July 7, 2020

Scott Robinson, AICP
Senior City Planner | Community Planning and Development
City and County of Denver
201 W Colfax Ave
Denver, CO 80202

RE: CHUN Support for the East Central Area Plan

Dear Mr. Robinson,

Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods, Inc. (“CHUN”), Denver’s largest, oldest registered neighborhood organization (RNO), is pleased to announce its support for the East Central Area Plan (the “Plan”). We cite the following as just a few reasons for our organization lending its endorsement for the Plan:

- **Community engagement is paramount to successfully planning neighborhoods for future generations.** At the heart of CHUN’s mission is citizen participation. Our organization’s leadership has closely monitored the level of citizen engagement throughout this process. With more than 9,500 online responses, 54 community meetings, 14 focus groups, 11 walking audits, etc., city planners have delivered on their commitment to an open, fair, and participative process. CHUN was proud to provide free meeting space at 1290 Williams St.—our historic Tears-McFarlane House—throughout this process and was host to a number of membership meetings where the East Central Area Plan was a core component of the agenda.

- **Preserving historic, architectural assets is essential to maintaining neighborhood character and enduring legacy.** The Plan encourages the preservation of historic and character-defining buildings by promoting the adaptive reuse of historic structures and allowing a broader range of uses. CHUN was integral to the efforts to preserve Tammen Hall and recently endorsed the restoration/reuse of the former Cathedral School at 18th Ave. and Grant St. We are excited to see other innovative uses for many of our city’s oldest, treasured structures.
Bringing Denverites together at the local level makes our community stronger. The Plan is comprehensive and provides a framework by which creating new neighborhood gathering spots will be central to future planning. Enhancing existing community open spaces, parks, and recreation facilities is equally important. These public assets, like Cheesman Park for example, should be made readily available to a broad, diverse range of Denverites regardless of race, class, or other socioeconomic background.

In 2019, CHUN reaffirmed our commitment to environmental sustainability. We love living in an urban setting and believe that neighbors should not be precluded from enjoying the many beautiful, natural settings we cherish. Our RNO encourages smart, environmentally friendly neighborhood design. Trees, climate appropriate landscaping, and preserving Denver’s tree canopy will be a defining feature of this new plan.

CHUN joins thought-partners like the Denver Streets Partnership in a shared mission to ensure safe streets for everyone – no matter their zip code, their financial means, or how they may get from one point to the next. The Plan makes modifications to myriad mobility systems with an emphasis on safety, mobility, and accessibility. We are pleased to see that key areas like 23rd Ave and Gaylord St., Montview Blvd. and Colorado Blvd., 8th Ave. and Sherman St., and many others within (or near) CHUN’s geographic boundaries will be improved subsequent to the adoption of this Plan.

Access to affordable housing is paramount to achieving economic self-sufficiency. Adopting this Plan will facilitate stronger partnerships with nonprofit agencies and direct service providers. Such relationships will complement the city’s infrastructure and capacity to deliver more affordable housing units for years to come. We are hopeful that integrating missing-middle housing into some residential areas, coupled with discouraging demolitions and encouraging affordability, will promote greater access to home ownership.

Finally, a diverse, thriving workforce bolstered through locally owned businesses and collaborative work culture is the heart of Denver’s evolving economy. Recruiting new small to mid-sized businesses provides opportunities for workforce development and economic opportunity. We agree that diversity of housing and jobs captures our shared vision for neighborhoods with equitable access to quality employment options and housing choices that accommodate households of different ages, sizes, and incomes.

On Thursday, June 18, 2020, the Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods Board of Directors held a regularly scheduled board meeting. Sarah Wells moved to endorse the East Central Area Plan and issue a letter of support; the motion was seconded by James LaRue.

- Votes favoring the motion: 24
- Votes opposing the motion: 1
- Votes abstaining from taking a position: 4
- Absent Votes: 6
CHUN’s mission is *Preserving the Past, Improving the Present, and Planning for the Future* of Greater Capitol Hill through historic preservation, affordable housing and tackling homelessness, promoting smart land use and zoning, advancing public safety, and encouraging community enhancements.

We acknowledge some may have concerns about this Plan and its implementation. However, it’s important to examine this initiative in a thoughtful, comprehensive way. In doing so, the proposed East Central Area Plan brings a fresh, forward looking perspective to vexing City issues while maintaining the qualities and characteristics that make Denver unique. Moreover, RNOs including CHUN, will be fully engaged in the Plan’s implementation and future development within our boundaries.

**We urge responsible City leaders—including members of the Denver Community Planning and Development, Denver City Council, Denver Planning Board, et al—to adopt this plan.**

Should you or other members of your team have questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at [chun@chundenver.org](mailto:chun@chundenver.org) or call 303-830-1651.

Sincerely,

Travis Leiker, MPA  
President, Board of Delegates  
Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods, Inc.
August 19th, 2020

Mayor Hancock,

The Denver Sustainable Policy Council (SFPC), tasked with making recommendations on food policy and programs to the Mayor, is pleased to announce support for the East Central Neighborhood Plan. SFPC’s mission is to influence policy that fosters food security for all community members and promotes a healthy, equitable, and sustainable local food system with consideration for economic vitality and environmental impact. As such, we believe the East Central Plan is in alignment with our mission.

The following aspects are some of the specific food-related recommendations we especially support in the plan:

- improve and maintain healthy options at existing East Central food retailers;
- improve the physical connections to grocery stores and other locations with healthy food options (e.g. complete sidewalks and bike lanes);
- support food growing and production in East Central neighborhoods (including food grown in public spaces like parks and rezoning specific areas, which aligns with SFPC’s current policy platform we promote across the City of Denver);
- recruit new small- to mid-sized grocery retailers and specialty stores;
- support innovative community food access projects; and
- support initiatives that address food insecurity (e.g. the Blueprint to End Hunger, Closing the SNAP Gap, and supporting food banks and food pantry coordination in East Denver).

In addition, SFPC recommends support for the LiveWell Colorado - Dahlia partnership to pilot a Farm to Corner Store program going on in the same neighborhoods.

On August 18th, 2020 the Sustainable Food Policy Council members held a general meeting and voted to support the East Central Plan with this letter. We urge responsible City leaders to adopt the East Central Neighborhood Plan.

Should anyone on your team have questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at denversfpc@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Kristin Lacy, Co-Chair SFPC
Doug Wooley, Co-Chair SFPC
Members of the SFPC
Hi Curt and team – Plan endorsement from Stuart at Transportation Solutions below.

Best,

Stephen Rijo
Department of Transportation & Infrastructure | Transportation Planning
720.913.0721 Phone | 303.829.6645 Cell

No questions. We were involved in the ECAP and EAP planning, and we believe that the effort aligns with our mission of sustainable transportation. It is with pleasure that we endorse the NPI plans.

Our service area goes from Lincoln to Quebec on the southside of Colfax.

Thanks!

Stuart M. Anderson
Executive Director
Transportation Solutions Foundation
P.O. Box 8448 | Denver, CO 80202
D: 303.472.0639

Hi Stuart – Turns out we don’t need a formal letter on letterhead, unless you prefer to go that route, and can simply take an email saying you support the plan as I think Curt wants to read endorsements during our hearings vs. publish them with the plan. Your first email would probably suffice, but I also want to give you an opportunity to ask questions etc. or provide different wording for your endorsement if you prefer.

Let me know your preference and happy to set up 30min to chat in the near future.

I hope you enjoyed your staycation and appreciate your support!

Best,

Stephen Rijo
Department of Transportation & Infrastructure | Transportation Planning
720.913.0721 Phone | 303.829.6645 Cell
To: Rijo, Stephen A. - DOTI CE0429 City Planner Senior <stephen.rijo@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: NPI Plan Endorsement(s)?

Go ahead and send me the sample letter, and I will follow up with questions. I’m out right now, but back in the office toward the end of the month. I’m happy to prepare the letter any time – I’m on ‘staycation’ – and check in daily.

Thanks!

Stuart M. Anderson
Executive Director
Transportation Solutions Foundation
P.O. Box 8448 | Denver, CO 80202
D: 303.472.0639

From: Rijo, Stephen A. - DOTI CE0429 City Planner Senior <stephen.rijo@denvergov.org>
Sent: July 13, 2020 11:00 AM
To: Stuart M. Anderson <Stuart@transolutions.org>
Subject: RE: NPI Plan Endorsement(s)?

Many thanks Stuart. Do you want to “meet” to discuss anything specific about the plan, or are you happy with the current drafts?

I assume we will draft an example endorsement letter that you can tweak accordingly and will be in touch with that in the near future.

Best,

Stephen Rijo
Department of Transportation & Infrastructure | Transportation Planning
720.913.0721 Phone | 303.829.6645 Cell

From: Stuart M. Anderson <Stuart@transolutions.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Rijo, Stephen A. - DOTI CE0429 City Planner Senior <stephen.rijo@denvergov.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: NPI Plan Endorsement(s)?

Yes, we would be happy to endorse. Thanks!

Stuart M. Anderson
Executive Director
Transportation Solutions Foundation
P.O. Box 8448 | Denver, CO 80202
D: 303.472.0639

From: Rijo, Stephen A. - DOTI CE0429 City Planner Senior <stephen.rijo@denvergov.org>
Sent: July 7, 2020 11:36 AM
To: Stuart M. Anderson <Stuart@transolutions.org>
Subject: NPI Plan Endorsement(s)?

Hi Stuart – Long time no talk, and I hope you had an enjoyable holiday weekend! How are you holding up these days?

I am reaching out to see if TS feels comfortable making a formal endorsement of the East Central Area (and East Area if TS overlaps with that boundary?) NPI Plans. I know we worked with you at several steps along the planning process and assume you are somewhat familiar with the ECAP & EAP NPI efforts, but want to offer my time in case you have any questions or comments on the current drafts. We are hoping to have endorsements together by the end of the month and I am happy to find time to discuss in the near future. Does that make sense?

Hope all is well and talk soon!
Scott - I'm contacting you to request that the East Central Area Plan building heights recommendation of 3 stories at the intersection of E 8th AVe & Pearl St be revised and changed to 5 stories. Here is my rational:

1. This property today is subject to a PUD allowing 4 stories
2. 555 E 8th, at the NWC of 8th & Pearl exceeds the height limit allowed in 3 story zoning. It is underway on a rezone with UO-3 and Landmark designation, but can't fit under 3 story.
3. CPD wants the entire PUD rezoned. Rezoning to 3 stories would be a down zoning in a Blueprint "Residential High" area.
4. The SEC of the PUD property has a 5 story height recommendation in the ECAP. This should be consistent for all the property in the PUD.
6. This small area is surrounded by 12 story height recommendations. Transitioning from 12 to 3 is too big a step.
7. This location has good access to transit and is close to downtown and employment centers.
8. As you can see from the photo below, the site is surrounded today by 12 and 14 story buildings, so the existing context is not supportive of 3 story zoning.
9. The rezoning from the PUD will make more sense if the entire property is rezoned to the same height - 5 stories.
10. Two buildings will be Landmarked - so height is protected.

Here is the height map page from ECAP. This little site is a hole in the donut where 3 stories is too few.

East Central Area Plan – Draft Maps

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please let me know if you require additional information.

Bruce
Bruce C. O’Donnell
STARBOARD Realty Group, LLC
Work: 720-441-3310
Cell: 303-810-3674
E Mail: bodonnell@starboardrealtygroup.com
Web: www.starboardrealtygroup.com  www.denverzoning.com
I have been recently made aware of proposals that would allow an 8 story building to be constructed at the dry cleaners location at Adams and Colfax. As this is a very large change to the dynamic, infrastructure, and skyline of the neighborhood, I have many concerns. Why are the city and/or developers not engaging the surrounding community to inform them of the proposed changes, hear feedback, and address concerns? Have studies been done to show shadows on the nearby properties? These are just a few of many concerns that could be addressed with more review time and involvement with existing property owners and residents.

Best Regards,
Daniel B. Vujnovich
Cell: 251-510-4346
1455 Cook St.
Denver, Co 80206
Good morning,

I am a resident of Congress Park and have attended two of the meetings on the East Central Area Plan. When there is not a pandemic, I commute via bicycle to downtown for work unless it is less than 40 degrees.

I do not believe it is smart to add bike lanes to 13th and 14th avenues. There has to be a collaborative effort between bikers and cars on street designation. Not every road should be used for biking, just like bike lanes are not for cars.

Bikers need to respect cars. The road network is primarily built for cars, and there are roads that people should not bike on. In Congress Park, these car priority roads are 8th, 13th, 14th, Colfax, and Josephine, York and Colorado. The biking community cannot assume they should be given lanes on primary roads.

13th and 14th are designated Collector roads for cars to drive in and out of the city. Taking away lanes for traffic will only slow down transit into the city and push traffic onto 12th in the future. 12th is designated to maintain a neighborhood quality, with two small business nodes. Adding traffic from 13th and 14th will destroy that character.

Pre-COVID stay at home; 13th avenue would back up for 5 blocks in the morning rush hour waiting to get to the lights at Josephine. If bikes are added to this mix, there will be additional blocks of backups and numerous bike / car accidents. This intersection is also difficult as it is access to East High School. No-one can safely bike in front of East High school as parents and students are coming and going to school.

An additional issue is the conversion of lanes on Colfax for BRT is also going to push cars down to 13th and 14th, and even to 12th if the traffic is not moving.

One of my strongest complaints about this project is that there are already bike lanes provided in this area. People can bike on 12th, 16th and 10th. I find it disrespectful that someone will bike down 13th avenue, when there is a bike lane one block away. Denver had more cars than bikes. There is not a need for taking away a lane on a priority car road as there are already several bike options.

I do note that the bike lane on 12th avenue could be greatly improved. It only lasts about 8 blocks, and then disappears and you are forced to merge with traffic. This is a smarter option than 13th and 14th.

I went downtown for the first time in months a few weeks ago and could not believe that there was a bike lane added to 13th between Grant and Speer. This does not make any sense. I did not see any advertisement or notification that this was happening. At the same time, there were cables across the road collecting data for a traffic count. I hope that the people analyzing the data factor in all of the people who are working from home at this time. Traffic counts are not accurate.
Lastly, I do not support the closure of 11th avenue for pedestrians between Josephine and Colorado. This is a very quiet street that has wide sidewalks with safe crossings at every corner. If you are a resident of Congress park, without notice, you were not allowed to cross 11th avenue. This project is bound by Colorado - where you cannot turn left or right easily and Josephine / York - two one way streets. This closure does not make sense in this neighborhood and very negatively impacts local residents traveling to their homes. The multi-use street is not multi-used - please study the foot and bike traffic; almost everyone continues to walk on the sidewalk in this area. The 11th avenue COVID closure should end terminate at York.

I am happy to talk more about my concerns with the planning department and biking.

Sincerely,
Emilie E. Helms
1244 Milwaukee Street

720-454-5253
Hi Scott.

I was given your email as the contact for comments on the East Neighborhood Plan.

I live on the south side of City Park. I love all the work you and your group has done. Very nice. Very detailed.

My comment: I would love to see all homes or buildings around/near East High school be 3 or less stories so that we can continue to see the beautiful East High School clock from the park and around the neighborhood. That clock is beautiful. At night, it is lit up, and gives off a feeling of “home”. I would hate to see it blocked from view with buildings or homes that are too high. I don’t know how high that should be. I’m thinking no more than 3 stories. It is a historic building and so many people love the view of the school when in the park. Please please consider. Thanks so much. Appreciate all your work.

Jan Reiley
Scott,

Comments for ECAP.

Entire Affordable Housing Section is lacking and for profit driven. CPW pulled together several non profit housing agencies and have these comments for the ECAP on Affordable Housing (attached) Please provide to steering committee. This affordable housing section should have input from all housing providers - maybe hold a summit or something and allow them to prioritize efforts versus the private developers.

1.1.3 Planning Context should explain the view ordinances history and how they restrict height regardless of zoning

1.1.4 applying plan to rezone - the common citizen has no idea what a legislative amendment or a text amendment is - need one sentence explaining each

I'm not sure where this fits but I have heard several residents comment about closing of roads in City Park is causing parking issues for residents (many are seniors) on Gaylord, 22nd and 21st. Additionally, some people with age and/or mobility issues are not able to use facilities (horseshoe, lake, playgrounds with grandchildren) because it is too far to walk into the park. We need to make sure the public places are accessible to all.

Dedicated bike lane on Franklin will create parking issues. There us at least one Multifamily complex on each block of Franklin

Additionally, I have my same comment regarding exclusion of many longtime residents and people of color. In this time of COVID we can’t do outreach nor should this all fall on RNO. I would like to see a change in policy at CPD about notification on any changes AND less of a top down approach. This should be a written policy including outreach plans for underserved and minorities and followed anytime there are major zoning changes. The steering committee involvement should be open to all and not appointed and outreach to underserved communities. The non profit housing agencies should always be involved in these conversations

Thank

Jo Untiedt
(303) 437-0131

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jo Untiedt <jo@affordablehousingconsultants.org>
Date: August 7, 2020 at 12:18:00 PM MDT
Thank you all for participating this morning. We hope this can be a continued relationship. Here are notes from our meeting and as we stated we will copy you on comments to the City. Please feel free to share this with anyone in the affordable arena and have them get in contact with me so that we can add them to our communication list.

Thank you for your work!

Jo Untiedt

Affordable Housing Consultants, Inc. – a women-owned business since 1995
1915 E 22nd Avenue
Denver, CO  80205
(303) 437-0131
Like us on Facebook and Twitter
www.affordablehousingconsultants.org
NOTES FROM MEETING WITH MISSION DRIVEN NON-PROFITS HOSTED BY CITY PARK WEST RNO ON August 7, 2020

Haley Jordahl and Chris Spelke – Denver Housing Authority cspelke@denverhousing.org, hjordahl@denverhousing.org

Jeff Martinez – Brother’s Redevelopment – jeff@brothersredevelopment.org

Dominique Acevedo – Northeast Denver Housing Dacevedo@nedenver-housing.org

Michelle Michelle – Colorado Housing Assistance Corporation michellem@chaconline.org

Jo briefly explained the history of ECAP and EAP and the concerns that the plans were for-profit developer driven breeding more gentrification and RNO concerns about needing to create and retain affordable housing.

How many of you have been involved in area plans? DHA explained they are mostly concentrating on West side due to the large public housing project at Sun Valley Homes and haven’t been involved in east plans. Brother’s has been working with Colfax Partnership due to housing project they are working on for brain injured tenants that will be on East Colfax. Other than that, they are not participating on steering committees or actively involved in the plans. We agreed to share notes and encouraged them to comment.

Michelle Mitchell of CHAC explained that under the current economic conditions in Denver metro area – about the only down payment assistance they are participating in is deed restricted units at Lowry and Stapleton, occasionally a condo under $300,000 in SE area. There is a need to create truly affordable ownership options that are deed restricted as City did on Lowry and Stapleton. With the affordability issues, deep down payment is needed. The RNOs can advocate for home ownership retention and creation as a priority and more deed restricted development

Chris Spelke of DHA and Dominique Acevedo explained that going over five stories puts projects in a different classification for Davis Bacon Wage Rates – they go from “residential” to “building” and both he and Dominque of NE Denver Housing explained that five or more stories makes a project VERY COST PROHIBITED due to this reclassification of wages. We heard all the non-profits say that up-zoning does not create affordable housing.

We asked about land use restrictions all were in favor of adding additional land use restrictions on affordable housing – City of Denver is striving for 60 years of affordability and CHFA is looking to expand affordability life.

Jeff Martinez from Brother’s Redevelopment suggested the City identify parcels of land and affordable housing be a priority for those parcels.

Dominique Acevedo of NE Denver Housing explained the difference between “mission-driven” non-profits and what we refer in the industry to “shell non-profits” Mission driven non-profits have staff,
mission, funding that all allows them to create affordable housing. She suggested the City target the mission-driven non-profits.

Everyone explained the difficulty in developing a small neighborhood sized project in that they are too small for LIHTC to be cost effective (under 40 units). Without LIHTC Haley Jordahl of DHC explained there is a huge funding gap. This seems to be an area us RNOs can advocate for additional funding and as a priority for affordable development.

Everyone agreed the cost of land in downtown area is a reason why the affordability is so difficult. Another reason for the City to prioritize city-owned land for affordable housing.

Additionally, with the new Group Living Amendment these non-profits are exploring a more congregate approach create housing. It was stated that the average cost per unit for a development is around $300,000 per unit.

Michelle Mitchell of CHAC explained that affordable needs to also address larger families. She has seen the affordable units of 1-2 bedrooms not be sufficient as the families grows but there is no “next step” in affordability with the average cost of a single-family home exceeding $500,000 - $600,000.

NEXT STEPS

The RNOs will share their comments with this housing group – additional funds for down-payment, additional land trust properties, prioritization of city land for mission-driven non-profits to create housing and to create small neighborhood projects, increased affordability years.

The Non-profits will consider commenting on these plans.
East Central Area Plan on page 45.

Support City Council led efforts to reform the RNO ordinance to make all RNOs in Denver more inclusive and representative of their neighborhoods.
1. Consider rules requiring membership from residents at risk of involuntary displacement and demographics representative of the neighborhood.
2. Review and adopt best practice RNO policies in cities that have increased equitable representation.
3. Innovate and pursue pilot projects that may reduce barriers to participation for underrepresented residents.

I agree the City should support the effort of helping RNOs with outreach if an RNO has capacity to do this AND there is not a pandemic going on and it is part of coordination with City and planning process. BUT it is the responsibility of the City to make the City processes inclusionary and have a written policy of outreach to underserved communities and then follow that plan (outreach to churches, non profits, housing authorities, minority newspapers and radio, etc). RNOs are one mechanism BUT IT IS NOT always feasible to do a lot of work as these are volunteer organizations and often have difficulty getting membership and involvement. Please acknowledge the ONLY reason the approval of ECAP has not happened yet is because RNOs raised the inequality issue. Please look at some best practices to create the City Notification Process and THEN pull RNOs together for input On how they can enhance that process before you change policy.

Jo Untiedt
(303) 437-0131
Hello Scott,

I would like to provide some feedback to the ECAP. I am the current owner at 1475 cook st, and have concerns with the plans for development of the former Paradise Cleaner site. My house is directly behind the site and adjacent to the parking lot. My understanding of the ECAP is that zoning would now allow for a structure up to 8 feet in height to be built. My top concerns include privacy, sunlight, traffic(parking) and general impact to quality of life. There has been zero information shared with the neighborhood regarding the plans (outside of the ECAP - which has no specifics) for this parcel.

I have seen several of these projects go up over the years - a prime example being the condo building a few blocks east on Madison and Colfax. This building has been plagued with exterior issues and now is definitely a negative to the aesthetic of the neighborhood. I purchased my home here due to its neighborhood feel, proximity to east high school and its location adjacent to a great historic business district. As high rises fill in - this quality is continually diminished.

I am in favor of limiting the height of a new structure to 4 feet. I also am requesting there is neighborhood involvement in design. We are learning that trusting the development and zoning process has not been a successful approach to maintaining the character of our and surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration of this feedback. Please advise on how I can continue to pro

Thanks.

> ---------- Original Message ----------
> From: myles tangalin <mylestangalin@outlook.com>
> To: "Daniel B. Vujnovich" <danielvujnovich@gmail.com>, Kris Vogel <krisvogel@comcast.net>
> Date: 07/29/2020 3:02 PM
> Subject: RE: Dry cleaner apartments
> 
> Hello Daniel & Kris,
>
> Please see attached PDF on East Central Area Plan (ECAP) and what it is recommending for those parcels. I do not currently know what is being proposed for the Paradise site, but I expect Buzz is working with the city on a plan that will include recommendations of the ECAP.
>
> If you or your neighbors disagree with the recommended 8 story height for that lot, you need to comment on the current ECAP Draft #3. You and others can also let them know you were unaware of this plan, what is being proposed and ask for more time to review. This comment period is ending and the plan will go to City Council for a vote in the coming weeks.
>
> You can also contact Chris Hinds and let him know your concerns because he will be voting on this plan.
>
> These recommendations are important because they will be used for new zoning.
>
> East Central Area Plan
> https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/community-planning-and-development/planning-and-design/Neighborhood_Planning_Initiative/Planning-Areas/East_Central_Area_Plan.html
>
> Let me know if you have any questions.
> Myles
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Daniel B. Vujnovich <danielvujnovich@gmail.com>
> Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 10:07 AM
> To: Kris Vogel <krisvogel@comcast.net>; mylestangalin@outlook.com
> Subject: Dry cleaner apartments
>
> Per our conversation Mr. tangalin.. Info on the dry cleaner Apartments plan for Kris.
Hi Scott,

My comments are brief!

I've been following and participating in this process for months and I want to say I think you and the planning team and the Steering Committee have done a very good job! I was at meetings when things were rocky and also there were when meetings were a real time example of local civic engagement in action. Through it all the Denver planning staff was always professional, approachable and helpful.

It is a thoughtful plan and balances many interests. I'm proud to be part of a community that is engaged and proud of the City of Denver. I know the process is not over but this seemed like a good time to express my gratitude.

Thank you and I look forward to saying hello when we can finally do that in person!

Stay safe and best regards,

Mark

--

Mark Cavanaugh
1050 Monroe Street
Denver, CO 80206
303 717-7239 Cell
Hello Scott,

I would like to comment on the proposed building height on the South side of Colfax between Adams and Cook. This lot is proposed to go from a current zoning height of 3 stories to 8 stories with a neighborhood incentive.

I would strongly discourage such a significant increase and don't believe an 8 story building is appropriate. This would be the only 8 story height allowed along this stretch and is nearly tripling the size of the current zoning. An increase to 5 stories seems much more appropriate for this lot and would better align with development along this stretch. An increase to 5 stories would still nearly double the height of the current zoning and neighborhood incentives would remain in place.

I strongly encourage you to reduce the proposed height to 5 stories if the neighborhood incentive is provided.

Thank you,
Richard Hansen
1526 Madison Street
Denver, CO 80206
303-903-5696
Mr. Robinson, thank you and your team for drafting the draft East Central Plan. I have provided some comments for your and the steering committee's consideration. I appreciate your efforts to incorporate community feedback into the planning document. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions about these comments. Thanks, Rob Parker

1. General Comment: Overall, the Congress Park neighborhood is significantly different than the other neighborhoods of the east central area; specifically, the Congress Park neighborhood has a higher percentage of single family homes, increased tree canopy, reduced car traffic, reduced number of cars parked on street and most uniform neighborhood as compared to other neighborhoods that have a significantly higher number of apartments and condo buildings that utilize the entire lots and result in higher density. I recognize it's likely too late to do this, but the City should consider either moving Congress park neighborhood to a neighboring "area," or blending the plans between the East Central area with neighboring areas to the east. At the least, recognition that the current character of Congress Park is significantly different than other neighborhoods and may need significantly different policies.

2. General Comment: Most of the figures would be benefited by being neighborhood specific, rather than area wide to improve the scale and make them more reader friendly. Also, some of the figures have very similar color schemes, making the difference colors hard to depict. Figures such as the one on page 103 are not helpful at this scale. Jobs diversity on page 19 highlights a number of blocks that are residential in nature. This figure is confusing.

3. Street repurposing comment: Policy M1: Expand the concept of repurposing streets to neighborhood streets as well. The recent closure, due to COVID, of 11th Avenue provided an interesting opportunity for recreational opportunities through Capitol Hill, Cheeseman and Congress Park Neighborhoods. Consider permanently making streets such as 11th Ave between Broadway and Colorado a formal biking/walking only street which would create a major east west biking/pedestrian corridor, taking biking/pedestrian traffic off of nearby streets such as 12th-13th Ave, which could be repurposed for other specific uses. Completely remove car traffic from the street, encouraging bikers/pedestrians to utilize 11th, which will provide greater opportunity for repurposing 12th Ave for specific transit oriented repurposing (removing biking pressure caused by M(2)(F) - the road is only so wide) and 13th and 14th for car oriented repurposing. The city could plant flower boxes/trees in the middle of the street to increase canopy and make it a unique recreational corridor right in the middle of the East Central neighborhoods. It could look like the picture on page 86, with wide bike lanes running right down the middle of the road, adding pedestrians, and subtracting car traffic. The concept isn't to try to make cars, bikes, and pedestrians work together on every street; instead, it's to route cars and bikes/pedestrians onto completely different streets. (Well, geez, now that I wrote all of this I see M3(A). Strongly support it)

4. Street Repurposing Comment: Extend M7(B)(3) to Colorado Boulevard (or at least 12th and Madison Shops) according to image on page 112.

5. Street Repurposing Comment: Recommend Q2(A)(3)(b) (contemporary parkways) be focused on 11th avenue rather than 12th from downtown to Colorado boulevard. Rationale, as discussed in number 3, above, is to completely isolate bike/pedestrian from car and transit oriented roads to reduce likelihood of serious accidents. 12th could
be further developed as a transit oriented road for RTD route 10, 13-14th car oriented and Colfax multi modal.

6. Street Repurposing Comment: Consider repurposing the southern portion of Cheesman Park road for biking and pedestrian use, similar to Washington Park.

7. Density Comment: Page 32 - places. Most of the Congress Park neighborhood should be labeled as Low Residential - Single unit. In the draft proposal, the area from 11th Avenue to Colfax is labeled as "Low Residential," which according to the description provided on page 30 means "Predominantly two-unit uses on smaller lots." While there are sporadic multi unit uses within the area, the predominant use is single unit uses, especially between 11th Avenue and 13th Avenue. According to page 238, 61% are single use within the neighborhood as a whole and a fairly clear trend up to 13th at least. Most of the residences in this part of the city are traditional Denver bungalows or single family Denver squares, not multi unit structures. Please revise this defined area of Low Residential - Single Unit to extend at least north to 13th, possibly even further. This is supported by the information presented on page 238, in section 3.7.2

8. Density Comment: I'm concerned that Policy E11 may be inconsistent with maintaining the look and feel of the neighborhoods and potentially against preserving the existing tree canopy.

9. Density Comment: Multiple policies (e.g L5 and L6) encourage maintaining the character of various places and neighborhoods. Further, Policy L5 recognizes that "Residents are concerned about losing the great neighborhood character that could change due to new construction." While I agree with this sentiment, I urge the planning department to consider factors other than new construction, such as the resulting parking, noise, stormwater and sanitation needs related to increased density through ADUs and multi unit structures that might have impacts on the existing character of places and neighborhoods. The great neighborhood character that I am interested in retaining, for example in Congress Park, are the single family, less dense use as compared to other east central neighborhoods in order to maintain the quiet streets, and increased tree canopy in front and back of homes.

10. Density Comment: It's unclear where in Congress Park ADUs will be favored. Page 243 indicates the southern portion of the neighborhood has affordability issues, and ADUs would be favored, but on page 39, under policy L5, Strategy A, the strategy is intended to integrate missing middle housing in "Low Residential Places" which is limited to the northern portion of the neighborhood. In order to properly comment, this uncertainty or inconsistency needs to be resolved. Overall, I believe Single Use housing should remain single use and it's incorrect to assume that "middle housing" is "missing." I think it's important to note that, according to p. 61, only 15% of respondents indicated support for an increase in the variety of housing types.

11. Density Comment: Policy E11 is more appropriate in multi unit neighborhoods. Single family neighborhoods such as Congress Park will lose its character with increased density. I also think it's noteworthy that, according to page 61, only 14% of respondents indicated support for encouraging more accessory dwelling units so I think it's fair to reconsider the language as written in the background section that states: "the most desired types were live-work units, detached ADUs, and townhouses." Even if it was one of the "most desired," the language likely overstates the support.

12. Procedural Comment: Policy L3 - The policy shouldn't dictate what the "primary community benefit" should be. It should be done on a case specific basis, as green space, restoration, or other cultural benefits may be more appropriate than low income housing in some circumstances.

13. Quality of Life Comment: Policy E4, strategy B references neon signage. I suggest
neon signage may be appropriate for certain corridors but not all storefront locations, especially those in residential neighborhoods.

14. Quality of Life Comment: I very much support Policy E10, Strategy H: Park and recreation access is key for all areas of Denver. Overall, spreading out the quality of life infrastructure to every neighborhood in Denver will have the best benefit for housing issues discussed throughout this document. Rather than pack people into areas with rising rents (deemed "desirable"), improve the quality of life in other neighborhoods using the techniques described. This will alleviate housing costs by "spreading the quality of life wealth" to every neighborhood in the city. Welcome to the best City in the Country.

15. Safety Comment: Add a visual street crossing light at the intersection of 11th Ave and Josephine (similar to that at 11th and York). Cars come down the hill from Josephine very fast and crossing can be dangerous.
Scott,

On this the thrice iteration of this woefully determined plan why is this not just a ballot measure?

Vicki Kelley