**COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Mr Webb –

The proposals for passing zoning changes to allow large numbers of unrelated persons to live in single family homes is totally unacceptable. If you want this change to allow people who cannot afford housing let them in your neighborhood, NOT mine. This will bring crime and antisocial behavior into neighborhoods where decent people who worked hard to buy their homes live. It will drastically reduce property values and change the character of good neighborhoods.

If the city is so worried about the people who cannot afford a good place to live, why not give them a make work job in your department and give them free lunch and build them housing where they can live with like people who share their values and interests. Don’t set up ridiculous rules export them to my neighborhood.

Good Afternoon!

I am writing you both to inform you of my strong opposition to any proposed group living rules changes. Cram-packing people into homes and creating high-density neighborhoods is third-world BS.

I am getting darned tired with Denver purposely changing what once was a great city into a third-world hell-hole. Kendra Black mentioned at a homeowners association meeting that one of the reasons for this is that rents are high. Well, when you turn the city into a sanctuary city and import the whole world to move in, you run out of affordable housing and rents go up.

So, that’s where I stand and I can tell you that by what is posted on our community portal, citizens of Denver are majorly pissed off over this hare brained proposal.

What a ridiculous idea to destroy our neighborhoods, to allow several unrelated people to live in single family homes. This is horrifying, it will be Motel 6 on my block, without a parking lot. Not to mention the crime rate skyrocketing. I totally understand the unaffordable housing here, sometimes we need to make adjustments, and move to a more affordable community, or get second jobs as we have had to do, in order to sustain our living conditions.

I present these awful proposed zoning changes. While understanding needs I also have a need for my home and area needs to be safe and hold value. This is not an acceptable realistic idea. I have seen what doing this kind of change does to neighborhood.

I pay taxes and do not expect to have that type housing in the neighborhood. Where are my rights as a full paying tax payer. I pay taxes and live middle class diverse neighborhood. We have two group homes that work. What you are proposing is not serving the greater good. Too me it is saying the homeless have more rights than I do. I pay the taxes and have worked even in adverse conditions. You will see tremendous flight from Denver if this passes. I will move.

I will fight these proposals.

Although I agree with your group about some changes in the city’s zoning code regarding the number of unrelated people living together I don’t think that the changes should be 1) so drastic and 2) should not be uniform throughout the city. The proposed change would make us more like New York City, which probably has stricter codes than you are proposing. Denver is a group of neighborhoods around a central downtown area. I was suggest specific blocks that could have many unrelated occupants so we do not compromise our community neighborhoods. Your proposal sounds a bit like communist Vietnam in the 1970’s. I hope we can find a compromise.

Our family objects to all the proposed changes to the Denver zoning code that will change single family neighborhoods into overcrowded slums. 1,600 square feet is not nearly enough space per person. Parking will be a disaster.

Mr. Webb, my city councilwoman, Amanda Sawyer, has communicated the proposed group living zoning code changes. I am writing to oppose the proposal. It is unrealistic to allow up to 8 unrelated people to live in an 1800 square foot space without expecting an unacceptable increase in trash, and parking in residential neighborhoods. I appreciate the need to provide housing for underserved populations. But the proposed change will also serve to disrupt the character of well-established neighborhoods and will affect property values. Compromises could include decreasing the total number of people in that amount of square footage. This would still allow for additional group homes and roommate options without overwhelming neighborhoods. Thanks for your consideration.

I would like to register my objection to this over reach in zoning. It seems your committee is bound to ruin our neighborhood which all of us have worked hard to live here.

I can tell you I am already opposed. Where does you think all these “family” members are going to park? Right now, one car per adult plus one is allowed for residential property. This will allow 9 plus cars per 1,600 sq ft home for the adults. A minor is under 21 years of age, so there are now UNLIMITED vehicles allotted to the home. NO! NO! NO!

I sincerely hope this law does not change. Too many residents in a home causes too much congestion in streets, too many run down, vehicles to park in front of homeowners residents, too many kids running the streets unsupervised, too much clutter in front and backyards such as toys, trash, vehicles and parts of vehicles cluttering yards, too much loud music, too many large vehicles such as RVs, trailers, tow trucks to be parked on street.

I’m writing about my concern regarding the potential changes to the zoning code. While I recognize the need for more affordable housing, packing more unrelated people into a small space is not the way to accomplish this. Allowing so many unrelated people in one house will cause terrible parking issues and puts pedestrians and cyclists at risk due to the increased traffic in neighborhoods. In addition, it will further increase housing by encouraging speculators to buy multiple properties as an investment rather than to live. With so many unrelated tenants, it’s unlikely the exterior or interior of the home will be kept to the same standard you would find in a typical homeowner. Please consider other options for the housing shortage such as allowing marijuana dealers to put their cash in banks rather than laundering the money through property rentals, stop providing benefits to companies for moving here and improve public transportation options for people living northeast and east of the city where there is ample lower cost housing.
COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

And we all thought that short-term rentals and ECAP were a big problem for our neighborhood. Well, the City Planning Department has even more fun and games for us. Please look at this and plan to attend one of these public meetings. I hope that Council Member Chris Hinds will let us know something about his perspective on this issue.

My question is since you stated at a meeting at the Eisenhower Chapel that you are considering raising the allowable number to 8 per unit, when and how did you arrive at that number? You stated that the average on the front range is 5, why not use the same number 5? why not be incremental in changing the number to see how this actually works out. Have you ever lived in house with 8 people? you forget the old saying the fish and company stink after three days- and that usually entails only 2 people visiting. This just another example of the city deciding what they want under the guise of telling the public about it and not even listening to what we want we say. We can always NIMBY about everything, but I this becomes code, maybe you might think differently if the first group of 8 living in one dwelling happens to be next door. Then again maybe you don’t live in Denver and it won’t effect you at all.

I am very concerned about the new zoning code changes. I’ve been reading articles about increased disease, crime and environmental (Litter) impacts on cramming too many humans into one dwelling. Really, it reminds me of our over-crowded prisons. I will be attending one of the pot informational meetings and hope you are there. Here are some thoughts:

1. There seems to be unlimited amount of children allowed in 1800 square feet with 8 unrelated adults. This could be dangerous for a child.
2. In my old neighborhood (not in Denver) a home was utilized by this type of living arrangement (illegally) and it became a drug ring.
3. I don’t see any evidence that this format has been used in any other large city to any degree of success. Do you have evidence?
4. I live near an upcoming large apartment complex, will they be able to do this in apartment rentals?
5. My selfish reason: the aesthetic cleanliness of our beautiful Denver neighborhoods and safety.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the Denver Zoning Code’s residential use regulations for “group living” as it relates to a single family dwelling. As a homeowner in the city and county of Denver, I feel this proposed update, specifically increasing the number of unrelated people allowed to live together in one single family dwelling (household) to 8 unrelated people is ill-considered.

I understand the desire of many to live in a traditionally single-family residential area/neighborhood rather than high density areas. Some reason being quiet areas, more space, less traffic, neighborhood schools, etc. I understand the idea that this change to the zoning code will offer more people the opportunity to live in such an area and would increase housing opportunities and flexibility for some residents. However, I think it has great potential to damage the integrity of what is a desirable neighborhood and make it difficult to keep the desirable features intact and will all diminish the lifestyle of those who have already chosen a traditionally single-family residential area/neighborhood for the obvious reasons.

By the nature of increasing density (to potentially unlimited residents) in one property will certainly change the feel of a neighborhood in a negative way. I do not feel like this is a positive way to build community, but rather a catalyst for discontent among neighbors. Some of the problems I foresee:

- Increased complaints to city neighborhood inspectors
- (unsightly trash issues, outdoor item storage issues, parking/too many cars, pet issues, noise...)
- Increased complaints to police
- Overcrowding in some district schools
- Stress on city waste water systems in older neighborhoods
- Decreased property values

Increased rents by landlords/management companies knowing more people splitting the bill = more rent I trust Denver Community Planning and Development will continue to work with developers to find ways to encourage construction of affordable and mixed-income housing, particularly in transit-rich areas for a connected and healthy city and address more affordable housing options, but I do not think this proposal is a positive approach for Denver neighborhoods. As it is now, I do not feel the zoning definition of “household” is too restrictive (limiting the number of unrelated individuals who can live together to 2 or 3). I think it is important to maintain the integrity of Denver’s beautiful neighborhoods by avoiding over crowded single family homes and the problems that will likely come with the proposed change.

The proposed update is a horrible idea. If people who chose to live in single family homes wanted to be surrounded by multiple families, and in proximity, they probably would have chosen to live in a multi-unit setting. I would like to express my concerns around this to the right person. Can you advise?

I have grave concerns about the proposed changes to the zoning code to allow up to eight unrelated people to live in a house/unit together. East Park is a neighborhood in southeast Lowry. We have the misfortune of having a subsidized housing/homeless complex called the Renaissance, on the north side the neighborhood. We also have an apartment/condo complex at Dayton and E. 5th Ave. These residential complexes are already hosting numerous people living in small quarters. The complexes don’t have parking spaces to accommodate all the residents living there. Their vehicles are parking in front of single family homes, on E. 5th Avenue and E. 4th Place, from Dayton to Alton. They also park up Dallas and other side streets. It’s terribly unfortunate for this neighborhood to have to endure so many vehicles parked on our neighborhood streets, in front of our homes, and also endure all the trash that the residents dump on the ground around their vehicles. There is a white sedan with out-of-state plate that has parked on our streets for over two years. I reported it to the police who said they two guys said they are homeless, live out of their car, occasionally sleep and use the bathroom of a friend living in the apartment complex. Is this what City Council wants to create in our neighborhood? Allowing more people to cram into residential units that clearly cannot accommodate a parking space for each resident, will only exacerbate the problem we already have in East Park. Please think about the homeowners and our right to live in a clean neighborhood not cluttered by vehicle parking in front of our homes. East Park in Lowry is not urban living. Thank you for your consideration.
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8 unrelated adults is a lot. I don't understand the rationale for that as the baseline #. The doc mentions a 1600 square foot home, however in our neighborhood a lot of the rental houses are significantly less than that (800-1200) and 8 adults plus unlimited related minors could be a lot of for a little space. Could this be compromised some? I would favor a maximum of 5 unrelated adults and a cap of the total # of occupants. So 5 unrelated adults and no more than 2-3 minors? Or setting a maximum of 8, including minor children. Dicey to put this into words, but no more adults and no more than 8-10 total including any minors. Therefore, if there were 2 adults living together and each had 4 children, that would not cut it at 10. I don’t mind the provision that over 1600 sf any additional 200 sf would allow for an added person (either adult or minor) over the 10. I definitely envision some worst case scenarios as its currently recommended with the unlimited minors, since minors are not necessarily young children. See the FAQ for a few questions related to this. Fair Housing laws limit how cities can regulate the number of minor children, but we will consider your ideas. I would also strongly suggest that the same notification system as used in zoning variances be used should any group living other than a single rental, would require notification to the immediate neighbors and to the RNO, with ample time for neighbor input. In our neighborhood there are plenty of rentals, often with students being the residents. But if we were to get a residential facility to be used as a half house, elder care facility and the like, I strongly advocate that the neighbors and neighborhood should have advance notice and a chance to weigh in. It also appears that in a residential area such as ours, we would qualify for a 9-40 resident facility. That seems excessive to me. Not sure who would be the solution, but we already have many, many multi-unit buildings on our outer edges. Am I reading this correctly? Residential Care Facilities like assisted living, nursing homes, recovery and similar are already permitted in low-intensity residential zones at this size. However off-street parking requirements and other regulations limit larger-sized facilities to bigger parcels of land. Typical residential lots of 4500-6000 square feet, with detached homes structures, are generally limited by parking and other requirements to smaller facilities serving 8 or fewer people, and this would not change. I fully understand and appreciate the goal of equity and accessibility, and know that some change is necessary. Just concerned about the potential for misapplication and misuse of the recommendations as written.

I am concerned about the proposed changes to the residential use rules for households in Denver. I believe that increasing the number of unrelated people allowed to live in an 1800-square-foot house to 8 is too much. The potential increase in noise, garbage, and cars this rule could bring to neighborhoods could make them unlivable. A more moderate increase (perhaps to 4) of unrelated people living together still allows for roommates without turning single-family houses into dormitories. Thanks for listening,

Our family is distressed to see the unrealistic and problematic number of residents and children you are suggesting for a very small space. This is not a good idea. Please reconsider and come up with other constructive suggestions to improve the lot of the homeless. It is a serious problem that needs to be addressed in a more thoughtful way. Thank You

I do not support this change and recommend not making this change. I fully agree with council person Sawyer describing this as an overreach. Effected neighborhoods have a high probability of being impacted by increased traffic, decreased available parking and the potential conflicts that come from these issues compounded by greater neighborhood populations.

I heard about Denver’s proposed housing changes and recently read your article “Housing Policy, Group Living, Zoning Code and Regulations”; it appears government is once again telling people where and how to live. As you know, the majority of people make informed and financial decisions on where and how they want to live regarding their housing needs. These decisions are typically based on a myriad of conditions, which creates sustains the desired environment and values of neighborhoods they choose to live in. It’s one thing to redevelop unsustainable neighborhoods, except that such redevelopment has a tendency to eliminate lower cost housing thereby forcing owners and occupant to live elsewhere and at a higher costs. Such redevelopments, in many instances helps Denver to generate more revenues and developers to earn profits at the cost of creating more housing that is not affordable. Rather than waiting for an area/neighborhood to naturally decline over many years; government now wants to come in and create a faster means for existing cohesive neighborhoods to self-destruct in losing their current qualities and values. The proposed plan of changing the current zoning of households from a two related family occupancy to an arrangement of many different types numbers of unrelated occupants and uses are very disturbing and unacceptable. Such proposed zoning changes of this magnitude and overreaching government authority needs to be approved by the people who own the affected real estate in the City & County of Denver; and not by the Denver Zoning & Planning Department, Mayor’s Office or the Denver City Council.

Have you prepared a map of where the new group living homes will be allowed? Will they be allowed in every neighborhood? Is there any recusal for neighborhoods which don’t want to change? Will these new regulations allow more Vrbo rentals? Will (do) Vrbo owners pay taxes like motels have to pay?

In my neighborhood, Barnum West, I see neighborhood homes full to capacity with a lot of people living in small 2 bedroom homes. The types of people who are packed into these small homes are not the type who take pride in their surroundings and therefore cause the neighborhood to disintegrate. I have lived in my home since 1953 and take immaculate care of it, with high regard for maintaining my property. However the rest of the neighborhood is in horrible shape, lots of cars parked on street, one neighbor owns a tow truck company and likes to park his large tow truck and down the street taking up my parking space in front of my home, not allowing guests to park there, weeds grow feet tall in summer, dog waste is allowed to accumulate in yards to the point that the stench is outrageous and causes me to call animal control, grass is a thing of the past and dirt/mud is the norm. Lots of kids run the streets unsupervised, I have to call 311 who in turn contacts authorities to come out to home and inst the situation, lots of hispanic music blares in yards, I have to contact 311 once again. The cost of neighborhood inspectors to come out on a regular basis I am sure is high, the property values, even though they have increased, are low because of the distressed properties and as a result I cannot get a fair market value of my beautifully maintained home. I see renters in these small homes pack more and more people into the to afford the rent. The owners of these small homes are slum landlords, who don’t care about maintaining them, just interested in getting renters in who can pay them $2000 a month. I am so hopeful that the zoning doesn’t get approved. The homeless are not my problem and the government should provide housing for them, with all the tax money they get from marijuana sales. I feel I am drowning, calling 311 constantly in an effort maintain the neighborhood. Laws are broken all the time with these numerous individuals who occupy the homes in this area, leaving long-time homeowner who take pride in their property to drown in unkept properties. Our property taxes should decrease, not increase due to the unkept neighborhood.
I am writing you today in regards to the proposed changes to the city’s Group Homes and Group Living regulations for residential neighborhoods. I am against any changes to residential zoning rules that would allow for expansion of most group homes in all residential areas of the city. The group homes that I and many of my neighbors are against are community halfway houses, Homeless shelters and the changes to increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling. It is my hope you will take under account what I hope you take under account while making your final decision. We hope you will understand how badly these changes will effect a home owner, parent and the overall the safety to our neighborhoods. I’m sure there are people who are living here and unhappy with the change. Is there a limit to the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling? Are there any restrictions on who may live in a single dwelling? We already feel overwhelmed worrying about a new sex offender registry and now you would impose another danger to the neighborhood. How would we know who is living here and what they did? Will there be any limitations as to what type of criminal or drug addict would be allowed to live next door? This would also effect the value of the homes that I do not believe that many decisions made by the city truly take homeowners under account. I feel as if the housing problem gets put on our shoulders. We pay more for homes these days and pay higher property taxes in recent years. We have to live next door to homes that are purchased for profit because we don’t regulate how many homes are actually purchased to live in or to be rented out. This brings me to the second big issue that I and most of my neighbors have. Increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling:

Again, you are trying to fix the housing problem but are making it worse. We already have single family homes that are filled with three or more families. You say that more unrelated adults can live in a dwelling without considering the amount of children that it would add to the home and to the neighborhood. I have lived across the street from a house that was. Specifically purchased to make money by being rented out. A family of six moved in. The only adults who were the parents had four children. The eldest daughter had two children. The second eldest became pregnant, moved in her overage boyfriend and they had three children. Then there was a teenaged daughter and young boy. The eldest daughter had multiple boyfriends move in. So as time went on there were 6 adults, a teenager and six young children living at the home. Parking was terrible because 7 vehicles were parked on the street from just this one home alone. The children were often unsupervised because the adults had to work. Most people who live in these situations can’t afford to live on their own and must live with others to get by. It’s a very sad situation but by trying to help them even more now, you hurt homeowners like myself and the neighborhood. The neighborhood gets overcrowded by people and vehicles. Schools get overcrowded and the teachers are already in bad situations. Neighborhood schools weren’t built to hold so many children. This increases the safety concerns at our schools. Most schools don’t have air conditioning and the ones that do only use it at a higher temperature to save money.

I am writing to express my support for the proposed updates to the Group Living Uses in Denver’s Zoning Code. I have reviewed these proposals which include the following:

- Increase the number of unrelated adults allowed to live together from 2 to 8 people
- Allow residential care and group homes in more places throughout Denver
- Update restrictions on Homeless Shelters and Community Corrections Facilities
- Allow the development of Permanent Tiny Home Villages. Upon review, I find that these important changes promote community, encourage the development and preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing, and better represent the values of our city. In the midst of our current housing crisis, it is imperative that we find additional ways to address the needs of the diverse populations that make up our city.

I am in support of the group living code changes.
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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” 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 move 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 establish 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 at 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 A 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 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 the lawn and 3 more around the corner. So there were 10 cars involved. I believe I speak for my neighbors on South Ivie 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 - they 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 Boulevard. Enough is enough, please. I notice that the information listed one bullet point in the communication we received as “require Community Inform meetings for larger residential care uses to notify neighbors.” I’m not sure I under 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...
I am writing to share my opposition to the proposed changes and our existing zoning pertaining to these facilities. (1) It is just horrible public policy to allow businesses to operate in single family zoned neighborhoods. These operations are businesses, i.e. profit motive, employees, tax filing, etc., and the City is ACTIVELY pursuing the expansion of these businesses in single family neighborhoods is appalling. (2) The City through their zoning laws are diminishing the market value of citizens homes by allowing these facilities in single family zoned neighborhoods. Any real estate expert would testify that allowing a residential care business next to single family homes definitely diminishes the market value of the houses on that street. This fact is indisputable. I applaud the City for pursuing solutions to such housing needs but to do so by destroying the fabric of single family neighborhoods is horrible public policy.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed changes to Denver Zoning Code’s rules for “group living.” I believe such changes will negatively affect our residential neighborhoods. I am not opposed to group homes or assisted living facilities - within reason - in our neighborhoods. But 8 unrelated people in homes with 1800 (1600?) sq. ft. of space (with an additional unlimited number of children under age 18 allowed) is a disaster. I myself grew up in a family of 7 (grandfather, mom & dad for a while), then mom only, plus 4 children. This was at a time when families had 1 car (not multiple cars). So am not opposed to several people in a home in general, but am opposed to too great a number of unrelated people in a house. The bonds of family are different from unrelated people sharing living quarters who are not family. I also lived next door to a rooming house - and I think at most 4 unrelated people rented rooms. Again, they did not own cars (this was in the 1950's and 1960's) were quiet adults. A different time, I suppose. Regarding group homes, my elderly mother was fortunate to live in what in Oregon is called an “adult foster home” during her last few months of life. She needed 24/7 care that her children could not provide in their own homes, and the 2 nursing homes in her small central Oregon city were awful - one was horrific and we were told by social workers to only use it as a last resort; the other pretty terrible. Her adult foster home was staffed 24/7 by a single caregiver (on 24-hr shifts) and cared for no more than 4 elders (and this adult foster home was owned by a well respected community nurse who saw the need for such group homes). That size home was do-able and fitted well into the residential neighborhood in which it was located. I would not object to smaller group homes in Denver. But the proposed up to 8 plus unlimited children is simply wrong for our neighborhoods. I urge that there be some compromise. Clearly there is a housing shortage in Denver. But such a radical means of solving it is not a solution at all. Our residential neighborhoods should work for everyone. This proposed change is simply crazy.

I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to current zoning rules that would allow for expansion of group homes in all residential areas of our city. Our neighborhood was designed long ago to house single family residents only. The streets and parking are designed that way too. An influx of numerous various people from all these groups would strain all the resources we have. Parking and traffic would be a mess. And house prices would decline significantly. Crime would skyrocket, and still more working family’s would leave for the suburbs.

I support the Group Living Updates to Denver’s Zoning Code (list below). Those of us lucky enough to have more space than we need should have the legal right to take in others who can’t find an affordable house. Candi, when you visited me in Globeville before your election, you disappointed me by NOT strongly supporting the Tiny Home village’s presence (at that time, proposed for Globeville), which the rest of the councilpeople subsequently unanimously supported. I’m ready to forgive you if you vote the right way on these proposals. I hope ALL of you pull a Mitt Romney on this one, and support the generous and welcoming choice here. This is our chance to actually prove “We Can Do Better” than allowing camping (which I also think is better than not allowing it). Perhaps you are getting all kinds of doomsday letters about Denver going to pot if these changes are adopted, but surely we can find other ways to respond to the kinds of problems that may arise in a few cases due to these zoning adjustments. Denver is changing fast. We need legal flexibility to maintain a city of diversity and livability for people of all income levels. Thanks for your hard and dutiful work on our behalf!

I am writing to express my support for the proposed updates to the Group Living Uses in Denver’s Zoning Code. I have lived in Denver since 2003 and understand the challenges that face our fine city as it continues its growth and expansion. I have reviewed these proposals, which include the following:

- Increase the number of unrelated adults allowed to live together from 2 to 8 people
- Allow assisted living and group homes in more places throughout Denver
- Update restrictions on Homeless Shelters and Community Corrections Facilities
- Allow the development of Permanent Tiny Home Villages

Upon review, I find that these important changes promote community, encourage the development and preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing, and better represent the values of our city. In the midst of our current housing crisis, it is imperative that we find additional ways to address the needs of the diverse populations that make up our city. Thank you for your support of these important updates!

I have tried to find, and cannot find, a definition of related versus unrelated people online for the city of Denver. For example, my husband (68 years old) and I (54 years old) live 1 block from my niece and her husband, and their baby. We would like to jointly purchase a large house, partly for all of us to save on our mortgage payments, partly to make babysitting easier, and partly to plan for my husband’s and my old years. But does Denver think that I am related to my adult niece? Or would we be considered 2 related adults + 2 related adults = 4 unrelated adults? This may seem to be a silly question (Chelsea is my identical twin’s daughter and shares 50% of my DNA), but in Boulder years ago I was that my twin sister and I were considered unrelated despite being genetically identical because we were over the age of 18 and not living with our parents. So it is not at all clear to me that I am related to my adult niece under Denver regulations - we may have become “unrelated” when she became 18 years old. (Tomatoes, botanically a fruit, are regulated as a vegetable under federal law, so reality is clearly subordinate to the larger reality of regulations and laws). I would very much like to know the current definition of related parties before the 4 of us shop for a larger Denver home to share. If you could copy me the relevant part of the Denver zoning code, that would be great! I support allowing more people to share a home. As I understand the current rules, only 2 people can share a house, no matter how large, while 4 are allowed to share an 800 sq. ft. apartment, which is absurd. Denver should not be involved in dictating people’s living choices as long as they do not significantly impact neighbors - that is perhaps car limitations such as 1 car per household +1 car per each off street parking space, as well as continuing current ordinances regarding noise, yard maintenance, etc.
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I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal for changes to Denver’s zoning regarding “group living” which would allow 8 unrelated people to occupy an 1,800 square foot piece of property. I understand this will be for ALL neighborhoods if passed. I moved to Park Hill 4 years ago because of the type of neighborhood it is, tree lined streets, the mix of ethnicities and ages, historic houses, closeness to all that Denver has to offer. But main reason was for the simple family homes offered in great family neighborhoods. I’ve seen the massive growth in Denver which has been driven by the greed of developers, building houses with no attempt to blend in with existing houses, huge houses on small lots encroaching over the top of smaller houses, minimal architecture in order to make maximum profit. I am also aware of lots being cleared in other neighborhoods for multi apartment buildings (with inefficient parking). I now have become aware that City Council is once again trying to increase density in established, stable neighborhoods by allowing 8 unrelated people to occupy an 1,800 square foot property. This is crazy, plain and simple. Yes, there is a housing crisis, prices are high and you can’t escape that by renting (those prices keep escalating as well), but creating apartment-like living in existing family homes is not the answer. On my street, there are exactly 2 spaces in front of every house (if you are a competent parallel parker) and not everyone can afford to replace their 1 car flat roof garages to get cars off the street. Where are cars for 8 people going to go? Just because you wish we all walk, ride bikes, use buses or light rail does not make it a reality. The bus is not convenient in all neighborhoods, RTD does not have a stellar reputation right now and you still need to get to light rail. Not to mention everyone wants to go to the mountains to enjoy what Colorado has to offer. Those cars even if they aren’t being used to get to work still have to be parked somewhere. Drive up and down the streets of Park Hill after 6 pm and see how many cars are parked on the street now. The rule is 2 unrelated people living in a home now, how did it jump to EIGHT? It’s not being enforced now, how will enforcement happen with EIGHT or will there be no enforcement? I am not sure how many neighbors even know this is happening. Without postings on Neighbor Next Door and thoughtful emails from friends, I would have no idea what City Council is entertaining. There should be flyers in every single neighborhood, emails from the City, more “daytime” meetings and a better attempt at notifications of major changes like this. The pit bull changes City Council just passed got more notification than this change. Why is that? I am asking you to NOT change the flavor of our neighborhoods with this ill advised plan. I take pride in taking care of my property, mowing my lawn, shoveling my walk, having great neighbors and a wonderful walkable family neighborhood. Please don’t change that. Thank you for your attention.

This is a BAD idea. Why can’t you leave the R1 districts alone. We’ve worked all our lives to be able to have a home. A home without a lot of traffic or noise.

Mr. Webb - I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to our city’s Group Homes and Group Living regulations. Our neighborhoods were designed perfectly for single family living, and have worked well for decades. Increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling will cause havoc regarding parking, traffic flow, crime, and will significantly decrease home values. These changes also drive even more working family’s to the suburbs. Do not move forward with this plan.

Thank you for your work on the Group Living Rules update. I know that you have been hosting community meetings and gathering input for many years, and I appreciate your commitment to listening. I am a Denver resident of the Baker neighborhood. I appreciate that the group living rules being updated, as for many years, we have lived in an “illegal” home. I moved to this neighborhood starting in 2014 with my partner when we bought a home, that we could only afford with roommates at the time as we both were working entry-level jobs and getting support from family during one point, we had 4 unrelated individuals living happily in our home. Now, as we are both full-time students (I am in a PhD program at CU Denver and my partner in law school at DU), we continue to have a roommate to help with the rent. I know parking is brought up by many folks as their opposition to these updates. In the case of our home, we have a 2 car garage that is always used and no more than 1 vehicle at any time in front of our home. We are thoughtful about this as we know how much folks enjoy being able to park in front of their homes. In addition, through my PhD research, I have spoken to many families in Southwest Denver who are only able to afford housing in our city by doubling up, or moving in with family members or families. They are making ends meet working minimum wage jobs and our current housing market doesn’t allow them the ability to rent an apartment with enough room for rent or their own home. For the sake of equity, it doesn’t make sense to continue pretending that these living situations don’t exist. Please let me know if there is anyone else I can share my comments with as I am unable to attend the feedback sessions.

The recommended changes to the regulations for residential neighborhoods are ludicrous! This one especially, which calls for increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling unit of under 1,800 square feet from the current two plus any of their family members, to eight plus any of their family members, would mean that a housing units larger than 1,800 square feet could add another unrelated adult for each additional 200 square feet – a 2,400-square-foot house, for instance, would accommodate 11 unrelated adults and any of their family members rather than just eight. Eight unrelated folks living in less than 1,800 square feet. Just what kind of squalor are you proposing? I live in Harvey Park and the number of cars at some of my neighbors homes causes them to park in such a way as to block the sidewalks at the corners so folks have to go our into the street to get to the other side. Adding more people will make off street parking impossible, add to the trash and recycle loads, add kids into the school system and etc. And not add a dime to your revenue. Please don’t do it!!!

I am encouraged by this news. Residents in Denver need to be able to rent rooms in peoples homes. Many people who have houses need to be able to rent out rooms to be able to afford their houses. Present zoning laws are causing many problems for many people. Friends I know in Aurora are allowed to rent five rooms in their house. While in many locations in Denver people are allowed to only rent one room.

Changing this is a good way to prevent homelessness for people who need to rent a room and prevent foreclosure for People who have rooms could rent but are not able to because of the zoning laws. Thank you for addressing this issue. I feel encouraged.

I am writing to express my support for the proposed Group Living updates to the DZC. It is clear these updates are the result of a thoughtful, considered process and I appreciate the work of the committee and staff. The updates will help to make housing more accessible for more people. I believe the changes to the number of unrelated adults who can live in a home are both appropriate and helpful to many of our fellow citizens who would live with roommates, either out of preference or economic need. The updates impacting shelters will help the City and service providers I serve those living in homelessness, particularly the most vulnerable of them. These are but two examples of what I believe to be an important, conceived collection of text amendments and I support it in its entirety.

Hello, I live in wash park west and this group living plan is incredibly disturbing to me. The impact I see to our neighborhood and property values could be devastating. I say NO to this. I will be at the open house this Saturday. Looking forward to this discussion.
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I am writing in opposition to the zoning changes the City of Denver is considering in their current form. I am not opposed to some increase in the number of unrelated persons who can occupy a dwelling unit, but I feel that the number proposed (8) is excessive. This would have a detrimental effect on our neighborhood, or indeed any residential neighborhood, in terms of parking, traffic, potential noise, and general quality of life. My wife and I have lived in West Washington Park for 18 years and are concerned about preserving the residential character of the area. I am also concerned about the changes proposed for group living. As a member of the WWPNA I support the modifications to the proposed changes that have written to you about. Thank you for your attention.

I would like to register my grave concerns regarding the group living facilities being proposed for our West Washington Park neighborhood. In recent years we are seeing more and more densification of our neighborhood, particularly in the section in what is called the Speer neighborhood. When we bought into our neighborhood we loved the charm of the mix of single family and mostly small multi-family buildings. Now we are seeing our neighborhood character erode with a speed that rivals the destruction of so many downtown neighborhoods in the 1950s. Ironically, city planners said they wanted more affordable housing in our neighborhood, yet it seems every month affordable bungalows or duplexes are torn down for large multi-family, expensive condos. When the city proposed zoning changes to our neighborhood several years ago, we attended many city-sponsored meetings and gave a great deal of input to the planners. From what we can see, it was all ignored and the city went ahead to change zoning to what they wanted. As a former city planner, I’m dismayed with the disregard of input by city planners in Denver these days. With this latest proposal for group homes and facilities, I believe we will once again be ignored as the timeline for input is unrealistically short. My husband and I have put off meeting with you individually due to family issues but at some point, we would like to discuss many of these zoning issues with you. In the meantime, we would ask that you slow down the approval process so the proposals can be discussed in a reasonable manner. Thank you.

The purpose of my writing is to ask you to slow the pace on the proposed zoning code changes that will increase density in our West Washington Park neighborhood. In the last ten years, the many apartment building and complexes that have sprung up are really straining our roads, traffic walkability. Increasing the number of occupants per dwelling seems like an opportunity for developers to make money, not an option for people trying to find more affordable housing. I will try to get to an upcoming meeting on this, but wanted to at least express my family’s sentiment to you.

Hi Mr. Webb - I’d love to have your address so we, the taxpayers, may send multiple unrelated people to live in homes in your area! It is a grand concept. Let me tell you, all the cars, all the people, all the noise, etc. is most enjoyable to live across the street from. I enjoyed tremendously our time living across from a rental home with many unrelated adults. We can’t quite be sure how many people were living there due to the house looking like a clown car but it was always fun to try and guess. The responses from the home owner, who is also a local real estate broker, were always a read. Hopefully you will embrace the obvious sarcasm and intellect and reason will descend upon the organ in which decision making should occur and realize increasing allowable non-related adults is a rather unpleasant idea. Or, perhaps, you might enjoy living next door to. I suppose that is always a possibility.

Raising the number of unrelated people living together to 8 from the current 2 is too high. A Residential Care facility of 9-40 people can hardly be considered “Small”, I have no idea what the Zoning Code would consider “Large”. I realize that the City desperately needs affordable housing but don’t think boarding houses are the solution. And even if a Residential Care facility “only” houses 8 or fewer residents, it still should be required to notify and educate neighbors. Four unrelated people living together seems like a reasonable number. A Residential Care facility of 1-5, assuming that one of the five is a manager/caregiver, would be “Very Small”. Thank you for your time.

I support WWPNA’s position on the proposed zoning change for West Washington Park. Our neighborhood association has been working with the City on zoning regulations. The proposed changes to the current zoning will create more problems for our residential neighborhood. The huge increase in the proposed number of residents, does not work for our neighborhood. This is a neighborhood of families. Please vote against the proposed zoning change approval.
I strongly oppose the proposed upzoning to group living and residential care in our West Washington Park (WWP) neighborhood. My primary concerns are as follows:

- Residents of WWP were not made aware of these material changes, which will significantly impact the value and livability of our homes.
- The impact of surrounding high-density construction cannot be evaluated until these developments are completed. (Gates redevelopment, Broadway/Alameda development, Speer Blvd developments, etc.) The highest density increase the city has ever undertaken, which will dwarf Rhino, is already in progress in our back yard.
- The current and planned transportation infrastructure improvements to accommodate the projected increases in population density are grossly inadequate.
- This upzoning from a residential neighborhood to tracts of rental properties is an intermediary step to high rises. It will displace the current residents, especially people with health and mobility issues, the elderly, and vulnerable families. It is not healthy for renters or owners.
- This proposal favors absentee investors profiting from lucrative rental properties over homeowners using their occupied residence as a place to raise a family, be part of a community, build equity in their home for retirement, and hopefully one day be able to age in place.

Recommendations, which I hope you will consider:

- Place a moratorium on all increases in density in and around WWP until the full impact of the largest increase in density the city has ever undertaken can be fully observed and evaluated.
- If immediate affordable housing is of utmost concern, require section 8 housing as a % of both existing and new apartment buildings above a certain size (ie: 10+ units). Close the loophole on developers and landlords being able to pay a fee and avoid providing affordable housing in the rental properties via an acceptable number of rent controlled units.
- Convert low-density commercial zoning to residential, which will allow for a holistic approach to growth that is more responsible, better-engineered, and healthier for all the city’s residents. There are miles of extremely low-density 1-2 story warehouses along transportation corridors within the city limits. (I-70 North & South, West of Santa Fe across from WWP, east of Lincoln between WWP and downtown, and these are just the ones I have been by)
- The density increase in residential areas is considerably out of balance with corresponding commercial areas, which have not undergone any requisite consolidation. We have absorbed explosive growth with the 38 story twin towers at Country Club Gardens, which creates a 10-block tunnel in our neighborhood, whereas the industrial parks appear unchanged at 1-2 stories.

The proposal to allow 8 unrelated adults to live in a single-family residence is ill-conceived and will be harmful to neighborhoods, especially neighboring homes. If you have ever had the unfortunate experience of living next to a rental house with 8 unrelated young people, you will know that the result is excessive noise, trash and poor maintenance, as well as an excess of vehicles. this is a far cry from specific needs, such as elder-housing. If there are specific needs to be addressed, then address them with specificity rather than making a sweeping change that will have unintended consequences. Here is the 55+ statement:

- Zoning restrictions limit the number of unrelated individuals who can live together under the definition of “Household Living,” which reduces opportunities for intergenerational living and other desired uses.
- Vehicle parking requirements for assisted living facilities exceed the vehicle parking demand.
- The Denver Zoning Code regulates Assisted Living Facilities and Large Residential Care Facilities based upon zone district contexts creating confusion for city staff. If these are the problems that stand in the way of assisted living facilities or co-housing for 55+, provide for exceptions if the number of unrelated people over 55 to live together under specified parameters and change the parking requirements for these facilities. This has been done in Southern California. However, there is no compelling need to allow 8 unrelated adults plus children to squeeze into small single family residences, although this already happens. The planning group needs to pay more attention to the negative effects of unrestricted group living in existing residents whose homes may border a house with too many residents and not make zoning changes that will degrade the quality of life and property values of existing residents.

I am a Denver resident (Congress Park) and want to share my thoughts on the proposed residential zoning changes. I appreciate the interest in expanding the zoning rules before two unrelated adults in one house. I would support expanding the zoning to 3-4 unrelated adults for house of 1800+ feet, with legal bedrooms for each - an incremental increase. Eight is quite a jump from two and seems like a radical change. Thank you -

I apologize for my late response to the newsletter. I had planned on attending tomorrow’s meeting but have sustained a painful back injury. I am a senior citizen & have lived in my home since 1981. Many changes have taken place in this neighborhood & in the rest of the city as well. This area was designated R1 residential then & now there are many people living together in these homes. I have no issues with moderate changes but when I read in this newsletter is quite frankly frightening. Are you planning on putting drug addicts & child molesters in our neighborhoods? If you are thinking of 8 unrelated people plus family members you had might as well build motels or apartment buildings to say nothing of the traffic & parking issues. Where on earth is Denver headed with this kind of insanity? As you have probably surmised, I am totally against increasing the amount of residents per household & destroying our neighborhoods.
He and you should be concerned about all people in Denver and think of less undesirable ways to house those with small or no incomes. Residents to be forced to live in the kind of situation this proposed change will cause. Are we in a democracy, or is the mayor trying to be a dictator? More unrelated people and possibly their children to live in what has always been called a single family house. It's just not right or fair for current homeowners as possible into this soon to be not great city. There has to be money to be made by someone in power to even suggest such a plan. We are already in a situation where we have an HOA that can never be dissolved since those private streets would have to be maintained by that HOA. Then the City of Denver made further decisions that had requirements of number of vehicles allowed, where they could be parked, etc., in addition to even what colors the homes could be painted. Those rules specifically only allowed a single family to live in the HOA house. (Please forgive me but putting a section 8, or sex offender halfway house, or halfway houses, mental illness treatment facilities, section 8, etc., to buy homes in those areas. I am not the only one on the south side was allowed to ask their questions so the main question I had, I asked Councilman Flynn after the meeting and he didn’t have a firm answer as it seems your zoning rules are changing as they go along. (An example is the information the Councilman and I received was that a single house on the property has been allowed more people than the number of bedrooms in the house. Are rent have moved in and out of the house there have been situations in which the renters where 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 insconsiderate of 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 where 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. Crea of these regulations that promotes recycling and composting and 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 term rental properties; I fully support this initiative. Having experienced a challenge in trying to track down the landlord of the property it pertains 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 management of the registry, would be able to verify rental agreements. It is my understanding that the City of Denver will continue to provide information on the registry, including how to access it, and that the registry will be updated regularly to ensure accuracy.

I am in favor of group living. Denver needs more options.

Thank you for your presentation this morning on the proposed zoning changes for Denver and your explanation for those changes. I would suggest more time for questions at future meetings as this mornings questions seemed to only be taken from the back and north sides of the auditorium. I was given and that is the information that is my main disagreement. Some 30 years ago the City of Denver started changing the way they allow buildings to build residential neighborhoods, first suggesting, and then in some cases demanding, that new housing/neighborhoods be governed by HOAs to help ease the burden of City Zoning inspectors by transferring some of the enforcement work of those inspectors to HOAs and having the HOAs do the enforcement of HOA rules, covenants, declarations, etc. The City also gave builders boiler plate covenants/rules/etc. that builders could insert into their HOA paperwork that was filed with the Denver Courts, put onto plats, etc., with NO input from home owners whatsoever since that paperwork was done before a single house was built in the subdivision. If you bought a house in that neighborhood it came with it’s own set of rules that the buyer had to agree to in order to buy the house. In some cases these rules were a good thing and increased the value of the home in the area because those rules DID NOT ALLOW halfway houses, mental illness treatment facilities, section 8, etc., to buy homes in those areas. Those rules specifically only allowed a single family to live in the HOA house. (Please forgive me but putting a section 8, or sex offender halfway house, or halfway houses, in the middle of an upscale neighborhood DOES decrease the values of the houses in that area so I disagree with your information claiming these types of residences don’t affect the value of houses in that area.) Other rules were also put into the HOA documents approved by the City that had requirements of number of vehicles allowed, where they could be parked, etc., in addition to even what colors the homes could be painted. My HOA (Marston Cove, 8501 W Union Ave) the subdivision was initially supposed to be a Denver Public School when the City of Denver allow homes to be built in the South West area between S Kipling/S Wadsworth and W Belleview/W Quincy. As more homes were built in the area DP decided to build a school in the Grant Ranch subdivision instead this area and sold 8501 W Union Ave to a builder to build single family homes in 1994. The City of Denver allowed the builder to build 50 houses in this area under some very specific conditions set by the City. One was that all houses have the same address of 8501 W Union Ave with each house being numbered 1 through 50 and that the streets would have to be private streets because to fit 50 houses in this small area the streets could only be 23 feet wide on the asphalt area, which is much smaller than the non 34 feet width required for the City to take over the streets as city streets. Those conditions FORCED all future homeowners in this neighborhood having an HOA that can never be dissolved since those private streets would have to be maintained by that HOA. Then the City of Denver made further decisions that had requirements of number of vehicles allowed, where they could be parked, etc., in addition to even what colors the homes could be painted. My HOA (Marston Cove, 8501 W Union Ave) the subdivision was initially supposed to be a Denver Public School when the City of Denver allow homes to be built in the South West area between S Kipling/S Wadsworth and W Belleview/W Quincy. As more homes were built in the area DP decided to build a school in the Grant Ranch subdivision instead this area and sold 8501 W Union Ave to a builder to build single family homes in 1994. The City of Denver allowed the builder to build 50 houses in this area under some very specific conditions set by the City. One was that all houses have the same address of 8501 W Union Ave with each house being numbered 1 through 50 and that the streets would have to be private streets because to fit 50 houses in this small area the streets could only be 23 feet wide on the asphalt area, which is much smaller than the non 34 feet width required for the City to take over the streets as city streets. Those conditions FORCED all future homeowners in this neighborhood having an HOA that can never be dissolved since those private streets would have to be maintained by that HOA. Then the City of Denver made further decisions that had requirements of number of vehicles allowed, where they could be parked, etc., in addition to even what colors the homes could be painted.

This is the craziest idea I’ve ever heard. My husband and I worked all our lives paying for a nice house in a single family neighborhood. It is not fair to put 8-12 unrelated people plus possible kids on either side of us. We have room for one car on the street in front of our house—same for neighbors on either side. The property value and liveability of much of Denver will suffer from this proposed change. Our mayor just wants to stuff as many people as possible into this soon to be not great city. There has to be money to be made by someone in power to even suggest such a plan. If you want to pack more people together, do it responsibly by building low cost apartment-type dwellings. Do not ruin our single family neighborhoods. There is already a rule for group homes. While I don’t agree with that rule, it is already in effect and does not need a zoning change to make group homes possible. No more unrelated people than bedrooms in a home should be allowed. As I stated before, parking is going to be impossible for more unrelated people and possibly their children to live in what has always been called a single family home. It’s just not right or fair for current residents to be forced to live in the kind of situation this proposed change will cause. Are we in a democracy, or is the mayor trying to be a dictator? He and you should be concerned about all people in Denver and think of less undesirable ways to house those with small or no incomes.
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You might want to investigate Baton Rouge’s history. They increased unrelated occupancy in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Problems arose and the policy was reversed. Making a jump from 2 to 8 is a lot. A more measured, thought out approach may be to increase the occupancy to 1 unrelated individual per original construction bedrooms (no room or garage conversions, etc). This would elevate potential overcrowding, excessive trash that is left behind including condom wrappers, empty drug baggies and paraphernalia and alcoholic beverage bottles and cans of all sizes along Dallas and other side streets. We have to regularly call to report abandoned vehicles, cars that have been broken into, pick up large quantities of trash that is left behind including condom wrappers, empty drug baggies and paraphernalia and alcoholic beverage bottles and cans of all sizes that are tossed and/or smashed in front of our homes where we walk our pets and children every day. Allowing even more people to live together in one unit than is already allowed is going to create an even bigger issue than we already have here in our neighborhood. Please consider proposals are the wrong direction. The ideal goal would be to remediate the housing crisis while keeping Denver a nice place to live. Allowing 8 unrelated adults and unlimited children to live in a house is going to lead to slum-like conditions. The house next to me is a rental. I can’t imagine trying to collect rent. To whom would you serve an eviction notice to? Separate copies to all 15 people? This was certainly thought up by someone without a clue about the real world and no respect for those who have sacrificed and worked hard to get ahead in this world and acquired property with their hard earned savings.

Unfortunately, I was not afforded a chance to make public comments on Saturday at Goldrick Elementary School on Feb. 22d, despite my hand being raised throughout the comment period. So, please see below the concerns of the Windsong Homeowners Association which I represented:

---

- Windsong is opposed due to the likelihood of significant traffic increases, increased crime, decreased property values, and likely inaccessibility of our streets for garbage, fire, ambulance and other emergency vehicles.

- This seems to be a “done deal” as evidenced by the presentation and unwillingness of the person carrying the microphone to allow opponents to speak. Is it? If so, why? If not, why not?

- There was no description of or opportunity to discuss the process by which homes would be purchased and converted.

- What is the source of funding to purchase houses or move occupants into them? State funds? City of Denver funds? Any federal funds?

- Is this a proposal to, as in Minneapolis, “level” race and class? If so, it is misguided as in Windsong or within 150 yards of Windsong reside Asians, Hispanics and Blacks and adjacent to Windsong to the north are multi-family residences.

- There was no opportunity to ask whether Denver can provide statistics from other cities where this has been implemented regarding changes in property values or crime rates. What are they? Has such implementation led to increased sales and flight by homeowners who object? If so, has this led to decreased property values, assessments/valuations, and a reduction in property tax receipts?

- Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there was no opportunity to recommend that this proposal, if implemented, be staged, beginning with “baby steps” in one neighborhood for a 5- to 10-year time period to assess issues with property values, crime, congestion and so forth. A mode staged implementation should be fundamental rather than a city-wide approach in one fell swoop. Please carefully consider these comments from the Windsong Homeowners Association.

This is a ridiculous solution to perceived housing issues. What a way to have an owner’s property trashed and ruin property values for surrounding homes. As a prior owner of 10 houses and managing the property myself, I can tell you there would be no accountability for damages or even just trying to collect rent. To whom would you serve an eviction notice to? Separate copies to all 15 people? This was certainly thought up by someone without a clue about the real world and no respect for those who have sacrificed and worked hard to get ahead in this world and acquired property with their hard earned savings.

I urge you to reconsider the group living zoning changes that are being proposed. I understand we are in an affordable housing crisis, but these proposals are the wrong direction. The ideal goal would be to remediate the housing crisis while keeping Denver a nice place to live. Allowing 8 unrelated adults and unlimited children to live in a house is going to lead to slum-like conditions. The house next to me is a rental. I can’t imagine the number of cars, noise and trash allowing that many unrelated people to live in a house would generate. Changing the law would leave no recourse when problems arise. Crime will undoubtedly increase. The sense of community would surely decrease since you have to no idea who even lives around you anymore. With the increased trash the rodent population would probably increase. It’s a step in the wrong direction and urge you to reconsider and come up with better alternatives. Denver seems to be becoming a place that wants to push out its productive residents I’m questioning if I want to live in actual Denver anymore.

Our family has serious concerns about the proposed changes to the zoning codes allowing up to eight unrelated individuals to live in one house or unit. We live in East Park in Lowry and have a subsidized housing-homeless apartment complex adjacent to our neighborhood called The Renaissance Apartments as well as a complex formerly known as The Griffiths I am unsure of its new name as the sign is unreadable. These two complexes already compromise our neighborhood because of their inadequate available parking due to so many individuals currently living together in units and the overflow spreads daily into the area of our single family homes surrounding the area on E 5th Ave, E 4th Pl, from Dayton to Alton along Dallas and other side streets. We have to regularly call to report abandoned vehicles, cars that have been broken into, pick up large quantities of trash that is left behind including condom wrappers, empty drug baggies and paraphernalia and alcoholic beverage bottles and cans of all sizes are both tossed and/or smashed in front of our homes where we walk our pets and children every day. Allowing even more people to live together in one unit than is already allowed is going to create an even bigger issue than we already have here in our neighborhood. Please consider homeowners and the situations we are already faced with daily with the conditions as they currently are and how much worse they will get if the zoning codes are changed. This neighborhood and East Park are not considered an urban area, this is a family community. As homeowners and families we have a right to live in a clean area that is not littered with large quantities of garbage, mostly inappropriate garbage for children to sit and vehicles parked in every available space. Again, this area is not urban living it is a neighborhood full of families and minors.
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Thank you. I am not opposed to most of the proposal areas. I am opposed to corrections and homeless shelters. The homeless need mental health services which are better administered in a residential setting with licensed medical staff. Nurses and psychiatrists, not part time revolving staff are paid minimum wage. I don’t want my neighborhood to look like the area around the City Mission. The city is far better off if mayor Hancock could take himself out of the pocket of developers and demand that a portion of the new residential buildings would be devoted to working homeless. As far as corrections, again, money needs to be spent up front on education and mental health support and opportunities for youth so that they may be less likely to turn to criminal activity and end up in jail. The current half way house for returning individuals to the community is over stretched because the criminal justice system has replaced the mental health and educational system.

Exactly where do you propose to place these correction residences... Cherry Creek? Hale Bellvue, Mayfair, Crestmoor Park, Country Club, Cong Park, North and South Park hill? How about in the new “micro unit” building going up at 3rd and Clayton in CherryCreek. These are expensive neighborhoods to buy into and many of us have worked hard to settle our families in these neighborhoods. These are communities with strong neighborhood ties. We have young children and youth and we don’t want them in proximity to those individuals in correction half way houses.

I would these houses not be placed in Aurora where there is access to public transit? Why is RTD diminishing routes when those routes are so near the population in these half way group residential homes. Don’t expect this proposal to go over easily.

I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes to allow group living and changes to zoning that allows multiple families to live in houses that equal to 200 square feet per person. This idea is a bad idea for multiple reason which include but not limited too increased vehicle parking at residence and city streets, increased problems with potential crime due to higher density and non-related individuals living under one roof, taxation on our infrastructure, health hazards, neighborhood security and problems associated with packing humans into small spaces. I urge you to reject this proposal.

It appears like there are between six and eight unrelated people living in this house. They seem to rotate on a regular basis. I can only tell as the cars seem to change every few weeks. If I’m understanding this correctly, existing zoning should not allow this many people there now. If approved, the number could go as high as 12 or more (this is a pretty big house). While the men living in this house have not created any disturbances, I would have to say the situation is not without its affects to the neighborhood. This is primarily in the form of parking on the street. Each person has their own vehicle and they line the street in front of the house with their cars. Sometimes it can interfere with things like trash collection and parking availability for our friends and family (in front of my home). I want you to know that I am not opposed to the facilities, and others like it, it’s just that impacts to the neighborhood should be considered too. A bone I have to pick with this particular home is that we were never informed of the operations and had no input as to rules, regulations, or even contacts for the home or for the City regulators. I would not object to its placement had they been required to check in with the existing residents, it just felt forced on us. I will not be able to come to either the upcoming meetings. I just want to know I think the proposed number of potential residents per house is excessive. The impact it has on neighboring streets and properties should be considered (perhaps a requirement for dispersed parking throughout a wider range of the neighborhood may help). Otherwise, I think 6 to 8 people per home should be the limit. If you have any questions, please let me know.

I was shocked to learn about the proposal to dramatically increase the number of unrelated people (and their minor children) who could live together in Denver. Quick question...I couldn’t easily confirm...can the 1600 sq ft include finished basement? How many bedrooms does a typical 1600 sq ft home have...three? How can a 1600 sq ft home accommodate 10 – 20 people? Can you share what parking requirements there are (if any) for residential condominiums and apartments in Denver? Does the proposed increase in density for household living take any parking requirements into account? I’d hate to see streets (and front of houses) where each home has 4 – 8 cars parked? Also, how could it be that Denver ordinance allows no more than 5 dogs and cats combined and no more than 3 dogs as part of the combined total yet we could have 8 – 20 people living in one house? Are services including water, sewer, recycle, compost & trash ready to accommodate for this increase? We personally had an assisted living home across the street from our house for 15 years. There were many issues including:

- Parking with very unsightly cars and non-working cars
- Constant activity – something was always happening outside with resident guests visiting
- Heavy resident turnover with moving trucks, vans and others to make the transitions
- The assisted living employee had their minor children living in the boiler room of the home.

There were continual problems with the house and police and child services were slow to respond and had little authority to do much about the situations. The home was a complete mess inside and out including bed bug infestation(s). No care was given. I’d suspect that a home with so many people living in it will become a rental with little regard to property values. Things like lawn care, shoveling, home maintenance were completely overlooked. My wife and I are extremely opposed to the proposal to increase group living.

I am strongly opposed to changes being considered to allow more unrelated people to live together and allowing residential care and group homes in more places. The proposed changes could result in a substantial degradation in quality of life for households near group living facilities and residences that house a large number of unrelated/minor relatives. AIRBNB already creates quality-of-life challenges in many residential neighborhoods. I believe that the City could do more to increase residential density by less intrusive zoning changes along major thoroughfares.

Will these changes apply to all neighborhoods or just some? No one seems to have given any thought to parking. If 8 adults are living in a 1600 square foot house they will probably have 8 cars. That is tity he only way they can go to anywhere out of town. They (at best) will be able to park two cars in the garage, two in the driveway and two on the street in front of the house. Two will have to park in front of the neighbor’s house, but there are eight people living there who will want those spaces. This can only lead to conflicts and over population problems. Is there any chance can be stopped? No one is giving any thought to adding parks for all these additional people. Eisenhower Park for instance is so crowded on weekends that visitors have to park blocks away. Washington Park is worse. Compare the ratio of persons per acre of park space 10 or 20 years ago to what it is today. We ought to use GOCO money to build more parks before we make the population denser. Which raises another question has the parks budget increased as quickly as the overall budget? People care about Denver and hate to see the city’s quality of life diminished by overcrowding. It seems that the committee that has proposed these changes thinks other factors are more important. Do they think overcrowding is not a threat? What did they think was more important than avoiding overcrowding?
I absolutely disagree with a jump from 2 unrelated people to 8 or more allowed in a residential home. Unlimited number of minors would mass increase the number of residents. I recognize the need to allow more residential care facilities. This proposal, however, will guarantee a a community united against allowing these type of facilities. Were any community members included in the development of this? Any health care members who advised on what is needed to fund, staff and plan these facilities. This absolutely needs to be redone with input with from expert neighborhood residents. Are there licensing requirements for these type of facilities? What I find missing from these proposed changes is requirements for staffing. Depending on the kind of facility, staff would be required to supervise/care for the residents. For example, for disabled people, 1 staff person for 3 residents. My nephew who is severely disabled with cerebral palsy lives in a facility in Phoenix with 1 staff person for residents. There have to be regulations depending on who is housed. Disabled vs mentally ill vs drug rehab require very different types of staff equipment. All staff should be counted as part of the new allowance for unrelated adults. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the proposal to change the residential housing rules in Denver. While living in Denver, I have lived in apartments, condos, patio homes, and now a neighborhood of single family homes. The suggested change to housing rules has the potential of disrupting the very reason I chose to live in a single family neighborhood. My neighborhood is filled with a close knit group of singles and families who show pride of ownership by carefully maintaining their homes. We know each other by name and look out for each other as good neighbors should. Filling homes with large numbers of unrelated people will destroy my neighborhood in the following ways:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Streets will become crowded if 9 adults live in home with 2 car garages - where will everyone park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased adults in the area will increase traffic (different from parking problems noted above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Living situations are often unmonitored due to difficulty retaining “good” staff members. Workers come and go, and the neighborhood starts to feel very transient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group living homes due not have the “pride of home ownership” that single family homes have. Group living homes are typically not well maintained, which can lead to property value decreases in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I grew up visiting many Group Living Homes because my grandmother was a caregiver in these homes. They make the neighborhood feel non residential and they bring a “rental” feel to the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration of my opposition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How will this proposed change in household living numbers be enforced? Are the current rules enforced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there enough people to do the enforcement? Have you considered the number of cars that will be added to residential neighborhoods with change?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Please don’t increase the current limit of two unrelated adults over 18 to eight. Why go from two to eight? At the worst please go to four unrelated adults and see the ramifications that that causes first. Quadrupling the current limit would be foolish and irresponsible. If nothing else, the additional cars in neighborhoods would be unbearable. We are already overcrowded on our streets. What is the justification to go from two to eight? Please explain. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, I oppose group living houses with numerous numbers per house, more government shoving it down our throats. Who started this issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm not going to go into the many issues these homes/numerous people per home will cause .. decrease my property value and sale potential for one thing, parking, etc. This stinks Denver residents should be on ballot of vote of Denver residents and no just decided by elected officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I want to express my great concern for the proposal to change the allowance for unrelated adults in a household from 2 to 8. Terrible idea for traffic, parking, safety, etc. Please vote NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the proposal to change the residential housing rules in Denver. While living in Denver, I have lived in apartments, condos, patio homes, and now a neighborhood of single family homes. The suggested change to housing rules has the potential of disrupting the very reason I chose to live in a single family neighborhood. My neighborhood is filled with a close knit group of singles and families who show pride of ownership by carefully maintaining their homes. We know each other by name and look out for each other as good neighbors should. Filling homes with large numbers of unrelated people will destroy my neighborhood in the following ways:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less individual safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Streets less safe because of increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential parking issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unmanageable trash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of pride of ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No longer a close knit neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This zoning change is a terrible idea. At the very least, determine occupancy by available conforming bedrooms and bathrooms, not square footage. Please do not pass this housing rule change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was recently notified that there is a proposal allowing unrelated people to live in homes. You may remember me as I...have had a huge, oversized duplex erected next to me. You indicated that there was nothing that you could do for the block since this was a Denver zoning decision. My husband and I persevered for 18 months with the nuisance and other issues that this project caused. Currently on the 400 block of S. Ogden there is a home that is now housing 5 young adults. The parties, the noise, the lack of parking, the trash and the total disrespect for tax paying owners of this block and other blocks are issues that we are all facing. The effect on the neighborhood is not positive. What do we need to do to stop this happening? Thank you in advance for your response and guidance in this matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unfortunately I will miss your open house meetings regarding changes to group living in Denver. I object to this change for a larger number of people to live in Denver residences. The increased density will cause multiple problems. It will result in much more traffic on residential streets. Visitors, caregivers, and residents themselves will be coming and going frequently. As a result many parking issues will arise. Increased number of residents will also impact the outdoor use of a building thus increasing noise and potential outdoor living issues. The value of a home someone invested in with residential zoning will now be side by side with a property with different zoning density - thus reducing the original homeowner value. Please do not approve this change in any Denver residential area. Thank you |

Please explain
I am writing in response to a proposal to increase residential occupancy as described in a newsletter I received from Council member Kendra Blackburn titled “GROUP LIVING OPEN HOUSES.” By way of background to support my comments, I am a resident of Denver (15+ years), an attorney representing municipal governments (+30 years), and an adjunct law school professor teaching land use law.

(1) The proposed increase for general occupancy is nothing short of unreasonable. I would be interested to learn if other large communities conceiving occupancy limits and unwillingly accept the associated impacts upon single family neighborhoods such as mine.

(2) Most municipalities allow not more than 5 unrelated persons in single family residences. At a 5 person standard, several of my client municipalities receive many complaints annually associated with groups of 5 unrelated persons within the common single family residential household creating unacceptable impacts on the neighborhood (largely cars, noise, and continual activity at the residence). Denver’s proposal not only exceeds the commonly accepted 5 unrelated persons standard, but far more than doubles the common standard for a large number of homes in Denver. Consider lowering the number to something reasonable like 5. It works nationally. Start with smaller steps than jumping to +12.

(3) Large number occupancy of single family residences is something that college communities always struggle with and eventually regulate and enforce against. These communities do not actively encourage +12 unrelated persons to live in a single family home because they know from experience that those high unregulated occupancy levels destroy community character and the quiet enjoyment of property.

(4) I own a 2500 sf house with a living room, dining room, two bathrooms, and a single kitchen sized to accommodate the anticipated number of persons who will reasonably occupy the number of bedrooms. To allow 12 unrelated adults and an unlimited number of children into that house (associated vehicles, activity, and trash) will be inconsistent with the house design and will substantially change the neighborhood character affecting the entire block. Neighborhoods of single housekeeping units (that is, a single family) logically present less impact on the immediate community than the activities of 12+ unrelated persons and their children who do not operate or organize as a collective unit.

(5) The proposed occupancy numbers essentially allow rooming houses to be established in single family neighborhoods. I reasonably expect owners/landlords to take advantage of these large occupancy limits to lease space to create a revenue source. For example, in my 2500 sf home I could use the existing bedrooms and cut up the basement into 4-5 additional single occupancy rooms. I can then rent out that space to +9 people for example the very low monthly rate of $500/person. It would essentially be the proverbial "crash pad." That income stream will greatly exceed the monthly mortgage and maintenance cost for the home (plus if I stop maintaining the yard and watering the lawn, the costs go way down). These occupancy limits create real incentive to convert single family homes into boarding houses that will change neighborhoods. Granted, if Denver’s goal is to maximize occupancy opportunities as a means of providing housing, the City would be doing so at the expense of the peace and quiet of the neighborhoods Denver already established and which maintain a quality of life expected by its existing residents.

(6) One might say that the impacts as I will call “boarding house conversions” (and the unlawful expansion of rental occupancy to put as many people as possible in one home) is not a solution. Any chance you are related to Wellington Webb? STOP RUINING COLORADO FOR THE NATIVES!

I am unable to attend the meetings. However me and all of my neighbors near Bible Park are 100% opposed to changing the rules on Group Living.

The city is becoming way to dense with people and not enough infrastructure to support it. Please don’t bring down our property values with a proposal like this. Please do all you can on behalf of your constituents to see to it these rules DO NOT CHANGE.

My wife and I object to the proposed changes (copied below) in household living arrangements. For neighborhoods similar to the one we live in (Goldsmith Gulch) where most of the houses are 2 to 4 bedroom with attached garages, the change would lead to:

- Overcrowded parking
- Emergence of commercial rental enterprises in long established, traditional residential areas
- Inability by citizens to reliably depend on the consistency of municipal zoning regulations

The city is already confronting difficulty in regulating online, short term rentals (VRBO, AirBnB). The proposed change would add to those issues such a proposal a wise thing to do?

I am writing to let you know I am not in favor of the proposed change in the group living rules. As it is, there are currently too many people living under one roof, both within the City & County of Denver and metro-wide. Having so many people under one roof also contributes to health hazards (i.e. excess trash, sanitation issues, etc.). I also think there is a risk of increased crime due to numerous people coming and going from one property. I know living in Denver can be expensive, but if you can’t afford to live here, you simply cannot afford to live here. Very simple. When I was looking to buy my home, I qualified for a $750,000 home at the time. Maybe I qualified, but in reality I could not afford the mortgage, taxes, and maintenance at that time. I was not about to take in other people just so I could live in a home that was beyond my means.

Please stop ruining my state. You all have created a mess and allowing group living isn’t going to fix it, it will make things worse for home owners and landlords and even renters! Quit selling out to the developers and begin finding affordable housing solutions for our City – THIS GROUP LIVING IS NOT A SOLUTION. Any chance you are related to Wellington Webb? STOP RUINING COLORADO FOR THE NATIVES!

I want to express my great concern for the proposal to change the allowance for unrelated adults in a household from 2 to 8. Terrible idea for traffic congestion, parking, safety, etc. Please vote NO.

We have met a couple of times now; I am a former planner with the City of Denver (in DDPHE) and now at Norris Design. I attended the Group Living open house on Saturday 2/22 at Goldrick Elementary School, and wanted to tell you what an outstanding job that Andrew Webb and his team did. Honestly thought it would be a small event, given that it was a Saturday morning. I was amazed to see at least 200 people in attendance. Andrew’s presentation was very thorough. I had a number of questions in mind, and they were all addressed by his easy to follow slide deck (even for a very complicated topic!). In the Q and A session after his formal presentation, he answered questions from the audience in a respectful, complete manner. Councilwoman Kniech also answered questions that were in her wheelhouse. The facilitator was very organized and moved things along while taking notes on charts. The whole event was well planned and well executed. Kudos to Courtney Levintong, Kyle Dalton and any other CPD staff I may have missed. I have talked with Andrew over the last few months as this zoning update has evolved through the process. I have been so impressed at how CPD has taken the time and committed the resources to do thorough research of best practices around the country. I am proud that Denver is trying to be proactive in updating our code to reflect changing demographics, household types, affordability issues, and housing products and forms. Particularly with the pressure from some voices to retain single family zoning for the ‘character of the neighborhood and quiet of life’, I am proud that Denver is attempting to expand housing equity and opportunity to all of our residents, similar to Minneapolis and other cities.

Thank you for supporting the great staff you have to do good work for Denver!
While I appreciate a personal response from you, since my original email, I have learned more insite into the reasoning for and the people behind this effort to change our zoning code so dramatically. When I wrote to you on Tuesday, I thought that somehow, someone was naive and was just unaware of the consequences of their actions. But after looking into things a little deeper, I now realise you know exactly what you’re doing. You don’t care about the consequences to existing homeowners and in fact have brought together an advisory committee of advocates for the homeless, for tiny houses, for community corrections solutions and for those in need in general. You’re looking for solutions for one class of citizen without regard for or (original committee) input from those who would pay the price for these solutions. And don’t tell me about a quality NGO representation. During your presentation last night at your third open house at the Hebrew Educational Alliance, you were happy to show us all how great it would be for the less fortunate person to live in any neighborhood with many of his or her kind. But when people brought up the obvious negative effects on homeowners in neighborhoods throughout the city, you and your team’s response was close to your response below: “we will share it with the project team and advisory committee”. This would be great if your team wasn’t so one sided. You told less than the truth last night when you did not present or admit any of the obvious negative outcomes to your proposal. Property values, parking, safety, garbage, home maintenance and general peace of mind within one’s neighborhood are real issues not to be sacrificed. And they will be sacrificed regardless of nuisance ordinances being kept in place. I was glad to have gone to your open house last night so as to learn of your informed decision to ruin our neighborhoods. We are all living with the higher density buildings going up all around us in areas presently zoned for them, but we will not just sit by and watch the destruction of the family oriented purpose of our core neighborhoods. I wish I could say thanks.

I am writing to provide resident input to the two proposed changes to the current residential housing rules. I am opposed to both of the proposed changes. These proposals are far too broad and, as a result, will have swift and negative impacts on our neighborhoods currently zoned as single family.

I understand that the city of Denver struggles with finding appropriate solutions to affordable housing. Still, I do not support quadrupling (or more) single family home occupancy across the board nor do I support having a few-to-no limits on placement of group housing. I also am perplexed by the City would want to ignore its own goals of increasing density specifically near public transportation by suddenly increasing density in all neighborhoods. Finally, in the documentation shared so far, I don’t see the impact analysis on city services and infrastructure - what will the impact be on schools, roads, public safety, etc? At what cost? At whose expense?

I have been a homeowner in Denver for 16 years. My husband and I specifically chose to live in southeast Denver because of the larger lot sizes, access to parks and trails, easy commute to work, and most of all a quieter neighborhood. (Seriously, when shopping for houses, I would stand in my eyes closed in the backyard of each house to determine how much road or neighborhood noise I could hear.) Throughout the years I’ve seen homes violating code by having too many unrelated adult residents, resulting in parking, trash, and noise issues, as well as lack of accountability. I don’t want to legalize this kind of behavior. In addition, when I try to shop or dine in other single family neighborhoods as those around South Broadway, I struggle to find parking in the surrounding neighborhoods; quadrupling occupancy will only make the issue worse.

Other thoughts:

Unrelated People Living Together - These proposals are supposed to help with the affordable housing issue, but instead will make it worse. A homeowner who realizes they can put even more people in a single home will just raise their rental rate. Whether the landlord collects the rent money from individuals versus a single payment from the residents is just accounting. Let’s face it - rental prices will go up, homeowners will cash in on the group housing business; this proposal just opens the market at the expense of those who want to live in a quiet single family neighborhood. Group housing should require permitting, be limited in quantity, and be restricted in placement to not overburden individual neighborhoods.

Thank you for accepting my input.

I am providing my feedback on the proposed group update to the residential housing rules. The residential areas that will be impacted by this change were not built to support this number of residence. I live in Cherry Creek Townhomes 2. Most of the units here are 1400-1800 square ft. The thought that 7-9 people could live in a home here is absurd with the expected result being not enough parking, excessive noise, and community grounds and amenities that cannot support the increased volume. I am a member of the board at our HOA and have serious concerns about the impact that could occur in our neighborhood.

Note that the issues I see occurring are not restricted to just my neighborhood. Increasing the # of adults plus any associated minors to the prop levels is excessive to say the least. I would be far more supportive if the number of adults permitted was cut in half from what is being suggested. This proposal seems extreme and not something that will benefit the homeowners who pay property taxes. Put me down as a solid NO on this proposal.

Do no favor the increase in the number of people allowed to live in a single house. What are you thinking that you could allow an unlimited number of people to live in a house of 1600 square feet. Can you not just once think about homeowners and taxpayers. I will follow this closely.

This is awful, you put 8+ non relative adults living together next to an older persons home or a home with young children. Adults living together have more adult type parties, more noise and language and they are in the yard right next to children playing or older adults who deserve some peace and quiet without the language, smoke etc. Very honestly Denver does not want older residence or young families living inside their bord. But a city can not survive on just young adults, as in nature there has to be a balance. Denver has become an awful city to live in, unless you are single or between the ages of 25 and 45. Denver Better consider that no matter how many buses and light rail there are people still have cars. Use them and the Roads in Denver are horrible. If Denver didn’t have the mountains Denver would be nothing. Do you sit in traffic, if not you are lucky because anyway of the week it takes you about an hour to travel across town. I have lived in Denver 55 years and it has gone from a Beautiful, caring city and now if it doesn’t bring in Dollars for the top the employees, and developers the other citizens are nothing. Work with developers and get the rent on all these apartments lower so people can afford to live decently without putting 8-10 adults in a house.
COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I've lived in the same home in University Hills for 21+ years and wanted to send a few thoughts about the proposed changes for group living. Kendra, we've met before ...I'm a friend and neighbor of your friend Delia. For the past 10 years or so, I've lived next door to a rental home that always had 3-4 single men (and occasionally a girlfriend) living there. There have been a revolving list of renters over the years and some have been better than others but never has the 2+ non-related issue been enforced. At times, there were repeated calls to 311 and DPD for different complaints (from noise at all hours to illegal activity, etc) but really have done nothing to remedy the long term situation. As a block communica

w/ the DPD Neighborhood Watch program, I do know that the neighborhood in general agrees this home has become an eyesore (trash in yard draws rodents, grass in summer often gets 1-2 feet tall). The landlord lives in Golden and rarely visits and the occupants could care less. You can only call 311 and the non-emergency DPD number so many times. The current renters are fine even though not an idea situation and they've be

nice to me when I see them (the two I know) so no big complaints for them. The issue is more the ability of the landlord to have a revolving door/ new renters every 6 months ...only a couple have lived there longer term.Yes, everyone should have access to affordable living but to suggest up

8 adults and unlimited number of children in a smaller home is ridiculous. We are not living on a college campus. Having lived next door to a hit

with 4 unrelated adults for years, I envision many problems with the proposed changes that will not be fair to long term homeowners like myself.

I worked very hard for many years to be able to purchase a home here. As a single woman, I also bought my home because it was

in a quiet, safe neighborhood. The new proposal would make this even less so. A few things as food for thought.

— I've seen everyone firsthand that unrelated adults in one home means totally separate friends. Unlike families who typically have the same soc

circle, non-related adults all bring their own social circle and extended family. The number of cars parked next door w/4 non-related adults and
guests is plenty. It would be unacceptable to have double that. Things are worse in the summer and infringes on privacy and solitude on my own

er home. I am aware housing is an issue in Denver, but this proposal is very disappointing as it is yet another threat to our neighborhood. On Wabash Cir

we currently have 7 rental houses the I am aware of, of those 7 rental houses, 4 currently house more than the allotted 2 unrelated adults. Current

state is bad enough, I can't even imagine increasing the allotted # of unrelated adults to 9 and their minor relatives.

In the past year, we have experienced a significant increase in police presence (pull the records) due to domestic violence incidents at one rental

which housed 4 unrelated adults and their 2 minor children. Luckily they NEVER once paid their rent and were evicted after 6 long months. Save

the rental houses stack trash on the side of the houses because there is not enough room in the trash bins which often bleeds out to the street.

Street parking has also become an issue. Most of the rentals have 3-6 cars parked on the street which also increases traffic and unsafe for the numerous small children in the area. I can go on for hours providing examples of the negative impacts the rentals have created on our street alto

ask you to PLEASE listen to our concerns, read the nextdoor.com comments, talk to the community, respect our opinions. I am curious how the

increase, from 2 to 9 was decided? That is such a drastic increase. Why not increase from 2 to 3 unrelated adults since this is happening anyway.

Why not contact all the developers that built these unattractive, monstrous apartment buildings to see if they are willing to lower the rent on some

units which would address a portion of the problem.

It appears the middle class homeowners are constantly being asked to make accommodations, pay more taxes, and compromise. I have worked

very hard the past 30 years to get an education, and get a good job to move into a nice, quiet and safe neighborhood. I have never lived in a house

in any city, that has housed 10+ people.

The neighborhood has changed dramatically in the 17 years I have lived here and not always for the better. I am used to the constant change but

this latest proposal is outlandish and if passed, we will seriously have to consider moving out of Denver. It is getting to be EXHAUSTING to live in

Denver! Has the research been done by city council or have members experienced first hand, how other cities have been negatively impacted by allowing

these housing practices? San Francisco, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Detroit? Chicago? My question to the both of you is, what is your stance on this proposal? Do you agree or oppose? When will this proposal be voted on? This proposal is not the answer! It is a short term fix to a longer term problem. It would be a shame to see our community turn into one big rental city, have families flee to the suburbs more than they already have.

Thank you for your time.

As a homeowner living in Denver, I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes to the Denver Zoning Code to permit a drastically increased number of unrelated people living in one single-family home. How do you possibly justify raising the existing restriction of allowing only two unrelated people living in one home to eight or more unrelated people, plus an unlimited number of relatives? Are you nuts? Why not permit 32 people or more to live in a two-bedroom home? Conceivably, that could legally happen under your proposal, by permitting eight unrelated people each living with three relatives in the same home. This proposal does not take into consideration the cramped, unsafe, and unsanitary living conditions that will likely result by having too many unrelated people living together in cramped housing. In your proposal, you didn't even cons

limiting the number of people to the number of bedrooms in a home. What about the safety of the occupants? What consideration has been given to ensuring the safety and welfare of having too many people crammed into a small home? How many people will be sleeping in basements that don't meet fire safety and egress requirements? Why wasn't consideration given to raising the number of people permitted incrementally, from

to only three, and then see how that works out? Why jump immediately to eight, plus relatives? And what consideration has been given to the impact on affected neighborhoods? What about parking? What about noise? I oppose this proposal, in the strongest terms. Such an outrageous proposal can only be the result of politicians catering to the will of special interests, without any consideration of the impact to the affected household, or to the neighborhood. There are better options to deal with limited affordable housing. One idea is to encourage the construction of

single Detached Accessory Dwelling Units, or permit homeowners to provide one additional living space by finishing a single mother-in-law

apartment. But the proposed changes are ridiculous, and will transform quiet, established neighborhoods into unregulated housing projects, ala

with the associated squander and crime. I urge you to rethink this absurd proposal.
COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

Doesn’t sound like our idea of living. You will hear this a thousand times...many of us worked hard to buy and maintain our homes. This plan will wreck our neighborhoods with overcrowding and the problems that condition creates. While the world comes to grips with the corona virus epidemic, your plan would impose living conditions conducive to the spread of disease. Any sane person would understand that.

When we tell people in other states of this plan, they wonder what’s happened to Denver. Never in their wildest dreams could they ‘devis such plan’, and they wonder what kind of people are capable of forcing their residents to live like this! Respectfully submitted.

As a 50 year Colorado resident, and a new Denver resident, I have read the questions and answers provided on the website regarding the Group Living Open Houses. After reading the information and reflecting upon it; I am opposed to any changes to the current rules and regulations. I foresee this proposal doing very little, if anything to substantively address the problem for which it is intended. But rather only creating even more serious problems within our current communities and diminishing the quality of life for everyone. I believe this proposal is riddled with good intentions ready to go awry.

I am very much opposed to the proposed group living changes. I feel it will be bad for my property values. I think it will only benefit landlords who can pack as many people in as the rule allows. I think it would be bad for off street parking. Most homes don't have 8 bedrooms. So there will be people willing to live 3 to a bedroom in my neighborhood. Were it to go through, I believe the zoning complaints dept. will be swamped with ya maintenance & trash complaints. I can’t believe this has even been proposed.

My husband and I would like to know why you or anybody would consider letting 8 or more people live in one household/apartment? That is just the most ridiculous unsafe and unsanitary thinking ever.

I certainly would not want that in my neighborhood as I know you wouldn't want that in your neighborhood.

I have had terrible experiences with multiple adults living in the condo next to me. (I live in Three Fountains) I think there were a minimum of 4 living/renting there. And I was never totally sure who was actually living there. Constant traffic of people and loud fighting anywhere from 1:00-5:00 in the morning on a once to twice a week basis. Multiple police calls were made. The HOA was notified many times - and they supposedly notified the rental management company. Multiple neighbors complained. It took 2 years to finally make contact with the owner. The owner was mortified when learning of all the specific complaints. The icing on the cake was when one of the drunk visitors crawled on to my roof and fell in my patio. Scared me out of my skin!

Fortunately, the renters are now gone. Of course, they left loudly. I didn't realize what constant tension I had until they were gone. My other neighbors have expressed similar feelings.

This is probably more information than you wanted. But, the idea of letting multiple non-related adults occupy a dwelling together definitely put me on edge. Thank you for your time.

The proposed number of adults able to live in one residence is far too many people. I understand wanting an increase, but increasing the number what is allowed now is not a good idea. Apartments are going in all over the city. There will be plenty of residences available for people wanting to live in Denver. Over 1,000 new residences are going in around my home. Proposing 8,000 new people in my square mile. Four times amount people living in one house will cause parking issues, overcrowding for public services, and over crowding in local retail areas and restaur.

The housing issue is being addressed by all the apartments Denver is allowing to be built. Increasing the number of people allowed in a house doesn’t benefit me or my neighbors. I moved here in 2013 and paid a lot of money for my small single family home. I live on a street with 18 houses. I don't want the home values in Denver to decrease because there are 144+ people living on my street instead of the 36 living here now.

Who is benefiting from this proposed change? The existing residents? No. Landlords? Yes. Homeless? Yes. People with lower income? Yes. My husband and I have worked very hard to get where we are today. Why can’t others be expected to do the same? Why change the American idea of working hard to get what you want? This proposal emphasizes doing/working less but but given more because everyone deserves to live somewhere “nice”. I’m sorry but not everyone does deserve it. This proposal will penalize the the hard working people of Denver who are paying their taxes and contributing to society. While the proposal is helping others that don’t always help themselves. Increase the amount of people by one or two. NOT 8 or more.
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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" 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 tonite'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. Related 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 adults 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 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 "homes" 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 enforcement issues that could arise. Go back to the drawing board. If you pass this proposal, you will drive many families out of the City. Please do not do this.

I am unable to attend tonight's Open House regarding the Group Living proposal, but have read of the proposed changes and am strongly opposed. We live in the Hampden Heights neighborhood. We bought in that neighborhood because it was a middle-class enclave of single family homes. It was not as fancy as it was exactly what we wanted. We previously lived in an area where a large number of homes were occupied by multiple unrelated people. To say that the neighborhood was a mess is an understatement. Too many homes had far too many cars, homes were not well-kept for, it was noisy and it was not a pleasant place. It had once been a decent neighborhood, but unenforced zoning laws and lack of care made it a difficult place to live. Hence, we were delighted to move into a neighborhood of homes that are well cared for, with a fairly low level of rental activity. Our neighborhood association said a few years ago that it was a micro-neighborhood, and that number of unrelated people is not there. However, it stands to reason that group living organizations will jump on houses for sale as they can make a lot of money from each person that they house or treat. For the organization, it is a business. Perhaps it's a non-profit, but it is still a business. The people who bought in Denver's neighborhoods in good faith, would be faced with falling house values and a much-decreased standard of living. This proposal will keep me up at night as we have neighbors both across the street and next to us who are going to be selling homes this summer. If you were to allow these changes, both those homes could be sold to private organizations and we would be forced to move Out of Denver. Destroying the character of our City's neighborhoods is not a solution to the need for additional residential living and care facilities. Go back to the drawing board. If you pass this proposal, you will drive many families out of the City. Please do not do this.

I believe this is way too many unrelated people under one roof to responsibly manage. We live in the Hampden Heights neighborhood. We were among the first to live in that neighborhood because it was a middle-class enclave of single family homes. We did not care for, it was noisy and it was not a pleasant place. It had once been a decent neighborhood, but unenforced zoning laws and lack of care made it a difficult place to live. Hence, we were delighted to move into a neighborhood of homes that are well cared for, with a fairly low level of rental activity. Our neighborhood association said a few years ago that it was a micro-neighborhood, and that number of unrelated people is not there. However, it stands to reason that group living organizations will jump on houses for sale as they can make a lot of money from each person that they house or treat. For the organization, it is a business. Perhaps it's a non-profit, but it is still a business. The people who bought in Denver's neighborhoods in good faith, would be faced with falling house values and a much-decreased standard of living. This proposal will keep me up at night as we have neighbors both across the street and next to us who are going to be selling homes this summer. If you were to allow these changes, both those homes could be sold to private organizations and we would be forced to move Out of Denver. Destroying the character of our City's neighborhoods is not a solution to the need for additional residential living and care facilities. Go back to the drawing board. If you pass this proposal, you will drive many families out of the City. Please do not do this.

As a Denver resident and taxpayer I ery strongly object to the proposed changes in unrelated adults in SF homes. The proposal is Ridiculous! I feel more suitable for Syria, Kenya, or China than for Denver.

Is the City intentionally making us into a Third World city? The number of unrelated adults which would be allowed in SF homes is too high. The change is not in keeping with SF residential neighborhoods in Denver. An increase of unrelated adults from 2 to 3 with minor children could be absorbed in Denver, but not 8!!

The proposal runs afoul of Covenants and HOA rules in our City which limit the numbers of vehicles per home. We an expect that 8 adults would bring 8-16 vehicles to our neighborhoods. Our SF homes do not have enough space to provide parking for the 8-16 cars which the unrelated adults would bring. Please take your changes back and make them reasonable for Denver's neighborhoods.
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I write to you as a concerned resident in the University Park neighborhood. My perspective is that of a homeowner of 23 years, and a resident of DU neighborhood since 1991. I am most concerned about how this proposal affects general residential, single-family homes. The proposal seems largely focused on the Human Services element, with less discussion on general residential. In point, this is glossed over; only stated that 8 adults would be allowed to co-exist as a use by right. While I do support a large part of what the committee is attempting to accomplish with respect to Human Services, I do not support allowing more unrelated people to live together in single-family homes, to the extent and as written. It is my opinion that redefining Household to 8 adults is an unrealistic proposal. I agree that the current 2 unrelated adults is a bit limiting, but increasing to 8 adults is too much. My apprehension is that nothing is being presented about safeguards or enforcement to protect existing homeowners & neighbors. All the current Group Living categories have some sort of governing authority; someone to enforce health & safety, be held accountable (excessive garbage, snow removal, parking, etc.), address fire and life safety issues, etc. But to use a blanket approach to every single-family home without restriction doesn’t seem well thought out. What safeguards will be available to prevent bad landlords from misusing this new change? What safeguards will be put in place to prevent bad tenants? These need to be clearly defined and presented (and not simply shuffled or referred to another City department). I know this comes across as catastrophizing, but abusing the current code is already a real issue in the DU neighborhood. We already need assistance in enforcing quiet enjoyment, not legitimizing more communal living. There are already issues with renters (DU students & non-students alike) exceeding allowed code, trash out homes, affecting neighbors, increased property damage to neighbors, excessive parking, etc. My experience is that many renters aren’t vested in the property they rent and don’t really care how they’re impacting their neighbors. Increasing the number of adults under one roof will only exacerbate the issues. I don’t want 8 adults living in the house next to me. I don’t want higher density in my neighborhood. I didn’t buy my home, in this quiet neighborhood, with that intent. I’ve worked hard to be able to afford my home, in the type of neighborhood I wanted. Why should my property and my quiet enjoyment be subjected to potentially unruly renters, or an out-of-town landlord who clearly does not care about the state of the property or the neighbors, while I have little to no recourse or remedy? I did read some of the suggested readings, posted on the City’s website, plus other examples and failures. Of interest was the Intentional Community in Minneapolis; plus Boulder’s and Portland’s. While Denver is none of those places, I did find it interesting that all of these case studies have some element for safeguards & enforcement to protect neighbors, and/or require a license or permit, and had some language about parking or a planning process. I’m not opposed to rentals, nor to some form of communal living. In fact, I’ve often thought it would be cool to be part of a co-operative arrangement with 3-4 other single mid-50/60 year olds buying in Wash Park. But there’s a component of vested interest in that example. Unfortunately, unregulated there are too many bad examples. I am currently dealing with two connected neighbors; communal groups, in excess of 5-6 adults each, staging two food trucks (plus two delivery trucks) out of the alley, unexplained property damage, increase in the presence of rats, excessive trash in alley, trash bins left in alley (no room on their property), etc. Most are Minnesota millenials transplants (only germane as many people have some element for safeguards & enforcement to prevent bad landlords from misusing this new change).

I would like to go on record that I am resolutely and unconditionally opposed to this proposal. First, 8 adults and unlimited children in a 1600 sq foot house is absurd. I did not move to my neighborhood to live in multi-family housing situation. Further, parking would be impossible and equivalent to living in NYC. I dealt with a situation in my neighborhood where one couple rented the basement to another unrelated couple and was less than pleasant. To even think this is a rational proposal to solve our housing issues is absurd. This proposal appears to me to be an irrational and ill-thought out solution to the housing shortage that is making hard-working homeowners bear the brunt. If you are looking for ways to bring down housing values in Denver and push Denver residents to the suburbs, you have found it.

I am opposed to re-defining the household definition as 8 unrelated people living together. First, this is a huge jump from the current regulation – quadruples the number that is lawful. Why such a big jump? Once this is approved there is no turning back. I understand other municipalities near Denver limit the number at 5. I believe the negative impacts on our neighborhoods have not been thoroughly evaluated. Impacts such as:

--- Traffic and parking – obviously increased neighborhood traffic and parking issues would be a concern. Most single-family homes have parking for 2 to 3 cars. This would likely increase to 8 or more depending on the size of the property. Increased traffic would put neighborhood children at risk. Increased traffic would put neighborhood children at risk impact the quality of “quiet neighborhood streets” that those of us who choose to live in single-family home areas desire.

--- Quality of life – As stated above, those of us who live in single-family homes desire a “community, neighborly feel” in a relatively quiet area. Group living with 8+ people in a home would create noise, distraction, and impact the quality of life that we purchased our homes for. We purchased our home in an area zoned “single-family homes” and that is how we want our neighborhood to continue. Allowing 8 unrelated people to live together would give a transient feel to our area and really is just a way for the City Planners to change the zoning with nomenclature (e.g., household). I oppose this.

--- Infrastructure – I live in a home built in 1960. Our home does not have the infrastructure to support 8+ people. Sewer, trash, water – all these things were not constructed for 8+ people to live in the home full-time. Surrounding infrastructure (parks, schools, roads) is not meant to support these types of households. These are my main concerns. The other overriding concern I have is as follows:

The City Planners are making changes to our city and in our portion of SE Denver without considering the impacts of ALL the changes. I am an environmental planner for the Federal Government. The Federal Government is required by law to consider “cumulative effects” of all past, known, and forecasted projects when planning a new project. So for instance in our area I ask you to consider the effects of your project on our social fabric and quality of life in SE Denver. The cumulative effect of these projects (and others I haven’t listed) along with the Group Living Project creates a very negative cumulative impact on the social fabric and quality of life in SE Denver. The essence of our neighborhoods is being destroyed. Please reconsider these changes. As a final note, I appreciate the improved communication with the public that the City Council has implemented. That said, the sound system at the public hearing was less than pleasant. To even think this is a rational proposal to solve our housing issues is absurd. This proposal appears to me to be an irrational and ill-thought out solution to the housing shortage that is making hard-working homeowners bear the brunt. If you are looking for ways to bring down housing values in Denver and push Denver residents to the suburbs, you have found it.
I'm a Bear Valley resident for over 30 years and home owner. I've been reading what I can about the proposed zoning changes to allow higher density living in traditionally single family homes and neighborhoods in Denver. I wanted to express my total disagreement with the proposed changes. The move is too far and too extreme. Yes, affordable housing is hard to come by in our city, but converting our residential neighborhoods into high density urban environments across the board is utterly irresponsible to event begin to consider. The city has been allowing developers to skirt the affordable housing requirements in their development projects, by allowing them to buy their way out. Now the established single family home neighborhoods have to take on that burden? That's not how this should work. Its the lazy way out and is an irresponsible approach to a problem that has been decades in the making in Denver. The developers tend to get their way without having to follow the rules established to were supposed to support affordable housing. We can't continue to allow that to occur. Our neighborhoods have inadequate parking for this proposal. Under the proposed new rules each home could potentially have up to 9 vehicles. We have a crippled and non functioning transit system that can't support the higher density. There are absolutely no positives from a single family home owner's point of view. My property value drop and I can't park in front of my home because some elite dreamers have come up with this urban high density wonder plan to potentially quadruple our density numbers with no support for the proposal at the neighborhood level? My work schedule does not allow me to participate in many a community meetings, so I'm hoping that this letter allows me to say what I would at a neighborhood meeting or city council meeting.

My husband and I have been residents of Mayfair since 1986. I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed zoning changes. It is my belief that the problems of the "most vulnerable" in our city require significant investments in affordable housing and treatment facilities not opening neighborhoods to what amounts to commercialization through group housing. I fully support reviewing zoning rules and regulations within reason. It is not that difficult to imagine the need for roommates for example with the cost of housing in Denver being what it is. However, we chose residential neighborhoods for a myriad of reasons one of which is the general stability of the populations, the safety it provides. Let's talk about permanent solutions which will assist the very real issues populations face in Denver. This proposition is not the way.

Denverites cannot turn their head without seeing a new apartment complex going up. Please make room in the multitude of those places and do not subject us homeowners who already have to deal with rental properties and the problems that come with them. The homes are unkempt and the dogs bark incessantly. This is a general example, and a specific one too! Please vote NO to group living and utilize the hundreds, maybe thousands of apartments being built across this city but do not put the burden on residents like us.

The numbers being proposed for group living aren’t suitable for residential neighborhoods. This isn’t the solution for the failures of the Mayor and council’s focus on development at any cost. The numbers being proposed will cause more problems than it will solve; there is no mention of how city will monitor and enforce the law. There is a real possibility that residential houses effectively serving as an apartment building will have a negative impact on property values of neighboring houses, not to mention the quality-of-living impact.

Hi, Andrew. I'm not sure if I can attend the meeting tonight, but in case I miss it I wanted to send you this email stating my strong support for the change in zoning codes. The current limit of 2 unrelated people has several problems, is counterproductive to the needs of contemporary society and in any case is unenforceable - or enforcement is selective and dangerous.

First, I noticed that the Planning Board has nine people in the development and real estate industry and only one resident representative. I think people on the board should reflect the community that’s impacted, not just those who will profit from the decisions. I am not clear what problem these changes are supposed to remedy. I am clear that the number of people who can live, and the number of cars that can park, on my block or increase five fold. Every structure can and ultimately will become a rental unit owned by wealthy entities outside Denver and or living in gated communities which are exempt from these changes. If the goal is to provide a structured living environment in a residential setting for particular populations in need, then why is the city proposing that all residence's can be rented to large numbers of unrelated people? Let the special populations be an allowable variance with rules, requirements and permitting and leave single family zoning in place. I paid a premium for this house for precisely the characteristics the city intends to do away with. I will quickly become surrounded by strangers with no connection to or interest in the neighborhood with an unreachable landlord. Parking problems will create strife and conflict. My "quiet enjoyment" will disappear. This change will result in higher rent income per unit which will increase, not decrease, housing prices with higher property taxes, more traffic everywhere, more pollution, more congestion. The only thing that will decrease is my quality of life. I will pay more and have less. Sadly, the city appears to be in league with the development interests who continue to see how much money can be wrung from each resident and square foot relentlessly cramming more and more people into the already cramped space in the city. The same bunch (developers, banks, mayor, council), it the way, who created and abetted these problems in the first place. The solution is not concentration but dispersion. Stop offering incentives for concentrating jobs and encourage the dispersion of jobs to the areas and communities where jobs are needed. To be clear, I am opposed to this change. It not only does not solve, it exacerbates Denver’s housing and congestion problems. It does seem to create profit opportunities for the moneyed interests. And it does so now, as before, at my expense.

As a resident of Denver my whole life and a person with deep community relationships who does not live in a "traditional" household with nuclear family relations, I support updating the zoning code to allow up to 8 people who are not related by blood or marriage to share a home. Intergenerational homes, shared housing & ownership, greater opportunities for transitional housing, and co-op housing make living in Denver sustainable, affordable and equitable.

As homeowner and resident of the city, I am very much against this rule change. There would be nothing against landlords and corporations from buying up homes and converting them into what is effectively high density apartments in the middle of single family home neighborhood fundamentally altering the character of a neighborhood. There is also parking and traffic considerations that single family neighborhoods simply were not built for. In my neighborhood that could mean 12-18 cars in front of each home! This type of ordinance change should be addressed through zoning changes not by filling single family homes with one one adult per 200 square fee.

This is the most absurd concept. I can't imagine what they are thinking. I knew another term for our current corrupt Mayor could be problem but I never imagined it would be this horrendous. If this passes we can kiss our neighborhoods goodbye. It will be the next mass exit to the suburban towns. Denver is letting down it citizens in a big big way. Just out of curiosity why 12 or 8 ... why not 2 or 3 more. This is bad. It will let investors buying houses and renting small houses to as many as they can. The word tenement comes to mind. BAD IDEA!!!
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Good Evening!

I attended the meeting last night at the Jewish Center and appreciate the effort to put this together. I came away from this meeting disturbed by a number of levels.

1) I registered early and picked up all info available at the time. The lady that sat next to me had a handout that I didn’t have. I went back and found out it was only available in Spanish. I was told I could only get it if I went on-line. Really? The document she had was a Spanish-language version of the powerpoint presentation we showed. We wanted to make sure that if someone in the audience was using our audio translation service, they’d also be able to read the slide content as we went along. You can download the English version at our website, here’s a direct link: https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/646/documents/Zoning/text_amendments/Group_Living/Group_Living_Open_House_Presentation.pdf

2) I was offended by the young moderator and her “rules”. She obviously was someone who needed a "safe space". How about having adults in charge, instead of a child.

3) I believe I sent Andrew an email about this, but high density living with multiple families living in the same house is what you find in a third-world country. Is this what you want your legacy to be?

4) FYI, the overwhelming number of people sitting around me were very much opposed to this proposal. Below is why.

5) This proposal seems to open the doors to group homes for drug addicts, possibly mental health problems; half-way houses, homeless shelters etc. to be built in residential areas. If I read the proposals accurately, it seems to skirt the initial review and comment process that exists today. problem... Residential Care facilities of several types are currently permitted in neighborhoods, and there are many examples around the city of assisted living, recovery homes and other such uses in residential neighborhoods. Currently, these uses require notification to RNOs and city council members prior to issuance of a zoning permit. We are proposing to update that by requiring a public meeting prior to permit application for any facility serving 9 or more people, with mailed notice to property owners, renters and businesses within 400 feet of the subject site.

After hearing about the proposed Group Living Rules Update from a cooperative-focused group here in Denver, and reviewing the webpage for the project, I am very excited about these changes! I am writing today to let you know that I find this issue very important and look forward to the benefits of its eventual implementation. Specifically, I know that cost savings are a major factor in the decision for multiple unrelated people to live together, and I am glad that these types of roommate arrangements will be more available to people in Denver. The communal aspect of group living is a also a benefit to our community, and should not be understated. Groups who can live together peacefully make better neighbors and citizens, and I think we could use a lot more group-minded people in our lives. Thanks for your hard work on this issue!

I am totally against having the zoning for households changed from 2 unrelated people living in the same home to 8 people in the same home. Property values as well as safety are my main concerns but also parking and security are in jeopardy. I do not want this...

I am writing to you to oppose the current group living changes that are being proposed to the zoning code. I want to preface my opposition- I know zoning has historically been used to segregate and discriminate and I do applaud the City for trying to address that practice and make zoning more egalitarian. I live here because I value the diversity the City brings. That being said, I think these changes are going to be detrimental for Denver.

I urge you to rethink the current proposal as written. First, this proposal is meant to try and address the impacts of Denver’s recent population growth and the concurrent increase in housing prices. However, we have experienced this growth at a time of overwhelming economic prosperity across the country. Investors have been freely investing in Denver real estate, thus driving up the prices. A period of economic contraction is inevitably coming, and we should wait until that occurs to fully assess the state and durability of Denver’s economy and the adequacy of its housing stock. Until such time, any drastic measures regarding zoning are premature. Given the uncertainty in the financial markets and the potential risk due to the impending pandemic, that decline may come sooner than we think and if coupled with these new group living rules, will contribute to the rapid decline in the City’s real estate values (and associated property tax). (I don’t want to use the cliche “flop house” reference, but that is what I envisioning.) Second, as a parent, I can’t imagine what the City is thinking regarding its proposals on Group Living Facilities. The idea that these housing situations should be regulated by number of individuals and not by use is a horrible idea, particularly with respect to former criminals who are trying to rehabilitate. The idea that a halfway house could just pop up in your neighborhood and in close proximity to a school is terrifying. I should be able to feel safe in our homes and in our neighborhoods and the explanation your proposal has provided us regarding correctional oversight was not reassuring in the slightest on how this process will be managed. Finally, because of the market dynamics, the effects of these proposed changes are going to have the opposite effect of what the City intended. Mixed income and up and coming neighborhoods are going to feel the greatest negative effects to their home values and their communities (particularly in another economic crisis) and wealth is going to segregate in a few choice neighborhoods. I urge you to rethink this and instead find a more incremental approach, particularly because we are heading into a time of such uncertainty.
Thank you for your presentation last week. I am appalled that my city would want to destroy my neighborhood with allowing 8 non related people to live in one home! Currently only 2 unrelated are allowed and now you want to go to 8? That will add so many cars on the street for residents their guests, as well as increase noise to unattractive levels. Many of us have moved out of the inner city and its’ charming character because those things. We like Southeast Denver because it affords us a less frenzied and crowded way of life! Your plan would destroy what we have come to love, and certainly destroy our property values. Denver did the same thing in the 1970’s when they wanted to integrate schools. Right or wrong, it had an enormous effect on property values and people left the city in droves. I’m not sure it helped with integration at the time either. It all sounds good on paper, but since we live in reality, it has a real and predictable effect. Please DO NOT allow this flawed idea to come to fruition.

a few years we had a neighbor who turned their home into an Airbnb, and it was a nightmare for the rest of the neighbors. Many bachelor parties/bachelorette parties, and people doing exactly what your plan allows - multiple people crowding into the home to share rent, party, leave trash everywhere, ignore the lawn, and destroy our quiet and calm neighborhood. I know you are new to Denver and do not have the love and history we do with our city. But please work on positive changes for us, not such a blatant disregard for our citizens who have worked hard to make Denver a nice city that so many want to move to. You referenced Seattle multiple times in your presentation, and that is a city that is in danger of being destroyed by the homelessness, and is not a city to want to emulate. Make Denver better! Your plan will destroy it!

An adjacent property are as an example of how code enforcement and the city can’t enforce the present law of no more than two unrelated adults sharing a household. It’s our elected officials that get to grapple with that one, lucky them (not).

> There is a revolving door of cars and people. One police officer said it was probably bought by some contractor to house his crew cheaply.

> When I called the city they said they must have illegally put up a different address number by the door because she could not even find this house on GOOGLE MAPS to be able to turn it in to code enforcement.

> We looked and we couldn’t find this 50s era home either.

> A police officer felt like there was nothing he could do even though we said there could be sex trafficking going on there with as many men and women coming and going, but AGAIN code enforcement can’t do anything.

> The front of the house always has cars lined up after dark in the winter and we saw the garage door open up once and even thought oh my, it looked a hazard the way it was totally full and he thought he saw paint cans at one time sitting outside and wondered how long it takes for those to start leaking into ground...if they sit outside and are not properly disposed...

> Lots of issues but if the address is incorrect...what are they hiding And why can’t code enforcement do something when the law is only two and FEW LANDLORDS at last nights meeting were anxious to start making more rental income if they could go to EIGHT!

Both parking would be a problem, plus the possible increase in disturbances and crime and the poor maintenance of the residence. People who main their homes and enjoy a quiet and safe neighborhood will move to the suburbs. Please vote against this measure. Thank you.

The proposed changes are counterproductive to what defines a single family residence. There are two rentals on our street that have tried to rent more than the current allowed non related persons and have caused issues on our street. If current landlords don’t obey the current rules, what makes you think they will abide by the new regulations for the sake of a dollar.

I would like to give another perspective of the group living proposed changes and how it may affect neighbors. I live in the Cory-Merrill neighborhood where, at least on my block, there are several rental properties. Because rents are so high there are 3, 4 and sometimes more people living in these houses in order to afford the rent. I have no doubt that they already violate the current rules stating no more than 2 unrelated people living together but that’s not the issue. What I do see as a problem is parking. You get all those folks parking their vehicles on the street, then you add the boyfriends, the girlfriends and all the other visitors, many times staying overnight or even several days. This creates a parking problem for all of the neighbors. I’ve seen instances where someone has to park their car clear down the street and walk back to their house. In my neighborhood right now this seems to be manageable, certainly not ideal, but manageable. If the proposed changes pass allowing more unrelated people to live together I can see this becoming a real issue. While I can appreciate Denver’s problem of population growth and affordable housing, I’m not sure packing more people into a single residence is the answer. I wish I could offer something better but city planning really isn’t my forte. It’s our elected officials that get to grapple with that one, lucky them (not).

Please do not increase the number of unrelated individuals living in a home from 2 to 8 that is 1600 sq. ft. This is a recipe for disaster. Our neighborhood in SE Denver has homes that are 2400+ sq. ft. It is absolutely insane to think that 12+ people could live in one of these houses.

Parking would be a problem, plus the possible increase in disturbances and crime and the poor maintenance of the residence. People who maintain their homes and enjoy a quiet and safe neighborhood will move to the suburbs. Please vote against this measure. Thank you.

The proposed changes are counterproductive to what defines a single family residence. There are two rentals on our street that have tried to rent more than the current allowed non related persons and have caused issues on our street. If current landlords don’t obey the current rules, what makes you think they will abide by the new regulations for the sake of a dollar.

I am emailing you to provide you with my feedback and concerns in regards to the Proposed Group Living Changes with a focus only on the Household Regulation changes. As background, I have lived in the Hilltop neighborhood for close to 30 years and have some serious concerns about the Proposed Group Living Changes the City is considering as I believe some of the changes, if implemented, will have material negative long-term impacts to the current single family neighborhoods in Denver. I believe the proposed changes are too drastic and I sincerely hope the City is considering the potential negative impacts of these changes before any of the proposed changes are put into the housing codes. Summarized below are my comments and concerns.

1) I do find it admirable that the City is trying to address housing affordability for Denver’s less affluent residents but it should not implement changes to housing codes to the potential detriment of Denver’s other residents, and more specifically, to Denver’s predominantly single family home neighborhoods.
2) Allowing up to 8 UNRELATED people to live together in a 1,600 square foot residence with potential to add individuals for each additional 200 square feet of space above 1,600 square feet is just too much density in a traditional single family home neighborhood. For example, a 4,000 square foot home could potentially house 19 people! From my perspective, the City would be creating European style hostels within its stock of single family homes and that type of density comes with potential negative impacts to the City’s predominantly single family neighborhoods: a) With the human density being proposed for single family homes, there will be negative impacts to nearby reside (e.g. the potential for more noise, residents constantly coming and going from the property, increased pressure on street parking, etc.). b) Assure a very conservative estimate of 25% of individuals living in these dense habitations will have cars, where will all these cars park? I can foresee someone parking their car near the property and that of their guests, as well as increase noise to unattractive levels.

b) Assure a very conservative estimate of 25% of individuals living in these dense habitations will have cars, where will all these cars park? I can foresee someone parking their car near the property and that of their guests, as well as increase noise to unattractive levels. The City would be creating European style hostels within its stock of single family homes and that type of density comes with potential negative impacts to the City’s predominantly single family neighborhoods: a) With the human density being proposed for single family homes, there will be negative impacts to nearby reside (e.g. the potential for more noise, residents constantly coming and going from the property, increased pressure on street parking, etc.). b) Assure a very conservative estimate of 25% of individuals living in these dense habitations will have cars, where will all these cars park? I can foresee someone parking their car near the property and that of their guests, as well as increase noise to unattractive levels.

As background, I have lived in the Hilltop neighborhood for close to 30 years and have some serious concerns about the Proposed Group Living Changes the City is considering as I believe some of the changes, if implemented, will have material negative long-term impacts to the current single family neighborhoods in Denver. I believe the proposed changes are too drastic and I sincerely hope the City is considering the potential negative impacts of these changes before any of the proposed changes are put into the housing codes. Summarized below are my comments and concerns.

1) I do find it admirable that the City is trying to address housing affordability for Denver’s less affluent residents but it should not implement changes to housing codes to the potential detriment of Denver’s other residents, and more specifically, to Denver’s predominantly single family home neighborhoods.
2) Allowing up to 8 UNRELATED people to live together in a 1,600 square foot residence with potential to add individuals for each additional 200 square feet of space above 1,600 square feet is just too much density in a traditional single family home neighborhood. For example, a 4,000 square foot home could potentially house 19 people! From my perspective, the City would be creating European style hostels within its stock of single family homes and that type of density comes with potential negative impacts to the City’s predominantly single family neighborhoods: a) With the human density being proposed for single family homes, there will be negative impacts to nearby reside (e.g. the potential for more noise, residents constantly coming and going from the property, increased pressure on street parking, etc.). b) Assure a very conservative estimate of 25% of individuals living in these dense habitations will have cars, where will all these cars park? I can foresee someone parking their car near the property and that of their guests, as well as increase noise to unattractive levels.
I have lived on my street in Denver for almost 20 years. I used to be the only one who parked on the street because I was the only one without a garage. Now that there are more people per dwelling, my block is lined with cars every night. If 8 people are allowed to live in a home, will they potentially have 8 cars to park per residence?

If eight people are allowed to live in rentals homes in my neighborhood near Denver University it will ruin our neighborhood. We don't have alleys. Neighbors dogs have ruined our fence. The guy who owns the home next door doesn't care one iota what his renters don't do. They haven't watered the lawn in three years. The yard is an eyesore. I’m beginning to dislike living in Denver. City Council has some new members who want to get rid of laws. The worst idea was thinking we'd be cool with tents pitched in parks so drug addicts can shoot up and deficate on lawns. The renters have more rights than homeowners and I’m sick of it.

I won’t be able to attend the March 4 meeting concerning the change for 8 unrelated roommates to live in a home 1600 sf or more. The only comment I would like to make is to consider the number of cars this one home may have, which does impact a street. We live near the University Denver. I am thankful most houses on our street are lived in by families. One home has 3 cars on the street. If all houses had 8 roommates, it would be a very crowded street. While buildings are being constructed on the university campus, several streets are filled with worker’s cars, making it hard to clearly see other cars or pedestrians, or navigate cross traffic. The number of cars is the only comment I have concerning the change in roommates. Thank you for trying to solve our housing problem!

Sir: As I have followed this proposal online, I have seen no discussions of traffic & parking implications. Particularly in the more mature, central Denver neighborhoods, street parking is already at a premium & adding 4-6 or more presumably working adults to each structure or condo will have a dramatic impact on neighborhood livability. The urban myth of public transportation/bikes/scooters/Uber/etc. replacing cars as a common transportation mode has been abundantly disproved in every large metropolitan area. As in Medicare/free college/minimum wage-income for all & how ya’ gonna to pay for it, where ya’ gonna to park ‘em ??!?!!? Eight adults in a 2400 square foot 4 bedroom house with the 2 car garage converted to 4 bedrooms for a group home for some protected group is one thing. Eight adults & an unlimited number of related minors in a 1200 - 1700 square foot 2-3 bedroom home is insane. Your motives are laudable. As usual, your liberal progressive execution is pie in the sky. This appears to be yet another progressive tactic to attract underemployed & possibly/probably illegal residents receiving government subsidized funding onto the Democrat voting rolls. How about FOUR unrelated adults & a total occupancy not to exceed 10 with children. That is still a bunch of folks in 12-1700 square feet. If y’all would try to meet conservatives in the middle instead of cramming your ideology down our throats, we’d all benefit, the people you justly suppose to support would still benefit & we could all help folks get back to work, be reasonably self sufficient & appreciate what the nation has to offer with prudent behavior & hard work rather than give away to garner votes at the expense of the decreasing numbers of us who do work hard. But then Big Government would be out of a job, eh?!

I emailed Kendra Black about my concerns for the changes in group housing. She asked me to contact you about these concerns. I am against the changes to group living. I live in southeast denver and it will ruin neighborhoods. A lot of the neighborhoods were not designed for this type of change. It won’t accommodate for the parking and the congestion it will cause. Why can’t the city have more affordable housing?

I have lived with the multi-resident single family dilemma for two years now. As a former city planner who grappled with this topic years ago (I am long-retired), I feel compelled to comment. While I fully realize the reasons why these changes are being considered, I wanted to make sure that new regulations address the pressures on infrastructure they might generate, namely garbage overflow and parking. As residents in an area with many multi-resident single family homes we deal with tenants who strew garbage all over the alleys and park in unauthorized places causing hardships for the neighborhood. I would propose that any allowance for up to eight residents in a single family home include a permitting process that requires: 1. one garbage receptacle for each (or at least for each two) resident, 2. a requirement that storage of trash receptacles be in some sort of enclosure and 3. a requirement for a parking space per resident (or at least for every two). For the most part, the multi-resident homes in area are not a problem (an occasional wild party or two maybe), but the garbage and parking are annoying, unsightly and, in some cases, dangerous. Please consider this when adopting new regulations.
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 11.1.1.1A) 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 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 differently from eight related adults living together does not result in reduced impacts."

Further, the City's Open House presentation undermines the argument that there is an "evolution of lifestyles." According to that document, "8 of Denver households contain just one or two adults -- this follows national trends and is not expected to change dramatically... Census data show there are currently approximately 72 homes with 8 or more people in Denver. We do not expect a major change in the way people choose to live together." The City's own statements indicate that there is no "evolution" to address. And they suggest instead that the City is merely catering to a small group of persons who may be violating the current rules, but that the City has no intent to enforce the current rules. That is not good.

Accordingly, the City has not shown a justification for relaxing the household and group-living standards in the Zoning Code, or that its stated justification is reasonable.

On the other hand, there are clear concerns that relaxing household and group-living standards will result in "adverse impacts on surrounding properties, surrounding residential uses and neighborhoods." The proposal would adversely affect single-family neighborhoods in many ways, including:

-- increased crime,
-- increased noise,
-- increased traffic and resulting threats to children and other pedestrians and bicycle-riders,
-- increased trash and vandalism, and

Here we go again! I attended your "Group Living Rules" and "adopted City Goals" meeting at the Hebrew Alliance Center on the 26th and once again my city "leaders" didn't disappoint! In my opinion, a rushed presentation, hard to see visuals and not adequate time allotted to address residents questions. I was offended by Robin's lecture on diversification in our SE neighborhood and comparing your "proposal" to the transgressions against the Jews and Catholics. Point of information...my neighbors are white, black, Hispanic, Korean and Chinese!! No one has been excluded! beyond me why you continue to chip away at the fabric and foundations of our society! The family unit is already disappearing and you want to further denigrate it by trashing our neighborhoods by accommodating those who choose to "live in a different way". Very hard for me to see how these proposed changes will "better" our city. Some of my other concerns:

1) Safety -- people know who their neighbors are...Are you going to add more police presence as is necessary in high density areas?
2) Parking -- no explanation necessary here...just look at some of the high density areas and see what the issue is. Start with the DU area along University (at Evans). Especially areas when you have replaced traffic lanes with bike lanes.
3) Services...Trash, Road Maintenance, Sewer, (other) costs will surely increase.
4) Ownership -- there has been an increase in absent owner "rentals" in my neighborhood...lack of maintenance, upkeep and pride of ownership is evident on all rentals. High density rentals owned by absentee landlords will only accelerate this problem. Property values suffer because of the current enforcement? There is none!
5) Enforcement -- Can't be done! Call me and I'll take you to three homes in my neighborhood where current limits are being exceeded. Where is the current enforcement? There is none!
6) "Per Andy"...we have talked to "Seattle and Portland". Really? Our leaders are looking to these cities for guidance? And I believe you come from Albuquerque? Can we not do what's best for Denver and not follow progressive cities that have NOT had positive results! If this is the path Denver wants to take, we need to elect and hire new people with a different vision!
7) Why is it that the "City Leaders" always think the responsibility should fall on "homeowners" to carry the burden? Just like a few years back when the city proposed to tax homeowners to fund our libraries! How about a little PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY? We homeowners and the city is NOT responsible to provide housing for those who "choose to live in a different way".
8) Cannot believe this was the "results" of two years, hundreds of meetings, and countless dollars spent!!
9) And I suppose that "safe injection sites" will qualify as a small care unit!!

Very disappointed......

All related family members and their vehicles.

Landlords are salivating at the possibility of this increasing their rent potential dramatically.

Neighbors see the downside of more vehicles and the possibility of turning homes into places where things like sex trading of young girls can occur and neighbors don't know because no one knows the revolving people and cars coming and going all hours of the day and night.

We have two homes like that in our Neighborhood and when we reported them exceeding the present 2 unrelated adults we were told they couldn't find the home on Google maps...as if they have posted a different address from the real address for some unknown reason...so the revolving number of adults and cars continues, with whatever the house is being used for and little property upkeep.

...Denver doesn't want cars burning gas circling to find parking spaces; car hoppers going off all night waking up babies; kids not able to safely ride their bike to the rec center or school because the parked cars can't see them and there are no bike paths; neighborhoods that are no longer neighborhoods where people know each other and bring food and help shovel after surgeries, as THREE neighbors have done for us.

We LOVE DENVER and rave about its incredible neighborhoods.

Please don't pass this proposal and destroy neighborhoods.

This is ludicrous...only the developers and landlords want this not the people who make up the true fabric of DENVER.

Check next-door. Nobody in University Hills is supporting this idea. Bad idea.
I have been attending community meetings now for 30+ years in an effort to be knowledgeable about the plans the City and County of Denver is making and how those plans may impact my life as a residential homeowner in Denver. When I bought my first property in 1983, my first criteria was that it have an R-1 zoning, to best ensure stable property value. I closely followed the rezoning changes that are fairly recent, changing that zoning to S-SU-F, which stands for Suburban-Single Unit-8500 minimum square foot lot size. I think it is interesting, and a bit concerning, that it is no longer in any way referred to as “residential”. I have lived in 3 locations within the city and currently live in the Southern Hills community, which I grew up in during the 1960’s.

Now there is an effort to allow for homes (now called “units”) to house over 12 unrelated adults throughout these residential communities with City and County of Denver. The city, city council, and the mayor are pressing those of us who own homes here to allow this to occur; that is, to go from a current allowance of 2 unrelated adults and blood relatives of those adults to 12+ UNrelated adults and minor children. This is nothing short of outrageous.

Since, in my opinion, zoning enforcement has historically been lax, I have lived the experience of numerous unrelated “adults” living together in houses within 3 neighborhoods. In my former University of Denver neighborhood, I had to contact the DU neighborhood liaison several times regarding problem houses, not homes, but apartment style living within a single house with unrelated residents. The last time was to ask them to see to the clean up of broken glass strewn throughout our block. In Washington Park neighborhood, there were countless calls regarding noise ordinance violations and parking violations to name just two problems. Currently, in Southern Hills, the house behind us had numerous unrelated adults living together for years. One day a police officer was parked in front of our home and came to the door to explain that he was surveilling our house because someone there was wanted by the police. Regarding the house next door to us, where multiple unrelated adults were living there who were acquaintances of the owner’s daughter, a neighbor from our block came to us seeking support for calling the authorities because his wife and daughter did not feel safe in their home during the day. We, of course, agreed that the authorities needed to be called.

We are pleased that both of these homes have been sold, rehabilitated, and sold again recently; one to a family who is thrilled to have a single family home in which to raise their child, and the other to a couple who we have yet to meet. Two other homes on our block have had elderly residents who have recently died, and the homes have been remodeled and are now owned by new families with children.

This proposed rezoning is not good for these and other families. I am concerned that what I am seeing occur in the City and County of Denver is How ridiculous this new proposal is . You and your cronies have helped ruin Denver. Crappy infill apt. Bldgs. On and on. Why do we need to attract more people to Denver? Politicians and developers need to get a clue about Denver and what it needs, less about getting re-elected and making money!

I am writing to voice my support for the group living zoning amendment. I currently live in a co-operative house and know first hand that living in a community can have an enormous positive impact on a person’s life. Living in a co-op has helped me become financially stable, civically engaged, build a social safety net, and even eat more vegetables. My greatest hope is that many more people get to experience life in this way, and amending the zoning code would make that more possible.

I am very concerned about the proposed zoning changes. Denver is a city with many wonderful neighborhoods; this will not make them better! You really think having a house with 8 unrelated adults next to yours on one side, and possibly a halfway house across the street will make your neighborhood better? Sounds scary as all get out to me! Perhaps a good way to get people to move out of Denver. I think all the consequences have not been well thought out either. For example, if parking becomes a problem (how could it not be), we will try to figure out something then. The kick it down the road solution. Please rethink this if you care about Denver being a great place to live!

The cost of housing in Denver is very high, but the solution of allowing large numbers of unrelated residents in a home is not a good plan for several reasons.
1. Running of a boarding house style living will impact the value of surrounding homes.
2. The large amount of additional traffic and parked cars from residents in a home will increase in an area.
3. Use of large amounts of residents in a one-family home will make for a greater chance of conflicts and calls required to the Denver Police Department.
4. More maintenance of residence will be required, but will it happen? Once again, decreasing the value of homes in the area.

Thank you for your considerations in negating this proposal for the sake of home buyers and the severe changes to a neighborhood.
I attended the Group Living open house at the HEA last week and want to thank you for the huge effort you have put into the project. Overall I think your team did a solid job of communicating the problem statements and the unintended consequences. As a concerned citizen I left the forum knowing much more than before and was able to share and engage with family, friends, and work colleagues on the topic.

I do want to make one specific comment on the public setup. When the forum began we all agreed to not clap and holler but that didn’t last for long. While it wasn’t unruly it did breakdown to a point where I felt like a diversity of voices could not be heard. The persons sitting next to me began to disparage both council members and other points of view. In the end, as I was taking notes and waiting for a microphone to come my way I decided to wrap up my evening (literally leave the sanctuary) and instead put my questions and comments to paper and ask for your feedback.

Overall I am in favor of the measure but do question how the calculation goes from 2 to 8; I would be concerned for the safety of that many people living in a small space if it were a single family home (SU/SFH)

1. Is there a formal definition of vulnerable populations? Is there a city measurement that identifies how many residents fall into this category.
2. Who are some of the vulnerable members of the community the task force has engaged with to learn what they think the impact would be and how we might seek resolution to their problem.
3. Is there a task force liaison to help communicate within the communities at greatest risk as to the change in code? Community activators.
4. How might all these changes impact population density and walkability of neighborhoods?
5. How do you measure success of such a change? Immediate and long-term?
6. Are there examples of other municipalities or cities you have observed, where a change like this has improved affordability or kept vulnerable populations from falling down the proverbial ladder or been empowered etc? I know Seattle was referenced in the forum and denvergov website mentions numerous other cities. Have their local representatives provided ample feedback to help guide Denver?

I am a Denver resident who was unable to attend the open house to discuss Group Living. However, I would like to let you know that I’m opposed to the concept of increasing the number of unrelated people from 3 to 8. That dramatic jump seems very excessive to me. I’m extremely concerned how this increase in numbers would impact both my neighborhood and the entire city of Denver. I understand and appreciate the city’s need to address affordable housing challenges; however, I don’t think this is the best approach to doing so. This action would truly change the nature of many of our neighborhoods. I am a Denver native and have lived here and contributed to the city in many ways for years—not just with my tax dollars. I don’t want to feel like I have to move because our city has become so overcrowded and our neighborhoods have changed so dramatically.

Thank you for your consideration.

I am a Denver resident. I have lived in Denver and its suburbs since 1966. I am very much opposed to the Group Living proposal. In fact, I believe the current laws and/or regulations should stay in place AND be enforced. My wife and I bought a townhome in a nice area two years ago. These are two and three bedroom residences. There is limited parking. It was designed in 1984 as a community of 60 residences and around 100 people. This proposal would subvert the intent of the builders and the current homeowners. I suggest the city administration and city council work on solving the problems rather than creating new ones. And those who think this will solve affordable housing problems have their own agendas, much different than most residents. I wonder what would happen if this proposal was voted on by residents who own single-unit properties, other than apartment buildings.
COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS

I find the proposed zoning code changes related to group living and residential care poorly thought out and unacceptable as they are presently written. My primary objection is to the proposed increase in the number of unrelated people being allowed to cohabitate in a single-unit dwelling. Following are my thoughts on the matter.

1) It is unreasonable (to me) to propose a 400% increase in the number of unrelated persons (from 2 to 8) that could be allowed to live together in a single-unit dwelling, with an unlimited number of related persons added in. It would be more rational (again, to me) to propose incremental increases in the number of unrelated persons allowed to live together, with an assessment of impacts following each incremental increase. For example:
   a. Increase from 2 to 3 unrelated persons for 3 years.
   b. Assess impacts.
   c. Based on assessment, decide whether to increase from 3 to 4 unrelated persons for 2 years.
   d. Assess impacts.
   e. Based on assessment, decide whether to increase from 4 to 6 unrelated persons for 2 years.
   f. Assess impacts.
   g. Based on assessment, decide whether to increase from 6 to 8 unrelated persons.

2) The unrestricted number of relatives seems to me to be a large concern. A potential "fix" could be to cap the total number of persons (related or not) to double (or, some other multiple, such as triple) the number of unrelated persons. Another alternative could be to correlate the total number of unrelated persons to other parameters, such as those noted in next item (#3).

3) It seems rational to me to correlate number of people living together per residential unit with square footage and facilities, such as toilets, bedrooms, parking availability, other — as I have seen suggested in a February 5, 2020, letter from WWPNA to Council President Jolon Clark. I have looked on the website for CPD Group Living Rules Update (https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/community-planning-and-development/zoning/text-amendments/Group_Living.html) and have found no definitions for the terms "unrelated persons" (does this mean both adults and children), "persons", "people", and "adults". As written, I find these terms confusing.

4) I have looked on the website for CPD Group Living Rules Update (https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/community-planning-and-development/zoning/text-amendments/Group_Living.html) and have found no definitions for the terms "unrelated persons" (does this mean both adults and children), "persons", "people", and "adults". As written, I find these terms confusing.

5) A major concern to me would be the number of vehicles and associated parking issues that could arise from increasing the number of unrelated persons per dwelling unit, plus an unlimited number of related persons.

6) From reviewing WWPNA’s February 5, 2020, letter from WWPNA’s comments regarding GLAC representation and participation in the process and lack of RNO participation to be compelling points about the lack of broad community engagement in developing the proposed zoning code changes.

Dr. Mr. Webb, I would have loved to go to some of the meetings, but I have babysitting responsibilities to grandchildren a lot of times, but than for the opportunity for me to make my concerns heard thru this link. I have been, in the past, an HOA President of the Board, and one of the more complex and concerning issues that came up in the three years of my presidency was (1) congestion of cars, by both owners and visitors. Twice had the Fire Department come to talk with us about safety and parking. We got an eye-opener because our developer. (Richmond) made the streets too narrow for parking on both sides, and only one side got sidewalks. How that was allowed by Denver I don’t know, but we are trying hard to make sure our owners are following the rules with their cars....not always successful. Obviously, putting more people in homes at the number of 8, all who will be aged able to have a car, will absolutely have problems parking, and we the owners, having safety issues put upon us.

(2) Our homes aren’t huge and even though one might be up for sale or rent and this recommendation goes thru, what will keep the owner(s) from putting two or three people in very small bedrooms, with maybe 2/3 bathrooms in the entire home? What about the size of the trash that will fit on the streets; what about fire regulations inside the home to accommodate 8 people? I heartily believe this is a bad idea from many concerns I think maybe everyone hasn’t thought out. Often government can’t see thru the trees to unintended consequences that are often attached to these type of decisions. I understand how important it is for us to solve homelessness and the high cost of rents and buying homes, but putting this on people who have worked hard to own and keep up their homes seems quite unfair and not the proper solution. Again, thanks for allowing this to be heard honestly.

I can appreciate the direction that the city planners are trying to move the zoning code with its Group Living Rules Update. However, I think that moving from 2 unrelated to group 8 unrelated adults is too big a change. Many of the houses in my neighborhood are 2000-2500 square feet size and we have no HOA here. Under your proposed rules, such a house could accommodate 8 unrelated adults or even more. This is ridiculous in my opinion. We have seen a number of different groups rent out their basement to bring in some extra cash. The house really stood out as it was always surrounded by too many cars and their various possessions. It looked terrible and junky. The people that house made a lot of noise and were generally disruptive. Eventually all the neighbors complained enough that the owner of the house threatened eviction and the renters finally eliminated their basement sub-tenants. Under your proposed rules, the number of people there would fine as it would be making their housing "more affordable." It is misleading to compare 8 unrelated adults to 8 related family members. Having a family this large these days is rare. Also, when a large family (8 related people) is in a home, it is usually only temporary as people take in elderly grandparents (who typically are quiet and eventually pass away) or have children who grow up and move out on their own. Also, children and elderly parents usually don’t drive, so there wouldn’t be 8 cars in front of the house. I can’t say I know of even one "family" that has 8 household members. It’s such a special and rare situation that they made a TV show about it in the 70’s called ‘Eight is Enough.' One cannot argue that "families can have 8 people so why can’t we have 8 unrelated people in a house." It’s a completely different thing. You can’t compare a family of (2 parents, 2 grandparents, and 4 kids) to 8 unrelated adults who are "down and out" or "in recovery." Is limiting a household to two people a bit restrictive? I can totally see that argument. Why not increase the limit to 4 unrelated people and "see how it goes" for a while before making such drastic change?
I am writing to express my deep concern about the possible changes to zoning laws related to housing. Increasing the number of unrelated persons living at one address to eight will be a disaster for Denver neighborhoods. I know, because I have been living next door to such a house for a number of years. The property owner always sublet part of her house to non-related persons, plus lived there with her two adult children, two grandchildren, and her grandchildren. There were a number of problems over the years related to an unlicensed home auto repair business, far too many cars for the property and the parking issues that creates, noise, and accumulated trash piled in the yard or spilling over onto my property. That is why when she lived there. She moved out two years ago, and has been renting the property to upwards of eight unrelated persons at any given time ever since. The problems mentioned above have continued, and expanded. On our narrow streets, where are eight people living at one property, even supposed to park their cars that won’t negatively impact the neighbors? I can’t count the number of times I have had to put up with cars parked just immediately next to my driveway, which is illegal, but actually parked overlapping it or in front of it. The current tenants have upwards of 16 cars between them, and this is difficult to grin and bear. One bad neighbor who only looks out for themselves has been enough to injure my entire block. Too many people in one home leads to too many cars, too much noise, and lower property values for everyone. The owners of these properties don’t care about the impact on the resident homeowners, they only care about their profit margin. In Green Valley Ranch where I live, I really don’t even have a police presence strong enough to protect our neighborhood safe, much less tasking them with addressing things like illegal parking, and noise complaints. I have two kids who are now young adults, and I sympathize with the difficulty of finding somewhere to live that is affordable and safe. Changing the zoning law to go from two unrelated persons to eight is overkill, and injurious to resident homeowners not to make a buck off the largest number of tenants possible. Increasing the occupancy of apartments is a logical step. Apartment dwellers are accustomed to noise and traffic, and have parking to accommodate extra vehicles. Please do not destroy the character of Denver neighborhoods. We oppose this proposal for several reasons:

1. It would allow too many people to live in homes originally designed as single family residences. The allowable number should be cut in half. There should also be restrictions on the number of homes allowed within a neighborhood.

2. It will create parking congestion on streets intended for parking a smaller number of cars. For example, the proposal would permit up to 8 adults and up to 8 cars. Please think about how this congestion would impact the quality of life for those who live on streets that would have these “congested” houses.

3. What is to guarantee that there would not be the social problems often associated from congested living situations that would not spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods and the bigger neighborhood? This is a particular concern for homes with large numbers of people in a home designed for fewer people.

Here is a real life example that we and fellow neighbors lived through for about 3 years: On our street several years ago there was a home that went into the Section 8 program. For a time, this house was a circus-- we did not know who was really supposed to be living in the house, and who was there to cohabit with a resident, to use drugs, etc. (There was often the smell of marijuana coming from this house.) It became a difficult situation for our street for several of us neighbors. Often, it was obvious there were more than 8 people who called this house their home. The outside condition of the home deteriorated as the people living there were more interested in chilling rather than real work. Thankfully, this home was taken out of Section 8 and sold. It now has responsible owners.

4. If the City Council really cared about its residents, a less extreme approach would be taken. We understand the need for housing where individuals might just want to rent a bedroom because of the high housing costs. We also understand the value of group homes (e.g., assisted living). That said, allowing for the potential of single-family homes with say 3,000 square feet to house even up to 16 people makes little sense as it does not even begin to consider how such a change could impact neighborhoods. As currently proposed, this proposal makes your constituents wonder if there isn’t some special interest that would hugely benefit from this proposal.

5. This measure needs to be reconsidered, and a more realistic proposal needs to be brought before the citizens of Denver, that you claim to represent. Many of us feel like you, who are supposed to be representing the hard-working residents of District 4, and instead turning your back on us and not even listening to our very real concerns, but are simply dismissing the very people who elected you to this position. We feel like you are not representing our views, but those of a special interest.

6. If you truly care about your council district, you will push for hearings of this proposal in every council district in Denver. Further, to show your concern about the people you represent think, you would urge the Denver City Council to place the idea before a vote of the people of Denver, and not rush to steamroll the current proposal.

Why is anyone in favor of the plan to allow eight unrelated people per house?
Is there a map that shows which neighborhoods will be affected by this change?
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1. It would allow too many people to live in homes originally designed as single family residences. The allowable number should be cut in half. There should also be restrictions on the number of homes allowed within a neighborhood.

2. It will create parking congestion on streets intended for parking a smaller number of cars. For example, the proposal would permit up to 8 adults and up to 8 cars. Please think about how this congestion would impact the quality of life for those who live on streets that would have these “congested” houses.

3. What is to guarantee that there would not be the social problems often associated from congested living situations that would not spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods and the bigger neighborhood? This is a particular concern for homes with large numbers of people in a home designed for fewer people.

Here is a real life example that we and fellow neighbors lived through for about 3 years: On our street several years ago there was a home that went into the Section 8 program. For a time, this house was a circus-- we did not know who was really supposed to be living in the house, and who was there to cohabit with a resident, to use drugs, etc. (There was often the smell of marijuana coming from this house.) It became a difficult situation for our street for several of us neighbors. Often, it was obvious there were more than 8 people who called this house their home. The outside condition of the home deteriorated as the people living there were more interested in chilling rather than real work. Thankfully, this home was taken out of Section 8 and sold. It now has responsible owners.
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I have lived 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 I 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 8 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 is 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 congestion 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 on the backs of homeowners who have chosen to live where they do in order to avert the very situations this proposal would create.

The City certainly understands that increased population requires increased police, fire, trash, transportation, meter maids, street sweeping etc, services. The City understands that increased population requires increased police, fire, trash, transportation, meter maids, street sweeping etc, services. The City certainly understands that increased population requires increased police, fire, trash, transportation, meter maids, street sweeping etc, services. The City certainly understands that increased population requires increased police, fire, trash, transportation, meter maids, street sweeping etc, services.

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 maintaining 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 is to know your neighbors, become familiar with their coming and goings, and check out suspicious activities. We have 7 duplexes as 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 the City 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 father’s 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.
As you may know, I’ve been trying to get DPS to consider homelessness as an educational problem. It’s uphill, but I do think Susana Cordova is more open to the idea than Tom Boasberg was. For years, I’ve been working to reduce educational achievement gaps and now I’m beginning to realize that the gaps are not just due to inadequate instruction. Poverty, plain and simple, causes all sorts of permanent damage to children. I have two books that are now my Bibles on the link btwn educ outcomes and poverty, both published in 2020:

1. Jeff Madrick, Invisible Americans: The Tragic Cost of Child Poverty
2. Nicholas Kristof & Sheryl WuDunn, Tightrope: Americans Reaching for Hope

Two points:

1. Madrick, pg 121 – poverty causes permanent neurological damage to children
2. Kristof, pg 39 – loneliness is sometimes the root cause of bad adult behavior

After we started the Downtown Denver Expeditionary School (in 2013?), which Susan Powers and Dana Crawford both helped to start, I focused supporting some of the low income families at the sch. One single mom was sleeping in her car w/ her kindergartner. I thought “piece of cake” her housed and get her a job. She actually had a job, but then her car stopped working. Two years later, still no public housing and while she was living w/ a boyfriend, he molested her now 7 yr old. Denver Dept of Soc Serv worked to reunited mom and dau, until Mom allowed boyfriend back into her life, despite the crim charges ag him and an ankle bracelet that identified at her apt, due to loneliness. Another homeless mom at DDE warned me ahead of time that loneliness would be a problem. It had never occurred to me. The child molester got off scot free cut Mom testified in court that the abuse never happened, despite Denver hosp records to the contrary, and of course the statements of the 7 yr old.

Allowing unrelated people, esp single moms w/ kids, to live tog could help reduce homelessness and loneliness at relatively little cost. BUT all support services are needed too. Please don’t forget that.

There are incredibly serious consequences of doing nothing.

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 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 lost 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 the 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 addition 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

My husband and I attended the Denver Group Living Code Update on February 26th. Along with most of the others who attended, we have concerns about the proposed changes. The following questions stand out at this point: 1) It is not clear why all conventional residential use is to be changed at the same time as zoning issues related to residential care and group homes. 2) An incremental approach moving conventional residential use from 2 unrelated adults to 3, possibly 4, would seem to be a more reasonable way to proceed. 3) In many of our neighborhoods potential parking issues involved with the proposed changes could be substantial. Therefore, the Denver Zoning Code as it relates to cars per household needs to be addressed at the same time as these proposed changes. All the news you regularly send about District 5 is so informative We appreciate that you alerted residents to this issue and will watch for further updates.
Affordable housing for low and middle-income individuals and families is obviously a serious challenge that needs to be addressed. My neighbor and I agree that it’s time for the city to update its definition of household. I recently received the GLAC presentation. It appears that the proposed changes would allow 8+ unrelated people to live in any house. The generalized and sweeping nature of these changes has problems that will ultimately backfire, creating the opposite results of the proposal’s good intentions. Allowing for 8+ unrelated people to live in any residential house without due consideration of each property and location, will draw group living industries into neighborhoods throughout Denver. Homes in residential neighborhoods will be bought by commercial entities, even those with non-profit and not-for-profit status, for short-term room rental. Commercial buyers will offer substantially higher prices to homeowners than the homeowners would otherwise get by selling their homes as standard residential properties. Surrounding property values and property taxes will go up. The commercial gain will be irresistible. And, apparently, these GLAC proposals remove protections of current safety measures, through building inspections, that are now required when more than four unrelated people live in a house. Short-term, unsafe rental housing will proliferate. Long-term housing and home ownership will be less affordable and less accessible. Is this city-wide policy being written by interests of group-living industries? We agree that the city’s definition and regulations of unrelated people living in one home need updating. The current proposal is too generalized, removes due consideration per property, and strips away safety protections. It goes too far, and ultimately works against the very populations it’s intending to serve. Changing the city’s definition of household by raising the number of unrelated people from 2 to 4 would align with the average of surrounding cities, maintain current safety regulations, and prevent a river of group-living companies from saturating 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 had. 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 landlord of that home was previously running an Airbnb 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 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 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 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.
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 minors 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 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 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 multiple individual residencies. We'd never anticipated that we would any chance that a halfway house for correctional facility inmates would be next door in our neighborhood or halfway houses for those with behavioral health issues. As aging residents who will live in our neighborhood, we worry about our personal safety. We have family members who have been in "the system" and know the risks and nature of these situations first-hand. The City of Denver cannot control the downstream actions or protect us as residents as this type of housing is implemented in our neighborhood. Also, the information presented doesn't specify if the correctional facility residents are those who were Denver residents at the time of conviction and sentencing or committed a crime in the City and County of Denver and are from somewhere else. We're already paying for law enforcement, court
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I recently learned about the Group Living Proposal meeting that occurred the other day (which I was not able to arrange attendance due to learning 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 build 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 shot 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 in 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 order 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 “B” to protect the surrounding residents?

We are writing you today to encourage your reconsideration for the proposed increase of unrelated adults for single family homes. Please please reduce the number that you are proposing. By increasing the number of potential adults in one single family home will destroy our neighborhoods on Denver.

We are natives of Denver and have lived in southeast Denver all of our lives. We have loved the neighborhoods we have lived in and want to see the culture of our neighborhoods continue to thrive, encouraging families to live here. With that in mind my husband and I are extremely alarmed at the current proposition for having 8 plus unrelated people allowed to live in one house. First of all the potential of having 8 plus cars for one house is inconceivable. My family wouldn’t be able to park at our house if we had to fight with 8 other people. Having that many adults in one space is only bring trouble...noise ... bad behavior to say the least.

The health and safety of our neighborhood would be compromised, resulting in a nightmare due to noise, impacted safety of ourselves, property, and children, a negative impact on property value and negatively affecting of sense of family community. Our neighborhood has many young families with young children; families appreciate the quiet, ability to play outside on the streets. Safety would be impacted by such influx of people even in one single home. Our neighborhood is seeing many more young families moving in than ever before. With this potential of increased community and apartment like living would be discouraging to these families to buy and to remain in our neighborhood. There are plenty of apartments and Denver for people, don’t let our single family homes turn in to over crowded apartments. As seen with many rentals already in our subdivision, properties are not taken care of and the tenants are less than desirable because they don’t care about the culture of the neighborhood. Adjoining neighbors to these rentals have been sorely impacted. If you double or triple the number of adults, you will increase the already existing problems by 3 fold or more.

We would hope that the city would want to encourage young families to come to our neighborhoods and stay here. Please don’t let an apartment like living with so many people happen. Please consider cutting the number in half. My family has remained in Denver all these years because of the quality of our neighborhood, a peaceful, safe and serene environment. Don’t destroy what we natives have worked for and enjoy all of our lives in Denver. Please reconsider your current proposal.

Yes, another email about your plans for group homes in Denver. While I understand your position I strongly disagree with it. Having that many people living in a house next to me is absurd. I’ve been in my “single family” home for 30 years. I’ve paid my dues, I’ve paid my taxes, and I don’t expect to have a dozen people in a single house on this cul-de-sac. A) It’s single family, not group housing or zoned for apartments. B) the extra traffic would be nuts. Even if only half those renters have cars where are they going to park? C) what will that do to my property value? The city needs to rethink this entire program and pay attention to those who have worked hard to live in a nice home on a quiet street and away from the elements that your plan brings.

I attended the open house on Feb 26, at the Hebrew Educational Alliance, having to do with group living. I am truly stunned by this proposal by Denver Planning Department. I cannot believe that Denver is expecting private households to absorb out-of-control growth. I understand you want to force Denver Planning Department to do this. This is not an issue to be decided by Denver City Council. This needs to be addressed by the voters on a ballot; It reflects a major change in zoning. I have always thought zoning was pretty good in Denver, despite the attempt by developers to twist it on their behalf. The planning department needs to expend its resources on the homeless, and to be creative about housing them, instead of dumping on homeowners. A gentleman at the meeting mentioned, a lot of older apartments are empty so how could they be employed?

My husband and I attended the Denver Group Living Code Update on February 26th. Along with most of the others who attended, we have concerns about the proposed changes. The following questions stand out at this point: 1) It is not clear why all conventional residential use is changed at the same time as zoning issues related to residential care and group homes. 2) An incremental approach moving conventional residential use from 2 unrelated adults to 3, possibly 4, would seem to be a more reasonable way to proceed. 3) In many of our neighborhoods, potential parking issues involved with the proposed changes could be substantial. Therefore, the Denver Zoning Code as it relates to cars per household needs to be addressed at the same time as these proposed changes.
I would 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 half way 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 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 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 I 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 the 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 congestion, 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 on the backs of homeowners who have chosen to live where they do in order to avert the very situations this proposal would create.

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. How is it possible to have a democracy if you don't expect these problems to occur. "Willful Ignorance" is the most polite way I can think of to respond to that!

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 low, so I'm supporting 4." Councilwoman Kniech has not bothered to respond to my concern. 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.

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.
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 Courts. 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 would 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 codes 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 aid zoning purposed community buildings such as frats, assisted living, halfway housing and such, but extending new rules on houses is not acceptable. Allowing unlimited numbers in a single house would encourage piling homeless into exploitative rental 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 anyone'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 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 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.
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 the 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 Clay 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.

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.
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 maintaining safe and vibrant neighborhoods.

Who could possibly believe that ten unrelated people with unlimited kids 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 and free from crime is to know your neighbors, become familiar with their coming and going, and check out suspicious activities. We have 7 duplexes as 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 you 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 father’s 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 vibrancy 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 lost 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 the 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, wouldn’t 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 addition 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
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<thead>
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<th>COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 maintaining safe and vibrant neighborhoods. Who could possibly believe that ten unrelated people with unlimited kids 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 and free from crime is to know your neighbors, become familiar with their coming and going, and check out suspicious activities. We have 7 duplexes as 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 you 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 father’s 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 vibrancy 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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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 lost 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 the 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, wouldn’t 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 addition 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
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 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 takes 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 members 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 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 landlady 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 an 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 47 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 all 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 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-habitate 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 our 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’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 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. ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 here 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 on 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, correction 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 minors 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 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 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 individual residencies. We’d never anticipated that we would any chance that a halfway house for correctional facility inmates would be next door in our neighborhood or halfway houses for those with behavioral health issues. As aging residents who will live in our neighborhood, we worry a |

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 adults per household which is already double the current standard. Let’s 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 and be forced to live next door to them.
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I recently learned about the Group Living Proposal meeting that occurred the other day (which I was not able to arrange attendance due to leaving 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 fact that 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 more aware of the growth of population and the strong 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 shut 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 in 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 is 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-resident 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 curb/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? Denver officials, Denver is NO NYC or Chicago as we don’t have the transportation infrastructure to support mass transit - the problems with HOA storages 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 one vehicle.

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” 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 at 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 basement, 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 WONT 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 these occurrences 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 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 the lawn and 3 more around the corner. So there were 10 cars involved. I believe I speak for my neighbors on South Ley 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 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 - they 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 Inform 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 a copy of the meeting notes.

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 bedroom 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 idiots.

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 people have moved in and out of the house there have been current situations in which the renters 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 and 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-term rental properties. I fully support this initiative. Having experienced a challenge in trying to track down the landlord of the rental property next to my home 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 changes, is envisioning among Denver's single family homes population? Though I sort of expect that at least most of those wouldn't be bringing 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 related to that is the issue of vehicular 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 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 "homes 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 lots that unrelated people have unrelated guests and visitors: each one driving their own vehicles and needing to park.
I have been attending community meetings now for 30+ years in an effort to be knowledgeable about the plans the City and County of Denver is making and how those plans may impact my life as a residential homeowner in Denver. When I bought my first property in 1983, my first criteria was that it have an R-1 zoning, to best ensure stable property value. I closely followed the rezoning changes that are fairly recent, changing that zoning to S-SU-F, which stands for Suburban-Single Unit-8500 minimum square foot lot size. I think it is interesting, and a bit concerning, that it is no longer in any way referred to as “residential”. I have lived in 3 locations within the city and currently live in the Southern Hills community, which grew up in during the 1960’s.

Now there is an effort to allow for homes (now called “units”) to house over 12 unrelated adults throughout these residential communities with City and County of Denver. The city, city council, and the mayor are pressing those of us who own homes here to allow this to occur; that is, to go from a current allowance of 2 unrelated adults and blood relatives of those adults to 12+ Unrelated adults and minor children. This is nothing short of outrageous.

Since, in my opinion, zoning enforcement has historically been lax, I have lived the experience of numerous unrelated “adults” living together in houses within 3 neighborhoods. In my former University of Denver neighborhood, I had to contact the DU neighborhood liaison several times regarding problem houses, not homes, but apartment style living within a single house with unrelated residents. The last time was to ask them to see to the clean up of broken glass strewn throughout our block. In Washington Park neighborhood, there were countless calls regarding noise ordinance violations and parking violations to name just two problems. Currently, in Southern Hills, the house behind us had numerous unrelated adults living together for years. One day a police officer was parked in front of our home and came to the door to explain that he was surveilling house behind us because someone there was wanted by the police. Regarding the house next door to us, where multiple unrelated adults were living there who were acquaintances of the owners’ daughter, a neighbor from our block came to us seeking support for calling the authorities because his wife and daughter did not feel safe in their home during the day. We, of course, agreed that the authorities needed to be called.

We are pleased that both of these homes have been sold, rehabilitated, and sold again recently; one to a family who is thrilled to have a single family home in which to raise their child, and the other to a couple who we have yet to meet. Two other homes on our block have had elderly residents who have recently died, and the homes have been remodeled and are now owned by new families with children.

We oppose this proposal for several reasons:

1. It would allow too many people to live in homes originally designed as single family residences. The allowable number should be cut in half. There should also be restrictions on the number of homes allowed within a neighborhood.
2. It will create parking congestion on streets intended for parking a smaller number of cars. For example, the proposal would permit up to 8 adults to live in a 1,600 square foot home. If each individual had a vehicle, that would amount to 8 cars.
3. What is to guarantee that there would not be the social problems often associated from congested living situations that would not spill over and impact the surrounding neighbors and the bigger neighborhood? This is a particular concern for homes with large numbers of people in a home designed for fewer people.

Here is a real life example that we and fellow neighbors lived through for about 3 years: On our street several years ago there was a home that went into the Section 8 program. For a time, this house was a circus-- we did not know who was really supposed to be living in the house, and who was there to cohabit with a resident, to use drugs, etc. (There was often the smell of marijuana coming from this house.) It became a difficult situation for our street for several of us neighbors. Often, it was obvious there were more than 8 people who called this house their home. The outside condition of the home deteriorated as the people living there were more interested in chilling rather than real work. Thankfully, this home was taken out of Section 8 and sold. It now has responsible owners.

4. If the City Council really cared about its residents, a less extreme approach would be taken. We understand the need for housing where individuals might just want to rent a bedroom because of the high housing costs. We also understand the value of group homes (e.g., assisted living). That said, allowing for the potential of single-family homes with say 3,000 square feet to house even up to 16 people makes little sense as it does not even begin to consider how such a change could impact neighborhoods. As currently proposed, this proposal makes your constituents wonder if there isn’t some special interest that would hugely benefit from this proposal.

5. This measure needs to be reconsidered, and a more realistic proposal needs to be brought before the citizens of Denver, that you claim to represent. Many of us feel like you, who are supposed to be representing the hard-working residents of District 4, and instead turning your back on us and not even listening to our very real concerns, but are simply dismissing the very people who elected you to this position. We feel like you are not representing our views, but those of a special interest.

6. If you truly care about your council district, you will push for hearings of this proposal in every council district in Denver. Further, to show your concern about what the people you represent think, you would urge the Denver City Council to place the idea before a vote of the people of Denver and not rush to steamroll the support proposal...
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I attended the Group Living open house at the HEA last week and want to thank you for the huge effort you have put into the project. Overall I think your team did a solid job of communicating the problem statements and the unintended consequences. As a concerned citizen I left the forum knowing much more than before and was able to share and engage with family, friends, and work colleagues on the topic.

I do want to make one specific comment on the public setup. When the forum began we all agreed to not clap and holler but that didn’t last for long. While it wasn’t unruly it did break down to a point where I felt like a diversity of voices could not be heard. The persons sitting next to me began to disparage both council members and other points of view. In the end, as I was taking notes and waiting for a microphone to come my way I decided to wrap up my evening (literally leave the sanctuary) and instead put my questions and comments to paper and ask for your feedback.

Overall I am in favor of the measure but do question how the calculation goes from 2 to 8; I would be concerned for the safety of that many people living in a small space if it were a single family home (SU/SFH).

1. Is there a formal definition of vulnerable populations? Is there a city measurement that identifies how many residents fall into this category?
2. Who are some of the vulnerable members of the community the task force has engaged with to learn what they think the impact would be and how we might seek resolution to their problem?
3. Is there a task force liaison to help communicate within the communities at greatest risk as to the change in code? Community activators.
4. How might all these changes impact population density and walkability of neighborhoods?
5. How do you measure success of such a change? Immediate and long-term?
6. Are there examples of other municipalities or cities you have observed, where a change like this has improved affordability or kept vulnerable populations from falling down the proverbial ladder or been empowered etc? I know Seattle was referenced in the forum and denvergov website mentions numerous other cities. Have their local representatives provided ample feedback to help guide Denver?

I am opposed to re-defining the household definition as 8 unrelated people living together. First, this is a huge jump from the current regulation – quadruples the number that is lawful. Why such a big jump? Once this is approved there is no turning back. I understand other municipalities near Denver limit the number at 5. I believe the negative impacts on our neighborhoods have not been thoroughly evaluated. Impacts such as:

- Traffic and parking – obviously increased neighborhood traffic and parking issues would be a concern. Most single-family homes have parking for 2 to 3 cars. This would likely increase to 8 or more depending on the size of the home. Increased traffic would put neighborhood children at risk of accidents and impact the quality of “quiet neighborhood streets” that those of us who choose to live in single-family home areas desire.

- Quality of life – As stated above, those of us who live in single-family homes desire a “community, neighborly feel” in a relatively quiet area in midst of a large city. Group living with 8+ people in a home would create noise, distraction, and impact the quality of life that we purchased our homes for. We purchased our home in an area zoned “single-family homes” and that is how we want our neighborhood to continue. Allowing 8+ unrelated people to live together would give a transient feel to our area and really is just a way for the City Planners to change the zoning with nomenclature (e.g., household). I oppose this.

- Infrastructure – I live in a home built in 1960. Our home does not have the infrastructure to support 8+ people. Sewer, trash, water – all these things were not constructed for 8+ people to live in the home full-time. Surrounding infrastructure (parks, schools, roads) is not meant to support these types of households. These are my main concerns. The other overriding concern I have is as follows:

The City Planners are making changes to our city and in our portion of SE Denver without considering the impacts of ALL the changes. I am an environmental planner for the Federal Government. The Federal Government is required by law to consider “cumulative effects” of all past, known, and forecasted projects when planning a new project. So for instance in our area I ask you to consider the effects of your project on our social fabric together with the impacts of the following projects in SE Denver:

- Recent new zoning and construction along Colorado Blvd and University Blvd
- Planned new projects at DU
- Expansion of Slavens School and increased traffic it has brought
- Planned changes to Yale Blvd
- Planned changes to Dartmouth Ave
- Planned changes to Hampden Ave

The cumulative effect of all these projects (and others I haven’t listed) along with the Group Living Project creates a very negative cumulative impact on the social fabric and quality of life in SE Denver. The essence of our neighborhoods is being destroyed. Please reconsider these changes. As a note, I appreciate the improved communication with the public that the City Council has implemented. That said, the sound system at the public forum was not very loud and it was difficult to hear some of the speakers.
I write to you as a concerned resident in the University Park neighborhood. My perspective is that of a homeowner of 23 years, and a resident in the DU neighborhood since 1991. I am most concerned about how this proposal affects general residential, single-family homes. The proposal seems largely focused on the Human Services element, with less discussion on general residential. In point, this is glossed over; only stated that 8 adults would be allowed to co-exist as a use by right. While I do support a large part of what the committee is attempting to accomplish with respect to Human Services, I do not support allowing more unrelated people to live together in single-family homes, to the extent and as written. It is my opinion that redefining Household to 8 adults is an unrealistic proposal. I agree that the current 2 unrelated adults is a bit limiting, but increasing this number seems excessive and should not be generally allowed. I also feel that the proposal allows the property owner to turn a one-family house into a “houseparty” without restriction doesn’t seem well thought out. Some safeguards will be available to prevent bad landlords from misusing this new change? What safeguards will be put in place to prevent bad tenants? These need to be clearly defined and presented (and not simply shuffled or referred elsewhere) to prevent bad tenants. I know this comes across as catastrophizing, but abusing the current code is already a real issue in the DU neighborhood. We already need assistance in enforcing quiet enjoyment, not legitimizing more communal living. There are already issues with renters (DU students & non-students alike) exceeding allowed code, trashing out homes, affecting neighbors, increased property damage to neighbors, excessive parking, etc. My experience is that many renters aren’t vested in the property they rent and don’t really care how they’re impacting the neighborhood. Increasing the number of adults under one roof will only exacerbate the issues. I don’t want 8 adults living in the house next to me. I don’t want higher density in my neighborhood. I didn’t buy my home, in this quiet neighborhood, with that intent. I’ve worked hard to be able to afford my home, in the type of neighborhood I wanted. Why should my property and my quiet enjoyment be subjected to potentially unruly renters, or an out-of-town landlord who clearly does not care about the state of the property or the neighbors, while I have little to no recourse if something goes wrong? I did read some of the suggested readings, posted on the City’s website, plus other examples and failures. Of interest was the Intentional Community in Minneapolis; plus Boulder’s and Portland’s. While Denver is none of those places, I did find it interesting that all of these cases studies have some element for safeguards & enforcement to protect neighbors, and/or require a license or permit, and had some language about parking, etc. I’m not opposed to rentals, nor to some form of communal living. In fact, I’ve often thought it would be cool to be part of a co-op arrangement with 3-4 other single mid-50/60 year olds buying in Wash Park. But there’s a component of vested interest in that example. Unfortunately, unregulated there are too many bad examples. I am currently dealing with two connected neighbors; communal groups, in excess of 8 adults each, staging two food trucks (plus two delivery trucks) out of the alley, unexplained property damage, increase in the presence of rats and roaches, excessive trash in alley, trash bins left in alley (no room on their property), etc. Most are Minnesota millennial transplants (only germane as many have some experience with communal living).

I’ve lived in the same home in University Hills for 21+ years and wanted to send a few thoughts about the proposed changes for group living. Kendra, we’ve met before …I’m a friend and neighbor of your friend Delia. For the past 10 years or so, I’ve lived next door to a rental home that has always had 3-4 single men (and occasionally a girlfriend) living there. There have been a revolving list of renters over the years and some have been better than others but never has the 2+ non-related issue been enforced. At times, there were repeated calls to 311 and DPD for different complaints (from noise at all hours to illegal activity, etc) but really have done nothing to remedy the long term situation. As a block community, we had a DPD Neighborhood Watch program, I do know that the neighborhood in general agrees this home has become an eyesore (trash in yard draws rodents, grass in summer often gets 1-2 feet tall). The landlord lives in Golden and rarely visits and the occupants could care less. You can only call 311 and the non-emergency DPD number so many times. The current renters are fine even though not an ideal situation and they’ve been nice to me when I see them (the two I know) so no big complaints for them. The issue is more the ability of the landlord to have a revolving door of new renters every 6 months …only a couple have lived there longer term. Yes, everyone should have access to affordable living but to suggest upping the number of unrelated adults in a one-family home is adding more problems than solutions. I worked very hard for many years to be able to purchase a home here. As a single woman, I also bought my home because it was quiet and safe neighborhood. The new proposal would make this even less so. A few things as food for thought.

- I’ve seen everyday firsthand that unrelated adults in one home make up a lot of our neighbors. Unlike families who typically have the same social circle, non-related adults all bring their own social circle and extended family. The number of cars parked next door w/4 non-related adults and guests is plenty. It would be unacceptable to have double that. Things are worse in the summer and infringes on privacy and solitude on my own patio.

- I don’t have small children but neighbors who do (within several blocks) have also told me that they don’t always feel safe (for their kids) with the increase of unrelated adults in a single-family home. Having additional non-related adults increases chance of having sexual predators or others with criminal histories move into rentals and homes next to families and children.

- A note… I noticed tonight when I returned from errands around 6 pm that there were 5 cars and 2 motorcycles (4 vehicles and one motorcycle) parked in the alley; while the two I know (w/4 non-related adults and guests is plenty). It’s a public street so I can’t prohibit this. This is just one of many issues that could escalate easily if you have 8 adults and all of their children in one 1500 sq ft home with limited yard or frontage to park.

- Allowing an unlimited number of kids on top of 8 adults? I may feel forced to leave Denver if suddenly my next door neighbors went from 4 adults to 8 adults and their children.
I am writing in response to a proposal to increase residential occupancy as described in a newsletter I received from Council member Kendra Bla titled “GROUP LIVING OPEN HOUSES.” By way of background to support my comments, I am a resident of Denver (15+ years), an attorney representing municipal governments (+30 years), and an adjunct law school professor teaching land use law.

(1) The proposed increase for general occupancy is nothing short of unreasonable. I would be interested to learn if other large communities can accept such occupancy limits and willingly accept the associated impacts upon single family neighborhoods such as mine.

(2) Most municipalities allow not more than 5 unrelated persons in single family residences. At a 5 person standard, several of my client municipalities receive many complaints annually associated with groups of 5 unrelated persons within the common single family residential home creating unacceptable impacts on the neighborhood (largely cars, noise, and continual activity at the residence). Denver’s proposal not only exceeds the commonly accepted 5 unrelated persons standard, but far more than doubles the common standard for a large number of homes in City. Consider lowering the number to something reasonable like 5. It works nationally. Start with smaller steps than jumping to +12.

(3) Large number occupancy of single family residences is something that college communities always struggle with and eventually regulate and enforce against. These communities do not actively encourage +12 unrelated persons to live in a single family home because they know from experience that these high unrelated occupancy levels destroy community character and the quiet enjoyment of property.

(4) I own a 2500 sf house with a living room, dining room, two bathrooms, and a single kitchen sized to accommodate the anticipated number of persons who will reasonably occupy the number of bedrooms. To allow 12 unrelated adults and an unlimited number children into that house (associated vehicles, activity, and trash) will be inconsistent with the house design and will substantially change the neighborhood character affery the entire block. Neighborhoods of single housekeeping units (that is, a single family) logically present less impact on the immediate community than the activities of 12+ unrelated persons and their children who do not operate or organize as a collective unit.

(5) The proposed occupancy numbers essentially allow rooming houses to be established in single family neighborhoods. I reasonably expect owners/landlords to take advantage of these large occupancy limits to lease space to create a revenue source. For example, in my 2500 sf home the buyer could use the existing bedrooms and create up to 4-5 additional single occupancy rooms. I can then rent out those spaces to +9 people for the very low monthly rate of $500/person. It would essentially be a proverbial “crash pad.” That income stream will greatly exceed the monthly mortgage and maintenance cost for the home (plus if I stop maintaining the yard and watering the lawn, the costs go way down). These occupancy limits create real incentive to convert single family homes into boarding houses that will change neighborhoods. Granted, if Denver’s goal is to maximize occupancy opportunities as a means of providing housing, the City would be doing so at the expense of the peace and quiet of the neighborhoods Denver already established and which maintain a quality of life expected by its existing residents.

(6) One might point that the impacts of what I will call “boarding house conversions” (the unlawful expansion of rental occupancy to put as members of a firm answer as it seems your zoning rules are changing as they go along. (An example is the information the Councilman and I received was that unrelated adults AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS would be allowed to live in a 1600 square foot house under the new rules, but in the meeting this morning that was changed to 8 unrelated adults and their MINOR family members which is a huge difference as you will see later in this e-mail.

First, I would ask about the information that these zoning changes will apply to every residential neighborhood in Denver. That was the information I was given and that is the information that is my main disagreement. Some 30 years ago the City of Denver started changing the way they allow builders to build residential neighborhoods, first suggesting, and then in some cases demanding, that new housing/neighborhoods be governed by HoAs and that the enforcement of HOA rules, covenants, etc. The City also gave builders boiler plate covenants/rules/etc. that builders were to include in their HOA paperwork that was filed with the Denver Courts, put onto platte plans, etc. with no input from home owners whatsoever since it was done before a single house was built in the subdivision. If you bought a house in that neighborhood it came with it’s own set of rules that the buyer had to agree to in order to buy the house. In some cases these rules were a good thing and increased the value of the home in the area because those rules DID NOT ALLOW halfway houses, mental illness treatment facilities, section 8, etc. to buy homes in those areas. Those rules specifically only allowed a single family to live in the HOA house. (Please forgive me but putting a section 8, or sex offender halfway house in the middle of an upscale neighborhood DOES decrease the value of the home in that area so I disagree with your information claiming these types of residences don’t affect the value of houses in that area.) Other rules were also put into the HOA documents approved by the City that had requirements of number of vehicles allowed, where they could be parked, etc., in addition to even what colors the homes could be painted.

In my HOA (Marston Cove, 8501 W Union Ave) the subdivision was initially supposed to be a Denver Public School when the City of Denver allowed homes to be built in the Southwest area between S Kipling/S Wadsworth and W Belleview/W Quincy. As more homes were built in the area DP decided to build a school in the Grant Ranch subdivision instead this area and sold 8501 W Union Ave to a builder to build single family homes in 1994. The City of Denver allowed the builder to build 50 houses in this area under some very specific conditions set by the City. One was that all houses have the same address of 8501 W Union Ave with each house being numbered 1 through 50 and that the streets would have to be private streets because to fit 50 houses in this small area the streets could only be 23 feet wide on the asphalt area, which is much smaller than the non 34 feet width required for the City to take over the streets as city streets. Those conditions FORCED all future homeowners in this neighborhood have an HOA that can never be dissolved since those private streets would have to maintained by that HOA. Then the City of Denver made further...
I am writing you today in regards to the proposed changes to the city’s Group Homes and Group Living regulations for residential neighborhoods. I am against any changes to residential zoning rules that would allow for expansion of most group homes in all residential areas of the city. The home services that I and many of my neighbors are against are community halfway houses, homeless shelters, and the changes to increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling. Below are my reasons and concerns that I hope you take under account while making your final decision. I hope you all understand how badly these changes will effect a homeowner, parent, and the overall safety to our neighborhood.

Community Halfway Houses: My concerns for these changes would be the safety of neighbors and children. We already feel overwhelmed worrying about a new sex offender registry and now you would impose another danger to the neighborhood. How would we know who is living here and what they did? Will there be any limitations to what type of criminal or drug addict would be allowed to live next door? This would also effect the value of our homes and I don’t believe that many decisions made by the city truly take homeowners under account.

I feel as if the housing problem gets put on our shoulders. We pay more for homes these days and pay higher property taxes in recent years. We have to live next door to homes that are purchased for profit because we don’t regulate how many homes are actually purchased to live in or to rented out. This brings me to the second big issue that I and most of my neighbors have. Increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling:

Again, you are trying to fix the housing problem but you are making the situation worse. We already have single family homes that are filled with three or more families.

You say that more unrelated adults can live in a dwelling without considering the amount of children that it would add to the home and to the neighborhood.

I have lived across the street from a house that was. Specifically purchased to make money by being rented out. A family of six moved in. The ok adults who were the parents had four children. The eldest daughter had two children. The second eldest became pregnant, moved in her overag boyfriend and they had three children. Then there was a teenaged daughter and young boy. The eldest daughter had multiple boyfriends moving in and out. So as time went on there were 6 adults, a teenager and six young children living at the home.

Parking was terrible because 7 vehicles were parked on the street from just this home alone. The children were often unsupervised because the adults had to work. Most people who live in these situations can’t afford to live on their own and must live with others to get by. It’s a very sad situation but by trying to help them even more now, you hurt homeowners like myself and the neighborhood.

The neighborhood gets overcrowded by people and vehicles. Schools get overcrowded and the teachers are already in bad situations.

Neighborhood schools weren’t built to hold so many children. This increases the safety concerns at our schools. Most schools don’t have air conditioning and the ones that do only use it at a higher temperature to save money.

As president of the Wells House Owners Association, RNO, I wanted to express my objection to the proposal increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling:

I strongly oppose the proposed upzoning to group living and residential care in our West Washington Park (WWP) neighborhood. My primary concerns are as follows:

- Residents of WWP were not made aware of these material changes, which will significantly impact the value and livability of our homes.
- The impact of surrounding high-density construction cannot be evaluated until these developments are completed. (Gates redevelopment, Broadway/Alameda development, Speer Blvd developments, etc.) The highest density increase the city has ever undertaken, which will dwarf Rhino, is already in progress in our back yard.
- The current and planned transportation infrastructure improvements to accommodate the projected increases in population density are grossly inadequate.
- Denver’s failure to meet EPA standards for acceptable air quality continues to endanger the health of its residents. That air quality continues to worsen each year with unchecked development such as this.
- This upzoning from a residential neighborhood to tracts of rental properties is an intermediary step to high rises. It will displace the current residents, especially people with health and mobility issues, the elderly, and vulnerable families. It is not healthy for renters or owners.
- This proposal favors absentee investors profiting from lucrative rental properties over homeowners using their owner occupied residence as a place to raise a family, be part of a community, build equity in their home for retirement, and hopefully one day be able to age in place.

Recommendations, which I hope you will consider:

- Place a moratorium on all increases in density in and around WWP until the full impact of the largest increase in density to date is fully undertaken can be fully observed and evaluated.
- If immediate affordable housing is of utmost concern, require section 8 housing as a % of both existing and new apartment buildings above a certain size (ie: 10+ units). Close the loophole on developers and landords being able to pay a fee and avoid providing affordable housing in the rental properties via an acceptable number of rent controlled units.
- Convert low-density commercial zoning to residential, which will allow for a holistic approach to growth that is more responsible, better engineered, and healthier for all the cities’ residents. There are miles of extremely low-density 1-2 story warehouses along transportation corridors within the city limits. (I-70 North & South, West of Santa Fe across from WWP, east of Lincoln between WWP and downtown, and these are just ones I drive by!)
- The density increase in residential areas is considerably out of balance with corresponding commercial areas, which have not undergone any requisite consolidation. We have absorbed explosive growth with the 38 story twin towers at Country Club Gardens, which creates a 10-block wide tunnel in our neighborhood, whereas the industrial parks appear unchanged at 1-2 stories.

As president of the Wells Home Owners Association, RNO, I wanted to express my objection to the proposal increasing the number of unrelated adults who may occupy a single dwelling.

To me, this proposal was not well thought out as to the repercussions to the community. Granted, we have an affordability problem when it comes to housing. This proposal does not address the true systemic causes or solutions. This seems more like a “back door” zoning proposal to MU(mu unit) housing. We are opposed to this proposal.
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I want to express my opposition to the new group home and group-living housing zoning rules in the Bear Valley community. I feel it is extremely inappropriate and unfair to change the zoning laws concerning my home and neighborhood in Bear Valley. This is a significant change and allowing this to happen without a vote of the people is obviously land grabbing. The City Council is stepping way beyond their stated powers and way out of the will of the people of Bear Valley. My family has lived in Bear Valley for many years and many of my neighbors are original home owners in Bear Valley and we all oppose this unfair plan. The plan to turn Bear Valley into a housing project is reckless legislation obviously designed to buy votes and change the fabric of Denver.

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 booming—yet often restrictive—economy.

I am not a citizen who often speaks up with proposed changes to our city. After becoming aware of this I feel it is my civic duty to report my grave concerns how this policy change could have detrimental impacts to the feel, livability and charm of Denver. This not only could have unintended consequences you are not taking into account, but the entire process has been way too quiet and not open for public comment and makes me think there are ulterior motives for some in your position. I am open to hearing directly from you why you and the council think this is needed or how would benefit the citizens. I think this should at least be delayed until a true public comment period has been open and transparent.

Regards

We attended the residential rezoning meeting for SE Denver at the Hebrew Educational Alliance. We want to voice our opposition to this proposal. We are happy to have new neighbors locate here, but 8 adults and unlimited minors in a 1600 square foot home can’t be good for anyone! If the 8 adults are 4 couples, and each couple has 2 kids, that is a total of 16 people living under one roof! And it could potentially be more than 16 if there are more minors.

Denver neighborhoods are becoming too dense. This proposal sure seems to say that it’s okay to just shove more people together just so we can say we are trying to take care of affordable housing. When developers buy up these properties and turn them into multiple units, how come they don’t put the stipulation that they all have to have a large percentage of affordable housing in those complexes? We have 2 large units going now; one across from the library and another larger one at Yosemite and Hampden. And, the probability that the old Kmart at Monaco and Evans will also be a complex of some sort. Do they have to comply with affordable housing? We are quickly turning into a city of “complexes” while most of us still prefer the single family housing. The phrase on your page that “this isn’t how people live anymore” is offensive to us. Who decided how people want to live in Denver? As was pointed out at the meeting Wednesday night, we’ve worked hard for our homes and we love our neighborhoods just the way they are. If we wanted cars parked all up and down our streets, and 16+ people living in a house next door, we would have bought a multifamily housing unit. In our area, Monaco to Havana, and Hampden to Yale/Evans, we are surrounded almost completely by businesses and/or large apartment complexes. We have enough!!

You may think it’s none of our business where these people will sleep, or how many bathrooms are available, etc., but it really is a humanitarian issue. “Quality of Life” is an important standard to us in Denver; we see those children sleeping on the floor in any space available. This likely means the basement, without an egress window!

It was also pointed out that HOA/covenant properties will likely be exempt from this proposal because their rules trump city ordinances. Now, it is fair is that?

A lot of comparisons to other cities, especially Seattle, regarding this issue was presented at this meeting. Denver is not Seattle, nor do we want to be Seattle. Please leave that out of the equation and let’s do what is right for Denver and not worry about how other cities do this.

We also would be extremely interested in the results of the survey handed out Wed. night. How many circled that they oppose this proposal?
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 their 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 hoping you will vote against such a proposal.

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 single 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 these 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) packed up 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 was 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 there, 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 what was happening. 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 and instead threatened us with lawsuits and other nonsense. We eventually reached out to the city and spoke to the Zoning Dept. and they helped us 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 tried to move 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 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 “protect 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 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.

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 this proving a collective housekeeping unit exists would be easier than proving there is a familial relationship among residents in a dwelling unit. What 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.

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 neighborhood tend to stay and put down roots which helps develop the sense of community we enjoy. I do not agree with the proposed changes 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.
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As a homeowner who wants to move out of Denver but can't - I'm sick and tired of the renters around me who have more rights than I do. You talk about laws, there are none when it comes to homeowners who don't have a viable HOA.

They trash homes and yards, getting help from the city is almost impossible. I see my neighbors using scissors to cut only the weeds down to 4 inches to avoid getting a visit from the city. They've managed to kill a tree because they haven't watered the lawn in three years. The back yard is disgusting, city doesn't care - the owner doesn't give a shit.

I own my home in Ruby Hill and Athmar park area. I'm so grateful to hear about the new zoning plans to be implemented to allow homeowners to have 8 non related roommates. As you know Denver has gotten very expensive. Offering a room to rent for a reasonable room rate is a good service to offer the community.

I am completely in support of the zoning law changes which would allow eight people per household of 1600 ft.² or more.

Please let me know if you receive this and share with me what your thoughts are on the issue.

I am writing to let you know that I am not in support of the proposed changes you are advocating to the group living codes. At the proposed level we could have 15 people residing in our home. If you multiplied that by the houses on our street that would be 150 people. That's quite a jump in potential school enrollment, parked cars, use of infrastructure such as sewer and water and overall a ripe mix for issues that the city isn't equipped to handle.

I agree with all of the problems you've outlined on the website. Given all of that and the opposition you're hearing from the meetings thus far, I understand why this initiative is continuing. Please know that we are not in support of this.

As I learn more about this group housing proposal, I have come to understand that ONE of the things driving it is the closure of the privately operated halfway houses. I see you both voted for those closures.

My question to you is why? Four Council members voted against it and both of you voted for it. What was your reasoning—and what was theirs that is my question. I'm open-minded; I would like to understand.

Also—I think there is some misinformation being propagated around the 2% number of the number of people in halfway houses who commit another crime—which I am told is the City Council’s number. Other people are citing “recidivism rates” from Dept of Justice studies which are multiple times higher than 2%. Why is there a discrepancy? Is it definitional?

Also, I think the reasoning I heard recently at one of the city’s information meetings regarding allowing up to 8 unrelated adults to live in one home basically anywhere in the city, is flawed. How?: I heard it said that those same 8 people are doing this today by simply saying they are related when they are not—and no one actually checks and there are no consequences, so why not just make what is illegal, legal. No harm, no foul.

By making it legal, you encourage more of it-with no real restrictions, no licensing, no nothing. I can just wake up one day and find 8 adults living door in what is now a boarding house and each has a car parked on the street and the house gets a car too, so now it’s 9 cars and an unlimited number of kids. That is not ok.

We work and save and maintain and improve our homes and with one vote of the council, we can be surrounded by group homes. What about that is good zoning practice? Is that what you want for your own property?

I clearly understand the need for more affordable housing in Denver; I don’t believe in the proposed solution. Dig deeper.

Thank you for your attention. I would appreciate an actual reply, as opposed to the canned variety. Thank you.

Thank you Councilwoman Kniech and Andrew. Your replies are much appreciated.

As a resident in Lowry, I’m extremely concerned about the proposed changes by City Planning to allow numerous unrelated persons to live in a single family dwelling, (8 in 1600 foot residence); we all purchased our homes in these neighborhoods because it was zoned as a single family neighborhood. Our neighborhoods were not notified. I understand this is coming up for a vote this Spring and the expectation is that you will support our neighborhoods in this critical issue. As I’ve heard from other neighbors in Crestmor, Hilltop (your neighborhood and my Mother’s); Mayfair, it is of more than great concern.

Separately, With the recent apartment/townhome Developments, we are already experiencing traffic congestion & speeding on Holly, Monaco, Quebec/1st Ave & Lowry Blvd., along with parking in the neighborhoods by persons leaving cars who are not residents; the Developers were allowed to provide minimal ratio spaces. Permit for residents only will be needed very soon.

I would appreciate a response acknowledging your support to vote against RE-zoning single family homes; I understand this is item #2 at the next ZAP meeting, though I don’t have the Planning commission item number.

I wanted to voice my strong opposition to newly proposed group living codes. Our three bedroom home would qualify for up to 12 people who would have ramifications for sewer disposal, parking, and burdensome traffic for a small side street. I can see noise problems and a disruption of single family living which our home was designed. Please stop this burdensome option before it destroys our neighborhood.
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 bee 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 designa 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 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 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 on 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 main an unjust status quo of restrictive housing policies. The impacts of the status quo to our neighborhood are tangentially felt through higher housi prices, greater auto traffic, poor air quality, underutilized retail storefronts, and lower transit usage. However, the people living on the outskirts 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 circumst but seldom seen, as few families choose to live in such confined quarters. As anyone has ever rented an apartment with roommates can attest an individual must personally be willing to share space with others, and they decide how many roommates they take on. As a council member, γ will certainly expect to see arguments based on the extreme scenarios, but I believe that it is more important --- and more realistic --- to discuss 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 propert with more than two bedrooms. Because the market for 3+ bedroom multi-unit properties is mostly constrained to families with multiple kids wh don't have a long-term housing locked in, developers will naturally skip building to a smaller market. That means that families have fewer housir 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 ha children:

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 alread 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 po 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 effected is very light. Develop 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 enc 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 regulatory and judicial process makes the process and any adoption invalid. I believe withholding for the purpose of achieving its choice rises to 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 glo pandemics like COVID-19. We need less density, not more.
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 politely tell 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 restrictive 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 intense 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.) Tin those situations, one can go at one’s own risk. But, I’m detecting a reaction that doesn’t fit at all 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, an indication that we should not be permitting other housing arrangements.

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 disrupted quite neighborhoods that people that have worked all their lives to afford. I totally understand that the city is addressing housing concerns 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 quite 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 compromise our neighborhoods.

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 concerns 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 quite community. I could have spent far less if I wanted to live in apartment/dorm/condo living that the zoning change will allow.

The proposed changes in residential areas is not good because it will create new problems for our neighborhoods and will be the deal breaker for 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 lines 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 it in to 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 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 Radcliffe 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 upon 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 in to living spaces. Do not destroy our Denver neighborhoods with this rezoning idea please.
I have contacted my councilman, Jolan Clark, and will next be writing to the mayor.

crowded areas.

Please, stop all of this nonsense and come up with real solutions to problems. This action discriminates against poor, minority and inflames already overcrowded services, more problems between neighborhoods and destroy the fabric of our community.

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

I am a long time resident of wet wash park, and over the past 25 years we have made our neighborhood one of the most desired in Denver. We now seem to be paying the price for the city problem of the homeless that was taken over and promoted by Hickenlooper administration. Business is abundant. This new ridiculous zoning plan of 8 or 4 will become a dangerous situation for all.

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 a mess and I don’t know of anyone who lives there long-term. It 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 recommitment 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. Business is abundant and now the city seems to want to solve it by passing zoning laws 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 is add 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 wet wash park, and over the past 25 years we have made our neighborhood one of the most desired in Denver. 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. More importantly, 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 allow number of young adults living in them and it results in loud parties, serious parking problems, excess trash and dumping, and illegal AirBNBs. These issues are 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 legislate this in more places. 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 recommitment 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 vehicle 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. Business is abundant and now the city seems to want to solve it by passing zoning laws 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 is add 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 wet 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 the way no one who lives there long-term.

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 overcrowded areas.

I have contacted my councilman, Jolan Clark, and will next be writing to the mayor.
I do not support the potential change to allow up to 8+ unrelated people living in single family zoning areas. I understand that additional habit 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 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 then 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 other homes 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 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 how the virus is spread, but this will not help.

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; 10-15 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.

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; 10-15 cars for the property, added “guests” staying over, noise at all hours, garbage overflowing, and a general lack of maintenance on the property.
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 commendable that Denver is seeking ways to improve housing options for vulnerable people, it is an outrage that the planners think it is accept 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 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 coah 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. Vulture real estate speculators would be limited to one group house, and as above would have to live there or have an invested partner live ti
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 close 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 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 RTI limiting 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 Alamed 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 city.

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.
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 re 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 environment increases are important reasons residential zoning should not change along with rising water costs, electricity, heating, drainage & trafficc 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 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 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 that 2 unrelated people living together.

Not sure how the number of 8 came about, but way to 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 that 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
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 increased 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 presented 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 concern 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 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 I 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 I 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 realized 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 other hat I wear is as a citizen, 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 per month 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 use bike/Uber/and use local transport to get to work. In fact, thus 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 of 2 to at least 4 or 5, if not the full 8 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 will help 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 booming—yet often restrictive—economy.

Thank you so much for your help.

Dear Councilwoman 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 structure. These structures ensure that these specific group living arrangements are safe, effective, and feasible. When the general public is solely involved in 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, 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 a 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, 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.” A score of “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...
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) 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 in 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 hugging 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(D0C) 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.
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 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 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. Handcock. 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 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.
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 want to 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 next 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 see no attempt to change the way we live.

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 times 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 do 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 neighborhood.

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 “treatment 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 outdated 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 unrelated (typically a housemate or roommate). Living with nonrelatives has become less prevalent since 1995”. The research indicates that most doubled-up households are families, which is already allowed under the current zoning code and does not require a change to the zoning code to accommodate 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 that 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 be violating the current rules and against whom the City has no intent, or desire, to enforce the current rules. Just because the City cannot effectively enforce the current rules for number of unrelated 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 exacerbate these 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. Additionally, the 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 for any person, let alone someone as elderly as 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 or 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.
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 benefiting our neighborhood? 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 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 constan 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.
- 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 of cities which do 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 needs.

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 cannot 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,
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 chang 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 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 this 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... Living with 7 adult in a fellowship program and helps reduce the cost of housing while helping professional 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.
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 quality 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 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 misplay 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' house 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 be covered by variances. Concerns 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 covenant 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. To many people and cars in dwelling. City offices 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 fearing 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 vales and quality of live
- Fair and equitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving people a chance to succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise, Violence, overcrowding, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable, enforceable, and good for sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This supports single moms like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People deserve help and opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and declining home values, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and declining home values, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Community Correction people may be too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and declining home values, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for more diversity and affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and declining home values, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit investors taking advantage of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofitting Sprinkler Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Changes to Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate and beneficial to developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Sustainability and more safe options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and declining home values, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slums and flop homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Divisive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen parking regulations limiting the number of cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns with oversight for very small res care. Parking, infrastructure, property values and Noise Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Neighborhood Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, Noise, and Property Rights concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and parking concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, Noise, Traffic, Safety impacts on tax paying home owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and landlord concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, parking, oversight, property values and infrastructure impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and property values impacts and not in my backyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property value and parking concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding, parking concerns. Epidemics like coronavirus cannot be self quarantine in such dense populated areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and overcrowding concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra cost on Tax Payers. Parking, Crime, Traffic and property values concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We deserve an inclusive diverse city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep regulation as-is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns with having ex-felons in our neighborhoods. Property Value concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not destroy the quality of life for those who live in single family homes. Traffic and oversight concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 is too many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, overcrowding and property value concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial impacts on public resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight, Parking and Density Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and parking concerns (enforcement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight (enforcement), overcrowding, parking, infrastructure, density, quality of life concerns. Concerns with Community Corrections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise, Parking, Crime, Infrastructure, oversight concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and property right concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, overcrowding, and traffic concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement and oversight concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and safety concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT ON PROPOSED REVISIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and quality of life concerns for homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight concerns. Not sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, parking, oversight, noise concerns and institutionalization of neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values, infrastructure and parking concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is political.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Correction Concerns in neighborhoods. Crime, parking, tax, and infrastructure concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One size does not fit all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Traffic, and congestion concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property safety and quality of life concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and property values concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, parking, crime, and safety concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, traffic, and quality of life concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and noise concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, property values, and crime concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Correction in neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, overcrowding issues. Community Corrections should not be allowed in neighborhoods but other are okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety requirements and inspections of rental units should be required similar to Seattle. Infrastructure concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am definitely against 8 unrelated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More people not paying taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Dressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values Impacts, Crime, Parking, Noise, and lack of sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, Parking, Trash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Changing Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for the Vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not carefully regulated now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and concerns with Commercial Landlords charging higher rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 SF is not reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on Proposed Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and (parking, crime, property Value) concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good Job answering questions and Facilitating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 is too high. Equating Community Correction with other Res Care is misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Flexibility, Thank you Staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability and removes discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about small Community Correction. Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>