

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I mostly support the draft plan.	We should be considering one-way streets in the west colfax district (Zenobia-Irving) to slow traffic and increase safety but this hasn't been mentioned	Your email updates page doesn't work
I fully support the draft plan.		I moved to the West Colfax neighborhood in 2020 and am concerned about all the homes being demolished to be replaced by ugly multi-family dwellings. This happened in Cherry Creek a few decades ago. How will you plan to uphold "Principle #2 – To preserve, we should... Preserve existing homes, small businesses, and encourage new development to fit in the neighborhood"? What will you do to balance redevelopment with investors buying up nearly every property with this preservation of the older homes that gives the neighborhood character?
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.		I am wondering what can be done about the arc thrift store. The outside of it is constantly trashed around Hooker St (it's a windy area so then the trash ends up all along the neighborhood) and they have a mud lot where trucks will come do illegal tricks and things. I think the arc thrift store needs some regulations to make the exterior more appealing and result in less litter. Thanks!
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	I like many aspects of the Denver Area West plan including the plans to improve walkability and bike-ability, additional focus on greenspace and urban trees, providing better access to healthy food options with more proximate grocery stores, implementing the BID partnership designed to revitalize the West Colfax corridor which is a great step to beautifying the area while making it safer for families. I struggle with supporting additional low income housing in this area because adding more will continue to contribute to the already relatively high volume of crime in this neighborhood; we have multiple low income housing establishments in West Colfax to begin with. Please reference study below finding a statistically significant relationship between low income housing benefits, this in the form of a voucher, and increases in crime especially among males: "Results indicate that voucher receipt causes a large increase in violent crime arrests for male recipients" (https://economics.nd.edu/assets/153486/carr_jillian_jmp.pdf). I also do not support high rise buildings planned with these developments referenced in this plan due to their lack of aesthetic appeal and unnatural disruption of the beauty of Denver including the view of the mountains. The effects of adding low income housing and therefore more criminal activity, loss of aesthetic appeal, and lower quality of life will be counterintuitive to our efforts to bring investors to the area who would otherwise prospectively bring more vitality to the neighborhood with small businesses and grocery stores for our current and future families. Please do not add more low income housing in West Colfax.	Can you keep any additional low income housing plans out of West Colfax please? Is there anything being done about the vandalism on W Colfax (graffiti, broken windows on store fronts, etc.)? Additionally, is the city doing anything to clean up the homeless problem along W Colfax Ave especially near the intersection of W Colfax & Sheridan? I consistently find trash and needles on the ground, people on drugs or sleeping along Sloan's Lake or in the alleys especially around the 7-11's on W Colfax Ave (I've seen them in my alley too), my/neighbors' packages continually stolen, homes/cars getting broken into, etc. By eliminating these problems the safety and vitality of the neighborhood will improve. I think providing these people in need with opportunities to do simple tasks that would afford them some form of income, perhaps sponsored by the government, like picking fruits/vegetables on a farm, picking up litter in the city, etc. could create cleaner/safer streets and financial independence and sense of meaning for these folks while they also contribute to society. I recommend inviting community members with security cameras on their properties provide you with video evidence of anything in question.
I don't support the draft plan.	reading between the lines, people don't want anything to change. "preserve and protect" and "affordable" are mutually exclusive. stuffing all the density along arterials is not equitable. why do apartment dwellers have to live along six-lane highways with all the noise and air pollution while home owners enjoy plentiful, free parking and quiet streets? that's BS. spread the density around. legalize small apartments everywhere. legalize corner stores on every corner. build protected bike lanes so people don't have to drive everywhere.	in response to inequitable decision making in past decades we've established processes which guarantee failure of any new ideas.
I fully support the draft plan.		On top of everything else I'm very thankful for the Pickleball courts coming to Sloans. My only request is to consider adding additional pickleball courts in other areas of the West Colfax neighborhood. It is a fantastic sport that is conducive to pick-up play and brings communities together. Furthermore, people are healthier and happier because just about anybody can play and play well fairly quickly at low cost. I would love to see a league started and I would not only participate but I would also help organize tournaments and clinics.
I mostly support the draft plan.	The factors of the plan are sound.. However I would add some detail that does not seem addressed. I live in the Sloans area and I observe the community on a daily basis. 1. There are hundreds of dog walkers in the Sloans area and it would be great for the community to have a dog park area where the community comes together when walking their dogs. 2. Recreational use of the water should be expanded as it has been in the past which also brings the community together.	1. Has there been any thought to adding a music pavilion to the Sloans park? 2. Can we modernize and expand the basketball facilities? 3. Can the maintenance area on the southwest corner of Sloans be cleaned up? 4. Concessions or a restaurant would seem to do well in the buildings at Sloans, are there plans?
I mostly support the draft plan.		It is really disappointing the west area plan calls for reduced density below what blueprint denver calls for in West Colfax despite the rapidly evolving conversation around the deep impact density has on urban affordability and climate. A light rail corridor running immediately adjacent to an urban neighborhood is (unfortunately) unique in Denver and we should seek to exploit the infrastructure investment as much as possible instead of continuing to pander to those who fear development.

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	The plan is presented very well and looks great but some of the content is confusing. For example the plan goes against blueprint Denver recommendations of higher density in mass transit locations as pertaining to the knox station in the villa park neighborhood. North of 10th should be medium density minimum, if not medium-high in my opinion. This will create more use of that station which will cause RTD to support that station with security more - as it is now it has not been very safe - I had to break up a fight there a couple months ago.	What is the schedule for final release of this plan?
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	I don't think the strategies for mitigating displacement are outlined well here. How does this reflect on years of data and engagement around displacement with the WDRC survey?	I think this needs to better integrate what the goals of RNOs are. How can this be where top down and grassroots meet? Also, the document is fairly hard to read from a graphic stand point. It's not as good as some of the other NPI documents.
I don't support the draft plan.	I can't believe it took three years and countless thousands of hours to produce a plan that does nothing but enshrine the status quo in minute detail. What does this plan change that isn't already part of the conversation and possible without it? Every single idea addressed here is already part of general city plans. Nothing is being changed from the direction it's already going.	The planning process is utterly broken.
I fully support the draft plan.	I support the West Area plan - and proudly contributed to KEY elements of it with the RIVER SISTERS CIRCLE Initiative. I am however deeply disappointed that there is not acknowledgement of the grass-roots organizers that kept this effort alive throughout the pandemic. You include the River Sisters Circle living policy statement verbatim, which is a big accomplishment but there needs to be some kind of acknowledgment of the people that make up this effort (Alfredo Reyes, Nita Gonzales, Adrianna Abarca, Stella Madrid, Lisa Saenz, Solicia Lopez, Jenny Santos, Jorge Figueroa, Paul Hellmund). OTHERWISE, it's PLAGIARISM and it risks co-opting a grassroots movement when financial investments are made in these areas. If our intellectual property is included and leveraged for resources, we MUST have a seat at the table and acknowledged as contributors.	Over the last three years it has been the LATINO CULTURAL ARTS CENTER and EL LABORATORIO that have keep this vital aspect of the plan - environmental justice and indigenous stewardship alive. Yet there is no mention of us. The impression is that the RIVER SISTERS CIRCLE is led by the City and County of Denver, Metro Wastewater, Mile High Flood District, Greenway Foundation, Trout Unlimited, and Colorado Conservation Board, which we know is obviously not the care. They are part of the puzzle for sure, but they are NOT Rivers Sisters. We very much look forward to building on this incredible opportunity for the City and People of Denver.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	Why in gods name would you alter the future places map south of paco Sanchez park, north of 10th between federal and knox????? Go back to the input you received when developing blueprint.... We need higher density near transit nodes!!! Medium high at the very least! Don't keep denver in the Stone Age! Higher density for future places in that area!!!!!! Don't move backwards after all the work we did for blueprint!	Why are you altering blueprint suggestions to LOWER DENSITY AROUND TRANSIT??? We gave all kinds of input when developing blueprint and you are basically going backward with these changes. M Move forward!!!!
I mostly support the draft plan.	Higher density between 10th and the park	
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	We need more housing around the west line stations and parks. More people want to live by those so buildings need to be closer and higher and more plentiful.	
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	Can we get more housing stock near paco Sanchez park	

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>I live in the Valverde neighborhood and believe that your plan will fail to achieve its desired outcomes for a few reasons. My take on the following is from the Valverde proposal.</p> <p>Reading the Blueprint 2040 plan and some of the other west area draft plans i think that your proposals do not go far enough when it comes to addressing housing inequities in one of the poorest areas of the city and as a result will result in underdevelopment of the area by investors and the city and state for the foreseeable future and will ensure that the housing stock that is here will become very unaffordable for vulnerable demographics.</p> <p>Right now: -Rental Rates are climbing upwards of 16+% annually for the past 2 years. -With the new landlord inspection laws (Especially in this area), you can reasonably expect that around 40 percent of the housing units in this area will not pass thus taking housing stock off line and driving up demand. -As landlords rehab these units and put them back online, rental rates will climb drastically for these units as the landlords will aim to recoup their capital expenditures.</p> <p>In reading the plans, i noticed that you have posed upwards of 8 stories on the corner of federal and alameda ... Going east on alameda to broadway those numbers fluctuate from anywhere between 8 stories to as low as 3-4. I believe there are a few 3-4 story properties that are in approval processes right now with one underway. -A vast majority of that alameda corridor has rather small lot sizes to warrant any actual development of which your office aims to achieve the "Central Corridor" area feel</p> <p>-a cap on the number of stories along with small lot sizes and setback requirements and add in the fact that most of these sites were/are mechanics shops and tire shops that will require huge capital expenditures to remediate and will not prove to be financially advantageous for any developer in their right mind. -Since little to none of these areas are opportunity zones there isn't a developer who would want to touch these sites.</p> <p>-The same could be said for the federal proposal running north from alameda to north of 6th.</p>	<p>I know the plan aims to maintain the look and feel of the neighborhood by limiting development and addressing displacement...</p> <p>No one that currently lives here is going to care about the look and feel of the neighborhoods and the roof lines and whether they're low/ medium residential if they cant afford to live here. Limited redevelopment here will ensure that wealthier individuals that cant afford to live in the sloans lakes or broadways will buy homes here rapidly accelerate gentrification.</p> <p>Rezone now, build up, dramatically boost housing supply, require affordable housing stock + owner occupant units if you want to ACTUALLY ensure that this area remains culturally diverse and not another Sloans lake.</p>
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	I don't think the plan goes far enough at all to seriously address the growth that Denver has experienced. The fact that there are still huge areas that will remain Single Family Zoning is negligent. The plans will say things about supporting missing middle but then clarify it with stupid qualifiers like "only on corner lots." It doesn't make any sense and won't meaningfully address the problem of there not being enough housing being built in our city.	<p>My most important priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Get rid of Single Family Zoning *Change the requirement for building only being allowed on 6,000 sq ft. lots. *The city should hire more people to help regular people and not only developers to build. <p>Afterall, homeowners live where they are building. They probably have more a stake in what is happening in their own neighborhood yet we create so much red tape that it effectively keeps average folks from helping with the housing crisis.</p>
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	You are literally changing the "Future Places" map to the PAST places. Blueprint fixed a GLARING problem of having a lack of density around light rail stations... It was awesome! Now, you want to RETURN THE FUTURE PLACES MAP TO THE PRE BLUEPRINT SUGGESTIONS OF LOWER DENSITY??? The irony of adjusting a future places map to a PAST place is strong. HIGHER DENSITY NORTH OF 10TH NEAR THE PARK!!!! BLUEPRINT FIXED THIS AFTER ALL KINDS OF FEEDBACK AND YOU ARE MOVING ASS BACKWARDS WITH THIS PLAN!!!! THINK WITH YOUR HEAD! PEOPLE WANT TO LIVE NEAR THE LIGHT RAIL SO WE NEED HIGHER DENSITY NEARBY, NOT JUST THE CLOSEST INTERSECTION!	
I mostly support the draft plan.	I would love to see more urban density of amenities from mass transit, to parks, to housing to retail, but less cars. Cars are too inefficient to scale and are dangerous both for air quality and collisions. They take up way to much space to allow for walkable dence but open neighborhoods. Denver is not a whole lot more open than Manhattan, in spite of its lower density because of its higher car usage. And trying to make a neighborhood car friendly is futile. It is way easier to discourage care usage than to solve parking and traffic.	How big will new building be allowed to be. Any plans for BRT, or additional rail?
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	Villa Park needs more commercial businesses like coffee shops, sit down eating choices, etc.	

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I don't support the draft plan.	<p>There seems to be little or no correspondence with people who actually live on the west side. Few residents of the west side have actually participated in this process and given feedback. Unfortunately its the same people who manage the neighborhood organizations who have had input and don't reflect our community makeup or needs. None of my neighbors were even aware of this plan. Have you sent anything to our homes via mail? Any direct community outreach to the residents? Stop wasting our tax dollars on bloated studies with the same people speaking on our behalf. Y'all should be ashamed.</p>	<p>Clean Barnum Park, maintain it like wash park. Do the same for the roads, schools, and businesses. We want equality nothing else. Until that happens nothing matters.</p>
I mostly support the draft plan.	<p>My comments are mostly regarding Barnum/West Arnumb Where I live. Basically I don't think this plan goes far enough.</p> <p>I really want a downtown barnum. I just don't think you're going far enough. We need it to be so much more walkable and pedestrian and bike friendly. That's what makes areas like South Pearl POP off. I don't see any awesome plans - benches aren't going to make downtown barnum walkable and friendly.</p> <p>I really want a few things that I can't find exactly in the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stop signs at EVERY intersection inside of the neighborhoods. So many of the side streets (not talking about Federal or Alameda) people fly through. We need to narrow these streets, add sidewalks, and have stop signs on EVERY corner inside the neighborhood. It's dangerous to walk about barnum right now. I think if you wanted to take it even further you could follow what Detroit did and add multiple speed bumps every block throughout the neighborhood - if DETROIT can do this, so can Denver. - Weir Gulch trail needs to be expanded and have safer street crossings. I would prefer the roads to simply end in dead ends where trail crosses the street (for example, crossing Meade St: where the trail crosses the road currently, the road should just end in both directions. It wouldn't even be an inconvenience to people who live there, they simply have to drive an extra half block and it would make their street much much safer). IF this isn't possible (it is, but sadly I see cars chosen over neighborhoods all the time), I think the path across the street (not jsut at meade but every crossing) should be a raised crossing at sidewalk level so that cars have to slow down when crossing it. Also it is ridiculous that the pedestrians have to yield to cars when crossing the street on this trail - the cars should have a stop sign! - Somehow shut down 2nd Ave between King st and Knox ct so you can continue Weir Gulch Trail all the way. It's a horrible break in the trail. It would then be awesome to add in another light at 2nd and Knox so that pedestrians can continue the trail much more safely - it is very hard and dangerous to cross Knox and ruins weird gulch trail 	<p>My comments are mostly regarding Barnum/West Arnumb Where I live. Basically I don't think this plan goes far enough.</p> <p>I really want a downtown barnum. I just don't think you're going far enough. We need it to be so much more walkable and pedestrian and bike friendly. That's what makes areas like South Pearl POP off. I don't see any awesome plans - benches aren't going to make downtown barnum walkable and friendly.</p> <p>I really want a few things that I can't find exactly in the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stop signs at EVERY intersection inside of the neighborhoods. So many of the side streets (not talking about Federal or Alameda) people fly through. We need to narrow these streets, add sidewalks, and have stop signs on EVERY corner inside the neighborhood. It's dangerous to walk about barnum right now. I think if you wanted to take it even further you could follow what Detroit did and add multiple speed bumps every block throughout the neighborhood - if DETROIT can do this, so can Denver. - Weir Gulch trail needs to be expanded and have safer street crossings. I would prefer the roads to simply end in dead ends where trail crosses the street (for example, crossing Meade St: where the trail crosses the road currently, the road should just end in both directions. It wouldn't even be an inconvenience to people who live there, they simply have to drive an extra half block and it would make their street much much safer). IF this isn't possible (it is, but sadly I see cars chosen over neighborhoods all the time), I think the path across the street (not jsut at meade but every crossing) should be a raised crossing at sidewalk level so that cars have to slow down when crossing it. Also it is ridiculous that the pedestrians have to yield to cars when crossing the street on this trail - the cars should have a stop sign! - Somehow shut down 2nd Ave between King st and Knox ct so you can continue Weir Gulch Trail all the way. It's a horrible break in the trail. It would then be awesome to add in another light at 2nd and Knox so that pedestrians can continue the trail much more safely - it is very hard and dangerous to cross Knox and ruins weird gulch trail
I mostly support the draft plan.		

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>The vision of this plan is too vague and aspirational. As most, if not all, of the aspects of the plan look to be beneficial, there needs to be refinement and incorporations of details.</p> <p>These neighborhoods, especially Valverde, need to be prioritized. It is incredibly sad and heartbreaking to see the more affluent neighborhoods of Denver consistently maintained and cared for. The history of redlining seems to never have actually left or been addressed. These discriminatory practices continue to be a blight that is ignored by the city.</p> <p>The road conditions, especially the portions of Federal and Alameda that are in this neighborhood, are abysmal.</p> <p>Crossing Federal and Alameda, which are identified in the plan as the most efficient means of crossing the neighborhood, can be a terrifying game of Frogger. A pedestrian bridge would help, but even more so removing a lane and creating more walkable space and protected bike lanes would be better. Trying to ride a bicycle on either one of these roads (not illegally on the sidewalk) is a death wish. If you don't get hit by a car, you will likely run over one of the many deep and massive potholes that consistently plague these roads. Details are important. Merely implementing "bike lane installations" as the plan states will be ineffective unless actual thought and investment is made. Striping one side of a road does not make a road bikeable. It must be protected, and in a condition void of debris, drainages, and other hazards.</p> <p>The sidewalks are incredibly narrow (when they exist at all), and are not buffered by vegetation like the ones in richer neighborhoods. There is no effective traffic calming such as speed humps or traffic circles in the residential areas. It would be cost effective to address multiple deficiencies at once. For example, when the lead pipes are finally replaced, it would be a prime opportunity to create traffic circles and speed reducers when the roads have to be repaved anyways.</p> <p>The alleys are always full of trash, not matter often residents try to keep them clean since the city ignores them.</p> <p>Identifying opportunities is not enough. This area needs to be prioritized with actual deadlines and accountability. Valverde, and I'm sure other surrounding neighborhoods, has been ignored for too long.</p> <p>Valverde needs a higher focus. As written, the plan discusses this neighborhood last, further illustrating how little the city continues to value and care. More thought and elaboration is needed in the final section, Implementation. Only three pages out of 287 of the document is dedicated to actually describing how this vision will/could/probably won't/just being hopeful/might be implemented!</p>	<p>Year after year, Valverde seems to be last in line for city infrastructure improvements. We are still using the issued water pitchers because the lead pipes have yet to be replaced. The roads are always in disrepair. Trash is more abundant than other neighborhoods. The food desert needs to be addressed (ironic when a King Soopers distribution site is in the neighborhood sending food away from the place that needs it the most). Why does Denver turn a blind eye to the less affluent neighborhoods?</p> <p>Resources must be dedicated to implementing the hopes of these plans. If plan components are only initiated and enacted through the private sector, nothing will be accomplished here. Money stays where money is.</p>
I mostly support the draft plan.		Can we use encroachments for gardening? For example, currently there is unused space all along both sides of Ellsworth Avenue as encroachments. If we could use this for gardening or growing trees, it would support existing initiatives in the plan.
I mostly support the draft plan.		What does the dark pink indicator "community corridor" mean? I have a house on Zenobia and it looks like you're proposing 5 stories when this area is mostly all one story single family homes currently. That seems like quite a hight difference.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	It was mentioned at several 1 to 1's that it would be nice if there was a comprehensive dog park in the plans, but we do not see any dog parks!	It would be nice if you could incorporate some dog parks or at least 1.
I fully support the draft plan.		
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>We are in need of a recreation center at the West Bar-Val-Wood park.</p> <p>30 some years ago the was money earmarked for the Recreation center with a swimming pool!</p> <p>This would HELP alleviate the youth getting in trouble.</p> <p>Yet to this day NO one knows what happened to the project or monies.</p> <p>However the WDA plan is a chance to rectify the situation as our youth in our elderly need a place to go for recreational activities.</p>	The rec center could also host a mini health services center.

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I mostly support the draft plan.		<p>I have specific feedback about the neighborhood that I feel should be addressed in the draft plan. Some of this may already be in there in one way or another, but some is not. Regardless, I hope this feedback will be considered in helping to uplift Denver West. I am a homeowner in Valverde, for what it's worth, so my focus is on this particular neighborhood.</p> <p>Close off neighborhood residential streets to business/commercial traffic (and enforce it/give residents an easy way to record and report violations - there is already a sign on Tejon between Cedar and Maple forbidding semi trucks, but they use it anyway, seemingly without consequence).</p> <p>Convert parking on residential streets adjacent to parks to permit-only for residents (and enforce it).</p> <p>Speed bumps on residential streets and through streets (like Tejon).</p> <p>Better policing - gunshots, illegal vehicles (including non-street legal motorbikes, ATVs, vehicles with expired registration, vehicles with no mufflers adding to air and noise pollution, etc.), homeless encampments and dilapidated RVS, etc. are plaguing this neighborhood.</p> <p>Hold commercial businesses accountable for noise and air pollution (King Soopers, Owens-Corning, Motorcycle shops, etc.) - the air is bad enough with being between 6th Ave. and I-25. Large manufacturing businesses are adding significantly to this problem and don't seem to be doing much about it. From food production smells to noise to general air pollution, something should be done to mitigate the impacts of these nuisances to our residents.</p> <p>Plant more trees - anywhere and everywhere as long as they can be properly cared for and maintained. Green canopies. Greenways. Partner with local businesses to get more trees onto their properties, especially the larger manufacturers that produce air and noise pollution like King Sooper's on Tejon, or Ownes-Corning on Bayaud.</p> <p>Make better use of the area near the Platte River - improve Valverde Park (it's mostly an astroturf baseball field right now - we can do better, maybe partner with the Denver Animal</p>
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>I'm an eviction-defense attorney who's had a number of clients in this area. This plan is not going to create enough new housing to absorb both newcomers and existing residents. Existing low-income residents will get pushed out as a result of this plan. City government knows this and does it anyway.</p> <p>"We have to block new housing to preserve naturally occurring affordability." Don't urinate on our legs and tell us it's a precipitation event. 1,000-sqft homes in this area are already selling for a half-million dollars.</p>	<p>Stop privileging people in this process who won't be around in 20 years to deal with the fallout of these disastrous decisions to keep new housing illegal, force car dependency, and promote involuntary displacement.</p>
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>With city permission, in my opinion. I believe zoning street poles shouldn't have be this way. I believe people should ask questions instead of taking it down. Should contact people of the flyer instead taking it down.</p>	<p>Why, is zoning is an issue to city?</p> <p>I'm unsastified this Denver. This city, pushing too many limits. I don't like fact is issue to everyone.</p> <p>Posting lost dogs signs, I usually see on light pole. So, what if person looking for people to help find missing pets? I'm saying it, because we assume city is taking things down, that make other people felt down.</p>

What is your level of support for the plan draft?	If you answered "I don't support the draft plan" or "I support some aspects of the draft plan but not others," please share your thoughts and concerns in the box below.	Questions or additional comments about the draft West Area Plan or the planning process can be shared below.
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	I find the proposed bike network far too fragmented. I support the proposed additions to bikeways, but I still feel they are inadequate. It still feels like biking will be deprioritized for the convenience of car users. The city needs to prioritize the pedestrian, transit and bike users on its streets in order to encourage those modalities, make them the best and most common ways to get around the city, and to transform the city into a place that is livable for people. In order to support biking there needs to be a continuous protected bike lane on a North-South corridor and an East-West corridor. The current configuration doesn't provide enough connectivity within the neighborhood or to other neighborhoods of the city. Ideally these protected bike corridors would be placed directly along commercial zones, in order to maximize bike accessibility and commercial activity.	
I mostly support the draft plan.	more roundabouts please, esp at 13th and perry st	
I mostly support the draft plan.	I want to make sure that all the transit stations have shelter for the elements and comfortable places to sit and wait for transit (not nasty anti-homeless folks architecture)	
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	The plan needs to increase emphasis on alternative modes of transit. Improving public transit infrastructure and access to it is essential. Increase density near light rail stops. Create protected bikeways to the stops. Increase pedestrian safety. Increase density so that people can live closer to transit and grocery.	
I don't support the draft plan.	The plan maps indicate 12+ height for buildings in Sun Valley, including properties between Lakewood Gulch and 8th Avenue. We have had significant planning meetings and discussions over the last 10 years and the only area that there was approval for 12+ height buildings was between Lakewood Gulch to the north to the Bronco stadium. The language in the plan seems to reinforce this position (higher buildings closer to the stadium), but the drawings do not follow the language in the plan.	
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	<p>1.Max Height Allowance: Oppose the W. Area Maximum Building Heights Recommendations map (P.175) and any other depiction or language that increases the max height between 9th and 13th to "Beyond 12 stories." Support a recommendation for the maintenance of the existing zoning heights between 9th and 13th with the exception that "a maximum of 12 stories" be allowed if affordable housing is included</p> <p>PLEASE RESPECT SUN VALLEY AND ITS COMMUNITY.</p> <p>2.Neighborhood Elementary School: Recommend that specific language be added to emphasize the importance of keeping the neighborhood elementary school in Sun Valley</p> <p>4.Climate Action and Green Infrastructure: Add language related to Climate Action and Green Infrastructure to reflect the Sun Valley's Climate Action Rapid Assessment results. Strengthen language to directly address the negative impacts already experienced by heat island affect, noise and air pollution that if not addressed, will only get worse with increased density.</p> <p>5.Rude Recreation Center facility expansion: Add the recommendation to expand Rude Recreation Center facility to accommodate the service demand that will result from residential population growth both in Sun Valley and surrounding neighborhoods served by this regional facility.</p> <p>7.Preservation: Xcel Zuni Steam Plan for renovation and reuses to serve the neighborhoods in West Denver.</p> <p>8.Active uses along S. Platte River: Support active uses along the South Platte River and oppose any additional electric substations along the River</p>	
I support some aspects of the draft plan but not thers.	The plan enshrines the status quo. Car-dependent low density housing remain so. All density is squeezed along arterials where it already is.	