

Comprehensive Plan 2040: Public Comments on Public Review Draft 2

Source	Feedback on Draft Plan
	<i>Comment</i>
Letter	Preservation language is a lot about people and culture -- can we also add more about the built environment?
Online Survey	A fair feedback period needs to be given once the plan is complete. I also feel that after listening to Mr Ambrose and Mr Glick that clearly stating in the Denverite plan that a plan of its magnitude and generality is just that. A vision. And that neighborhood plans will be the default when considering any significant changes such as rezoning, setbacks and design.
Online Survey	<p>For clean up, North Capitol Hill (Uptown) is labeled as Cole on the map on page 2. This Comp Plan really needs to emphasize the importance of a diverse city. I moved here from the east coast and I have never seen as many discrepancies between white residents and black residents as I have here., especially for a progressive city. These discrepancies are seen in our neighborhoods and in the workplace in my observations. Some of most densely populated neighborhoods where you would expect the most diversity such as the CBD, Uptown, Capitol Hill, and Baker seem to be predominately white which suggests to me 1) lack of affordable housing, 2)lack of equal access to jobs and 3) the sense of community in these neighborhoods may be missing or lack inclusion. I think it is very unique to Denver that dense neighborhoods reflect a predominantly white population and that is unfortunate for an urban city (I am a white male). I also see a lack of diversity in professional jobs here as well. High paying jobs here are held overwhelmingly by white men and women WAY more so than back east. You see this in the streets here too. It is very obvious the inequalities that exist in Denver when it comes to access to education and job opportunities and again, it is very concerning and especially for such a progressive city.</p> <p>Connected, Safe, and Accessible Places should include either a goal or a strategy that includes expanding enforcement and education. What I've noticed is that Denver is doing a great job expanding the bike and pedestrian network, however, both drivers and bicyclists are still failing to understand how to use these networks property and what the value is in these. I also find that right-of-way enforcement for things such as drivers parking in bike lanes, people loading in not only striped bike lanes but bollard protect lanes as well, bikers biking on sidewalks, bikers going the wrong way in bike lanes, and pedicab drivers on sidewalk , is almost non existent here. The point of enforcement is not to make money for the City but rather to educate people on how to use these facilities and I believe that without a strong dedication towards enforcement and education, we're just spending time, effort, and money to build facilities that no one uses property. Use road diets, on-street parking, and bollard protected bike lanes wherever possible.</p>
Online Survey	For each of the other 4 Denveright plans, there is a listing of the task force members, city council members, etc who helped get the plan together - I could not find that for the Comp Plan 2040 - was it a combination of the 4 plans task forces? It's not clear in the Comp Plan.
Online Survey	<p>"How to Use this Plan"</p> <p>- It may be beneficial to emphasize the importance of partnerships and their ability to accomplish many of the aspirations that are described in this plan. Specifically, I think calling out the role and responsibility of non-profits and other community organizations to really champion the plan and move it forward will be very compelling.</p>
Planning Board listening session	The plans should do more to emphasize homeownership
Online Survey	My feedback is about "making sure that neighborhoods are economically strong and vibrant." I believe we need to relax zoning regulations so that property owners can add housing like duplexes, triplexes, 4-plexes, and ADUs, especially to underused, oversized property lots in all Denver neighborhoods, but particularly neighborhoods like Park Hill, which have an overabundance of large single family homes and large property lots. Housing diversity will bring economic diversity and a mix of businesses that can serve a broader population.
Letter	<p>Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods, Goal 8C, page 34 -- Need more specificity in this goal to make sure neighborhood plans are achieved before major changes are made. We request that this goal be expanded as follows (wording in CAPS is new text):</p> <p>Ensure neighborhood plan recommendations are consistent with the local vision and with this comprehensive plan, BEFORE UNDERTAKING MAJOR CHANGES OR LEGISLATIVE REZONINGS BY CITY COUNCIL.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I am disappointed that the City has not issued a guide to the changes. With over 1000 pages (conservatively) in the various plans, it is a herculean effort to re-review all of this to ferret out changes.</p> <p>Please let us know the rationale behind not including such a document with this voluminous and historic effort.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I believe the Denver Comprehensive plan must make a clear statement that housing affordability, diversity, equity, community health and connection are a priority. This plan must take a clear stand on whether these priorities and the need for more dense, affordable zoning and development will be championed and facilitated in the face of decades of obstructionism, frivolous lawsuits and the dogmatic preservation of single family housing with roots in racial and class bias.</p> <p>Please make a clear policy statement and discuss action points, unless we wish to allow resistance and the value of "neighborhood character" to trump our responsibility to create housing for all who need it.</p> <p>We also need to allow development, at the very least up to mid density, 3-5 story development (the affordable, needed "missing middle housing") in all neighborhoods, including Congress Park, Hilltop, Hale, City park and other privileged neighborhoods that have been able to block almost all development, not just cram the demand for housing in lower socio-economic neighborhoods that don't have the ability to resist.</p>

Source	Feedback on Draft Plan
Online Survey	<p>The plan is visionary, humane, and green. I appreciate its in-depth, global approach.</p> <p>I do have a simple suggestion for transportation planners--and it's inexpensive! We just need more consistency with safe pedestrian crossings. Painted crossings seem random--some minor intersections have elaborate one, some major intersections have none. Can't we be consistent and supply every important pedestrian intersection with a painted crossing?</p> <p>Example: S. Steele and Alameda has a blinking yellow light to warn motorists of ped/bike crossing, but no painted lines.</p> <p>Another suggestion: raised pedestrian walkways to slow traffic and remind drivers on busy boulevards to slow down. Example: Colorado Blvd. and Exposition.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I VERY strongly agree with the other public comments about putting some focus on MIDDLE level housing, not just affordable housing. Otherwise East Colfax is going to become an affordable housing center with no consideration for anyone else.</p> <p>I'd like to see more police presence along East Colfax to try and curb some of the early morning (5 am) prostitution and drug dealing. It's really tiring to have to see that every day while I'm waiting for the bus.</p>
Online Survey	<p>Our Indivisible group has spent hours attempting to review the Comprehensive Plan and we exist with more questions than awareness of how the plan guides planning and work within Denver.</p>
Online Survey	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I believe that the Villa Park Neighborhood should update the zoning to allow more ADUs and smaller lot sizes. There are so many small 3,000-4,000 lot sizes that were just "grandfathered" in that it's really laughable to say that lots sizes have to be at least 6,000 feet for "safety" reasons. Our neighborhood is so close to the Lightrail W line that it makes no sense at all to not allow for more reasonable density. It appears that only the stretch to the north of the line gets the more inclusive zoning, but please look at updating the region to the south of the line (from 12th-6th ave.) so that homeowners can make better improvements to their lots and allow for more density that doesn't destroy the look of our neighborhood.</p>
Online Survey	<p>w.r.t. the language on page 66 about when policies and strategies are applicable, I think what concerns alot of people s it almost sounds like in individual rezoning cases, all the good policies about respecting neighborhood context and preserving an affordable stock of small homes, etc... would not be considered as valid criteria for assessing a zone map amendment application, because it sounds like they are only applicable in larger / legislative rezoning.</p> <p>At the open house, I was provided with a good explanation of this language, which is that it is not up to individual property owners to implement the city wide policies and strategies, which makes sense. So, perhaps it would be good to include language like that on the page, and also reassure the public that in cases where a zoning application may conform to general place type and context considerations, but otherwise violates a wide variety of other policies, that it could be rejected on the grounds of not conforming to the policies and strategies.</p> <p>The language on the page, can almost be interpreted to say that the opposite is true, and that individual applications need only conform to the city wide place type and context recommendations, but need not conform to other policies.</p>
Online Survey	<p>Impressed. Too bad we can't start now in limiting high density developers from changing approved plans so there are the connecting green spaces from one park to the next. An example is Boulevard One.</p>
Planning Board listening session	<p>Concern about how complicated the documents are, inconsistency between glossary defintions, no one will understand them anyway due to achievement gaps thanks to DPS. The plans do not do enough to address structural issues, capitalism, and displacement. You cannot take plans seriously in a democracy where only 20% of the population votes.</p>
Planning Board listenting session	<p>Would like cottage zoning to appear as a housing strategy</p>
Online Survey	<p>I'm a big fan of the BRT project(s), but am fearful</p>

Source	Feedback on Draft Plan
Online Survey	<p>I'm surprised that the city planners are backtracking, giving in somewhat, to complaining single-family home owners. This is especially applicable to the Sloan's Lake Neighborhood, where a small group of single family home owners are vociferously complaining about multifamily homes being built along Sheridan Blvd, near Sloan's Lake Park.</p> <p>These homeowners want to shut the door on more people enjoying the access to the park. While they sit in their environmentally inefficient homes with huge driveways, two-car garages, while the middle class people, or less, can't afford to live in this great location because houses are exorbitantly prices.</p> <p>I value Denver's mixed use, smart use philosophy, but am sad to see some downzoning on major transportation routes: i.e., Sheridan, Federal, Colfax, 38th ave, 29th ave.</p> <p>Please don't buckle to the Nimby's who are afraid of beneficial change, especially change that benefits those who can't afford houses.</p> <p>On another note, I hope the "Planning Board" is aware that neighborhood groups (RNO's) are generally very unrepresentative of the demographics of the actual neighborhood. For instance, SLCG is completely composed of Single Family Home Owners!</p> <p>The are few, if any, reps who live in apartment houses, row homes, slot homes, assisted -living, affordable housing. Also, from what I've observed, RNO members are very out-of-touch with the general community. Hence, they are primarily concerned with stopping "any growth" and keeping a community static and preventing access to other groups. Again, RNO's are honestly very unrepresentative of an actual neighborhood, especially in the Sloan's Lake Neighborhood. Therefore, it should be required that RNO's make a greater effort to recruit "diversity," so we have a better view of what a neighborhood's true needs are.</p>
Online Survey	<p>It does not do enough to address affordability or land use planning. The consolidation of lots to build giant SFH is not curtailed, nor is the majority of land area allowed to have greater density by right. This document is great at producing a vague vision, but does not land anywhere close enough to concrete goals and actions.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I feel there needs to be higher density in main streets. Most already are connected to transportation.</p>
Online Survey	<p>Please look at my powerpoint on Mixed Use - Smart Use on, especially as it relates to a Sloan's Lake Development project on 17th and Sheridan. It is on a classic transportation arterial which will connect people to the community on a much higher level. The benefits of a rezone far outweigh any negatives. My POWERPOINT says it all! Please look at it!</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1xjqz3H9QqFXeeO_B3Ej14CpUKMJ-0Hj5_hbu06UpqFw/edit#slide=id.p</p>
Online Survey	<p>We need better and proper bus systems taking residents in GVR to 61st and Pena station. As residents have to pay to park their cars over there. There currently is no bus system operating to the station</p> <p>Please ensure bus frequency to/From 61st and Pena is running every 15 minutes from 5am-9:00am and from 5:00pm-7:30pm on weekdays</p> <p>Also please use courtesy planning to ensure the bus schedule and route is planned so that it arrives to the station with 5 mins to give so folks can board the train. Currently the bus system to 40th and gateway park comes 1 min after the train leaves to Union, and everyone is taking in the cold at 5:30am for 15 mins for the next train to arrive.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I liked it but it is hard to visualize at this point in time. How will this affect me and my neighbors is not clear.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I'm happy about removing focus on the areas of change vs areas of stability. Certain neighbors shouldn't be exempt from change and growth, all need to pull their weight. I'm happy about the designation of high speed transit corridors and hope BRT or streetcars can be added to Colorado, Broadway, and Speer as well as Colfax as soon as possible. The Plan needs benchmarks for growth, 2040 is too long and too far away for transit, especially with regards to climate goals. We also need more complete neighborhoods with various types of housing, not just single family housing, so people can find something affordable for their time in life and so people can age in place.</p>
Online Survey	<p>Our growing city needs to provide equity for many of the residents who have not risen with the real estate prices. Density doesn't equal affordability. Almost 50% of the city allows ADUs and they have not made those neighborhoods more affordable. It has made them more dense and less valuable. The neighborhood with more land are more valuable. The character of our neighborhood is not the people alone, it is the diversity and age of the housing stock. Many of the neighborhoods developed are those whose demographics are most diverse. We need to preserve and increase our parks and open spaces. Denver is in the top 10 of heat island effect in the nation. We need to ensure the success of our neighborhood and city by demonstrating investment in the 360 quality of life: housing, education, transportation, industry, environment.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I would like to thank all of you for drafting this plan and for outreaching to the community so strongly. I found the use of the phrases "bold action" and "aggressive action" within the text to be truly encouraging. I am also joyful that the plan mentions composting efforts. I would like to strongly encourage considering overall soil health as Denver and Denver county continue to develop. I think that many areas within the city and county need to be 'undeveloped' to allow for proper rainwater permeation of soil and to allow for a healthy biodiversity to flourish. If we are to honor the rich history of our home, we must also remember the days before the pioneers and homesteaders. We must seek to honor the land as it was before it became this territory. In relation to this and similar concerns that I have, I would advocate for a requirement that a certain percentage of concrete on any property be offset by a fair proportion of more ecologically diverse land-usage on that property. We must offset the tying up of so much land in pavement. We must take a stand on how much soil we allow to be paved over.</p>

Source	Feedback on Draft Plan
Online Survey	<p>Restoring areas within our develops to a more natural habitat has many benefits to the biodiversity of an area, but also towards mitigating heat-sinking effects of concrete, towards flood prevention, and to the mental and emotional health and safety of the surrounding communities. Air pollution is just as dangerous and deadly as human warfare, so we must aid local flora in their burden of absorbing carbon in our societies. Air quality is tied to physical and mental health, and we must consider the mental and emotional health of our citizens. Creatures like birds and squirrels need to be considered in our development, and their species need to be encouraged to thrive. I believe strongly that we should take the population of bees and other pollinating insects into account while we continue to develop. It is critical that these species be allowed to and encouraged to thrive even in our cities. I would love to see more biodiversity in and around Denver in the forms of goats and chickens that would contribute to a more sustainable food-path for us all. We need to give other lifeforms the rights that we so lovingly give ourselves, and we need to realize the intricacies of our co-dependence. Over-development and pavement-locked lands are dangerous, so I propose measuring and encouraging ecological health based on many of these aforementioned factors (such as permeability and biodiversity of an area by appropriate percentages in ratio to human development).</p> <p>I find it encouraging to read your language in regards to reusing old buildings and to implementing smart grids. Our need for Smart Grids is great. I sincerely hope that we can take a holistic approach to how our communities thrive alongside the local ecology, and I appreciate you using that word (holistic) within the plan.</p> <p>I thank you for the language in the 2040 plan that mentions these things. I would hope that we will work to attain achievement above and beyond what we have planned on paper and that we will work towards alleviating environmental disasters caused by our changing climate and changing habitats. We can do this by changing our ideas about our lifestyles, and this plan seems to reflect that to me. I encourage you to move forward with it. Thank you for being so open throughout this process. Please continue to be transparent and adaptive as challenges and successes present themselves, and please encourage us all to maintain adequate integrity for the sake of our people and for our planet. Live long and prosper.</p>
Online Survey	<p>I am Gisela Boderke and have lived in the Northwest Corridor/Federal Blvd./District 1, for 20 years and in Denver since 1970. I am a member of the Federal Boulevard Action team/Regis Community Council. I have attended today's listening session, just for my own listening. I heard about zoning, high density/low density communities. I fully agree that Denver needs stricter laws about new constructions addil am Gisela Boderke, I have lived in the North West corridor/Federal Blvd./ District 1, for 20 years and ing to more density downtown and spreading. I feel priority must be placed on the health and well being of each community, that means, green spaces, safe walking spaces and bicycle tracks.</p> <p>Also, there is a lack of connectivity of communities, we still get stuck in rush-hour traffic on the way home from downtown. If I didn't have to take my car, I would not add to parking and condensed traffic. I have yet to see the Gold line work, from a stop on Federal Blvd. near where I live. Connectivity from one neighborhood to another is still a big problem without a car. How is Denver working with bordering Counties to connect and facilitate pedestrians/bikers to access the green spaces so close to us? These green spaces could be accessible to high density neighborhoods as well. We are taking our lives in hour hands just to cross Federal Boulevard, it is a dangerous street. The natural landscape is suitable to build an under path from one side to the other. I am afraid nothing gets done or even planned if Counties don't share their plans. Regis community is part of our Northwest corridor with Regis University owning most of the land. There is even a Regis Planning Committee with big changes in store. Is the Denver Planning Board even talking to Regis Planning Committee or Adams County Planners?</p> <p>Denver is not an island, it needs to connect with bordering Counties and communities.</p> <p>Thank you, this is what I had to say.</p>

Source	Feedback on Draft Plan
<p>Online Survey</p>	<p>The biggest flaw is the lack of integration between plans for density and transit corridors. Combining density with the unrealized need for transit is the biggest opportunity with this round of planning revisions. Denver is substantially built around cars which is outdated and due to be rethought. The transit plans doesn't include streetcars and even a connected network that many have identified as key opportunities to activate major corridors down Colfax, Broadway, Federal, 38th, Colorado and Speer that are currently overrun with cars and lack of development.</p> <p>This plan is a unique combination of vague undefined moves and also lack aspirational elements typically seen at this scale and complexity. For example--there are few if any examples nationally and internationally of urban transit in a city of this scale that doesn't include trains as this one does. Busses and even BRT alone lack the capacity and frequency/reliability to in the most dense areas of the city where ROW already exists for streetcars. Trains on major corridors are proven gamechangers to activate corridors with higher density development and Denver is of a scale and level of economic development that can support trains. East Colfax is a great example of what's possible. The unrelenting focus on BRT is out of touch with the consensus of community feedback. No one is inspired by BRT and this key corridors are of a population density that demands that streetcars considered. Most importantly, the plan lacks integration between a connected network for transit that includes streetcars/BRT on major arterials with bus circulators, massively upgraded bike/ped infrastructure and even ride sharing that solves last mile challenges. There isn't a clear path or timeline for how millennials or other are encouraged to forego their cars with a reliable, inviting system for transit. At this point, the process could benefit from being extended for planners to consider how density and transit could work for people .</p> <p>I and also are also deeply concerned that its a reflection of tendency for top down planning that is a problem throughout the current planning process in Denver where people are widely unaware of what's going on in their own neighborhoods. One thought is to open up smaller scale planning offices in multiple neighborhoods so public is widely aware of major developments rather having to be reactive. This fortress mentality with plans and planning holed up in the Webb building has been widely identified as a problem and hasn't been addressed including in this plan. Thanks for considering the feedback</p>