would allow this of density.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Councilman Kashmann and all others.

We are writing today to voice our opposition to the proposed zoning changes being discussed.

This has got to be the most ill-conceived plan this city has ever come up with. A plan designed by "experts" and not residents is a failure before it even starts.

First, having 8 or more people in a 1600 square foot house with one bathroom is unsanitary and borderline abuse. Prisoners in jail have more space than that.

Second, allowing each person to have a car plus one would be a nightmare for the neighbors, it would take away parking for the surrounding homeowners. It would increase traffic on our already overburdened streets and add to safety problems for pedestrians and our children walking and from school. This would also add to the air pollution in the neighborhood affecting the health of everybody especially our elderly citizens. If there was just 2 rental houses in a block with 8+ people in it and they all have a vehicle, that would mean at least 16-18 more cars on the street, Where are we supposed to park?

The house next door to us has 3 people sharing it. Between the 3 of them there are 5 cars. They have frequent overnight guests adding 1-3 more cars. The street looks more like a parking lot than a residential street. And that is just 3 people.

Third, everybody sees the need for affordable housing, but this is not the way to do it. This is just overcrowding. Do you want 8+ people in your house?

At a town hall meeting I attended, Councilwoman Kneich was saying that people cannot afford to buy a home because of the inflated prices and needing to come up with a 20% down payment. Let me dispel that statement.

There is money available for low down payment loans; we know this because our daughter got such a loan. Also the reason that homes are so expensive can be traced right back to City Council and the Mayor's office and zoning laws implemented over the last 10-15 years. By allowing developers to build a 1.5 million dollar home in a \$300,000 neighborhood only causes over inflation of the surrounding homes. This leads to others being sold and scraped and more inflation. Now those 1000 sq ft \$300,000 homes are selling for \$500,000-\$600,000 and the only people that can afford them or want them are the developers. No more affordable homes for the working class.

Also at that same meeting Mr Webb was saying that in Seattle they found that after changing their zoning, there was little difference than before. So, our thoughts are: 1- if there is no change in occupancy, why are you discussing changing the zoning at all? 2- The current zoning laws are being openly violated and there is no real policing going on, why change the zoning at all?

Fourth, with the ongoing threat of the COVID-19 virus, having 8+ people in a small house would only amplify the problem of spreading it. This is how it grew so rapidly in China (high occupancy residences). Instead of 2-3 people that can infect each other you will now have 8 or more. I don't know

I do not agree with the zoning changes that are proposed.

It will ruin neighborhoods.

Not fair to someone has paid PROPERTY TAXES and has to put up with 8 unrelated people, including homeless in a 1500 sq foot house.

What about parking. And are these 8 people going to take care of the upkeep of the lawns, house gardens? It will bring down the value of the neighborhood.

Group homes for people who are not able to live alone are ok. There already many around and they are very nice.

I am sending this letter to all above on the advice of my council person - after reading an article by Vincent Carroll of the Denver Post and at the behest of every friend and acquaintance in Denver I have discussed this with - who overwhelmingly share this sentiment. We may have many more pressing issues to deal with right now. But we can't and won't forget this zoning proposal that would have lasting negative impacts for all. Please read the following:

I am writing to appeal to your sense of pride in the Denver neighborhood you serve to oppose the changes to zoning that would annihilate the peace, serenity and safety your constituents embrace.

These are the same constituents that voted for your return to office based on the trust they placed in you to honestly represent the district.

The fact that this kind of change, that directly impacts every homeowner in this city, would only be voted on by the city council is mind boggling. I am specifically frustrated by the new code that would allow up to 8 unrelated adults in a 1600 sq. ft. home - as well as their minor children. I have personally experienced this tragedy of illegal activity within the past 8 years - twice - I do know the negative impact it has on a neighborhood; too many cars for the property, added "guests" staying over, noise at all hours, garbage overflowing, and a general lack of maintenance on the property. The argument about HUD and Seattle and California just don't hold water in my opinion.

I attended the meeting at the Jewish Learning Center. I am sure the moderator did not present truthful facts and spun information to serve the planning committee. In addition, they compared our reluctance to being like bigots, prejudiced people without consideration of those less fortunate or whatever - really??? really??? I am also sure you heard that the overwhelming majority were opposed, fearful that these changes could decimate the equity in the homes they all worked hard to get.

Why the city has the hubris to put the burden of limited affordable housing on established neighborhoods is completely unfair and unethical. The developers continue to build un-affordable housing at an alarming rate, making money without being charged to bear this burden themselves.

We need a voice that will stand up for what now seems to have mobilized a community towards a common goal - to stop this in its tracks before it is too late

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I am writing to protest in the strongest possible terms the group living proposal in late stages of development by Denver City planners. While it is commendable that Denver is seeking ways to improve housing options for vulnerable people, it is an outrage that the planners think it is acceptable to put up to 18 people in the house next door to mine.

Whatever the final proposal the planners settle upon, this momentous zoning change must be decided by the citizens on a citywide ballot, not by thirteen council members.

It is confiscation without due process to contemplate turning 3 or 4 bedroom single family houses into boarding houses full of people with no commitment to the neighborhood. Even spaced out, this proposal is almost sure to negatively change house values and quality of life. The City should give at least as much priority to protecting the taxpayers and quality of life in their neighborhoods as to increasing affordable beds for vulnerable persons.

I suggest the City of Denver adopt the following criteria if a zoning change is to be made allowing unrelated persons to occupy a single family home in a currently single family neighborhood:

1. The number of allowed residents should be no more than the existing number of bedrooms. An exception could be made in the case of cohabiting couples who would share the same bedroom.
  2. One of the residents should be an owner of that property with at least 50% share of total equity/debt.
  3. There should be one bathroom (at minimum toilet/sink half bath) for each bedroom.
  4. Off street parking should be required at one vehicle per licensed driver. No extensive paving of existing lawn or gardens would be permitted.
  5. Landlords would not be allowed to partition existing bedrooms or other living spaces to increase sleeping places.
  6. Real estate speculators would be limited to one group house, and as above would have to live there or have an invested partner live there.
  7. City to establish a compliance department and ensure that any deviations from neighborhood standards are corrected or the occupancy permit will be withdrawn.
  8. Recognizing the potential for negative outcomes, the City should accept their responsibility and agree to reimburse any seller with cash at closing any amount by which the selling price falls below the most recent appraisal in neighborhoods with one or more permitted group homes.
- If the current Group Living proposal passes city Council, you should veto it. If a reasonable amended proposal emerges, it should become a ballot item for the voters to decide.

I think this is another reason group housing in our neighborhoods is a bad idea. How many more people would be infected in the neighborhood if we had 8 people living in a home that are not related? Again not to mention the increase in trash and parking if they were all directed to stay at home.

I am a concerned citizen who wants Denver to grow wisely and respect the current neighborhoods and property values. If passed, the Denver Group Living Project proposal will impact Denver negatively. Here are my main concerns.

### Safety

The Denver Group Living Project proposal plans to eliminate redlining and send 750+ former and current prisoners directly into ALL Denver neighborhoods through their "group living" and "residential care" use code changes.

### Parking

With the new code change, 8 adults can have a parking spot on the street and the house can have a parking spot. Owners of the home are only required to have 2 parking spots in the back.

### Traffic

The city believes we will get rid of our cars with high density living. We can walk, ride bikes, and bus to work. How are we to get around when RTD is providing limited service?

### Roads

Let's not forget about the wear and tear of our roads with more people able to live in Denver. Currently there are 30,000 cars that travel Alameda each day. Who knows what the traffic will be when Gates redevelopment, Broadway / Alameda development, Speer Blvd developments, etc. are completed.

### Pollution:

Increase of trash, night pollution and air pollution. Denver's failure to meet EPA standards for acceptable air quality continues to endanger the health of our residents.

I realize that energy and time currently need to be dedicated to the COVID-19 crisis, but I still wanted to email you about the Group Living proposal that I have read about and understand is being planned for Denver as a solution to the housing shortage. While I agree that the lack of affordable housing is an issue for our city, I am strongly opposed to the proposal in its current form. As a life-long resident of Denver, I ask you to please listen to the concerns that are being raised about the proposal, including effects on noise, traffic, and parking, and find a different way to address housing in Denver.

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I understand changes to Occupancy Levels were being reviewed before we came into our "new normal" with COVID - 19 and stay at home social distancing. It made me think if my home and neighbor were under this "Occupancy Levels" what would my neighborhood look like?

NOTE: I apologize for not knowing where our City Council is on this issue. If it was voted for, against, passed or voted down.

Just to make sure you know my thoughts on our community ... with recent community situations that presented themselves, increased Occupancy Levels would be wrong for my neighborhood and I feel many other neighborhoods in Denver. In looking at the Pros & Cons there are more Cons having these Occupancy Levels in our neighborhood.

CONS include:

- Problems with having this many people within a small square footage. (Brought to light to me under social distancing)
- Parking, with this many adults many adults are not using our public transportation and still have cars. Our neighborhood was not planned for many people.
- In our recent fire, would we have been able to get the residents out if they all were at the (See Note) Occupancy Limit?
- Trash increase with more people within a community that was planned for less people.
- Water & sewer demands with increased use than planned.
- Our neighborhoods were NOT planned when built for the amount of people this change would bring. We need to adhere to the way our communities were planned and not destroy what we have built.

PROS include:

- An immediate answer to people moving into our city.
- Making an easy "solution" to our growing population, instead of leading our city through a growing situation of development.

What this could be:

- Opportunity to create or appropriately plan change to our neighborhoods with current residents to create sustainable neighborhoods that make Denver the great city we love!

This outrageous unhealthy proposal should be trashed. The disastrous new virus and according to various exterminators "bed Bugs" in this type of environment increases are important reasons residential zoning should not change along with rising water costs, electricity, heating, drainage traffic trash What were those proposing this issue thinking!!!

I hope the present virus threat causes the city to re-think increasing the density of all neighborhoods.

Eight unrelated people living in one house with one bathroom is a formula for disaster if we face another pandemic. I can't imagine what would be a safe level, perhaps two or three.

The density of large cities like New York and San Francisco, I'm sure is contributing to the severity of the outbreak there. We ought to consider creative solutions to the housing crisis.

Telecommuting will increase after we get through this pandemic. There will be opportunities to spread out businesses, jobs, housing to surround small towns. That would be healthier than putting more and more people into this one big city. Denver shouldn't have to solve the housing crisis alone.

Please consider a new approach. Do something other than changing the zoning laws to allow more people in single family houses.

I just wanted to weigh in on the issue of allowing more than 2 unrelated people living together.

Not sure how the number of 8 came about, but way too high for my Goldsmith neighborhood north of Bible Park. Nearly every street is a cul-d-sac here, we don't even have enough street parking if one of our kids come home, let alone more than 2 cars per household.

I have no problem folks living together, but there is NO parking available in SE Denver for these situations.

I'm sure your neighbors recognize this in your area too. Take care, stay healthy

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I am writing today wearing two hats. My first is as UPCC (Neighborhood RNO) President. As an RNO, we were wondering if CPD is planning on postponing the process of moving forward with these and what the timeline was for public comment.

My other hat, is that as a citizen, individual neighbor. I would like to whole heartedly support the updates that have been proposed for increasing access to housing for ALL in Denver and aligning Denver code with that of the state in providing equal access to all protected (and some unclassified/unprotected) groups. I thought you did a phenomenal job in clearly presenting the why behind the 8 residents being allowed based on state code and the need to make housing equitable and accessible. I have been a strong voice within our RNO pointing out that many of the supposed concerns about parking disruption will actually be alleviated by opening up more affordable housing close to where people work and live. One of the concerns of our neighborhood is DU parking. Having been an instructional professor at DU (and paid less at that job than the one I had prior to receiving my PhD), I know that the adjuncts, even some of the tenured professors, cannot afford housing in Denver, let alone our neighborhood, would love to be able to live closer to their work. DU pays lip-service to having enough parking, but the amount they charge to faculty and staff is frankly, not affordable. By having more affordable housing, closer to work, the demands for parking could actually decrease.

As a parent of two young kids, and last year's PTA president of University Park Elementary, I know the schools have extreme challenges hiring staff (Paraprofessionals, janitors, care for before and after school programs) because there is no transit (not your department) and no affordable housing nearby. Our young teachers (who don't have partners in high earning professions) cannot afford to live in Denver and require multiple roommates to pay the high costs of rent. These are the people that used to make up the fabric of our neighborhood. I would like that to again be the case. The best way to provide access to affordable housing is to increase the amount of homes available, this proposal supports that.

I have also been strongly in support of advocating for more spaces for "half-way" housing (I apologize as I might not be using the completely correct term here). For one, our neighborhood has many families that have had children at Joshua School or The Rise School of Denver serving kids with different needs. As these kids become adults and need semi-independent living, these families would like to not leave Denver. As the situation stands, there are not enough available locations for homes supporting such living situations. Fortunately my children are both healthy, but if they were to suffer a brain injury and need support for their housing, I would hate for them to have to leave Denver and be farther from their family because we have failed to make changes that benefit all their needs and not just outspoken, wealthy home owners who do not realize that all bodies are only temporarily able-bodied.

Thank you to CPD for reaching out to neighbors and those most impacted from the beginning of this process years ago (I have the flier still). The

I am a resident and homeowner in southeast Denver. I am opposed to the proposed Group Living changes to the Denver Zoning Code. This proposal is an assault on our existing property rights. This proposal will in essence change all single family neighborhoods into multifamily, group home, boarding house and commercial neighborhoods where every room in a house represents financial gain to the landlord. This is not the purpose of single family neighborhoods.

Hi Andrew,

I would like to write in and voice my support for the new proposed Group Housing Laws. We are a communal living home located in the Cole Neighborhood near 36th and High streets. The house is 2400 sq ft and has 7 bedrooms. It was built in 1889 and needed a lot of work when we first moved in (to the tune of over \$170k and counting).

Living communally has allowed us to afford to preserve this beautiful home. All of my housemates share in the rent, which is approximately \$600-\$700 per room and includes utilities, internet, a furnished house, and some communal food. We all participate and make decisions at weekly house meetings for the good of the house as a whole (i.e. the smoking, guest, cleaning policies, etc.).

This way of living allows us to:

- 1) Live affordably
- 2) Create a community of support
- 3) Live in a green, sustainable way

We are better able to take care of the house and the yard because there are more people to help with these tasks. We participate in Cole community meetings and have plots in 2 local community gardens. We know, help shovel walks, and are friendly with our neighbors.

Because most of my housemates are on a tight budget, they do not own cars and bike/Uber/and use local transport to get to work. In fact, those without cars often ask housemates with cars for rides. So there is less environmental impact compared to the single family houses around us that own 3+ cars for one family.

I saw a list of some of the comments recently submitted, and I feel that many of those anti-Group Housing comments are using racist and prejudiced overtones, especially towards those who make less money, which I found very offensive. I would urge the City Council and Denver Planning to take the bias of the commenter into account and work towards increasing the affordability of housing in Denver. It is our most urgent priority if we are to have a city that belongs to everyone, not just the wealthy, white majority.

I hope you'll both find a way to increase the number of unrelated people who can live together in a household from 2 to at least 4 or 5, if not the full 6 that is being proposed. To do so will help alleviate the adverse impacts of gentrification and reduce homelessness for children.

Thanks and stay well.

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

As a long time northwest Denver resident, as well as a housing advocate, I've seen the burden that rising housing costs have put on lower income neighbors, and on providers to groups who need group living environments. I want to urge you to stand with advocates and neighbors who believe that significantly increasing the number of unrelated people allowed to live together in Denver. We have to expand opportunities for group living in Denver to ensure that all residents are safely and securely housed. In the face of opposition from vocal opposers, I urge you not to abandon the spirit and intent of a more equitable zoning code.

Thank you for all that you do for our northwest Denver community.

I am writing to ask you to support the changes to the Denver Zoning Code's residential use regulations that govern group living. As a resident of Denver and a member of Mothers Advocate for Affordable Housing, I believe that the city should be doing everything in its power to increase the accessibility and affordability of housing.

This issue of affordable housing affects people across all stages of the life cycle — from the young, first-time employee, to the couple starting a family, to the baby boomer retiree — and nearly all income levels. Making these changes will help everyone: young people who want to live with multiple roommates, people of all generations who want to live in co-housing or co-op communities, and families with young children who would benefit from some extra helping hands.

Updating these outdated and unnecessary regulations in the Denver Zoning Code just makes sense. The city needs to keep up with the times and a booming—yet often restrictive—economy.

Thank you so much for your help.

Dear Councilwomen Kendra Black (district 4); At-Large Council members, Debbie Ortega and Robin Kniech; and the entire City Council Members: I believe that the Denver City Council is making a grave mistake by allowing group living among unrelated and related persons in the city of Denver. I am urging you to vote against this money-grabbing, developers', corporate investors', and foreign investors'—dream proposal. City Manager and Planner, Andrew Webb says that the proposal is "progressive and all-inclusive," a trendy catch-all phrase, in my opinion, for the sole purpose of governmental social-engineering.

Group living may be preferable and ideal among seniors, disabled, sober living, homeless shelters, and in dormitories with college students living away from home for the first time. The aforementioned situations create highly specific regulations, rules, and boundaries within their structures. These structures ensure that these specific group living arrangements are safe, effective, and feasible. When the general public is solely involved with group living arrangements with little to no regulations or structures in place, I believe its outcomes will create distinct problems for the city of Denver. In a city which is desperate to find new ways to solve its housing crisis, a crisis made evident by a very pro-growth, pro-development City Council and Mayor.

I live among renters in the Wellshire Heights neighborhood in Denver. Of the 22 single-family homes on my city-block alone, at least 10 of these homes are rentals, almost half. I also own a rental home in east Denver. I see daily (and have seen first-hand) the many issues related to general care regarding home maintenance and upkeep, issues which (many) renters are reluctant and not inclined to address. Because of the number of rentals on my block, I also witness numerous city-code infractions. The issues of density, parking, noise, overcrowding, and congestion, as well as code infractions, will intensely increase with the advent of group living in the city:

- With its increased density, group living scenarios are an invitation to more crime among neighborhoods! How can several, unrelated or related people living in one, single home not affect or perpetrate more crime, break-ins, vandalism, and impact city-safety? Among various Denver neighborhoods [of course I only see the Southeast neighborhoods] property crimes, as reported among real neighbors in real time on the neighborhood app Next Door, are an unfortunate, daily, and continuous occurrence.
- There is a statistical correlation between density and crime. According to the website, [www.neighborhoodscout.com/co/denver/crime](http://www.neighborhoodscout.com/co/denver/crime), Denver crime rate as of December 2109, is rated as "6," meaning Denver is safer than 6% of US cities. A score of "100" is considered "the safest." According to the website, Denver has a crime rate of nearly 45%, violent and property, (44.6%). Of course, the statistics are "reported crimes and rates are based as per 1000 residents." PLEASE consider the impact of increased density regarding property and violent crimes within established Denver neighborhoods.
- City planners speak of the need for "diversity" in addressing the lack of affordable housing in Denver. In group living arrangements, aren't likenesses among individuals more important and apparent than differences for such living situations to be successful? How is a living arrangement



**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I recently read an article in the Glendale Chronicle relating to the proposed changes to the zoning laws for single family homes. I know this newspaper can be somewhat sensational in their presentations, but I was aware of this issue earlier and hoped there would be more information provided before any changes. What I am not clear about is whether the zoning change is really being pushed by for-profit groups wanting to establish group homes throughout existing neighborhoods (as indicated in the Chronicle). The project website ([www.denvergov.org/groupliving](http://www.denvergov.org/groupliving)) details about what is proposed, as well as a list of advisory committee members. The proposals are informed by a wide variety of stakeholder input, adopted city policy and peer city best practices.

I am totally opposed to this zoning change. According to the proposal, my house would be zoned for up to 12 people. That would be totally crazy so many ways.

I share the general concerns about the price of housing, the homeless, the house-poor, etc., but this seems like a very poor way to address it.

Could the suggestion be to change the zoning to allow property owners, living in the property as their principal residence, be allowed to rent bedrooms on a long-term basis, maybe a minimum of 6 months? That would address the concern of raising density to tenement levels as well as profit shelters buying up properties to rent.

Does the Council have the ability to incentivize builders to build affordable housing and apartments and dis-incentivize the building of luxury apartments? There are several existing city programs aimed at encouraging and/or requiring development of affordable housing. They include zoning incentives like the 38th & Blake Height Incentive Overlay and the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee system (a requirement for residential development). you can learn more about these programs at the Dept. of Housing Stability's website, here.

As for group homes for targeted groups, I am not familiar enough with the challenges of the permitting process to make any useful suggestions. widely rezoning all homes to be able to become group homes seems like a foolish approach that is fraught with opportunities for unintended consequences.

Thank you for your time.

I have been living in the University area for six years. I have worked for the Ruffly Rose Flower Shop, the Garden Patch, the South Pearl Farmers Market, and Sweet Cow Ice Cream. It's a wonderful place to live and work.

I have three unrelated roommates, as I would never be able to afford to live in Denver alone. I absolutely love living here, and one day dream of owning a home in the area.

I am interested in co-op style living and co-buying, which would make owning a home much more realistic for me. I recently learned that in the 1970s, the average first-time home buyer was 25 years old... today the average age is 34.

I am 24 and want to start building wealth. More than anything, I want to be able to turn my yard into a big garden (my main passion). Landlords, far, have been pretty against that idea. I have seen home after home in this neighborhood destroyed, only to be replaced with a super-modern, extremely expensive house. Inevitably, a wealthy young couple moves in, usually from out of town. Please take care of those who have been here loving this neighborhood, but who are afraid they will be forced out.

This is all to say that I encourage you to support the Group Living Code change. I would really appreciate the opportunity to create a life here. What is your position on it?

I am a resident of City Council District 10, and I am writing to voice my support for the Group Living Code Change.

It is my understanding that the code change has received some vocal opposition, so I felt it important to make my voice and the voice of my community heard. Although I do not currently live in cooperative or community housing, I think it is vitally important that the City of Denver allow such living situations to exist legally.

I believe that the proposed change would be of great benefit to the people of Denver, to the greater sense of community in the city, and especially to those who, like myself, find themselves on the verge of being priced out of the city's housing market.

I respectfully and humbly request that you, too, support the Group Living Code Change.

I am a long time resident of Denver. I vehemently oppose revision of zoning code provision  
11.12.2.1.B2(DZC)

which would allow massive increases in density in areas now zoned for single family residences. Homeowners in these districts have put their life savings into their homes, in reliance upon single family zoning restrictions. Implementation of this code provision would increase density, increase traffic, increase parking problems and would inevitably forever erode the character of their neighborhoods and lower the value of their homes.

One of the core values of any legitimate zoning code should be the preservation of the character of existing successful neighborhoods. This would do just the opposite.

Please do everything possible to prevent this disastrous provision from being enacted.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I recently came across an article in the Glendale Cherry Creek Chronicle detailing proposed changes to Denver Zoning Code 11.12.2.1.B.2 involving occupation limits on single-family housing. I want to express my concern regarding the proposed changes as it jeopardizes the stability and attraction of Denver's wonderful single-family neighborhoods that have helped to preserve Denver's intimate feel that people have become more and more drawn to in recent years.

Our family fully supports the continued growth of Denver and Denver Metro but we cannot allow special interest groups and developers to dictate the transformation of the city. Managing increases in population density needs to be addressed in a thoughtful manner that concentrates change in the city center but maintains the integrity and family-focused feel of our great city.

The Honorable Paul Kashmann  
1437 Bannock St.  
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Council Member Kashmann:

I am writing to ask you to support the changes to the Denver Zoning Code's residential use regulations that govern group living. As a resident of Denver and a member of Mothers Advocate for Affordable Housing, I believe that the city should be doing everything in its power to increase the accessibility and affordability of housing.

This issue of affordable housing affects people across all stages of the life cycle — from the young, first time employee, to the couple starting a family, to the baby boomer retiree — and nearly all income levels. Making these changes will help everyone: young people who want to live with multiple roommates, people of all generations who want to live in co-housing or co-op communities, and families with young children who would benefit from some extra helping hands.

Updating these outdated and unnecessary regulations in the Denver Zoning Code just makes sense. The city needs to keep up with the times and a booming—yet often restrictive—economy.

Thank you so much for your help.

In my opinion, this zoning change is a terrible idea for our city at this time. We are already a congested and overcrowded city with a new unemployment problem due to the Corona Virus. Our neighborhoods are designed with multiple housing units at the north end of each area. There is no parking ever on the street, and already way too many persons residing in many of the units. My own neighborhood backs up directly to I 25, which causes noise, pollution and crime due to access to our area on the light rail. The city is overwhelmed with calls about zoning violations due to illegal numbers of persons residing in one home. We have at least one illegal Air B and B with no live-in manager or owner. you will lower real estate values and the neighbors with school age children will choose not to take advantage of Denver Public Schools. Please reconsider this terrible idea.

A few thoughts:

On the single family home zoning change being proposed- this change will cause the quality of life to deteriorate in our neighborhoods. Too many cars, property will not be kept up and disturbances will arise as more people are packed into homes. This is especially true if the people are unrelated.

In addition, communities/neighborhoods are organizing. They have had it with the developers and Mr. Hancock. They ushered out a few council members in the last election and will not hesitate to do it again with those elected leaders who are ignoring the will of members of each community.

As an FYI.

The proposed moratorium on mortgage payments and rent is not a good idea. The federal Govt. approach is the way to go. Get the money into the hands of laid off workers and allow them to pay their rent. If the city stops the rent/mortgage payments, the normal expenses for landlords still come on. Among them- property tax bills now due, condo dues, water heater replacements, the upcoming inevitable air conditioner repairs, plumbing electrical repairs, etc. Once the city stops the normal flow on payments and some expenses, the system will back up quickly and the negative consequences will blow out in other areas of the system. I have seen too many landlords just walk away from their buildings in New York City 30 years ago when city regulations made it impossible for them to operate at a profit.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Hello,

I came across a posting on NextDoor that I thought was an April Fool's joke... But i am shocked to learn that this is an action that city officials wa impose on our neighborhoods.

Allowing 8 unrelated adults and unlimited minors live in the same 1,600 sq ft house. plus one per each additional 200 sq ft. as well.

1. The amount of resentment that will be created in our neighborhoods will be noticeable. Eight people scraping to get by in a house located ne door to a 1.1 million dollar house with 2 adult occupants. I guarantee that there will be resentment and frustration on both sides of the fence.
2. Pandemics is our new reality. COVID is changing our life in many ways. We know COVID-19 is not the first and will not be the last. This living arrangement will be ripe for virus spread.
3. It seems inhumane to put that many people in a single family home. limited amenities for each resident, and living on top of each other... I se recipe for disaster.
4. Dwellings in our neighborhoods were not designed for this type of living. The amount of wear and tear on the dwellings will be 4 time the intended amount. Without building/fire code changes, I feel it is unsafe for the occupants and the surrounding neighborhood.
5. Allowing 8 unrelated people in one house is not affordable housing. It is a flop house. it lacks the pride and dignity that people deserve. We not have an affordable housing crisis, we have an income inequality problem. We are the richest county in the world and shoving 8 unrelated people into a small house in an expensive area is not solving any problems and creates more issues. Let's work harder to bring people out of financial incarceration. This idea tries to treat a symptom but really perpetuates the problem.
6. Traffic problems, privacy, and noise will be brought to the neighborhood.
7. I have yet to hear how this upzoning will improve our neighborhoods. There seems to be no benefit for the residents of our current

I am asking you to support the upcoming rule change to allow up to 8 unrelated adults to live in one household. I have relied on group living arrangements throughout my graduate education and postdocs (as do many other cash-strapped science workers), and Denver is the first city I've lived in which makes this difficult and expensive with pointless restrictions. Please update the rule to allow people to live affordably close to wh they work!

My wife and I live in a single-family home on South Clayton Street, and we are against the City's proposal to relax the household and group-living standards by amending Article 11 of the Zoning Code.

First, there is no good reason to relax the standards. The primary intent of Article 11 (reflected in section 11.1.1.1(A)) is to promote economic development in Denver "while mitigating the potential for adverse impacts on surrounding properties, surrounding residential uses and neighborhoods."

The City proposes to relax the standards, because it deems the current definition of "household" to be outdated and limit common living arrangements "to reflect the evolution of lifestyles", and provide housing for vulnerable populations, not to promote economic development or mitigate adverse impacts to residential uses. The City's Overview and Frequently Asked Questions documents do not mention economic development at all, and provide only a circular, conclusory statement that "treating eight unrelated adults living together substantially different from eight related adults living together does not result in reduced impacts."

Research posted by the City on the Group Living project website undermines the City's argument that the current definition of household is out and does not reflect current living arrangements. The Shift Research Lab report on doubled-up housing states that [emphasis added] "Doubled-up family households are more than twice as common as doubled-up non-family ones" and represent a majority of households (72%) in Colorado.

Pew Research Center Article draws a similar conclusion, stating that "only 18% of extra adults lived in a household in which the head was unrela (typically a housemate or roommate). Living with nonrelatives has become less prevalent since 1995". The research indicates that most double households are families, which is already allowed under the current zoning code and does not require a change to the zoning code to accommo Furthermore, from the same Shift Research report, the size of doubled-up households in Colorado only increased from an average of 3.2 person 2006 to 3.4 persons (making no distinction between adults and children) in 2017, which is within the current zoning code limits of 4 un-related a for multi-unit use (if the doubled-up households are non-family) and in no way suggests an "evolution" of lifestyle different from what is already common nor does it substantiate the need to increase a household size to 8 adults in the proposed changes to the zoning code.

Census data (census.data.gov) for Denver County show that as of 2017, there were less than 100 households out of nearly 297,000 households t have 7 or more non-family members. Two persons make up 73% of households in Denver; 93% of all households (family and non-family) have 4 persons. That data makes no distinction between adults and children. The City itself has said that "it doesn't expect how people live to dramatic change", therefore, there is no change in household definition to address. It seems that the city is catering to a small group of persons who may violating the current rules and against whom the City has no intent, or desire, to enforce the current rules. Just because the City cannot effectiv enforce the current rules for number of unrelated of adults living together is not sufficient justification to change the definition of household to their enforcement easier.

## COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I've just learned of the proposed zoning changes for unrelated adults in one house, and unlimited relatives of any age to live with adult relatives. This is not going to help our neighborhoods, it's a disaster for parking and the idea that we could have 8 unrelated adults living together in a 1,600 square foot house, or 15 related persons living in a 3,000 square foot house makes little sense. Why would you do this? The idea that a person is allocated 200 square feet of space in a house? I'd like to see the studies that determine that 200 square feet per person has been implemented in another city and has improved neighborhoods.

I'm not sure if Landlords are sponsoring this proposed change but I am VERY opposed to this expansion of the zoning code. We are having enough problems with Air BNB renting to large gatherings and have noticed disturbing impacts from those short term living arrangements. This proposed change just asks for trouble.

If you have further questions please feel free to send them my way and please reconsider the negative impacts that this would have on existing neighborhoods.

I wish to add my comments about the group living code amendment proposal. Generally, I applaud efforts to revise the zoning code to clarify inconsistencies and adapt it to contemporary circumstances.

I do, however, have concerns about the proposed changes that would allow more unrelated adults to live together. I believe eight unrelated adults is too many in most circumstances and that a better number is four, regardless of the size of the dwelling. I am concerned about houses being purchased and rented to unrelated adults and the resulting additional on-street parking. Allowing larger numbers in larger homes would expand those issues. I do not support potentially significantly changing the character of single-family residential neighborhoods. Further, I believe these changes would negatively affect property values. For these reasons I do not support the proposed changes to household regulations.

I also have concerns about changes to residential care facilities. I believe it is inappropriate to add group homes for the homeless and community corrections to the protected classes in the Colorado statutes. It is more appropriate that these facilities be sited in commercial areas than being spread to all residential neighborhoods. For these reasons I do not support the proposed changes to how Denver regulates residential care uses.

Absolutely opposed to removing single family zoning and allowing 8 plus people in a single family house. Already happening in this neighborhood (East Bethany Place and Monaco) and numerous cars on the street in front of other people houses, parked for days, people coming and going all hours of the night. I know street parking is public and legal but legal should not be confused with polite and courteous.

I am writing this letter in concern to the proposed changes to the zoning code in Denver.

First of all, I adamantly oppose the allowance of eight unrelated adults in a 1,600 square foot house. I have a family of three and it is perfect. The homes were built for a single family. Like our house, many of these bungalows were built as two bedroom houses with one bathroom. Many of the attics have been retrofitted into another one or two bedrooms to support the modern day family with their kids. The clay flu septic lines were not built to sustain the use of 8 adults in a house. In addition, the garages are too small for modern cars, and most people park on the street. Additional people would bring additional cars that we do not have room for. All of our neighbors drive kids to school and themselves to work, no one takes public transportation. Where would 6-16 additional cars (with kids driving) per house park? For this reason, I believe that each house should continue to allow for 2 unrelated adults and their kids.

Second, I utterly oppose the change to how "residential care" uses are addressed. Again, opening up these homes to larger groups of people is not practical. For these homes to safely house assisted living or elderly people there will need to be a great deal of construction, altering the current charm of the neighborhood. All of the houses on our block have 8 to 20 steps to get up to the house, which makes them not handicap accessible. My father who is 72 and able bodied struggles to get into our house. Will you then change the zoning for housing setbacks and allowances for garages? Furthermore, adding people to these houses will significantly change our neighborhood. I do not want homeless shelters, correctional facilities and halfway houses near us. We currently see more crime than I would like. We have a young son and I do not want him growing up near any of these housing options.

Thirdly, I oppose the "group living/group homes/congregate living" section. I do not want to open the door for any entity to purchase and subdivide a house, in order to turn it into a boarding facility of any kind. I do not want my neighborhood to become a transient community where people are renting a mere 1-6 months. With the number of break ins we have, I would like to know who is and is not supposed to be next door.

Furthermore, changing the zoning to accommodate college kids and seniors is not a valid argument. The current zoning is not being enforced as there are currently neighbors that rent to college kids. This is an annoyance to many of our neighbors. In particular when it comes to college kids: throwing up in your yard or peeing in the alley. In addition, our streets are already congested with parking, and adding people will only exacerbate the problem. Lastly, the current infrastructure does not support the current number of people. During rush hour it often takes 15-30 minutes to get from Logan to Kalamath, typically a 2 minute drive.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Mr. Webb,

I write to provide feedback about increasing the number of unrelated adults to living under one household.

I moved to Southmoor Park Vista neighborhood because it is family-oriented.

I am firmly against the increase to allow 8, 9, 10, 12+ adults (based on square footage) to live in a single family home. This will completely change the nature of 'family friendly' neighborhoods. Please allow our voices to be heard.

I moved to Southmoor Park Vista with a 14 year old daughter, and a 1 year old son, after living in an urban environment. We specifically left to be family friendly neighborhood. This is my children's home, their community, their friends, their neighbors. They went to school here and feel safe growing up here. Why would we disrupt family life? How is allowing 8-12+ people to live under one roof benefitting our neighborhood? More cars, more traffic, more adults - and fewer children. How can family neighborhoods survive this change in the housing rules?

Please do not allow this to happen.

I am proud to call Denver my home. But changes like this are not conducive to a better quality of life for families.

I live here with my two daughters. We moved to Southmoor in 2007 from urban Denver, to enable a better quality of life for our family, while continuing to reside in Denver and having a reasonable commute.

Since that time, a lot has changed in our lives, and our neighborhood. We have many of the same wonderful neighbors that we started with, and have some new ones who have enriched our lives and the community as a whole. One of our neighbors, however, has chosen to rent his (single-family) home (SFH), recently to a number of people - I say "a number" as I really have no idea how many people are actually living there. We approached the rental agent and the owner, and they claimed that they had no idea that there was an ordinance restricting the number of unrelated adults allowed in a Denver SFH. They also claimed that they really couldn't do anything about it, since they signed a lease with these people.

A result of having innumerable adults living in a SFH is a stark change in the culture of our community and neighbors. Not only do we have constantly unrecognized cars parked outside our and our neighbors' homes, we have many dogs in the back yard, barking, as well as parties - despite the restrictions due to COVID19.

And all of this goes on...even given today's restrictions on unrelated adults living in SFHs in Denver.

If Denver elects to increase our current restrictions to 8 (I have heard that you don't support 8, but do support an increase), there will be unforeseen consequences - some of which my girls and I are currently experiencing.

Others that I have thought of may include, but are not limited to:

-a drain on already low resources for public services. Same amount of property taxes supporting and large potential increase of people in the city of Denver requiring services. This would imply a required property tax increase for all Denver residents, I would assume, in order to pay for the new "multi-family households" increased needs. If not, this would seem to imply reduced availability of services, which seems untenable.

-a further segregation of people, as residents (like me) who have found pockets of Denver which support(ed) our desired lifestyle are pushed out to cities which do not support our desired quality of life. I realize the flip side of this is that people cannot afford to live in Denver and purchase SFHs - however this isn't new. We saved and saved to afford our current home. It wasn't easy and I certainly didn't break the rules to enable my desired living situation.

-More people living in the city without the functioning public transportation to support them will increase density and improved infrastructure

Dear Councilwomen\*,

Please update the City of Denver zoning code to legalize group living. As your constituent, and one in a district that will be highly impacted by this change, I urge you to vote "Yes" on this matter. The proposed change follows both the building and fire codes. The proposed changes ensure that our city's rules reflect the reality of living in Denver. The proposed changes also remove restrictions steeped in classism, racism, and homophobia. The proposed changes are a positive evolution in zoning.

As you know, the current code only allows for two unrelated adults to live in a single family home together. That means unmarried partners can legally have roommates. It means some of Denver's larger homes cannot legally be used to their full bedroom capacity. And, it means the city defines what a "family" is, without taking into consideration that bloodlines are often complicated and are not an immediate indicator of safety.

I'm disappointed by some of the fear-based and unrealistic claims some of the dissenting voices have made: Criminals have never been known to follow rules to begin with, so changing these rules doesn't magically legalize drug dens or encourage criminal activity. I also don't believe these issues are happening with the same frequency and prevalence as homelessness, unaffordable housing costs, and underutilized housing.

The proposed changes do offer lower rents, better density, and provide safe living options for many more Denverites than the current code allows. And it's for that reason that I ask you to please support the Group Living Rules Update.

Thank you,

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Greetings Mr. Webb,

As a polio survivor, I certainly hope the COVID19 virus has killed off any proposal of allowing eight people to live in one home.

My mom was convinced the little girl next door to us when I was two years was carrying the polio virus. Carriers of polio virus , don't always get polio...it was a sneaky little virus, just like COPD 19.

What we're experiencing today was similar to the polio epidemic, only the summer months were closed off. Pools were closed, parks, playgrounds, movie theaters, beaches and more.

I didn't survive one epidemic and come this far physically, collected money from age four - to twelve as The Ambassador of Colorado for The March of Dimes so you and your kids wouldn't get polio just to be killed off by rental homes filled eight strangers with no ties to the neighborhood. It's just me who would be at risk, every Denver citizen in the "group living" areas of Denver would be at risk too.

It took twenty years to find a cure for polio Andrew - keep that in mind when you're mulling over the "group living" proposal in the era of COVID

I'll be keeping closer tabs on your "group living" proposal and will gladly do what I can as a survivor of one epidemic to stop another.

Please do everything you can to make sure the single family zoning provisions do not change. There is too much risk in the proposal that Group Living Advisory Committee (GLAC) supports. I understand that over 75% of members and stakeholder in the GLAC have ties to for-profit group living businesses and organizations. Please do not be naive. Corporate investors and foreign investors will infiltrate Denver's real estate market to take advantage of the Group Living Code Amendment, should it be passed.

Thank you for representing my views and not supporting the Group Living Code Amendment.

This Coronavirus Pandemic has opened our eyes to the problems associated with high density living. Denver is pushing an agenda to increase the number of non-related people in a home from 2 to 8. I think it's time to disband the Group Living Project in light of how aware we all are of the problems associated with high density living. This is not the time to promote this!

Dear Mr. Clark:

We are aware that Denver's Community Planning and Development department is proposing changes to the zoning code regarding "group living. We have lived in West Washington Park since 1997, and would like to contribute our thoughts to the discussion regarding these proposed changes.

We understand that there is a lack of affordable housing in Denver, and there is a move nationally toward higher density. However, we don't believe that changing the character of our neighborhood is the way to achieve this goal. We feel fortunate to have lived where we do for so many years. We have seen an influx of younger families with children over the years; when we moved in there were only three kids on the block. This makes the block and neighborhood sociable, vibrant, and a wonderful place to live.

Most of the residents in the neighborhood own rather than rent, and those that do rent are families and responsible. Residents take pride in their neighborhood, and maintain their properties.

Due to the nature of smaller houses, and smaller garages/houses without garages, many people either do not have availability of off-street parking or use their garages for storage and park on the street. Allowing eight or more unrelated adults to live in one of our relatively small houses would only compound this problem of many cars on the street.

Several years ago, the 1600 square foot house directly across the street from us was a rental property. At least five people lived there, and their friends and girlfriends frequently stayed as well. The number of cars and amount of trash after parties or just a normal weekend was striking. We were so happy when the owner sold to a responsible family, with only two cars, and who maintains the property.

While we understand your goals of allowing more people to live in Denver, please don't destroy the culture of our wonderful neighborhood to do

[Redacted]

Living with 7 adults in a fellowship program and helps reduce the cost of housing while helping professionals with growth.

More kids in the school system from the same house and not paying property tax to help with schools.

When will these proposals be finalized? And Enacted? What should be done if you are about to propose a residential care home (16 residents)?

How is 'group' established? How are facilities selected, who selects? Can anyone rent/lease parts of their homes? Greater density of population escalates safety issues and quality of life.

Does this proposed zoning change trump existing protective covenants that now prohibit certain uses? For entire subdivisions.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

I am a small business owner living in a cooperative in the capitol hill neighborhood. We are a professional, clean efficient organization who gets along with our neighbors. Half of our house does not own cars and only ride bikes. We shop and work for other local businesses, reducing our carbon footprint and engaging the local economy.

What are you doing to coordinate better public transportation in the industrial areas? What are you doing to pop up the 'underserved' communities that are currently shouldering much of this?

Regarding the makeup of the advisory board and other stakeholders, it appears that perhaps the police dept was not included. The number and of police calls for service can indicate impacts to neighbors from any of these uses perhaps in a more important way than trash, weeds, and parking zoning violations. Example regarding Denvergov crime map for a large residential care with several assault crimes and public disorders. I would assume then that the amendment package might put significant additional burden on our police dept. Do these data matter for this amendment package or for the zoning permit process.

I am definitely against 8 unrelated.

8 would be a disaster. Example: drug house 4 blocks from here had police called on them 16 times and this impacted the neighborhood.

Enforcement is an issue. Didn't Denver mismanage the affordable housing project and lose many properties that were affordable.

Safety, overcrowding and infrastructure concerns.

This part of Denver is clean, safe, and property values have increased with resultant tax receipts.

Seattle has excluded several of its neighborhoods from similar zoning changes to preserve the character of these single family neighborhoods. Can Denver do the same?

Tiny Home Villages: What is the city's position on mobile home/manufactured housing communities.

Parking and traffic concerns. Can the zoning limit vehicles?

Would this change allow families to buy together and separate their spaces (basements, etc.) in the way they would like?

Single people being NOT permitted to live with more than 1 other unrelated person while 'related' people can have as many people in a 'flop' home as they want is DISCRIMINATION. Unsanitary concerns for 8 people in a 1600 SF home.

What work has been done to estimate the impact these changes will have on public services - roads, safety and schools? What was the outcome of those studies?

Save single family homes. The Planning Board does not have neighborhood representation. Let special populations allowed by variances. Concern with Parking, Noise, Higher Rents, Pollution, Congestion, Traffic, and Quality of Life. The solution is not concentration but dispersion. This seems to create profit opportunities for moneyed interests at my expense. I oppose this.

Concerns about not having spacing requirements for very small community corrections!

What happens to my property rights?

Why not allow the changes not be made for Pinehurst?

Would the proposed changes override those covenants and declarations (similar to HOA) such as exist in the Stapleton development.

Concerns with predatory landlords

How will this change affect regional air quality and climate goals?

Landlords concerned about not having zoning code backstop to limit tenancy would be helpful to issue some guidance for landlords

Parking and Noise Impacts - No enforcement in the city

Makes no room for landlord who offer communal living

Current rules should not change, overpopulation, traffic, over use. Parking, safety, noise overuse. Too many people and cars in dwelling. City officials do not care about my opinion. Having their own agenda that disregards tax payers.

More inclusive

Tearing down structural inequities that have existed in one way or another for centuries. Concern is that people will block this text amendment out of fear and ignorance

Need to prioritize people over free car storage

The city should not tell me I should have a hetero normative nuclear family home

Acknowledge transitional and alternative lifestyles

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

The benefits of communal living is beyond financial

8 is to many people. Parking issues related to partners, boyfriends, friends visiting and staying the night

Allow ADUs citywide. Infrastructure not addresses as an immediate opportunity to access current zoning allowance

End racist zoning codes

Parking and clarity on fire safety codes

Let people define their families

current definition is out dated and to restrictive

Would create much relief for students in debt and LGBTQ abandoned by family

Open-ness and less restrictiveness

Enables attainable housing for poor people and develops community.

Diversify Housing Stock

Decrease Homelessness (AW does a great job communicating)

Equity and Housing Affordability

Work with the transportation problem

The presentation is clearly propaganda. Unintended Consequences and unrelated households are inherently more transient

Parking

Impacts to stable neighborhoods and trample on the existing property rights

Poor Sound System. I do not want a dormitory next door. Children should not live next door to recovering alcoholics and drug users and those on probation.

Parking and Changes to Life

Unacceptable

We did not agree to this with Blueprint. Pollution and ruining communities. Parking

No oversight. Criminals in neighborhoods

Support only if it does not apply to HOAs.

Parking and declining home values, crime

Parking and enforcement

Home Values and preservation of Single Family Home

Density Concerns, Destruction of neighborhoods, Difficult to Regulate, impacts to property values, sober living not properly regulated

You don't care what we think

Access to resources and reduces stress and anxiety, connectivity, demographic mixes and compassion

We are in a housing crisis and we need to expand housing.

Decline on property values and quality of live

Fair and equitable



**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Giving people a chance to succeed

Noise, Violence, overcrowding, crime

Overcrowding

Equitable, enforceable, and good for sustainability

Home Values

This supports single moms like me

People deserve help and opportunity

Parking and declining home values, crime

Parking and declining home values, crime

Affordability and Sustainability

8 Community Correction people may be too much

Parking and declining home values, crime

Parking and Noise

Allows for more diversity and affordable housing

Parking and declining home values, crime

Parking

Affordability and Sustainability

For-profit investors taking advantage of this

Retrofitting Sprinkler Cost

Parking

Affordability and Sustainability

Parking and Changes to Life

Vacancy Rate and beneficial to developers

Affordability and Sustainability and more safe options

Change the city

More Flexibility

Parking and declining home values, crime

Parking

Lack of Oversight

Slums and flop homes

This is Divisive

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Please do not let 8 adults become a norm.

Overcrowding, and property values impacts

3-4 adults

Parking and property values impacts

Stress on public services

Not clearly defined

There is nothing wrong with the outskirts of Denver. We pay for light rail and buses. Safety and overcrowding impacts. Not enough police staff.

Parking and notification process is not thought out

City is not transparent

Overcrowding, Crime, illegals, and property value impacts

Parking

Why would the city support tiny home villages but not support mobile home communities which provide affordable housing?

Taxing on the infrastructure

Parking and density impacts

Affordable and Equitable (Concerns on lack of oversight)

Parking and Trash Impacts

Parking and Trash Impacts

Overcrowding and parking impacts. No oversight.

Density and lack of infrastructure impacts. Property values and investor impacts.

Taxation, infrastructure and overcrowding Impacts

Parking, Crime, and Noise Impacts

Oversight Concerns

Parking and Noise impacts

This is badly needed. Fairness and right balance of regulation.

Parking Concerns. This helps young people.

Parking, density, property values and Oversight concerns

Community Correction Concerns in neighborhoods

Affordable and Flexible. Resists gentrification.

A good first step

Parking, Crime, property values and Noise Impacts

Waste of time.

Should not be allowed in smaller single family homes

Affordability and Flexibility

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Strengthen parking regulations limiting the number of cars.

Concerns with oversight for very small res care. Parking, infrastructure, property values and Noise Impacts

More Neighborhood Meetings

Parking, Noise, and Property Rights concerns

Traffic and parking concern

Parking, Noise, Traffic, Safety impacts on tax paying home owners

Traffic and landlord concerns

Safety, parking, oversight, property values and infrastructure impacts

Parking and property values impacts and not in my backyard

In Support

Property value and parking concerns

Affordable

Overcrowding, parking concerns. Epidemics like coronavirus cannot be self quarantine in such dense populated areas.

Traffic and overcrowding concerns

Extra cost on Tax Payers. Parking, Crime, Traffic and property values concerns

We deserve an inclusive diverse city

Keep regulation as-is

Safety concerns with having ex-felons in our neighborhoods. Property Value concerns.

Do not destroy the quality of life for those who live in single family homes. Traffic and oversight concerns

8 is too many.

Safety, overcrowding and property value concerns.

Financial impacts on public resources

Oversight, Parking and Density Concerns

Oversight and parking concerns (enforcement)

Oversight (enforcement), overcrowding, parking, infrastructure, density, quality of life concerns. Concerns with Community Corrections.

Parking concerns.

Noise, Parking, Crime, Infrastructure, oversight concerns.

Parking and property right concerns

Parking, overcrowding, and traffic concerns

Parking Concerns

Enforcement and oversight concerns

Traffic and safety concerns

Waste of time.

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Oversight and quality of life concerns for homeowners

Oversight concerns. Not sustainable.

Crime, parking, oversight, noise concerns and institutionalization of neighborhoods.

Property values, infrastructure and parking concerns

This is political.

Community Correction Concerns in neighborhoods. Crime, parking, tax, and infrasturcture concerns

One size does not fit all.

Crime, Traffic, and congestion concerns.

Property safety and quality of life concerns.

Parking and property values concerns.

Infrastructure, parking, crime, and safety concerns.

Parking, traffic, and quality of life concerns.

Parking and noise concerns.

Parking, property values, and crime concerns.

Community Correction in neighborhoods

Parking, overcrowding issues. Community Corrections should not be allowed in neighborhoods but other are okay.

Safety requirements and inspections of rental units should be required similar to Seattle. Infrastructure concerns.

I am definitely against 8 unrelated.

More people not paying taxes

Window Dressing

Parking

Property Values Impacts

Property Values Impacts, Crime, Parking, Noise, and lack of santiation

Builds Community

Traffic, Parking, Trash

Parking and Chaning Neighborhoods

Options for the Vulnerable

Not carefully regulated now

Affordability

Affordability

Affordability and concerns with Commerical Landlords charging higher rent

Affordability and Flexibility

200 SF is not reasonable

**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Affordability and (parking, crime, property Value) concerns

Consider 4

Very Good Job answering questions and Facilitating

8 is too high. Equating Community Correction with other Res Care is misleading

Affordability

Affordability and Flexibility

Affordability and Flexibility

Parking

Affordability and Flexibility. Thank you Staff.

Affordability and Flexibility

Choice

Affordability and removes discrimination

Worried about small Community Correction. Parking