

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>•Acknowledgments page: oDecide what order to list Task Force members in. Alphabetical seems appropriate. oPlease identify chair & vice-chair of Planning Board oI wish there was a way to recognize Brad Buchanan in the acknowledgments. I'm not sure how to do that appropriately.</p>	Document Usability	Email
<p>Tracking the completion of the Denver Moves plans at a high level would be an excellent way to show the trajectory of implementation and highlight if investment levels are sufficient to complete the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks in a reasonable time. Today, we tend to focus too narrowly, talking about what gets done in a year, rather than having a perspective as to the rate of change towards the network goals as our primary measurement. Elevating this into regular Blueprint Denver reviews would allow a more strategic perspective.</p>	Document Usability	Internal
<p>DPW may be able to recommend additional high-level metrics worth tracking in regular reviews, such as “pavement quality index,” which is important to mobility of all modes.</p>	Document Usability	Internal
<p>Please include a table of contents with page numbers. The “About This Plan” section provides section numbers and no way to quickly access a section or map by page number instead it requires lots of scanning of going back and forth to find what you’re looking for.</p>		
<p>Please include one or two Denver Moves: Transit Plan maps because Blueprint Denver’s goals and recommendations reference terms that need maps from the Denver Moves: Transit Plan to understand them. You shouldn’t have to have both plans open to fully understand Blueprint Denver.</p>	Document Usability	Online Survey
<p>missing middle housing - the wording is too vague and there is concern about negative impacts to historic fabric of neighborhoods, Concerns about lack of clear guidance and possibly incentivizing scrapes(page 82) Clear about the intent should be density/intensity with out full demolition - need additional guidance</p>	Document Usability	Task Force
<p>For maps, particularly transportation maps, it would be helpful to have insets of downtown for readability</p>	Document Usability	Task Force
<p>There can be downsides to allowing an interactive map where someone can navigate to their property.</p>	Document Usability	Task Force
<p>split out all equity maps for appendix - Rachel</p>	Equity	Internal
<p>Rachel re run jobs to have wage diversity and total jobs - Checking with OED first</p>	Equity	Internal
<p>Definitions for Equity and Health Equity: Please find below the recommended definition from DDPHE Office of Health Equity, which should be consistent across both Blueprint Denver and the Comprehensive Plan:Equity is when everyone, regardless of who they are or where they come from has the opportunity to thrive. (Source: Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment)Please pull this definition out more prominently on page 30, as it is currently hidden among the images and difficult to readHealth equity means that everyone has a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible. (Source: Metro Denver Partnership for Health)Equality means providing the same set of resources or services to all people, regardless of their starting place.” (Source: CO Office of Health Equity, 2018). Health equity practice intentionally supports policies, delivers public services and allocates resources to advance health equity and eliminate institutional biases and barriers. Historically underserved / historic barriers (see page 36). DDPHE’s Office of Health Equity advises to use “historic and present barriers” language that doesn’t trivialize current barriers that Denver residents still face today, while also acknowledging that there are also historic barriers that have negatively impacted populations for long periods of time. Equity terms should be defined, used consistently throughout the plan, and not used interchangeably, including but not limited to equity, health equity, social equity, diversity, inclusion, etc. For example, the term “social equity” is used on page 28 as interchangeable with equity, but is never defined.</p>	Equity	Internal
<p>On page 54 - We recommend emphasizing affordability and the cost of living in this section as a means to assist with access and displacement. It would be good to call out how displacement increases health disparities because it increases stress puts people farther from their work and schools and contributes to our growing homeless population in Denver.</p>	Equity	Internal
<p>P 44-45 – this map is pretty vague and unclear – it is not clear to me if the dark green area is where we need to diversify jobs or if it is the light green areas? If it is the dark green area, I would take issue with downtown needing greater job diversity. If it is the lighter green areas, many of those are primarily residential, so that doesn’t make a lot of sense. Since most of the city is green, this really doesn’t tell me much.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Include the equity subcommittee of the task force in the implementation matrix for accountability purposes</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Pages 31-45 – no mention on how those concepts (access to opportunity, etc) should be utilized in the plan. Important to be in the plan but also needs clarity so they are not misinterpreted in the future.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>P 54-55 – this seems very skeletal and incomplete still.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Recommend equity questions be listed as part of using an equity lens</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Complete Neighborhoods are critical. Those neighborhoods that are already complete are in high demand-which results in too much pressure on them). If all neighborhoods were complete, the impact would be spread out. Need to have pushback on neighborhoods that resist change at the detriment of other areas. This includes affordable housing and businesses in every neighborhood. Need ADUs and parking maximums. Vulnerability to Displacement measure is flawed.</p>	Equity	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Deep dive into equity was a great start. Plan will not be set in stone-implementation is key step. How can we bring communities to the table in an authentic and meaningful way, not just the people who can show up to evening meetings. Look at equity analysis from subcommittee.</p>	Equity	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>How do you use and apply the equity recommendations and how can we make it clearer to a plan reader?</p>	Equity	Task Force

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
It's clear where we want poor areas of the city to change but it is unclear where the affluent areas are going to change. Where does the map say that areas with access to opportunity should take on affordable housing?	Equity	Task Force
Housing diversity map should have more of a gradient for clarity	Equity	Task Force
Jobs map is still unclear. Make sure the color ramp means the same thing between the jobs and housing maps	Equity	Task Force
Vulnerability to Displacement: concerned about the use of Median household income as opposed to using households who are cost burdened (spending more than 30% of income on housing). Burden may be a more accurate measure of individuals vulnerable to displacement and it will show households in areas that appear to be less vulnerable to change in the map. Maybe add that as a separate map in the appendix?	Equity	Task Force
Added verbiage about affordability vs attainability. Be more specific about promoting homeownership	Equity	Task Force
oThere is an opportunity to strengthen language/data that links climate change to equity and to the disproportionate impact of climate disruption on already underserved populations.	Equity	Task Force
Equity maps are blending general factors, which can lead to some questions. Can appendix map each individual factor contributing to equity maps?	Equity	Task Force
We don't specifically talk about PEOPLE in the households themselves. Incorporating this into implementation could be a really important step	Equity	Task Force
someone else noted at the Task Force that they found a term defined in the Blueprint Denver glossary that is not otherwise used in the plan. I chuckled because I also found the same thing, but with a different term: Community Land Trust is in the glossary which caught my eye, but then on searching, I couldn't find it in the plan. (I did find one mention in the Comp Plan, and so I assume the glossary is being shared between the two documents, but haven't attempted to confirm.) . Might be worth a pass to ensure everything in the glossary is in the document, and maybe identify anything else that is defined in the text that can be copied over to also define in the glossary.	Glossary/Appendices	Email
<p>6. Revise definitions as follows:</p> <p>a. Equity and related definitions as noted in item 1 on this letter.</p> <p>b. Health analysis (page 298 in glossary): change to "Health Impact Assessment" - a tool that DDPHE has deployed in multiple neighborhood plans.</p> <p>c. Quality of Life - add to glossary</p> <p>d. Environmental Justice (page 297 in glossary) is spelled wrong.</p> <p>e. Food insecurity/food access definitions should include "healthy, affordable, and culturally-relevant" in definitions.</p> <p>f. Community Land Trust (page 297 in glossary) is mentioned in glossary but never mentioned in the plan. Add this into the Housing section (page 80-87).</p> <p>g. Update DDPHE in implementation matrix key (PDF page 155) to Denver Department of Public Health & Environment (word "public" was left out).</p>	Glossary/Appendices	Internal
We appreciate the addition of relating implementation strategies to goals and the implementation matrix in the appendix to clarify and prioritize implementation strategies, as well as implementation partners and responsible parties. We understand that strategies will continue to grow and develop during the tenure of this plan, but we encourage continued prioritization and evaluation of which strategies are to be pursued, and when, and by whom. We recommend establishing a cross-departmental advisory team to evaluate and prioritize strategies on a regular basis and would gladly offer a representative from DDPHE to serve on this strategy prioritization team.	Glossary/Appendices	Internal
Because the plan is robust and extensive, the implementation matrix is important in determining which policies and strategies will move forward earlier, and which later. We did want to point out that nearly all the strategies related to design quality and neighborhood character, such as establishing design standards for projects of a certain scale across contexts or encouraging the retention of smaller, more affordable homes, are in the more delayed 4-10 year category. We understand that not everything can happen simultaneously, but urge you to move some of this work sooner given the very current concerns about design quality in this building cycle. Pairing the appropriate design quality and preservation strategies with some of the growth, land use and housing strategies in terms of timing and implementation will lead to much better outcomes with fewer unintended consequences.	Glossary/Appendices	Letter
<p>More generally speaking,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It would be helpful for you to include an organizational chart with the Implementation matrix. Who holds this together? •Consideration should be given to the suggestion at the end of the last meeting that there be an appointed board to advise and support Blueprint implementation. This is especially important given that successful implementation will require intense collaboration between agencies that have a natural tendency to focus inwardly. Also, it might help to buffer Blueprint from the disruption of election cycles. 	Glossary/Appendices	Task Force
Under General Land Use & Built Form recommendations, policy 8, remove "explore" and keep "require" EV charging stations to match the stated commitment in the 80x50 Climate Action Plan.	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Internal
Recommendation - Design Quality-Mixed Use and Main Street Areas. Thank you for including Main Street along with Mixed Use in the Problem Identification statement. On Page 102, Recommendation 3.F, please change the word "abutting" to "in close proximity to". This will address issues where an alley or residential street separates a mixed or main street building from low-density homes that may not necessarily "abut" the mixed/main street building, but are in close proximity and require transition	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
Page 102 strategies E. F. G. should apply to MX and MS. Policy F, change "abut: to "are adjacent to"	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
Many of the recommendations rightly focus on new tools and future efforts, but we would also like to see the plans affirm a continued commitment to the city's existing historic districts, while also encouraging new designation, as well as incentivizing the adaptive reuse and preservation of structures with tools beyond designation, as described on page 104 and throughout Chapter Three.	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Additionally, on pages 102 and 103, pertaining to centers and corridors, there is little mention of historic preservation, which can be equally important in mixed-use areas as it is in residential neighborhoods. In many cases preserving existing buildings can do as much or more to support exceptional design outcomes as establishing design standards or zoning requirements. We'd like to see a strategy related to identifying important mixed-use historic structures, and encouraging their continued use or adaptive reuse, whether in generally "historic areas," or in areas of mixed-age development, such as corridors that have both old and new structures.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
<p>P 102-103, items 03-04: there is nothing here about providing pocket parks or plazas, or decreasing "build-to" requirements when if it would improve the pedestrian experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 03G – define massing variability. This is vague; e.g., is it a 5' differential, a 20' differential, or 50'? Item 03H – need to give direction here on intent. Is it access to sky, or is it intended to regulate solar access and mountain views? If misinterpreted, this could be used to really restrict vertical development. Item 03I – love this idea. Item 04A – do not agree with a complete prohibition on ground floor residential. It is very difficult to have continuous retail or other active commercial space everywhere on ground floors. And, if residential is allowed, is there a residential setback for buffering/greenspace. Also, does residential use include common area for a residential building? Need to clarify. Item 04C – very supportive of this concept. 	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
<p>P104, item 06C – is it also possible to allow flexibility in non-life safety building code requirements to foster adaptive re-uses?</p>	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
<p>Should add language that says respect views, privacy and light. What will happen inbetween this Blueprint and NPI plans?</p>	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>We call for language similar to "Preserve historic character and design including historic flagstone sidewalks, and develop policies for continued use of flagstone in historically designated areas where this is a valued part of the area character" be added into policy 2 on page 99 of Blueprint Denver under "Ensure residential neighborhoods retain their unique character as infill development occurs." Flagstone sidewalks deserve mention as much in the historic character section as in the mobility section.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Design Quality and Preservation	Letter
<p>Under the "Economics" section, we appreciate the support for locally-owned businesses. We recommend enhancing this to also provide support for community-serving businesses and organizations, particularly food-serving establishments that take SNAP benefits in areas of limited food access, by providing better access to navigation through city processes, multi-lingual resources, fee/fine waivers or reductions, and/or funding.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Internal
<p>P 92-93, item 04/05 – there is no discussion of small businesses other than the specific categories mentioned here – how do we foster the growth of small business in general?*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 04 – add artists in addition to creative industries and maker spaces. Item 04 C – add reduce rent and other costs of business. Item 05 – need to add a goal of supporting economic opportunity across Denver and a tactic about partner with organizations already undertaking this work. Item 06A add "education/training" after regulatory processes. Item 06C – at the very least, add "and economic opportunity." Bigger question is how does being a destination for healthy living tie into this section? Item 07, italicized paragraph – should we say Rocky Mountain region rather than just Colorado?. And, "tens of billions of dollars is vague – is there a more precise number?" 	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Letter
<p>The fostering of existing businesses and support of new businesses needs to be addressed through an equity lens in the plan</p>	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Letter
<p>Street parking is important for small business. Concerns about tree planting and impacts on business signage.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Plan does not address taxes needed to support the City. The plan should be more specific in terms of the economic impacts to the community.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>pg 92-93. Did not see anything about helping support small businesses, not just maker spaces. Request to broaden a bit</p>	Implementation: LUBF Economics	Task Force
<p>On map of NPI areas, add a note that we are not officially adopting this map and it could change through NPI</p>	Implementation: LUBF General	Internal
<p>A key aspect of equity in this plan will hinge on how, when, and why communities are engaged throughout the tenure of this plan. We would like this plan to establish strong commitments to equity in community engagement, including more concrete strategies to prevent involuntary displacement and to support community engagement in planning and policy-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under policy 10 of General Land Use & Built form recommendations (page 78): either add a strategy or combine into strategies B or C to enhance resources and capacity and require city projects/programs to provide multilingual and culturally-relevant resources to better deliver services to diverse populations and increase engagement. 	Implementation: LUBF General	Internal

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 01, Strategy A Recommended strategies for growth do not reference the need for following Neighborhood Plans Using zoning and land use regulations to encourage higher-density development MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should state: GROWTH MUST FOLLOW NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS. .	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 01, Strategy B Recommended strategy for large rezonings along transit corridors does not reference need for following Neighborhood Plans. Using zoning to encourage higher-density development along transit corridors MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should add: WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, FOLLOWING THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 02, Strategy A Recommended strategy for incentivizing density does not reference need for following Neighborhood Plans. Using incentives and requirements to encourage higher-density development MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should add: WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, FOLLOWING THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 11, Strategy A Recommended strategy for larger-scale legislative map amendments does not address what the public process would be. This approach of larger-scale legislative map amendments would be transformational, to the detriment of existing neighborhoods. A carefully considered public process would be needed to ensure a voice for all affected stakeholders. A plan for the public process should be included in this strategy, with reference to following NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS. While updated language improves upon the first draft, we believe this could be strengthened further.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Include the points of ensuring input from communities of color, robust community engagement with benchmarks, use a race and social justice lens and/or the City's developing Race and Social Initiative, be intentional about inclusion and engagement of vulnerable populations who are most impacted. look at equity maps with legislative rezoning as an implementation measure in the matrix	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Chapter 3: WWPNA continues to object to broad-brush recommendations that do not differentiate between types of transit stations and areas where they are located. The Growth Strategy and Growth Strategy Map state that 80% of growth is to be focused downtown, e.g., in regional centers. However, lack of specificity in the recommendations creates the impression that all areas anywhere near any type of transit station area, high-capacity corridor or medium-capacity corridor are open for redevelopment. Words such as "adjacent to", "close to", in "transit-rich" areas (see e.g., General Recommendation No. 2) deeply concern WWPNA, as we are close to two major transit stations and to a third station intended as a neighborhood walk-up station. We renew our request that Item B of Recommendation No. 2 and the introductory language be revised to clarify that maximized development opportunities are to be directed to the regional centers and corridors and in the high-intensity downtown and urban center contexts areas identified in the Growth Strategy.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 07 How will sites be defined? Will RNOs be consulted in determining compatibility? We agree with this policy to facilitate compatible redevelopment of institutional sites within neighborhoods. How will such sites be identified? Will preservation of existing structures be an important component/requirement of redevelopment? Will RNOs and neighbors be consulted in determining what is considered "compatible"? This policy still needs to answer our questions.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
P 74-75, item 05B – how do you mandate affordable commercial spaces? This could discourage constructing commercial space altogether.	Implementation: LUBF General	Letter
I'm writing to support the ADU recommendations for Denver in your recent plan. I am a Denver native, growing up in North Denver - now known as the Highlands. I've seen the city, especially my neighborhood, grow and change quite a bit. The need for additional affordable housing is needed more than ever in the city. I believe ADU's can provide some of that relief. I own a small home on a large lot. An ADU would allow me to offer a home for rent, help with additional income, save me money on yard and water maintenance, and help me afford to stay in the city as I reach retirement. Currently, my house is not zoned for ADU's. One of the things I loved about growing up in North Denver was the diversity. Many families have moved out of the city for more affordable homes. I believe ADU's could help. If a homeowner has the option to build an ADU and stay in their home, it helps maintain the balance of people who live there. It's not just the more affluent moving in. I support the Blueprint adoption right away. I would love to start planning the addition to my property as soon as possible. I appreciate the work you are doing!	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
I am expressing my support for the recommendations for ADU's on page 84 of the suggested changes. ADU's are proving to provide low impact, affordable and usable housing in many markets. Their inclusion as legal dwelling units is having positive impact on many cities across North America. Denver should lead this movement. I would like to see these changes implemented as quickly as possible.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
Hello Planning Board - I was told that I could email Denver City Planners and weight in on whether I support accessory dwelling units becoming more accepted in Denver neighborhoods. I am a single mom living in Mayfair and would LOVE to have the option of building an ADU on my property to retire in some day when my daughter goes off to college and I am ready to downsize! This plan could help me rent out the big house to help pay for my daughter to attend college. As of right now my property does not have the proper zoning and was told it could be costly to change that. I think there are so many benefits to ADU's in our neighborhoods and that they could really solve a lot of housing issues as house prices rise to levels that become hard to manage with Denver salaries. I believe this is especially true for neighborhood that have enough street parking to handle more density, and a lot of Northeast Denver neighborhoods fit that bill. I have also been selling houses in Denver for 17 years and I have had so many clients that get excited about the idea of buying properties with ADU's, though a rare find.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
I fully support the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver I think that ADU's are the solution to Denver's housing needs. For both the higher rental prices and the need to senior family housing	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Denver needs to provide diverse housing options - including filling the gap of "missing middle" housing options that fall between high-density and single-unit houses. Denver Zoning Code needs to include 2-4 unit building forms that promote the quality of urban design and are mapped within 1/2 mile along transit corridors.</p> <p>I also support the use of Accessory Dwelling Units and eliminating limits to unrelated adults cohabiting in homes, especially as there are many single-unit homes where there could be adults living together in community or as friends, but as I understand is technically illegal now above a certain number of individuals. We need creative solutions to housing issues and less barriers. This is a specific request, but I'd like to see the intersection of York and 26th to be changed to add left-hand turning lanes from 26th onto York, as 26th seems to be used as an arterial road at least going westbound, so oftentimes, especially in the winter during rush hour, the road will clog up and drivers will then take 27th, a small road with just a stop sign in order to turn onto York, usually going south. It makes the side road more congested and dangerous and doesn't seem to really alleviate the traffic at 26th. It just seems hazardous and ineffective. Is there a way to add signage or redesign many of the intersections, like 16th and Park, where I see drivers nearly every day pulling into what should be the bike lane in order to make right turns? It seems people just want to turn wherever they feel like it and can't be bothered to wait, and the street design and markings on the road currently aren't dissuading drivers from just doing what they'd like. Some sort of system to slow down traffic on York, especially between 17th st and 40th would be really fantastic. The speed limit is 30 miles per hour but I regularly observe cars going down it, north and southbound, going at least 40 miles per hour. In light of the common collisions there, including one I heard happen on 2/25 at York and 26th and the fatal crash at 27th and York on Oct 13th 2018 (if a cause was determined I didn't hear it, but I wouldn't be surprised if speed had something to do with it), I really think that a redesign, maybe a median or more radar scanners that display speed should be added to slow the traffic down. I'm not sure all my comments are in the purview of Blueprint, but I hope they are considered by the city in any case.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>My husband and I currently own a home in the Platt Park neighborhood. We support the adoption of Blueprint Denver, especially the ADU recommendations. We strongly support the broad and immediate adoption of ADUs to increase housing density in a progressive, independent, and demand driven manner. We also feel that ADUs provide the unique solution of increasing housing density without sacrificing a neighborhood's character. ADUs provide better housing accessibility and increases supply of housing within Denver. Lastly, we strongly feel it is the right of a homeowner to construct an ADU on their own property whether that ultimate use will be for out-of-town family, renters, or short-term bookings.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 02, Strategy A-1 Concern with implications of adding density at corner lots along collector streets, Oart 1. The idea of allowing 2 to 4-unit buildings at corner lots along collector streets and along corridors or at centers would have unintended consequences: Incentivizing demolition and replacement of corner structures and those along corridors and at centers would transform the urban form of our city and eliminate the iconic corner lot and commercial node structures that give our neighborhoods their character. We can see examples of this along corridors like West 44th Avenue where the corner houses are being lost to new duplexes under the 2010 Zoning Code.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 06, Strategy A Concern with incentivizing additional height without following Neighborhood Plans. Height bonuses city-wide would conflict with adopted Neighborhood Plans. There must be requirements to work within the Neighborhood Context and following the Neighborhood Plan.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
<p>We, however, remain concerned that without more description of the intent related to strategy 02.A, which suggests adding 2- to 4-unit structures on collector streets or corner lots as an example, could exacerbate the loss of key, character-defining homes in our older neighborhoods. We believe the goal should be to add density without, or certainly with less, demolition. This not only sustains neighborhood character, but also reduces the waste lost in demolition and can support affordable housing goals by introducing new housing options within existing buildings. A solution could be to more closely tie the two bullet points under strategy 02.A.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
<p>Without limiting the generality of the above, WWPNA objects in particular to the language in Recommendation No. 2 - Hou ing that would allow duplexes, and in particular fourplexes, on the corners of collector streets in Low density residential areas. Allowing a duplex to replace an existing single-family home in a current SU only Low density zone may be tolerable on an arterial, but not on collector streets. There are sufficient numbers of comer arterial lots throughout Denver to allow the City to incrementally increase density in Denver neighborhoods, if indeed the number of units intended through all such neighborhoods is 900, as you indicated in our recent meeting. However, we entirely disagree with allowing fourplexes in an area presently zoned SU. Frankly, the West Washington Park and Speer neighborhoods already are shouldering their share (or more) of growth and density with the over 5,000 new housing units (including affordable and multi-unit housing) built or in the works in our community or on our exterior borders and the existing ADUs already on the ground here. If the City is truly concerned about equity, then please consider what is equitable to existing residents and limit anything more than a two-unit structure in an area currently mapped under Blueprint Denver for single-family homes only to comers on arterial streets, not collectors.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
<p>Recommendation No. 4 - Housing promotes ADUs in all zone districts and WWPNA continues to object to this. Many lots in WWP and Speer are 6,250 square feet or less - small compared to the 7,500 to 10,000 square lots existing in other Denver neighborhoods. The impact of this is that a 2-story ADU built across the alley (and our alleys are not as wide as residential streets) from one's property can and in many instances will totally deprive the other property owner of any privacy in their own backyard. As Denver becomes ever denser, we at WWPNA are hearing more push back from residents who see the quiet enjoyment in their own homes and backyards eliminated or materially reduced. Additionally, a 2-story ADU also may adversely impact solar access/panels of an abutting or across-the-alley neighbor. When we have held meetings with residents where a request for an ADU is at issue, lack of privacy, reduction of solar access and lost parking are the opposing issues we hear.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We suggest that rather than stating in the Plan that ADUs are permitted everywhere and then putting the onus on residents to reject this premise in neighborhood plans or with the Board of Adjustments in the event of applicant-driven proposed rezonings, the City adopt an approach used by other municipalities (see enclosed Zoning Summary of ADUs in Lakewood) and limit ADUs to areas zoned "D" or "E" or zone lots of 7,500 feet or more. Neighborhoods wishing to permit ADUs on smaller lots then can "opt in" to allow this in their neighborhood plans and maps. We also ask that the Plan be revised to prohibit ADUs on lots where an existing single-family home in an area mapped currently for only single-family homes is replaced with a two-unit or greater density structure. Allowing ADUs in this situation could thrust quadruple or greater density on our neighborhoods.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
P 84-85 general – we talk about aging in place but don't offer any specific policies on how to foster it.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 01 Will changes to city regulations include changes to zoning regulations on unit sizes and allowances for ADUs?	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 02, Strategies A-1 and A-2 Concern with implications of adding density at corner lots along collector streets, Part 2. Increasing density needs to follow the local context. What is the process for implementation if the increased density exceeds the current zoning?	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
P 84-85, item 04E – this item needs clarification	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
Redlines - page 82 - remove "to 4" (just state 2 unit structure) and change collector to Arterial from Policy 2 Strategy A. as we can not agree to allow a 4-unit structure where we worked so hard for SF homes zoning. Add "as provided in a small area plan, neighborhood plan or with significant neighborhood support" after the first sentence in the second sub-bullet.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
We also noted and support the changes in Chapter Three (page 82) that do more to clarify that introducing missing-middle housing can be done in a way that does not increase speculative demolition but does add housing units and options to our neighborhoods.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Letter
Concerned about ADUs detracting from the character of single unit areas. Consider using the ADU zoning and TU zoning we already have in place today before expanding ADUs. If we ADUs citywide, do it incrementally	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Office Hours
I wholeheartedly support the cottage zoning concept.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I would like to show my support of "cottage zoning" and more attainable housing in the Denver area.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Please consider cottage zoning in urban and urban edge zone districts. We need to add more units on the large lots in our inner ring suburbs.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Overall I believe the City is attempting to solve a number of policy issues. However, I do not believe the City has gone far enough to address Attainable Solutions. Expanding the viability of ADU is a start; however, they are very expensive to construct and hard to finance. The City should consider "Cottage Zoning" as a way to provide small lot housing within the existing neighborhoods. Cottage Zoning would allow owners to subdivide traditional larger SFD lots creating cost effective small cottage housing options. The interesting component is how Urban Cottages can be implemented throughout a large portion of Denver; without concentrated developments that really no longer exist.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I am a professor at the University of Denver in the Burns School of Real Estate and a homeowner/resident of the City and County of Denver. I fully support the Cottage Zoning (#CottageZoning) both professionally and personally. There is a huge need for attainable housing in the Denver metro market, and this initiative does a great job opening up many zoning opportunities to fill that need.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Agree with the conclusions of Blueprint 2040 but would also request that the concept of "Cottage Zoning" which is being discussed also be included as part of the solution to the attainable housing issue.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Overall I think this is a good plan for the city. We are growing and will continue to grow. We have to be proactive as a city and implement smart development. I believe that ADUs are an answer to the cities housing issues. They will help keep families in neighborhoods, they will allow more housing stock that will help with affordability, it's a great option for aging in place, it allows for additional income for some families to have an additional rental unit on their property. The current zoning is like a checkerboard and it's hard for homeowners to know if they can even build an ADU. I would like to see ADUs by right throughout the city. I would like to see the current code changed to allow a full 2-stories for ADUs. We are forcing people to build a larger footprint than they want to so they can have a comfortable living quarters above the garage. We have three ways to protect the neighbors from shading currently in the code and this is too much. Remove the 1.5 story rule, it doesn't make any sense! Many of the ADUs that have been built in the city so far have provided more parking. Many of the old garages in the city aren't even used for cars. When they build a garage apartment they provide living and parking space. I would also see higher density zoning near the light rail systems. More ADUs!!	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I really like the pro ADU stance of the blue print. I would hope that as the city rezones, that properties along transportation corridors would be given priority ADU rezoning attention. Any home along a bus route or a street with dedicated bike lanes should be allowed to build an ADU. Any home along a traffic collector is a target for redevelopment. Allowing ADUs on these corridors will preserve neighborhoods and increase the ROI of public and private development.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
We need to get rid of single family zoning in Denver. We live in a city that is fighting affordability issues. The only true solution to this is to get more housing supply. ADUs should be allowed on every lot. Minimum lot size restrictions should be eliminated. Seattle, Minneapolis and Boulder (among other cities) have all reduced or eliminated single family zoning. Blueprint does a great job of addressing alternative transportation solutions outside of cars but that does not good if we are pushing people to the suburbs. We need to allow for more density.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I think a lot of good work has occurred on this but feel very strongly that those of us that live in urban Denver should be allowed to have ADU's. I don't believe ADU's change the character of neighborhoods anymore than the very modern looking duplexes that are occurring everywhere. I live in Packard Hill Historic District which was contentious to say the least and limits what homeowners there can do with their existing structures. Allowing ADU's not only can assist with infill and smaller more affordable units but can also allow expansion on homes that otherwise have no room or are prohibited in other ways from expanding. This allows people to increase their existing square footage with a multiple use space that has the ability to serve their varying needs over time whether it be as a rental, to make room for aging parents, or even to act as their spouses separate space. I would strongly encourage this to be proposed as a more immediate solution and if needs to be phased in, I would strongly suggest that areas such as the Packard Hill Historic district be one of the first where it is allowed. They are allowed north of 38th but not south of 38th and could really assist in this neighborhood specifically.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Just a short note to let you know my support for your comprehensive plan to allow ADUs in Denver. I think at a minimum ADUs should be encouraged and allowed along transportation corridors. Specifically bus routes and streets with designated bike lanes. Allowing ADUs along transportation corridors is a win win win. The city will receive a greater return on its transportation investment, home owners along these corridors will be able to increase the value of their home and the charm and character of the neighborhood will be preserved.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I support the ADU recommendations in the draft. ADU's can support affordable housing, increase property values, support neighborhood diversity and more. ADU's also allow for people to live in neighborhoods with houses, not just apartment/condo complexes. They would help families afford to stay in the city by either building one on their property or living in one.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Want to note that it is incredibly important that ADUs are made a priority and that the constraints are such that they can be built cost effectively and consistently across the standard lots of Denver. Don't prioritize parking and give coverage exemptions only if the unit is above a garage, don't limit them to 1.5 stories, and allow them everywhere. These three small changes could make an incredible dent in affordability and limit gentrification but right now even developers and architects who want to build affordable or attainable units cannot get it done.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I would really like to see ADUs allowed throughout Denver including options for attached properties.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
My only thoughts as a homeowner are that "ADU's" should be greatly encouraged along bus routes and other busy transportation corridors.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I am in full support of the recommendations on p84 allowing ADUs in all areas of Denver, and removing the layers of barriers that make it difficult for home-owners to have one. The ADU is an "invisible" housing form that does not disrupt the patterns of homes from the street and it cleans up the alleys. I would like to see this implemented ASAP. I have spoken with at least 20 people that want to live in an ADU but there are not enough out there, and I have spoken to even more people that want one but can not have one for a number of reasons including cost and zoning restrictions. I also recommend that we go further and allow an internal and an external ADU on a Single Unit Property, like Vancouver. We would be the first in the US to do this, and it makes sense. People are already putting ADUs into their basements without permission (permits). This is a life safety issue, so like California, that allowed ADUs everywhere IN THE STATE to save lives, we should permit both interior and detached ADUs.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
It has not addressed the middle class or affordable housing. It favors developers and development. It sacrifices public amenities and will make Denver even more unaffordable and ultimately boring. It also favors cars too much and parking over bikes and pedestrians	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
My wife and I live in the West Colfax neighborhood and really love the recommendations in Blueprint for expansion of ADU zoning. We believe that your recommendations can have a real impact on affordability while adding additional density to our neighborhoods. Smart density means more walkable neighborhoods with more services. ADU development is the only real grassroots development opportunity that the common person has access to. It's seems crazy to allow some homeowners this opportunity but not allow their neighbor down the street who isn't zoned this opportunity. We are hoping that this moves towards adoption quickly as this process is already been stretched out far too long.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I am writing to express my support for the ADU recommendations in the current draft. I strongly believe that expanding access to ADUs is an important part of addressing our city's affordability crisis. ADUs represent an easy way to add density to our city without negatively impacting neighbors/communities. Moreover, it does not make sense to me why they should be allowed in certain parts of the city but not others. I support adopting the recommendations as drafted, but would actually like to see them go further (e.g., allowing ADUs on duplex lots and behind townhomes). Please adopt the plan as drafted!	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
We live in the Berkeley Regis neighborhood at 49th and Stuart. Our neighborhood is cut in half by zoning, the south of I70 area zoned in support of ADUs the north of I70 part, zoned single family (despite dozens of duplex units spread all over). Being so close to the school, being able to offer students rental options that are less expensive than a "full house" while freeing up multi room housing for families could be a huge win for the neighborhood and Regis students. Additionally, down the road, our hops is to allow my parents to age in place near us, but still being as independent as possible.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I want to express my strong support for the ADU guidelines laid out in the draft of Blueprint Denver. I believe they provide a much needed supply of housing without changing the characteristics of a neighborhood. Increasing density in ALL Denver neighborhoods is much more sustainable than sprawling into the burbs.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
ADU's need to be allowed in North Park Hill.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
ADU's must be approved citywide. You can't allow one street to have them and not others. These structures are beneficial and needed in our ever growing population. As a taxpayer, I demand they be approved for all citizens. It feels unethical and criminal to allow my neighbor to build one and not me. My elderly parents will need one built at my home soon and I don't want to have to beg and plead for it. Please change the zoning codes at once.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
More ADUs!!! Allow 3 foot side interior setbacks for ADUs, where the primary house also has 3 foot side setbacks. Currently ADUs must have 5 foot side interior setbacks, even when the primary house has 3 foot setbacks.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Overall, I am pleased with the potential progress afforded by the update Blueprint and I support its adoption by City Council immediately. This has already been going on for three years and it would be a grave disappointment if this much needed update were pushed back any further. Some specific policies I would like to see more overt direction are a) city wide loosening of zoning and increasing of density (with fourplexes being the minimum residential density) and b) a complete abolition of all parking minimums city wide. Given the serious housing and climate crises our city (and planet) face, doing anything less only serves to protect the interests of single family homeowners seeking to maximum their investment and to keep us in a myopic, 1960s era automobile focused dark age. It's time to stop subsidizing car storage on public right of way and to allow missing middle housing to flourish in our city.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
The voices of the disenfranchised citizens have not been adequately represented through this process. As the President and CEO of Florence Crittenton Services, a Denver non-profit that educates pregnant and parenting teen moms and their young children, I see that our young families continue to be pushed out of Denver due to a lack of affordable housing. In speaking with our moms and their families, I have not heard of one of them renting an ADU. This is not helping the disenfranchised in our communities. Instead, I have heard the stories of them having to leave their former Section 8 housing because of someone selling it or renting it out at market rates.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I support of "cottage zoning" and more attainable housing	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I would like to support the concept of "cottage zoning" as a potential component of increased access to "attainable" or market-rate affordable housing.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
This is a timely and important initiative, I appreciate the acknowledgement that the conversation and vision are likely to evolve over the next 20 years. I am excited about the role that ADUs can play in meeting many of the goals outlined. ADUs can decrease the cost burden of home ownership by allowing lot owners to increase the utilization of their land asset as well as decrease the cost burden for additional occupants by increasing the supply of housing units without displacement. As units that are often different from the "primary unit" on a lot, ADUs increase diversity by attracting residents from different walks of life into increasingly dense proximity. I most often hear about the housing elements of ADUs, but economic diversity is also served by increasing ADU ownership, homeowners become landlords with an additional income stream which they can use for income security as well as for additional spending in their neighborhood from dining out to reinvesting in their primary home.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I am in support of the concept of Cottage Zoning. The idea of an ADU is great, but many of the people who would benefit from it wouldn't have the finances to be able to afford to do it. Allowing a further subdivision of lots could allow more attainable housing and current homeowners to be able to benefit from their larger backyards.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
My wife and I currently own a home in the Platt Park neighborhood. We support the adoption of Blueprint Denver, especially the ADU recommendations. We strongly support the broad and immediate adoption of ADUs to increase housing density in a progressive, independent, and demand driven manner. We also feel that ADUs provide the unique solution of increasing housing density without sacrificing a neighborhood's character. ADUs provide better housing accessibility and increases supply of housing within Denver. Lastly, we strongly feel it is the right of a homeowner to construct an ADU on their own property whether that ultimate use will be for out-of-town family, renters, or short-term bookings.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Neighbors for neighbors please! I've lived in Denver about 30 years and I think that if we keep making decisions about the entire city based on specific neighborhood protests, we risk freezing Denver in place. Single-family neighborhoods should not be immune from growth - it's unrealistic and lacks vision for tackling our future. That future includes having to plan for 900k new residents. It is really unfair that older folks who want to downsize can't find affordable and/or smaller places to live in the neighborhoods they've lived in for so long. It's also really unfair that staff at the neighborhood coffee shop everyone wants aren't allowed to live in the neighborhood they work in because "we don't want THAT kind of housing in our neighborhood." By allowing flexibility and growth, missing middle economic, environmental, and social success for all residents in all all of our neighborhoods we can create vibrant, beautiful, and sustainable housing, accessory dwelling units, parks, and small businesses back into neighborhoods for ALL to enjoy, not just the privileged few who are continuing to benefit off the red-lining days of old.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I came and testified today but I wanted to belabor one point in particular. This plan is going to determine who can live in Denver for the next several decades. It's not going to be possible to maintain any degree of affordability without removing the 20th century concept of single family zoning. Denver's population did not grow for 50 years, but has skyrocketed in the last 10, our old plans won't cut it. I also don't feel the concept of "areas of stability and growth" works. Cities are alive, we can't arbitrarily decide which neighborhoods are off limits based on the kinds of folks who can come to these sorts of meetings. Thanks for all your work, I look forward to arguing over the Denver 2070 plan	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I listened to the discussion this evening on Cottage Zoning and completely agree. The draft of Blueprint and the zoning code exclude moderate density increases in the vast majority of the city. This will combined with the changes made with the adoption of the zoning code combine to continue exacerbating the supply of housing and dramatic increases in cost of housing and degradation of existing housing stock. Both these documents increase the likelihood of pushing existing residents out of their communities while encouraging scrape off of existing homes.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
We support the adoption of the ADU recommendations contained within Blueprint Denver. The ADU recommendations should be adopted broadly and immediately. We feel that ADUs help solve Denver's housing shortage crisis while preserving a neighborhood's character. Paul and Michele	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Home ownership - helps build wealth. Not mentioned enough in the plan. Plan needs to add that ownership is a key strategy and that we want to encourage home ownership.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Blueprint is lacking "cottage zoning" provision (provided white paper). Like an ADU but freestanding-not an accessory. Cottage zoning or similar is necessary to achieve many of the strategies in the plans. Missing Middle needs more, high density housing is not enough on its own.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Language needs to be amendmended to require NPI plans to state where density in each neighborhood should go in order for shared responsibility towards growth. Missing middle housing - attainable housing for middle income folks- we believe the map should show where the duplexes and fourplexes will go	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Denverright process was inclusive, open and transparent. While there are concerns, I recommend this plan move forward as scheduled. I am supportive of missing middle housing, as it creates options. Also supportive of ADU policies as it enriches quality of life. Support parking maximums as we need to learn how to move around differently. Concerned about revision that took out the option to rezone from single unit to two unit	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Short term rentals are impactful to neighborhoods and should be required to be rezoned. ADU's should not be allowed to be used as a Short term Rentals	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
West Wash park does not agree with ADU's everywhere recommendation as it impacts privacy and other negative aspects. Recommends looking at Lakewood's ADU standards. These standards require design standards, minimum lot sizes. 2-4 units on corners should be limited to arterials and not collector streets.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Supportive of ADU recommendations. I would be willing to give up privacy and solar access in order for the greater good.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Denser neighborhoods can pay for their own infrastructure, single unit neighborhoods cannot. The plan is not calling for getting rid of single unit zoning, it just says that it doesn't have to be a requirement. The majority of enviornmental impacts come from suburban and urban edge single unit neighborhoods. What people say they want their neighborhood to be would require traveling back in time. We need strong leadership. Supportive of allowing ADU's and two units in single unit neighborhoods.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
Supportive of ADU recommendations. I have a 4,000 square foot lot because it is going to be expensive to construct. Pedestrian safety should be a priority.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
In Support of ADUs and Transit oriented zoning. Plan for next 20 years, not 20 years ago	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
In favor of removing areas of stability and single family zoning. Feel that it's necessary to maintain/provide affordable/attainable housing. Environmental benefits of providing more housing choices. Give flexibility for housing diversity.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Planning Board Listening Session
We would be remiss to not look for oportunties to mention homelessness issue.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Task Force
Concerned with the alignment of transit investment and density how that impacts implementation of missing middle housing policy,	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Task Force
I applaud the hard work, public outreach and initiatives put forth in the most recent draft of Blueprint Denver. As a business owner, attainable housing and how Denver attempts to solve this issue is one of my and I believe Denver's biggest challenges over the next 20+ years. The cost of housing has outpaced household incomes to point where a majority can't afford to live in Denver. This results in a multitude of economic impacts, traffic and infrastructure demands, growth limitations in surrounding counties and a number of other synergistic issues. While the expansion of ADU's will help, I believe the committee should strongly consider "Cottage Zoning". Cottage zoning is a concept that would provide existing homeowners the ability to subdivide larger SFD lots with the Denver framework for smaller cottage units to be constructed. Denver has very limited land for housing. The large master plans such as Stapleton, Lowry, Green Valley Ranch and others have a limited life. Construction defect has stifled the ability to build condos that are affordable. The only ones being constructed are high priced and not attainable. The key to long term viability is to allow density to be spread across Denver within the existing neighborhoods.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
Denver needs to provide diverse housing options – including filling the gap of “missing middle” of housing options that fall between high-density and single-unit houses. Denver Zoning Code needs to include 2-4 unit building forms to promote the quality of urban design and they need to be mapped within ½ mile along all transit corridors. Adding these options will not eliminate single family housing as some people fear, it will only allow options for homeowners who believe it's the best option for them and their neighborhoods.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey
I support ADUs, density bonuses, inclusionary housing reqs and increasing linkage fees. I dream of a Vision Zero Denver with Complete Streets and more publicly funded housing. I want more Mariposas and Sun Valley EcoDistricts. Additionally, we need a diversity of housing options. Thus Denver should do more to encourage 2-4 unit building forms "within ½ mile along transit corridors." Plus, expand it's existing stock of 2 to 3 story courtyard, dingbats or Deco/Moderne style of "Poets Row". As criticism gets louder, I also think it is important to remember that Denverright has many aspects that (based on conversations even with some "NIMBYs") enjoy widespread support (for instance the parts focusing on Parks & Rec or Pedestrians and Trails) and I would suggest that it shouldn't all be viewed through lens of those arguing for more/less density ie: NIMBY vs YIMBY. Yet, I would note that the much ballyhoed Minneapolis 2040 changes were the result of, to quote it's own website (as of today 2/11/19), "three years of civic engagement" whereas Denverright's own website (also, as today 2/11/19) references "the city's two-year" process. Why not allow all citizens to feel they were heard and no criticism that the process was rushed. Why not wait until after elections to ratify and add to the legitimacy of the outcome, at least in eyes of some few holdouts? I firmly believe that the larger goals (affordability, equity, livability) have wide support and that the momentum built up to date will not be at risk by a short delay in adoption.	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I'm writing to support the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver. My wife and I moved to Denver a little over a year ago. In that time, we bought a house, had a baby, and have become enamored with this city and lifestyle. We want to see Denver continue to thrive and we see the ADU recommendations as one way to do so.</p> <p>The house we bought actually had another dwelling unit on the property (not sure if it's officially an "ADU") and we fixed it up for family, guests, and short term renters to stay there. Our first rental was a young woman who is looking to move to Denver and needed a place to stay for a few months.</p> <p>Once the initial wave of baby visitors wears off, we will rent the the unit full time and I'm sure the renters will be a great addition to the neighborhood.</p> <p>We believe that more ADUs in Denver will help with affordable housing, neighborhood density, and do this with little to no ill effect on the fabric of the neighborhoods.</p> <p>We ask that Blueprint Denver gets adopted as soon as possible to open the doors to more ADUs being built.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>Hello whomever gets to read these emails! my name is Krista and I support the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver. Since incomes have not matched the increase in rents around town, one way families can reach the very important middle class bracket is to more fully utilize and monetize their existing resources - aka the property they already have. Lets support manageable growth. Also, I'd rather that home owners benefit from the housing crisis then out of state developers.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>With all the explosive growth out city has undergone in recent years, the growing pains associated have taken a significant toll on longtime residents. With skyrocketing home values and soaring rents, the situation for many residents has become dire- pay rent or eat is of course one reality for young, elderly and other marginalized and somewhat financially powerless groups of citizens.</p> <p>Ruthless gentrification of longtime minority and immigrant neighborhoods has pushed out residents with generational neighborhood roots.</p> <p>Also impacted heavily are Service workers, working class & the shrinking middle class from living where the jobs are and ultimately preventing home ownership by also elevating cost of living in the suburban markets.</p> <p>DENVER should not be only for the Gentry, a sanitized playground for the privileged.</p> <p>How we got here is open for much protracted debate and discussion. The road back to a diverse and inclusive city is a tricky one to be sure.</p> <p>An elegant solution could be the expansion of ADU's or Accessory Dwelling Units.</p> <p>Without the neighborhood impact of new large apartments , these ADU's would open up much needed affordable housing a handful of ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create affordable options for renters in the city 2. Offset high mortgage payments for current homeowners and more importantly open up home ownership to a large group that could apply the ancillary revenue stream of an ADU rental to their bottom line by greatly reducing their monthly housing cost. 3. The implications are huge- with more affordable housing consumer confidence rises and more money is flowing through the community and ultimately increased sales tax receipts and thriving businesses. <p>I realize I haven't touched on everything and have been somewhat condensed here But this has helped Vancouver deal well with affordability crisis- they are the most expensive city in North America.</p> <p>Ok just some quick thoughts here</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider one citizens opinion.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>Although not a citizen of Denver, we represent 700 Real Estate Investors throughout the Metro area, the vast majority of their properties are in Denver.</p> <p>We are fully in support of the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver.</p> <p>Affordable and attainable housing is a key issue in Denver. Many property owners cannot rent their properties in this market as rent compared to mortgage payments at current property values makes rental housing difficult.</p> <p>ADUs would allow for a property owner to add a unit to help with that shortage, and make the home more affordable.</p> <p>I built an ADU when I lived in the DFW area years ago. My father died, and my mother suffered a stroke. Had we not been able to build that Mother-In-Law suite for my Mom and allow us to care for her while affording her privacy, she would have had to liquidate all her assets and live in a nursing facility.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my comments</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>In my opinion, allowing A D U's is a very practical approach to impacting the affordable issue in Denver in a positive way. It's quite similar to carriage houses that for many years were built in many neighborhoods.</p> <p>Obviously, there will need to be some practical controls with the proper conditions and requirements.</p> <p>I do not believe that the city will be over run with A D U's.</p> <p>As a property owner in Denver, I only see an up side to adding to the affordable housing stock in Denver.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>I just wanted to send a quick email regarding my strong support for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's), their future in Denver and their roll in our ever-growing city. I believe ADU's are a wonderful opportunity for so many reasons. Firstly, it legally allows more people to live on one lot or in other words, it will continue helping Denver to infill existing space without tearing down homes, rebuilding or rezoning. I would also find it to be a more organic approach than multi-unit buildings or condo complexes. Lastly, it allows current homeowners to offset their mortgage by creating rental space on their property, though also extremely ideal for aging parents (mother-in-law suite), out-of-town guests, or adult children who are pursuing studies and trying to wean themselves from mom and dad's house.</p> <p>All in all, I strongly support Accessory Dwelling Units, their existence in our city and hopefully the continuance of leniency towards zoning and allowance to make the permitting process easier and more attainable for homeowners who are willing to invest the upfront costs. I hope you will take these thoughts into consideration when implementing future laws and regulations regarding ADU's. Thank you very much for your time.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>I am writing in support of the ADU recommendations found in Blueprint Denver. As a moderate income owner of a 1000sq ft home on a 9000 sqft lot, the ability to build an ADU on our lot would present a way to allow our family to grow in place by allowing additional room for children and aging parents. It would also represent a wealth building opportunity for us and other low and moderate income homeowners feeling the pressure of increasing cost of living. More broadly, ADUs represent a form of densification our city needs to keep up with its increasing need for affordable housing with easy access to transit, amenities, jobs, and social services.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>To Community Planning & Development:</p> <p>I want to contact you to register my support for the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver. ADUs represent the "low-hanging" fruit of tools to expand affordable housing options in Denver. They also can build household wealth in the face of rising property taxes and so can help stem the tide of displacement.</p> <p>Please proceed Blueprint Denver adoption with ADUs ASAP so that implementation can begin without delay.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>I am emailing you to say great work on the current draft of Blueprint Denver and to note a particular item I am in support of.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I am in support of the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver Making ADU's accessible to all of Denver will create OPTIONS for homeowners, as well as increasing density, increasing small more affordable housing stock, that contributes to mobility, (as many of these tenants will be vehicle-less), and gives homeowners income potential to stay in their home longer without changing the character of neighborhoods. This is a component of the affordable housing crisis we are currently in and if Denver wants to continue to grow, we need to find a way to get more of these built every year. This plan has been a long time coming and it deserves to be pushed to the finish line. I do not support delaying this plan any longer like some opponents are suggesting. Please implement Blueprint Denver ASAP, on the original schedule 	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I wanted to send this email to show my support of ADU's! I know this is a popular subject and I think the expansion of ADU's in the Denver area is a great option for our city. As a fast growing and progressive city, we should be on the forefront of trend setting city planning and providing the best for our city. I would love to discuss this further with you if needed but this is how I break down the benefits for ADU's and I think they are undeniable!</p> <p>Economic -Increased tax revenue, property taxes and more taxable income for a city -ADUs provide flexible dwelling options in neighborhoods by using existing infrastructure and they reduce the demand for expanding infrastructure -Creates housing near employment, retail centers, and transit -Wealth building opportunities for home owners</p> <p>Environmental -ADUs create housing with a relatively small footprint. Less energy to construct, deconstruct, habitat. -Reduce energy of heating/cooling bc of the size of the unit. Residential buildings account for 22% of energy use in the US. -ADUs tend to be build where there is an active market demand where residents walk, bike or use public transit. Transportation is responsible for 33% of energy used in the US.</p> <p>Social -ADUs provide 1-2 bedroom units in locations that are generally in short supply of housing stock. -Provide affordable options. -Provides a unique configuration for multigenerational living. Kids moving home after college or kids taking care of their aging relatives.</p>	<p>Implementation: LUBF Housing</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>ADUs are a solution to provide housing where I don't see any other viable options. We could effectively double our housing inventory by a simple rule change. I would like to have an understanding of how this city wide zoning change will actually work but I love the idea! ADUs provide a flexible housing type that can serve many purposes. For a young family, it can be a great place for grandparents or a nanny to stay that can help with children. Or a rental property that can subsidize a lost income of a parent who stays at home. It could also be a solution for a family with adult children returning home from college, trying to get started in a professional career. One of the most important uses I see for ADUs is a place for aging parents who can live independently near family. This type of living is very common in other cultures, but since the birth of the atomic family in 1950s we have stopped building infrastructure that accommodates multigenerational living. Instead we drop our kids at daycare and stick our parents in nursing homes. We have a massive generation of baby boomers who want to live in smaller homes closer to the city center. I do think we should change some of the rules around ADUs so that we can accommodate this demand and make sure these ADUs have first floor living and at least one bedroom for an aging population with no stairs. I like ADUs because they are being built by individual homeowners who can design and finance these projects. Most other development is done by business people to maximize profit. You actually cannot get a permit to build an ADU unless you are the primary resident of the main home, so this is not a niche for developers or investors. When homeowners guide the planning, building, and financing of the building, I find you have very thoughtful and well designed home as the final product. I also like that adding ADU zoning preserves the neighborhood character, create density, and activate alleys. Neighborhoods like Highlands are a hodgepodge of old and new standing in juxtaposition. If homeowners have another opportunity to expand on their property in a different way, they may not to scrape the existing structure. ADUs also add density into city center neighborhoods with amenities where people want to live. Businesses need high density neighborhoods to flourish and buses need ridership to keep routes open. We need density to create walkable cities. Denver witnessed the opening of the Dairy Block alley last summer and I think it is the first step in opening our eyes and mind the the amazing potential of our abandoned alleys throughout the city.</p> <p>Struggles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The city needs some dedicated people in permitting who really understand ADUs to help citizen, architects, and builders navigating the permitting process. 2. Private partnership with banks would be helpful to enable financing for these projects. If the city could cut any of the fees to incentive the building of these structures, it would help... they cost \$200K-\$300K! 3. Why no decks? Come on... we have such get weather, a deck would make the space much more livable. 4. A full second story would also make these things live so much better. The story and half rule makes creates all sorts of weird spaces. If I'm spending \$300K, I want to be able to hang a picture on the wall. 5. Why does the second level must be no more than 75% of the total ground level? 6. The dedicated parking square-footage required to achieve the maximum buildable square-footage exemption incentives second level living not good for aging population. <p>Please include ADUs in BluePrint Denver!</p>	<p>Implementation: LUBF Housing</p>	<p>Email</p>

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Thank you for all your work and the comprehensive process that led to the second draft of the Denver Blueprint plan.</p> <p>First, I wanted to comment on the process that led to this point. I was involved in early conversations about the makeup of task force groups in 2016 as the Executive Director of WalkDenver. We were disappointed to not be invited to participate in the process as members of the task force groups. However as the process went on our comments were included in the plans and given fair consideration. I feel like resulting Denver Moves Pedestrians and Trails Plan was reflective of our feedback. I also believe that public engagement process was robust and allowed residents who wanted to contribute multiple opportunities to do so. My personal favorite was the board game linking growth to transit network. It was brilliant!</p> <p>As we near the end of the process there are groups who want to delay adoption of the plans arguing the lack of opportunity to contribute. While there is not a perfect process I believe that Denveright was extensive, transparent, and accessible to all and therefore I would encourage you to not delay adoption and move forward with implementation of the plans.</p> <p>Below are my comments regarding Blueprint Denver plan:</p> <p>I'm a huge supporter of inclusion of "missing middle" housing in the plan (p.82). As always the challenge will come with implementation and the zoning code amendments that will allow for duplexes, fourplexes, row homes, and townhomes in SU zones. I'm personally interested in assisting CPD in building support for more inclusive housing options in Denver's neighborhoods.</p> <p>I also want to voice my support for expansion of accessory dwelling unit allowance throughout all residential areas (p. 84). I keep hearing an overwhelming support for these building forms among my friends and neighbors. It's another excellent tool to increase affordability and diversity of housing stock in our neighborhoods without altering the architectural character.</p> <p>I support implementation of parking maximums in the downtown and urban center contexts (p. 108) and eliminating parking requirements in residential areas near transit (½ mile along transit corridors designated in the Transit Plan).</p> <p>I'm concerned to see CPD removing the recommendation that existing predominant pattern of development can be considered when an application is made for rezoning from one-unit to two-unit zoning. (p.198, 215, 231). This change sets our neighborhoods up to move backward — when single unit zoning exists in a neighborhood with a pattern of duplexes already, this change increases the likelihood that non-conforming duplexes will be replaced with large single houses, reducing the available housing stock and intensifying the housing shortage, rather than allowing zoning that allows the continuation of existing patterns. This needs to be changed back, as it avoids even the most simple and straightforward implementation of Land Use & Built Form Policy 2 (pg. 82): "Diversify housing options by exploring opportunities to integrate missing middle housing into low- and low-medium residential areas"</p>	<p>Implementation: LUBF Housing</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>1) Your support for the ADU recommendations in Blueprint Denver I absolutely agree to the use of ADUs withing reason. They must provide their own parking and it must be within the fair market price rental value. I would support rezoning for my neighborhood of Athmar park to allow for ADUs from E-SU-Dx to E-SU-DX1</p> <p>2) Why you want to see ADUs available more broadly in Denver As a resident and home owner, I would be looking at an ADU on my property to provide fair market price housing during this housing crisis. Building an ADU would pay for the construction loan I would need to take out and hopefully make some profit in the future for house maintenance.</p> <p>3) Support for Blueprint Denver adoption ASAP so that implementation can begin without delay I do!</p>	<p>Implementation: LUBF Housing</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>I believe that ADU's are one piece of the puzzle to help increase the number of housing units in Denver. Many of them are small, so hopefully they are somewhat affordable. Denver has walkable neighborhoods and decent public transportation, so many of the new residents may reduce their daily driving, compared to suburban locations.</p> <p>There should be design guidelines to ensure the ADU's fit into, and even enhance existing neighborhoods. Also, parking requirements should be carefully considered. Maybe in some cases, on-street parking or no parking requirement is sufficient.</p> <p>Also, by the way, can you do something about those ugly utility boxes visible on slot homes? Why aren't they screened?</p>	<p>Implementation: LUBF Housing</p>	<p>Email</p>

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>To the Planning Board, and City Council: This is to register firm support for Attached and Detached ADUs throughout Denver as a Zoning Use by Right. Current regulations are too restrictive for many contextual forms. An alternative Design review should be added to allow for administrative adjustments, and contextual design thinking. The benefits of ADUs are many--most significantly are the possibility ADUs give us to maintain neighborhood street character while increasing dwelling unit density in a distributed and incremental way. Thank you for your time on this.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Housing	Email
<p>DQ and Preservation Policy 6 Strategy 1 and 2. How will non-landmarked structures or districts be preserved? Will RNOs be involved? We agree with this policy to incentivize the preservation of structures that contribute to the established character of an area, even if they are not designated as landmarks or historic districts. The strategies are vague. How will this happen? Do RNOs have input into where incentives are applied? This would be very helpful in preserving what's left of our neighborhood's history in non-landmarked areas. This policy and strategies have been relocated and strengthened, but our questions on vagueness and RNOs still remain</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Letter
<p>The old blueprint Denver made mention of the importance of respecting privacy (and views/air/etc...) in areas of stability. The new blueprint Denver makes no mention of privacy. New construction in our neighborhood towers over adjacent low height homes, and it destroys the sense of privacy in back yards and interior spaces. Privacy fences cannot address height discrepancies of several 10s of feet, and sadly it seems easier for developers gain entitlements for more stories than it is for a resident to get a height variance on a privacy fence. This is not an equitable situation.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Online Survey
<p>Architectural design and density of neighborhoods is still a concern</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Online Survey
<p>1. During permitting process of large-scale developments (more than 4 units?), please require notification of surrounding neighbors and RNO's 2. Please set more ambitious design standards for City Park West to maintain character of community. Make CPW a Landmark District like Curtis Park or approve a Conservation Overlay for CPW to maintain character and residential / human scale. 3. Please require an aesthetic review including more serious evaluation of scale compared to existing buildings for proposed projects as part of zoning including higher quality standards 4. Require as part of permitting, construction parking planning and worker parking planning. Also require long-term plan for parking and alley use rather than allowing a large developer without any notice to dump hundreds of units and decide to make parking garage access through a heavily traveled alley. Requiring advance planning for parking and traffic during construction and advance notification of events that require heavy equipment, and long- or short-term road closures.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Online Survey
<p>Overlays are heavy handed and should not be used.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Need more standard, stringent design standards for multi-unit structures in order to enhance compatibility with single unit homes.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Concerns about the level of design and 0' setback in some zone districts.</p>	Implementation: LUBF Urban Design	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>•We need more 4 way stops in residential areas. I live on 24th and vine, and people drive 30-40 mph down our street regularly to avoid york. It's unsafe to walk or bike without the stop signs. •We need more ped crossing signs and flashing lights. The ped crossing at 23rd and Gaylord has no signs, and drivers cannot see the zebra crossing. It has a double yellow line, so they drive fast up to the light at york. This is adjacent to the St. Elizabeth's school, and endangers students and locals walking to City Park. I almost got hit here, myself trying to cross. Can we have a flashing ped sign, or even just a sign here? •similarly, we need safe ped crossings on 17th and 198th. It is exceedingly difficult to get to colfax businesses on foot or bike from whittier, cole, etc. because of 17th and 18th. There are few pedestrian crossings, if any. Cars drive very quickly and it's hard to see if its safe to cross because of parked cars along 17th and 18th. Please invest in pedestrian crossings on 17th and 18th, so that it's not just an urban highway.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Email
<p>Page 58 under Implementation; more proactively commit to a city-wide Complete Streets policy. We recommend using the same language from Denver Moves: Pedestrians & Trails under Recommendation #24: "Update Denver's Complete Streets policy so that it reflects current city transportation values and priorities, as well as national best-practices for Complete Streets policies. A City Council-adopted policy is stronger than a policy of a city department ." Complete Streets has been well-researched and shown to be an evidence-based approach to increase equity.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Internal
<p>Redlines- page 114, strategy D should add the following, " such changes shall be consistent with the designations on the Future Places Map and Growth Strategy Map and shall be undertaken in a manner designed not to disrupt the existing land use pattern in already complete neighborhoods."</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>P109 (Policy 3) This is an important aspiration policy, yet strategies are not necessarily enough to get there. E.g. How does a bicycle priority or transit priority street always accommodate pedestrians above all? There are bound to be trade-offs that reduce the priority of peds. Another example – any time we have a driveway crossing across a sidewalk, the vehicle is typically prioritized.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
P109 (Policy 3, Strategy B) No, this should be about design speed, not about access management; design speed should be appropriate for the context, separation between modes is only appropriate where speed differential is anticipated to be higher.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P109 (Policy 3) Add new strategy G. to update pedestrian crossing guidance to be consistent with FHWA Safe Transportation for Every Step (STEP) guidance.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P115 (Policy 13, Strategy B) No exactly sure what this means: is everything on the table? Would like to see specific mention of multipurpose tools such as congestion pricing and VMT-based user fees.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P115 (Policy 14, Strategy C) This strategy seems out of place – these do not belong as a comp plan strategy	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
State the real problem: The conflict between reliance on cars as a primary mode of transportation and other community needs. As we pointed out in our comments on the previous draft, we are troubled that the introduction to the Mobility Recommendations (page 106 in the updated draft), inaccurately states that safety, moving people, and creating attractive public spaces are competing needs, while failing to acknowledge that these three needs do compete with reliance on cars as a primary mode of transportation. Rather than correcting this fallacy, the updated draft actually further obscures the real trade-offs that Denver faces by stating on page 46 that in the envisioned future it will be “convenient to drive . . . throughout the city.” The reality is that achieving many of the Blueprint Denver goals -- including providing mobility options beyond driving for people of all ages and abilities and promoting a healthy community with equitable access to healthy living for all residents -- will require making driving less convenient in at least some parts of the city. In addition to correcting the problem statement to more accurately reflect these trade-offs, we recommend describing driving in the envisioned future as “safe” rather than “convenient.”	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P111 (Policy 7, Strategy A) Make a reference to Denver Moves: Transit after calling out transit priority corridors.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Equitable TOD investments should be included in the plan	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Recommendation No. 12- Mobility. We continue to believe that this Recommendation requires revision. Please see our attached mark-up of Page 114.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Redlines - page 114. The background text stating "A foundatuon of the BP Denver growth strategy is focusing growth along transit priority corridors, which martch the high-and medium capacity transit corridors..." This does not necessarily comport with the growth strategy map, which you said focuses growth 80% downtown. Please make an insert to make clear that this must comport with the growth strategy map	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>We also support the following revisions to the draft Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding “Eliminate traffic related deaths and serious injuries by 2030” as one of the main metrics for “Measuring Our Success” (page 52). • Incorporating more specific Vision Zero strategies into the plan, including the following (page 109): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure safe pedestrian crossings, especially along the High Injury Network identified by Vision Zero. o Create and adopt a citywide “Complete Streets” policy to support comprehensive street design guidelines. o Align street design guidelines, standards and rules and regulations to support Vision Zero goals and improve safety along the High Injury Network. • Revised strategies to ensure pedestrians remain prioritized and to discourage zerooccupancy vehicle trips as technology evolves (page 110). • Adding a policy and strategies to support the creation of a new long-range comprehensive transportation plan, as well as a strategy to pursue increased long-term funding for mobility (page 115). <p>2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding to the description of “Complete Networks” recognizing that “all streets should be designed safely for the most vulnerable users, especially those in our community who are the youngest and oldest and those with disabilities” (page 166). 	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P108 (Policy 2, Strategy B) Is this implying an increased interest in engaging in public-private-partnerships to complete strategic public infrastructure	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P109 (Policy 3, Strategy C) This strategy seems out of place here – depending on the context this varies greatly from a transportation perspective.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P110 (Policy 5, Strategy A) The primary purpose of these technologies is to improve vehicle through-put; seems out of place with an emphasis on safety	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
P113 (Policy 11, Strategy A) the highest and best use may not necessarily accommodate the most people – suggest removing the phrase	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Should include mitigating measures for improving safety on Denver streets	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Need more pedestrian infrastructure, need safer streets in S Denver	Implementation: Mobility	Office Hours

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>There should be stronger language and funding proposals for multimodal streets that discourage single passenger automobiles, encourage biking and walking, and enable useful transit.</p> <p>The transit plans should be further emphasized in other documents besides Move, specifically talking about how zoning should change to support the new transit routes.</p> <p>Greater emphasis should be placed on actual residents of Denver having choices in their movement, with less deference given to suburbanites commuting in.</p> <p>Focus on the "missing middle" of housing density should be increased, with middle density housing allowed everywhere in the city, with no single family housing only areas. This is the only way Denver has any hope of growing smartly and remaining economical.</p> <p>An education component should be added so that residents understand that density doesn't cause traffic, sprawl does.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Online Survey
<p>On page 112 of the document you refer to the "Neighborhood Traffic Management Program." The program is actually called the Neighborhood Transportation Management Program. https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/transportation-mobility/neighborhoods.html</p>	Implementation: Mobility	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. 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. 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>	Implementation: Mobility	Online Survey
<p>Concerned about Pedestrian and Trails plan is not going to be open for comments or re-released. Concerned how often we give patio permits. It is un-acceptable to make sidewalk smaller if patio encroaches</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Supportive of the plan generally. More mixed use in neighborhoods means: more mass transit, better energy and water usage in multi-family. More walkable, less reliance on cars, less crime.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Think about reallocation of time - traffic singals. How much time does the pedestrian get vs the car. HOV lanes as getting priority in allocating space. We should say in the plan that the reallocaton of space or possibly timing of lights for pedestrian could resault in a convience trade off for motorist</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Task Force
<p>Since the first draft of Blueprint Denver was published, City Council and DPW have made progress on clarifying where low-speed vehicles such as electric scooters may be used, but as yet we have no guidance as to where space should be allocated to store them, balancing proximity to destinations with appropriate space allocation, and avoiding impeding sidewalks for those walking and rolling. Policy 11, Strategy B, assigned to DPW, calls for maximizing use of curb space including "shared mobility and on-demand services, including transportation network companies" – we recommend adding "and storage of personal mobility vehicles such as dockless bike share, scooter share, personal bike corrals" to Policy 11, Strategy B on page 113 to emphasize the need to consider these non-automobile needs for curb space.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver should specifically call for the creation of "neighborhood slow zones" as a Vision Zero strategy, which appears in the Vision Zero Action Plan.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>We continue to call for a strategy to be added to Policy 13 ("Pursue funding mechanisms to raise revenue to fund multimodal infrastructure improvements and maintenance") on page 115 of Blueprint Denver, to "Study simple, fair, efficient and scalable ways to fund sidewalk installation, enhancement and maintenance citywide." The existing strategies speak far too generally about "multimodal infrastructure" for any reader to know whether this long-standing problem with the way we pay for sidewalk installation and maintenance is being considered, or if the identification of this problem in the older Pedestrian Master Plan has been forgotten.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>Policy 3, Strategy C on page 109 calls for café seating in the right of way to leave "adequate" space for pedestrians and streetscaping – however this continues to sound minimal, in line with existing practice in which a minimal 5-foot sidewalk with the pedestrians pushed up against moving traffic is the result, when a nice, wide comfortable sidewalk was available prior to the café introduction. Strategy C is not strong enough to prevent this all-too-common outcome. We recommend replacing "adequate" with "ample and high-quality" to better capture the intention implied elsewhere in the document regarding pedestrians having priority.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver should identify the need to diagnose and correct whatever regulatory limitation is preventing enforcement streetscape design and maintenance standards for what is installed and maintained in the right-of-way by adjacent property owners. Without clearly identifying this problem, we have little hope that Denver will prioritize addressing the problem so that we can benefit from effective streetscape requirements. This may belong in Quality of Life Infrastructure Policy 5 in page 121, replacing the weak "Encourage" language. It may also belong in an appropriate Mobility strategy. As it is, we can find no acknowledgement of this de facto regulatory gap, nor goal to solve it.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>Thank you for Policy 10, Strategy B, "Explore partnerships and programs for preserving and maintain existing flagstone sidewalks" in the Mobility section. We recommend the addition of "where this is a valued part of the area character" to this Strategy B, as it sets up a discussion about identifying areas in the city where the community values these assets, in order to scope the partnerships, programs and policies to follow.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>The new Blueprint Denver draft extensively promotes the Vision Zero goal and key elements of the Vision Zero Action Plan, such as the High Injury Network. Thank you!</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver has added more high-level measures of mobility improvement, including the Vision Zero goal and the Mayor's mobility mode-shift goal, on pages 52-53.</p>	Implementation: Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Thank you for clearly calling for a Complete Streets policy, in addition to an update of comprehensive street design guidelines. (Blueprint Denver Policy 4, Strategy B on page 109). When implemented with a commitment at the highest levels, a Complete Streets policy will flow through to day-to-day street design decisions and have a major effect on the rate of implementation of safe, multimodal streets.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
As discussed above, the new Blueprint Denver draft extensively promotes the Vision Zero goal and key elements of the Vision Zero Action Plan, such as the High Injury Network. Thank you!	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
Policy 5, strategy C on page 110 of Blueprint Denver looks toward emerging technologies for mobility and transportation safety, with a focus on reducing single-occupant-vehicle trips in favor of more efficient modes that move the greatest number of people. Thank you for the strategy to disincentivize zero-occupancy vehicle trips, should the technology advance to the point where autonomous operations make this congestion-accelerant possible.	Implementation: Mobility	Letter
In coordination with the Denver Food Vision, we recommend enhancing language around retail and food systems. DDPHE supports the expanded inclusion of references to health, affordable, and culturally-relevant food as a key community need and infrastructure throughout the Blueprint. a. Food access/systems goals should strive for "healthy, affordable, and culturally-relevant" food options as vital community amenities	Implementation: QOLI	Internal
Page 122 - DDPHE supports the inclusion and specific language around Recommendation 8 to "Develop tools to improve access to healthy foods to support community health outcomes."	Implementation: QOLI	Internal
Qof L Goal 10, strategy 2: use "accessible" instead of walkable to acknowledge those with mobility issues or disabilities	Implementation: QOLI	Letter
P118, item 02F – strengthen this by changing incentives to requirements for landscaping that also incentivize redevelopment.	Implementation: QOLI	Letter
Environmental concerns and burdens should be better addressed in the plan	Implementation: QOLI	Letter
P119, item 03D – state ways to use public ROW space for meeting development water quality requirements that provide additional public benefits, such as green space.	Implementation: QOLI	Letter
Concern with environmental aspects of carbon absorption. Not enough undeveloped land, too much concrete. Would like to see more land reserved to promote air quality. Local ecology is overtaxed from carbon absorption. Consider soil health, animal health, plant health. Heat island effect. Composting, greenwater and greywater.	Implementation: QOLI	Planning Board Listening Session
We have climate adaption in the glossary but never use it in the document. Find a way to use it in the document	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many reasonable people believe that the city's current goals and Climate Action Plan is not aggressive enough in light of the most recent findings by international climate scientists. Advances in knowledge about the science of climate and behavioral/technological solutions will pick up speed. Denver's Climate Goals & Plans have to keep pace and should be continually assessed and updated. Clearly, Blueprint cannot do it all, but just as Blueprint calls for Denver Moves Bikes to be updated and for a Comprehensive Transportation Plan to be developed, Blueprint should call out the need to beef up our Climate planning and programs. o This plan should address the fact that Denver is not currently dedicating sufficient resources to mount a credible response to the challenge of climate change. Resources dedicated to Climate Change should be increased, be annual and be permanent. 	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force
Include the idea of bringing back public water fountains -- this helps to reduce plastic	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Blueprint Draft leads with a statement highlighting Water and Climate as a prominent cross cutting theme for the plan. This is visionary. However, climate change is not subsequently treated as theme throughout the plan. o There should be more clarity and urgency in the body about the difference between mitigation and adaptation. Climate change is happening now; and it will get worse. If Denver were to meet our 80/50 goals tomorrow, climate disruption is still assured, there will be no sighs of relief. And if we don't meet our goals, if the world continues to act slowly as it appears it will, climate disruption will get dramatically worse than we are currently imagining. It is equally vital that we simultaneously take steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to minimize the potential impact AND to create a resilient city that is ready to adapt to inevitable and unpredictable climate disruption: extreme weather events, wind, heat, drought in Denver AND in the Mountains, water supply disruption ("think Capetown, S Africa - day Zero"), environmental refugee migration, etc. 	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>o There are currently many recommendations in BP that are “deep climate actions” but not identified as such. Unless a reader or resident has already been thinking about climate change and solutions, the importance of these actions will not be recognized. A growing number of individuals want their neighborhoods and communities to take climate action, but don’t realize how solutions pervade virtually all municipal planning decisions that affect how and where we live and move. e.g. many residents may be happy to ride a bike or buy an electric vehicle but may be less likely to accept higher density on their block or in their neighbor’s back yard. An opportunity for building a sense of urgency and support for Blueprint actions is missed in the current draft. These actions should be highlighted - either through a sidebar or an appendix. To look at the current language, one would think that trees and impervious surfaces are the only solutions offered. I believe that Blueprint may well be a new standard for Climate forward urban planning, but I believe that the reader has to work too hard to see it. Examples:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Complete neighborhoods, complete networks, any measure that keeps people out of a fossil fuel burning vehicle reduces emissions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Any measure that reduces the distance between origins and destinations, home and work, home and school, home and recreation, home and commerce . reduces greenhouse gases.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Any measure that reduces the number of people moving distances to meet their needs reduces greenhouse gases.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Any measure that increases social interaction between residents and neighborhoods increases our resilience during times of stress. Complete neighborhoods, higher density, . . . mixed use, local food and community urban gardens, turning vacant buildings into community centers, any action that enhances the use of shared assets all of these reduce greenhouse gases and build resilience at the same time.</p>	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force
<p>•Staffing - To say that city staffing for climate change adaptation and mitigation is woefully inadequate for the current workload is an understatement. Blueprint will increase that workload. The Blueprint Implementation matrix should include, at least, a FT person in DDPHE to monitor BP implementation from the perspective of climate. In addition, CPD should have a FT urban planner who is an expert in urban planning and climate change. You would know more than me, but I believe that this is a growing niche within the field of urban planning.</p>	Implementation: QOLI	Task Force
<p>Mode share chart on page 10-11 is still confusing and hard to read.</p>	Introduction	Internal
<p>Page 31 - there is only one sentence that says ' Because all of the measurements....they cannot be effectively applied to small-scale rezonings'. This doesn't seem sufficient to be clear on how the Equity measures will or will not be used. Perhaps highlighting or expanding on this issue as was done on p 67.</p>	Introduction	Letter
<p>Transit Priority Streets" are well-defined and consistent with how Denver Moves: Transit defines them -- it's the subset of corridors that have high- or medium- capacity transit. In fact, it's the subset of High Frequency corridors that also have priority for high- or medium-capacity -- it's both. Every place I can find in Blueprint that "Transit Priority Streets" is defined, it's defined consistently. However, having done so, I would encourage an editing pass to find OTHER places in Blueprint that use "high capacity" or "medium capacity" and instead use the defined "Transit Priority Streets" term throughout instead of talking about capacity where the important point is the prioritized transit, not the "capacity" of it -- repeatedly saying "high capacity" treats the "capacity" as the key feature, not the prioritization or the frequency, and frequency is key. This seems fiddly, but the word "capacity" is too specific, leading to reasonable questions about "what about high frequency -- that's just as important". After all, a long train that arrives once an hour has high capacity, and that's not what we're talking about.</p> <p>oln short: we've defined the term "Transit Priority Streets" -- let's use it everywhere it makes sense, as it embodies both high-frequency and a medium- or high- level of capital investment for priority/capacity.</p>	Modal Priority	Email
<p>change transit priority legend and write up to say transit captial improvement corridors instead of high and medium</p>	Modal Priority	Internal
<p>update transit priority map to refect transit plan change to Speer Leetsdale corridor routing in Cherry Creek. Should use Steele, CCD North, Alameda, not 1st Ave</p>	Modal Priority	Internal
<p>pg. 175 , 183 - add "trails" to text on the lefthand side. Currently, the text on both the bicycle priority map and the multimodal networks map only reference "streets" and make no mention of trails (yet the map shows trails).</p>	Modal Priority	Internal
<p>We found discontinuous mode designations and missing connections. Here are the changes we request:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fill in the gaps where West 32nd Avenue changes from Bike/Ped to Bike only along the south side of Highland Park, west of Federal (in West Highland), and at a block between approximately Decatur and Eliot Streets east of Federal. Fill in the gap on 16th Street between Boulder and Central (where Bike/Ped changes to Bike only) AND show connection over the Highland Bridge over I-25 to the Platte River Trail and beyond. <p>SEE HUNI REDLINE OF MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Zuni Street shows Ped/Bike designation between West 32nd Avenue and Speer Boulevard. This is not a designated bike route and it is not a safe street for bicyclists. There is also transit present south of 29th Avenue. We believe this street should be highlighted for pedestrian use between 32nd and 29th, and combined pedestrian and transit south of 29th. We request that the designation between 32nd and 29th Avenues be changed from Ped/Bike to Pedestrian Only, and that the designation between 29th and Speer be changed from Ped/Bike to Pedestrian/Transit. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>The 20th Street bridge over I-25 and the South Platte River serves pedestrians, cyclists, and transit, connecting to downtown and, in the case of pedestrians and cyclists, to the Platte River trails and Platte Street pedestrian route. We request that the map be changed to show the multi-modal nature of this bridge. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>P168-169 Consider adding increased crossing amenities such as curb daylighting, enhanced crosswalk design, pedestrian actuated signals, shortened signal cycle lengths, shortened crossing distances through the use of bulb-outs, crossing refuge islands.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The Pedestrian/Bike path between Inca (and on to the Fox Street Commuter Rail Station) and Mile High Stadium has missing sections and omission of Pedestrian designations. There is a mostly-completed ped/bike path from the Fox Street Commuter Rail Station to Mile High Stadium along the west side of I-25. We request that the map be updated to show the completed section between 20th Street and Inca Street as a continuous ped/bike route, and continuing northward into Sunnyside along Inca Street AND we request that the missing section at the top of the Speer/I-25 interchange connecting between the Speer/Zuni intersection and 15th Street. This should also continue south of Speer along Zuni Street in Jefferson Park. The path along the west bank of the South Platte River should also be shown as a Ped/Bike path. SEE HUNI REDLINE MODAL PRIORITY MAP</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Highlight the extensive overlap between the High Injury Network and other key geographies identified in the plan, and therefore the urgency of improving safety on these corridors. As we pointed out in our comments on the previous draft, this overlap includes priority transit and pedestrian streets, and community and regional corridors where the majority of growth is targeted. The updated draft does mention the High Injury Network more frequently than the previous draft, but still fails to note this overlap. The plan should also highlight the need to reduce speeds on streets citywide, and particularly on the High Injury Network. While the description of street typologies in the updated draft adjusted the design speed to be lower for residential streets (page 164), many of the streets in the High Injury Network are mixed-used and commercial streets.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>There are gaps and missed connections in several locations, and there are incorrect designations that push cyclists onto unsafe streets and that miss transit connections. Our goal is to create consistent corridors for all modes of travel that align with current and future paths that will strengthen Highland's connections to surrounding neighborhoods and the entire metro area. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF MODAL PRIORITY MAP and specific descriptions of street types requiring modifications that follow:</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>P176-177 Replace large center transit-priority corridor photo. Design shown has a very dangerous situation for peds and is blatantly inaccessible for people with disabilities.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>We were pleased to see that many of our comments on the previous draft were incorporated into the updated draft. We are particularly supportive of the "inverted pyramid" diagram added on page 166, and the revised text describing "Complete Networks" on this same page. The diagram and text now clearly convey an overarching prioritization of the most efficient transportation modes, with people walking and rolling given top priority, followed closely by people using transit, bicycles, and other "small vehicles" that are about the size and speed of bicycles (e.g., scooters). This clarity of priorities will be essential for achieving many of Blueprint Denver's goals, particularly when our community is faced with difficult tradeoffs regarding how Denver's street space should be designed and managed</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>P166 Picture of cyclist should be more appropriate to show actual utilitarian use of a bike as a mode of transport</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>•The second objection is the identification of 1st Avenue from University to Downing as a transit priority street allowing it to be a high capacity transit corridor. •CCHN objects to this identification as we believe that creating a high capacity corridor will create an upsurge in cut-through traffic in our neighborhood, intensify air pollution and increase overall traffic congestion for our residents. CCHN would endorse a street design that is more consistent with our historic neighborhood.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Regis neighborhood pedestrian north-south connectivity and safety crossing under I-70 at Tennyson and Lowell. What specific improvements will be made ?</p>	Modal Priority	Office Hours
<p>colorado and iliff needs ped improvements around U park elementary</p>	Modal Priority	Office Hours
<p>Concerned that the Future Multimodal Network Map on page 182-183 in Draft 2 does not align with the pedestrian priority zone map on page 17 of the Cherry Creek Area Plan.</p>	Modal Priority	Office Hours
<p>I would really like to see a bicycle lane, path, or trail going from Quincy & Happy Canyon to south Rosamond Park, along Quincy. That is a very important corridor for connecting the Platte and Highline Canal to Cherry Creek, widely used by bicyclists. Since it is at the tail southern border of Denver's boundaries, it gets ignored and overlooked. But that one connection would do a lot of bicyclists a ton of good, allowing them to get safely across the west, south, and east metro area. The current stretch along Quincy is very scary and dangerous for bicycles.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>Too car centric! Isn't colorado supposed to be hydrocarbon free in 2040? How can we do that with such a car centric plan?</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>I think Blueprint Denver needs to make explicit whether walking, biking and transit will be given priority over inefficient, polluting and dangerous single occupancy vehicles. Otherwise the the oil, car and other interests will easily sidestep the good intentions of this plan.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>As every "big" city knows, cars and traffic have limits and we need to plan near transit, more local businesses integrated into our neighborhoods, for future growth with an efficient multi-modal city with options to live and comfortable pedestrian and bike environments, so that cars aren't the only viable option. When you build for cars, you get more cars. Please preserve Blueprint Denver's call for parking maximums in downtown and in urban center contexts as noted on page 108 of Blueprint Denver.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>I think we can go further with a focus on pedestrian and how we fund pedestrian treatments and safe streets. We have to be creative in denver with traffic calming techniques and make people feel safe waking or rolling.. Instead of planning for cars always and defaulting to the argument "we need to move cars and we ran this engineer model" we need to start with the pedestrian and context. If we need to add better circulation for cars a pedestrian treatment should be part of that. I do not think we should have residential arterials. If they are nessesaty they should be given highest priority of pedestrian treatments to slow traffic through neighborhoods. Some metrics I think would be helpful. If it is a fully residential steet car traffic should be limited to 10k/ day and the speed limit should be no higher than 25. Additionally there should be pedestrian crossings ever other block.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>I am strongly in favor of more walkable neighborhoods with good sidewalks, slow car traffic, and mixed use density. I'm an avid walker and cyclist and want to be safe on our streets.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey
<p>The city needs to prioritize the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transit over cars. Streets that work for people are always more pleasant. Streets that are car centric are void of people. A city has life when the streets are full of people walking, riding and taking public transportation.</p>	Modal Priority	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I believe that transportation including biking and walking should be safe at all times .It should be a priority.	Modal Priority	Online Survey
I've been biking and walking to work, recreation and shopping opportunities in Denver for five decades. I would love to see more bikers and walkers in our community. But that will only happen if our sidewalks, bike paths and roads provide for a pleasant, non-threatening experience across Denver. We're not there yet. Your leadership on this issue will ensure our community is healthier and happier.	Modal Priority	Online Survey
Denver needs an improved trail system that's interconnected with the rest or the day you w	Modal Priority	Online Survey
We need to have a way to classify streets as pedestrian- / bike-only, or to leave room to have a classification that generally does not allow cars. Cities across the world are taking large areas of street space away from cars and giving them back to people. In our neighborhood community planning sessions we are hearing that there is a hunger for that throughout Denver. Let's not let policy get in the way of serving the people. If this means that these particular streets in question would have to be transitioned to Parks & Rec as they are identified, so be it, but the language has to be in place to allow it.	Modal Priority	Online Survey
Scooters! Can we be more inclusive in this document now, enhanced bikeways network should be renamed to capture new technology.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Complete networks section did not change (pages 167 - 183 or so) Ped enhanced map does not say much, maybe include the high injury map? More bold actions should be listed. Neighborhood bikeway description would be useful. High capacity vs high frequency needs more explaining	Modal Priority	Task Force
High capacity vs high frequency could be clearer. Should high capacity be linked to transit priority streets?	Modal Priority	Task Force
Would it help to include the 5280 loop in the modal priority maps	Modal Priority	Task Force
The High Injury Network could helpfully be incorporated into more of the maps, such as the Pedestrian Enhanced map, Bicycle Priority Map, and Transit Priority map, reinforcing the combined priority that overlaps in these modal maps with the HIN should have.	Modal Priority	Letter
It remains unclear in key plans, such as Denver Moves: Transit and Blueprint Denver, that implementation will require a high level of coordination with surrounding communities. In fact, despite acknowledging this feedback in the "summary of changes" transit plan document, the paragraph added to the plan on page 1-2 makes no mention of surrounding communities. Similarly, no acknowledgement of this need was found in Blueprint Denver. We sincerely hope this doesn't indicate a "blind spot" that will become a problem during implementation.	Modal Priority	Letter
The major gap in Denver Moves: Transit as an implementation plan is the absence of strategy and prioritization for funding these important improvements to roadways, pedestrian access, and service. It appears that this discussion is being deferred to "Phase 2". If this plan is to gain traction in time to meet the 2030 and 2040 goals, Phase 2 needs to begin promptly, and continue to have significant public involvement to ensure focus and support.	Modal Priority	Letter
Denver Moves: Transit identifies stop quality and stop amenities as important issues.	Modal Priority	Letter
The final, updated Denver: Moves Transit adds an important near-term recommendation – Strategy 2, Action 2.1 – to develop a stop and station inventory and typologies, prioritize improvements, and develop guidelines for stop siting. This is a significant addition and is greatly appreciated.	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>With regard to the City of Denver's Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the City Blueprint Denver I respectfully request that you consider incorporating language that fulfills the intent of the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consideration of preserving neighborhood integrity (e.g. single-family dwellings, parking, and traffic) and that residential occupancy comply with HOA and City single family density requirements that preserve a neighborhood's character. 2. Consideration of HOA / RNO (Registered Neighborhood Organization) covenants / by-laws: residential conditions that homeowners understood when they purchased their homes and conditions that have guided the respective neighborhood and sub-division living conditions. 3. Advance notification by the City of Denver about residential use changes with adequate time to respond to neighborhood HOA / RNO concerns; moreover, residents must be assured that their voice can affect relevant City decision-makers. 4. Clear steps for recourse or mitigation of HOA / RNO concerns. 	Other/General	Email
Landmark photos swap	Other/General	Internal
DDPHE has been pleased to have several staff sit in on the project management and task force team of the Denverright planning process, and we are very pleased to see strong threads of equity throughout the Blueprint Denver Plan. We are also pleased to see many of our previous comments and revisions updated in this final draft and are looking forward to working with CPD and other city departments on deployment of these strategies as a foundation for land use, transportation, design, and growth for the City of Denver. We strongly endorse commitments to equity, evaluation, community context-specific strategies, and people-focused policies.	Other/General	Internal
P264-265, 2nd para, 2nd line – change to "grid of streets, a complete network of pedestrian and bicycle routes, and diverse transit and other mobility options."	Other/General	Letter
Redlines - remove the words "and close" from the sentence under the Street Types guidance on pg67 heading as it was ambiguous. How close is close to. Adjacent is adequate here.	Other/General	Letter
We encourage the City to adhere to the current schedule aimed at City Council adoption of the final Plan in spring of 2019 so planning transitions to action. The DSP looks forward to actively partnering with the City on implementation.	Other/General	Letter
I really appreciate the tremendous amount of work the Blueprint Denver team has made to incorporate so many of the public and task force comments, and the Downtown Denver Partnership comments in particular. Blueprint Draft #2 is a greatly improved document now – more obvious in its intent, with a balanced approach to growth, a better relationship (although still not completely clear) between the Equity section and the rest of the document, and a clearer roadmap regarding how the document should be used and how it can evolve in the future.	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Chapter 1 (Applying Blueprint to Rezoning). We still do not know what "interpretation of neighborhood context or future places with "limited flexibility, especially at the edges" is intended to convey. We renew our objection to the vague nature of this reference, and our concern that this creates significant uncertainty for residents. WWPNA residents need and deserve assurances that allowing growth on our exterior borders won't serve as pretext for rezonings within our neighborhood, including erosion at the edges of our borders. Thus, we disagree with any suggestion that rezonings at the "edges" of the Future Places Map would be acceptable and ask that this language be deleted from Page 16, Chapter 1.	Other/General	Letter
We appreciate that there has been favorable change in the January 2019 draft Plan compared to the 2018 draft. However, we continue to believe the Plan leaves residents without protection from efforts by the City and/or the development community that would erode our neighborhood's existing land use pattern and character. In particular, residents within the WWPNA boundaries seek to preserve the existing mix of land use; i.e., if a block in a SU zone has one duplex, then we don't want this used as a pretext to add more. Similarly, we don't want to see a single-family home in our Speer neighborhood replaced with only a 3+-story building. CPD's approach is to leave such determinations to adopted small area and neighborhood plans, but residents want the certainty of having this addressed in the Plan itself. Denver residents are becoming exhausted by the significant time and effort required of them to preserve a reasonable quality of life in the City. We encourage CPD to adopt our requested changes to the Plan so that we can advise residents within our boundaries that their voices and desires have been not only heard but also addressed.	Other/General	Letter
I am writing on behalf of Historic Denver, Inc. to offer feedback on both the draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the second public comment draft update to Blueprint Denver. We recognize and very much appreciate that many of our November 2018 comments were included in the revised drafts, which now offer stronger language regarding historic preservation values and strategies, including both traditional preservation tools as well as new ideas that will support the places that make Denver Denver.	Other/General	Letter
Specific improvements in the revised drafts include a better description of the Strong and Authentic Neighborhoods vision element, as well as the inclusion of "preservation" in the title and description for the recommendations related to Design Quality and Built Form. We do want to emphasize that people, culture, and the built environment are interconnected, and those relationships and how they support strong and authentic neighborhoods need to be well understood if Denver is going to sustain and enhance our diverse cultural heritage.	Other/General	Letter
In closing, there are many elements of both the Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint Denver that we support, and with some additional refinement related to the topics in this letter we believe the plans will reflect the value our community places in our historic assets and cultural history. It will then be imperative that the intentions of this plan be reflected and applied consistently during implementation.	Other/General	Letter
Miller Park is a low-density residential neighborhood. Specifically, Miller Park is currently zoned as a variety of residential zone districts, including the Suburban Single Unit (S-SU-D and S-SU-I) zone districts, the Residential-1 (R-1) zone district, a small portion of Planned Unit Development, and a small portion of Suburban Mixed Use (S-MU-20) zone district. Blueprint Denver 2002 places Miller Park in an area of stability, which means that the current comprehensive plan does not contemplate change to the current land uses and density in Miller Park. Miller Park is currently a quiet residential community with single-family homes on large lots, minimal traffic, minimal noise and minimal impact from nearby non-residential uses. Miller Park strongly supports the current Blueprint Denver 2002's designation of Miller Park as an area of stability due to the concern that change to the Miller Park neighborhood would significantly and negatively impact the characteristics of the neighborhood.	Other/General	Letter
Please take time to prioritize density, improve transit, and do absolutely everything to reduce reliance on SOVs and eliminate all mandates for single family detached homes.	Other/General	Online Survey
On the first draft	Other/General	Online Survey
I suggest you need 51% approval from the citizens and resident of Denver for this plan to be valid.	Other/General	Online Survey
I like the focus in the new Blueprint Denver of creating complete, inclusive neighborhoods. Maintaining vast areas of the city as exclusively single-family detached neighborhoods is inequitable, unsustainable, and only worsens the affordable housing crisis. In order for Denver to truly be a great city, we need to have "missing middle" housing found throughout all Denver neighborhoods. The Blueprint Denver process has been going on for several years with substantial community outreach. The people who are not demanding that the process be delayed until after the municipal elections are known NIMBYs who only want to keep Denver's neighborhoods segregated by income, housing type, and housing tenure. I fully support the new Blueprint Denver and I urge Denver City Council and the Denver Planning Board to approve the new Blueprint Denver as soon as possible (along with the rest of the Denver plans) so we can get to work on implementing them!	Other/General	Online Survey
It's really hard to figure out what I'm supposed to comment on. There's a ton of information, but it's very confusing. On purpose?	Other/General	Online Survey
This would be a great plan for the city and add lots of opportunity! Denver is ready and in need of changes like this.	Other/General	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Re: Park Hill Golf Course and green space. It is my understanding George Washington Clayton wanted his land to remain agricultural and entrusted the City of Denver to keep it so. Denver did not and instead used Clayton's estate for its own benefit. The probate court discovered and relieved the city of its executor duties. Nonetheless the city has found other ways to obtain Clayton's assets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of its condemnation authority to obtain 90 acres of Park Hill Golf Course for a detention basin 2. Use of its power to rezone to change the classification of the golf course from open space subject to a perpetual conservation easement (current zoning) to privately owned open space unrestricted and potentially available for other uses subject to planning (proposed zoning) 3. Use of its planning authority to conduct a sham visioning process for the future of Park Hill Golf Course ignoring/violating the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. George Clayton's wishes, b. current zoning, c. taxpayer purchase of a conservation easement, d. opposition by stakeholders to the conclusions drawn by consultants in the visioning process, and, e. environmental considerations (heat island, air and water quality , wildlife habitat, need for parkland, quality of life, psycho-sociological impacts of nature deficit, health, etc.) <p>Denver was once considered a city in a park. It now has less than 8% of its land designated as park land, much less than comparably sized cities which have designated over 20% of their lands for parks. The additional concrete called for in Blueprint Denver requires mitigation with offsetting green space. Park Hill Golf Course is one of the few large open spaces left in the city which could be designated a city park. If we want a livable city we must have green space, responsible stewardship of our land, and an enlightened fox guarding the hen house.</p>	Other/General	Online Survey
<p>Transit: I support increased alternative transport (bike systems, trails, scooters), especially with dedicated and safe lanes. I think we needed dedicated lanes for buses so they don't get stuck in traffic. We do need affordable fares. I rode FF2 from Denver to Boulder once a week, until 36 got so busy that the bus was stuck right along with the traffic, and it cost me more than driving my '96 Bronco.</p> <p>ADU's: Full support. I built one in 2018, it has changed my financial reality and allowed me to remain in a neighborhood where the cost of living is rapidly escalating and pricing me out otherwise.</p> <p>Single Family Zoning - I propose that this designation is an outdated way to classify desired density. Marriage, blood, and adoption are the tickets into unlimited occupancy, whereas the limit is otherwise two unrelated people. It seems discriminatory, based on religious principle and increasingly outdated social norms to require marriage. What is the actual goal of this policy?</p>	Other/General	Online Survey
<p>I was a part of Blueprint Denver back in 2010 with Councilwoman Jeanne Robb and soon to be Councilwoman Carla Madison. We worked together in charrettes all over town, talking with fellow stakeholders, meeting with representatives from Portland and other cities discussing the highest and best use for our neighborhoods and city. The city of Denver brought in city planning experts like Peter Park to truly meet with concerned and engaged citizens, and listen. That Blueprint Denver project was the most transparent and welcoming of neighbors ideas that I have ever been involved with before. City Council and the Denver Planning Office honestly and professionally wanted our engagement. This time around I do not see the same concern for openness nor commitment from the City or Council to protect the integrity of these historic and iconic neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are the pride of Denver. There are ways to blend business needs for expansion and growth, and residential concerns together with honest compromise. Based on what I see of this blueprint process neither the City nor Council have operated with the same level of integrity or respect for the stakeholders as back in 2010. It is with concern for the hard-won historic neighborhood protections that I am expressing my disappointment. Since former Councilwoman Carla cannot speak for herself, I believe she would be outraged.</p>	Other/General	Online Survey
<p>Love the idea.</p>	Other/General	Online Survey
<p>Request that the Planning Board public hearing be postponed until after May elections</p>	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Concerned about the aspirational nature of the documents, looking for implementation. Concern about how complicated the documents are, inconsistency between glossary definitions, 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>	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Lot of talk about disparaging areas of stability and areas of change. Arapahoe Square should have the heights, with growth funneled there, whereas development in neighborhoods like Curtis Park should have appropriate re-development. We need to be more decisive and binary about where the growth should go. Plan is too vague.</p>	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Sufficient time and process. This has been going on for years. Plan doesn't call for too much change, in fact it doesn't call for enough change. Better use of density and infrastructure. Need walkability and places to walk to. Allow a little more in single family neighborhoods. No parking minimums, excessive parking reduces quality of life. Restaurant patios need to be smarter and not take as much space with a fence in ROW. Too deferential to Single Family housing</p>	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>The meaning of areas of stability and change have changed significantly. 2010 zoning code update may have been most inclusive outreach in Denver history, and residents still didn't know about their zoning changed. Had no idea of the effects and unintended consequences of the code. The code has not been easy to change and no holistic strategy has been considered, but instead taking on this extensive planning process. Vet plans further.</p>	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Keep the process moving forward, do not delay. There have been significant opportunities for involvement. Hope that plan will deliver a mandate to allow and facilitate ADUs throughout the city. Remove procedural barriers to ADUs. Consider impacts of requirements for design standards, don't let it become a barrier to people staying in their homes. Neighborhood voice in plan is great, but small area plans can be awhile away. Assurance neighborhoods without plans will still have a voice in processes.	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
Don't delay. The process has been happening for years and it's a good compromise. We even need it to do more. We have an affordability issue. Supply and demand-with a good economy people want to move here. Need to be bolder than just ADUs (Minneapolis example). More choice is better. So many neighborhoods where you have to get in your car to go anywhere. Need to zone for more intense uses.	Other/General	Planning Board Listening Session
The plan needs to be explicit on how to use this plan as it relates to their property. For example, when I help someone with the plan I say, "step one find the context, Step two, find the place, then go to that description in Chapter 5 and read.	Other/General	Task Force
Need to make sure RNO's have diverse representation from their neighborhoods.	Other/General	Task Force
The new Blueprint Denver draft clarifies high-level funding strategies for implementation of mobility improvements by clarifying that its recommendations are intended to be used to inform annual budget and work plans, CIP priorities. The addition of consolidated strategies and recommendations in the implementation matrix improves the ability to reference the plan on an ongoing basis. While it is in the nature of high-level plans that specific assurance cannot be given on funding the priorities identified – which is a major concern in of our members – the new draft provides an appreciated improvement.	Other/General	Letter
Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend next weeks "listening session" on the draft of Blueprint. In general I believe there is much like and a little not to about the proposed plan, but one section gives me grave concern. In the urban, urban edge, and suburban residential description the Blueprint draft includes the attached language which I would suggest be removed or modified significantly: This passage biases Blueprint against individual homeowners while allowing latitude for developers doing large projects. What is says to me as an individual homeowner is 'we don't have time for your case' This clause works against historic preservation goals. I renovated a vintage home that from an economic perspective was not worth saving given the significant structural, mechanical and other work that was needed. It sits a very large urban lot that is expensive and unnecessary in today's environment and that excess land gave us the confidence to invest in saving the structure as we could access it's value if we needed to. There many other historic homes that have been saved because owners were able to make good use of land that they did not want or need. This passage is redundant as character and context will already be addressed in other plans. Finally, there is no need for this passage. The prevalence of individual lot divisions is very small as noted by perhaps only 2-3 having reached planning board in the past 3 years. (regarding Residential Low implementation box)	Places Descriptions	Email
Consider adding language to Low Min Lot Size guidance that you need to look at lot patterns of SIMILAR land uses (ie. single unit to single unit, not single unit to industrial lots)	Places Descriptions	Internal
pg 290 - add description of influence area in text. Use "Airport Influence Overlay in the DZC"	Places Descriptions	Internal
Add guidance to Res Low about minimum lot sizes and that patterns should be of similar uses.	Places Descriptions	Internal
Remove reference to "residential" arterials and collectors in Low-Medium descriptions. No need to limit to only residential collectors.	Places Descriptions	Internal
Consider changing heights in UC community centers from 8 to 12 stories or more. Could affect regional centers as well	Places Descriptions	Internal
In aiport section, where we describe potential process to change AIO, change from City-DEN led to City-led. Check if this is also in Airport recommendations in LUBF Econ	Places Descriptions	Internal
Districts chapter: add description of AIO to airport section that can be referenced from maps.	Places Descriptions	Internal
P270, Quality of Life para – second sentence is unclear – what does “Social interaction is prioritized through the center” mean?	Places Descriptions	Letter
Chapter 5.4 - General Urban Context. Our Speer neighborhood is particularly vulnerable to excessive change that is incompatible with our existing land use patterns. As previously indicated, we object to the lack of a "Low" designation for the General Urban Context. If a "Low" designation cannot or will not be added to the General Urban Context, then please be advised that WWPNA will seek to have a number of blocks within our Speer neighborhood recharacterized as Urban Context. Additionally, assuming a City-wide intended absorption for Denver neighborhoods of new units and given the current G-MU-3 zoning in our Speer neighborhood, how many units would that accommodate? Furthermore, if our Speer neighborhood is allowed to expand to 5-8 stories, how many more units would that allow by 2040? We believe this would lead to considerably more density than has been suggested. Again, this is inequitable to our neighborhood.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Redlines - page 231 For applying Residential low guidancen change "neighborhood input" in last sentance to "neighborhood support. Add "existing neighborhood plan" before "adopted small area plan". With minimum lot size guidance change "in the surrounding blocks" to "on the applicable block"	Places Descriptions	Letter
P267, Quality of Life para –add “A high quality, well-maintained network of parks, flexible outdoor spaces, plazas and landscaped streets is essential in the intensely built-up Downtown context, in order to enhance the microclimate and pedestrian environment for all users. This is highlighted by a consistent canopy of street trees incorporated within green infrastructure, planters, or structural cells.	Places Descriptions	Letter
P268-269, second para, first line, change to “Examples of iconic places in this context include...”	Places Descriptions	Letter
P 270, Mobility para, third line, change to “area with a complete network of high ease-of-use bicycle facilities.”	Places Descriptions	Letter
P270, Quality of Life para –add “Streets are well-landscaped with a consistent and robust street-tree canopy to improve the microclimate and walkability.”	Places Descriptions	Letter
P 272-273, Quality of Life para – add “These spaces are connected by a consistent canopy of street trees and landscaping incorporated within green infrastructure, planters or structural cells.”	Places Descriptions	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>P 274-275 – Quality of Life para – at end of first sentence add “ designed to be welcoming to all ages.” Then change last sentence to “These spaces are connected by a consistent canopy of street trees and landscaping incorporated within green infrastructure, planters or structural cells.”</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>P 276, Street Types – Add “Intersections are well-designed to clearly protect pedestrian and bicycle users”</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>C11apter 5.3 - Urban Context. We continue to object to the lack of a single-family only designation in the Plan itself. Reducing "Low" density to a combination of single family and two-unit structures (and more, if your proposal allowing fourplexes on the corners of collector streets were to carry the day) puts our neighborhood in the position of having all R-2 or greater density zoning, which is what we fought so hard to address as it did not match the predominant existing land use and still doesn't. This is not what residents have told us they want. In 2018, the WWPNA membership voted to re-affirm heir support for our existing Neighborhood Plan and the U-SU-C, U-SU-B and U-SU-B2 contexts in our Speer and WWP neighborhood. We continue to believe CPD's position that rezoning existing single-family only areas be determined by small area plans, neighborhood plans, and neighborhood input is a flawed approach because: (a) it requires constant vigilance, time and effort on the part of residents to maintain the single-family quality of life they already fought hard for, which is disrespectful of the years of effort already invested and (b) it pits residents against developers. Please also see our changes to Pages 230 and 231 (enclosed herewith), which we believe are the minimum protections to which residents are entitled in the Plan document.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>Redlines - page 230. From Low test remove "as well as" in the second sentence after collector streets. In the last sentence in the LUBF paragraph of low, change "generally up to" to "limited to" as it relates to 2.5 stories in height for Urban Residential. Add "as expressed by an existing neighborhood plan , adopted small area plan or with significant neighborhood support."</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>Dear Denver Community Planning and Development: Foster Graham Milstein & Calisher, LLP (“FGMC”) represents the Miller Park RNO (“Miller Park”), which is a registered neighborhood organization with the City and County of Denver. Miller Park encompasses the region of real property that is located roughly East of University Boulevard, North of Alameda Avenue, West of South Steele Street and South of Cedar Avenue. Miller Park is a low-density residential neighborhood. Specifically, Miller Park is currently zoned as a variety of residential zone districts, including the Suburban Single Unit (S-SU-D and S-SU-I) zone districts, the Residential-1 (R-1) zone district, a small portion of Planned Unit Development, and a small portion of Suburban Mixed Use (S-MU-20) zone district. Blueprint Denver 2002 places Miller Park in an area of stability, which means that the current comprehensive plan does not contemplate change to the current land uses and density in Miller Park. Miller Park is currently a quiet residential community with single-family homes on large lots, minimal traffic, minimal noise and minimal impact from nearby non-residential uses. Miller Park strongly supports the current Blueprint Denver 2002’s designation of Miller Park as an area of stability due to the concern that change to the Miller Park neighborhood would significantly and negatively impact the characteristics of the neighborhood. Denveright identifies Miller Park as a Suburban Neighborhood Context and primarily as a Low Residential Future Place 2040. Denveright defines the Low Residential Future Place as “generally characterized by single-unit uses on larger lots. Accessory dwelling units and compatible two-unit uses are appropriate and can be thoughtfully integrated.”¹ Miller Park strongly supports Denveright’s Low Residential designation because such designation reflects the current character of Miller Park, which should be maintained and continued. However, Miller Park is concerned with Denveright’s future place designation for the property on the far western and far eastern sides of Miller Park. Specifically, Denveright identifies the western portion of Miller Park abutting University Boulevard as a Low-Medium Future Place. Denveright defines Low-Medium as a “mix of low-scale, multi-unit residential as well as some more limited single- and two-unit residential uses.”² Miller Park respectfully opposes Denveright’s designation of the western side of Miller Park as a Low-Medium Future Place because such designation would significantly and negatively change the character of Miller Park. As explained above, Miller Park is currently predominately single-family homes on large lots. The Low-Medium Residential district calls for low-scale multi-unit residential with a limited amount of single-family homes – a drastic change from the current predominately single-family home neighborhood. The western portion of Miller Park identified as the Low-Medium Future Place is currently developed as a church, however, its zoning designation is S-SU-D. Miller Park strongly believes that Denveright’s future designation of the currently developed church property should reflect the current area of stability and that any future redevelopment of the church should be limited to Low Residential Future Place to ensure compatibility with the character of Miller Park. Denveright identifies the eastern portion of Miller Park abutting South Steele Street as a High Residential Future Place. Denveright defines High Residential as “a high number of multi-unit residential buildings.”³ Currently, this portion of Miller Park is zoned S-MU-20, which is a Suburban Mixed-Use Zone District allowing 20-story buildings. To the extent that the High Residential Future Place designation does not increase the future developable density to greater than its current density, Miller Park does not oppose this future place designation. However, to the extent that the High Residential Future Place designation would increase the allowable density on the eastern portion of Miller Park, Miller Park strongly opposes such designation. Miller Park is specifically concerned that an increase in residential density in either of the above discussed portions of Miller Park would: (1) increase both residential and non-residential traffic within Miller Park, thus changing the quiet neighborhood character; (2) increase noise and parking congestion; (3) cause congestion on current open space in the neighborhood; and (4) strain the current infrastructure in Miller Park including, but not limited to the drainage system, streets and sidewalks. For the foregoing reasons, Miller Park formally expresses its support for Denveright’s Low Residential Future Place designation in Miller Park. Miller Park also respectfully expresses its opposition of Denveright’s Low-Medium and High Residential Future place designation for certain portions of Miller Park. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments and thank you for your consideration of Miller Park’s concern and support.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>It feels like the suburban context is still trying to approve an untenable, sprawling building form that should not be necessary just because there is available open space. By signifying that suburban context is "more auto-oriented" than others, this document will basically ruin any attempt at "quality multimodal activity." I do appreciate mentioning how people walking and biking need to be able to reach destinations safely. However, I feel like adding the caveat, " the trips may be longer than in other contexts," will be interpreted by some to mean that long, circuitous routes are fine, meaning most pedestrian and bike routing will be long, inconvenient paths between two destinations that most will not want to utilize. Block patterns, which prevent easy walking, biking, and emergency services, should not continue to be installed as irregular and curvilinear.</p>	Places Descriptions	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The "Applying Residential "Low" Guidance to Proposed Rezonings" language or very similar appears to be included in the urban, urban edge, suburban residential sections of the plan as relates to rezonings. I live in an urban district and my reading is that this language biases the plan against individual homeowners vs developers doing large projects, it is a barrier to historic preservation where unnecessarily large lots by today's standards may be a burden to remodeling and preserving and existing structure, and it is redundant to other plans which will already set context and character requirements. The effect of this clause will be to make nearly any residential rezoning inconsistent with Blueprint and more flexibility should remain here.</p>	Places Descriptions	Online Survey
<p>On p. 230, under the description of Urban Neighborhood, the language about providing "guidance for evaluating potential rezoning" in "low residential areas," is too restrictive, burdensome and unnecessary. The zoning code already has "minimum lot size requirements" and there is no need to further add restrictions. In fact, Blueprint should be supporting infill in Urban residential areas, especially on large estate lots and other underutilized plots of land like carriage lots.</p>	Places Descriptions	Online Survey
<p>These comments are offered by Hilarie Portell, Executive Director of the Colfax Mayfair Business Improvement District, on behalf of our board of directors.</p> <p>Street Type Page 157: Colfax is characterized as a "Neighborhood Arterial" on the Street Types map. Yet Colfax is envisioned as a Main Street in the East Area Plan initiative and has been called a Main Street in numerous earlier plans for more than 20 years. The Bus Rapid Transit and Colfax Corridor Improvements plans contemplate a walkable Main Street context and related public improvements, which would not be implementable in the Neighborhood Arterial type. The map itself shows NO main streets at all in Denver. This appears to be a mistake.</p> <p>2. Community Corridor Page 228-229: A large portion of our district is called "Urban Neighborhood Community Corridor." This is East Colfax Avenue from Elm Street to Monaco Parkway on the north (South Park Hill) and roughly Holly Street to Monaco Parkway to the south (part of Mayfair Neighborhood). The description of "Urban Neighborhood Community Corridor" includes mixed use buildings up to 8 stories tall. However, photos show 4-story buildings.</p> <p>This is in direct conflict with language on the map of Urban Areas on pg. 225, which states: "Urban areas are largely residential, with low- and mid-scale mixed-use areas along community corridors."</p> <p>It is also in conflict with language describing urban corridors on pg. 212, which states that urban corridors "should be consistent with the character of the surrounding area in scale and design." Adjacent neighborhoods (South Park Hill and part of Mayfair) are low density, predominately 1-and 2-unit neighborhoods, typical of the Urban Neighborhood context.</p> <p>In addition, most commercial parcels in that part of Colfax are too small for such large-scale development (75% of the parcels are less than 20,000 square feet). By contrast, parts of Colfax in the higher density "General Urban" context (Capitol Hill and West Colfax) allow for buildings up to 5 stories tall (pg. 244) but photos on pg. 245 show buildings up to 10 stories tall. And parts of Colfax in the "Urban Edge" areas east of Monaco Parkway allow for buildings up to 5 stories tall (pg.212) Buildings up to 8 stories tall are allowed in the much higher-density "Urban Center Community Corridor" context, in areas like Cherry Creek and the Gates Redevelopment (pg. 258). Why would the city allow buildings up to 8 stories tall in the lower density Urban Neighborhood part of Colfax? This context is not remotely comparable to the Cherry Creek and Gates areas. Economic development planning for the East Area Plan is focused on encouraging taller buildings on large lots near BRT stations and in the Mayfair Town Center. A small-lot strategy is being analyzed for the smaller lots.</p> <p>We request that the language for Urban Neighborhood Community Corridor in this section of Colfax be changed to buildings that are a maximum of 5 stories, with the location of those buildings being informed by the subsequent East Area Plan.</p>	Places Descriptions	Online Survey
<p>On page 234, concerns about the street graphic representation being accurate.</p>	Places Descriptions	Task Force
<p>I applaud the hard work, public outreach and initiatives put forth in the most recent draft of Blueprint Denver. As a business owner, attainable housing and how Denver attempts to solve this issue is one of my and I believe Denver's biggest challenges over the next 20+ years. The cost of housing has outpaced household incomes to point where a majority can't afford to live in Denver. This results in a multitude of economic impacts, traffic and infrastructure demands, growth limitations in surrounding counties and a number of other synergistic issues. While the expansion of ADU's will help, I believe the committee should strongly consider "Cottage Zoning". Cottage zoning is a concept that would provide existing homeowners the ability to subdivide larger SFD lots with the Denver framework for smaller cottage units to be constructed. Denver has very limited land for housing. The large master plans such as Stapleton, Lowry, Green Valley Ranch and others have a limited life. Construction defect has stifled the ability to build condos that are affordable. The only ones being constructed are high priced and not attainable. The key to long term viability is to allow density to be spread across Denver within the existing neighborhoods.</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>•The Westwood Neighborhood Plan recommends the currently unavailable zoning code of UE-MX-5 (Urban Edge, Mixed-Use, 5 stories). The closest zoning code that is available is UE-MX-3.</p> <p>oIf the corridor implements the plan's recommended zoning of UE-MX-5, it would encourage parcel assembly to allow for bigger sites all along the corridor. But the panelists recommended doing something different to highlight the unique sizes and shapes of the existing sites and to encourage the ongoing use of existing buildings along the northern end of the corridor to keep rents affordable, since new construction is expensive.</p> <p>oThe problem with a single zoning code along the corridor is that when you want to do something unique, zoning typically won't allow it.</p> <p>oZoning in Denver was designed primarily for rectangular blocks on a street grid, but Morrison Road's diagonal creates unique parcel shapes and sizes that don't fit well with the existing code.</p>	Places Mapping	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>•Since Morrison Road has smaller parcels and uses in the north and larger parcels and uses along the southern end, overlay zoning can treat these areas differently. Variations to be addressed in the overlay zoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oBuild-to (street activation). Flexibility in form standards: build-to requirements (variety in how buildings address the street) oSiting (public and green space). Expand public space (with the goal of more public art, gathering space, and plazas) oAccess (customized, shared) oParking (creative solutions at site and on the street, incl. side streets) oMassing & Setbacks (attn. to height and shading of adjacent properties) oEnsure options for pop-up and cluster vending oEnsure uses accommodate art making, live-work-exhibit space in the mixed-use zoning oCreate options for interactive or installation public art (special uses) <p>•Sub-area 1: Alameda to Perry (Arts District) - small scale development, rehab, reuse (incentivize small local business, creative rehab, and new construction on large sites)</p> <p>•Sub-area 2: Perry to Sheridan: larger scale development, mixed use</p> <p>oProvide incentives (like a density/height bonus) in this subarea for developers who provide Community Benefits, such as: Affordable Housing & Retail Space, Community Space/Plazas, Public Art, Tree Canopy and Green Space, Live/Work & Exhibit Space for artists. RiNo has implemented this if you would like a direct example of how to implement.</p> <p>•Adopt Morrison road overlay into Denver Zoning code including standards, guidelines, and an opportunity for community input.</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>o Morrison Road Blueprint Denver – Place designation from Community Corridor to Local Corridor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Currently listed as “Pedestrian Shopping Corridor”</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>I represent the owners of 1634, 1640, 1650 and 1680 Sheridan. I am contacting you on behalf of these property owners to officially provide input to the January 7 Blueprint Draft for the Sheridan Street area between Colfax and W 17th Ave. Regarding Neighborhood Context, we support the Urban Context. For the Future Places Map we support the current High-Medium Residential designation at this location. It is appropriate for Sheridan properties here and is also consistent with the recommendations in the West Colfax Plan. Given proximity to services, shopping, transit, parks and amenities in the immediate area High-Medium is the best designation. We request that High-Medium be kept and made a part of the final version of Blueprint as Blueprint advances through the approval process.</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>I represent the owner of 1080 + 1090 King Street in Villa Park, just across Lakewood Dry Gulch Park from the Knox Court Rail Platform on RTD's W Line. I am contacting you on behalf of this property owner to officially provide input to the January 7 Blueprint Draft for the Villa Park Neighborhood north of 19th Ave. Regarding Neighborhood Context, we support the Urban Context. For the Future Places Map we support the current High-Medium Residential designation at this location. It is appropriate for Sheridan properties here and is also consistent with the recommendations in the West Colfax Plan. Given proximity to services, shopping, transit, parks and amenities in the immediate area High-Medium is the best designation. We request that High-Medium be kept and made a part of the final version of Blueprint as Blueprint advances through the approval process. Please contact me should you wish to discuss this.</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>change Boulevard One from General Urban to Urban</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Clean up "extra" corridor lots at Colfax & Osceola</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Clean up "extra" corridor lots south of Colfax between Lowell & Knox</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Clean up "extra" corridor lots around Meade & 1st</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Park QA/QC for Far NE- SEE MAP FOR EDITS</p>	Places Mapping	internal
<p>Future Places QA/QC for Far NE- SEE MAP FOR EDITS</p>	Places Mapping	internal
<p>Stadium district plan coordination for places mapping</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>fix urban edge color in context map legend on pg 139</p>	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Add current boundaries of AIO overlay to the following maps, with legend explaining these are areas where residential is not allowed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth map - Places map - Neighborhood context map - Places map in suburban and districts chapters 	Places Mapping	Internal
<p>Some Low Residential areas are still noted as Low-Medium Residential Areas Where Low Residential areas are shown as Low-Medium Residential Areas, the Map and accompanying descriptions of density and height would incentivize redevelopment, destroying the character of those areas of our neighborhood. Specific requests include changing the map where U-TU-B and U-TU-B2 districts along Federal Boulevard (in the Potter Highlands Landmark District) are shown as Low-Medium to Low Residential Areas, changing ALL U-RH-2.5 districts from Low-Medium to Low Residential Areas, and changing other U-TU-B, U-TU-B2 and U-RH-2.5 districts along West 32nd Avenue and in Southeast Highland from Low-Medium to Low Residential Areas. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Some U-MX-3 areas are still mis-characterized as High-Medium Residential Areas. Where U-MX-3 districts are shown as High-Medium Residential Areas, the Map and accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment beyond current zoning regulations, destroying the character of those areas of our neighborhood. These 3-story districts should be shown as Low-Medium Residential Areas. Our specific request is to change the map where the U-MX-3 district along Navajo Street between West 35th and West 37th Avenues is shown as High-Medium Residential to a Low-Medium Residential Area. The extent of this Low-Medium Residential Area should correspond to the boundaries of the U-MX-3 district. SEE HUNI REDLINE of FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>The U-MS-3 parcel at the NE corner of West 32nd Avenue and Zuni Street is mis-characterized as a Local Center. The U-MS-3 parcel at the NE corner of West 32nd Avenue and Zuni Street is mis-characterized as a Local Center. This is a residential structure developed by a neighborhood organization. Our request is to change the mapping from Local Center to Low-Medium Residential Area. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>The B-4 parcel at the NE corner of Speer and Federal is mis-characterized as a Community Corridor. The B-4 parcel at the NE corner of Speer Boulevard and Federal Boulevard is mis-characterized as a Community Corridor. Because commercial uses along both Boulevards in Highland tend to be nodal rather linear, we request that this parcel be changed from Community Corridor to Community Center. Community Corridor designation allows heights up to 8 stories, well beyond Highland's typical allowed heights. Community Center would allow a more reasonable 5 stories. SEE HUNI REDLINE of FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Some U-MS-2 districts are mis-characterized as Community Centers or Local Corridors. Along West 38th Avenue between Decatur Street and Alcott Street, areas zoned U-MS-2 are mapped as Local Corridor (3 stories). This is another location where the commercial uses are at nodes rather than being continuous along a corridor. These designations on the Map and in accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment beyond current zoning regulations, significantly altering the character of those areas of our neighborhood which are particularly sensitive to change because of the adjoining Potter Highlands Landmark District. Heights are currently limited to two stories. Our request is to change the Map from Local Corridor to Local Center to better align with the Highland Neighborhood. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first objection is the identification of the section along the west side of University Boulevard, from 1st Avenue to 4th Avenue (the "Area"), as Community and Regional Urban Centers. •CCHN objects to this designation as it does not accurately reflect the character of the CCHN neighborhood which the Area borders nor does it recognize the potential impact to the residences the Area adjoins. While the Area is considered part of the Cherry Creek Business Improvement District (the "BID"), it shares a boundary line with CCHN. As such, we believe that the Area should be designated in keeping with the zoning laws (C-CCN-5 and PUD) previously approved by City Council for the Area. We seek assurance that the Planning Board recognizes the CCHN historic residential neighborhood adjoining the BID and provides a transition between the Area and our neighbors' backyards. 	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>However, Miller Park is concerned with Denveright's future place designation for the property on the far western and far eastern sides of Miller Park. Specifically, Denveright identifies the western portion of Miller Park abutting University Boulevard as a Low-Medium Future Place. Denveright defines Low-Medium as a "mix of low-scale, multi-unit residential as well as some more limited single- and two-unit residential uses."2 Miller Park respectfully opposes Denveright's designation of the western side of Miller Park as a Low-Medium Future Place because such designation would significantly and negatively change the character of Miller Park. As explained above, Miller Park is currently predominately single-family homes on large lots. The Low-Medium Residential district calls for low-scale multi-unit residential with a limited amount of single-family homes – a drastic change from the current predominately single-family home neighborhood. The western portion of Miller Park identified as the Low-Medium Future Place is currently developed as a church, however, its zoning designation is S-SU-D. Miller Park strongly believes that Denveright's future designation of the currently developed church property should reflect the current area of stability and that any future redevelopment of the church should be limited to Low Residential Future Place to ensure compatibility with the character of Miller Park.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Denveright identifies the eastern portion of Miller Park abutting South Steele Street as a High Residential Future Place. Denveright defines High Residential as "a high number of multi-unit residential buildings."3 Currently, this portion of Miller Park is zoned S-MU-20, which is a Suburban Mixed-Use Zone District allowing 20-story buildings. To the extent that the High Residential Future Place designation does not increase the future developable density to greater than its current density, Miller Park does not oppose this future place designation. However, to the extent that the High Residential Future Place designation would increase the allowable density on the eastern portion of Miller Park, Miller Park strongly opposes such designation.</p> <p>Miller Park is specifically concerned that an increase in residential density in either of the above discussed portions of Miller Park would: (1) increase both residential and non-residential traffic within Miller Park, thus changing the quiet neighborhood character; (2) increase noise and parking congestion; (3) cause congestion on current open space in the neighborhood; and (4) strain the current infrastructure in Miller Park including, but not limited to the drainage system, streets and sidewalks.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>The designation of the C-MX-5 district on the north side of the intersection of West 32nd Avenue and Tejon Street is difficult to discern on the map. It appears to be half-way between Low-Medium and High-Medium Residential. We request that the C-MX-5 zone district at this location be shown CLEARLY as a Medium-High Residential Area to conform to actual and proposed development. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>FUTURE PLACES MAP This map still mis-characterizes some portions of the Highland Neighborhood We request that this map be fully updated per our version of the map. We have superimposed existing zoning districts to help clarify where the currently proposed map does not correspond to currently allowed zoning, densities, height, and locations of Centers and Corridors. SEE REDLINE OF FUTURE PLACES MAP and specific descriptions of areas still requiring modifications that follow:</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Change context from General Urban to Urban in Residential Core</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Change Federal from Community to Local Corridor (no taller than 5 stories)</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Denverright identifies Miller Park as a Suburban Neighborhood Context and primarily as a Low Residential Future Place 2040. Denverright defines the Low Residential Future Place as “generally characterized by single-unit uses on larger lots. Accessory dwelling units and compatible two-unit uses are appropriate and can be thoughtfully integrated.”¹ Miller Park strongly supports Denverright’s Low Residential designation because such designation reflects the current character of Miller Park, which should be maintained and continued.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Change properties at 3411 Albion and 3400 Albion from Residential Low Medium to Medium High</p>	Places Mapping	Office Hours
<p>Overall, I believe it is a good plan. However, I am particularly concerned about your designation of Country Club being bordered by an area designated as Urban Center. Currently, there does exist some commercial development that borders Gaylord Street from 1st Avenue up to 4th Avenue; however, the houses that line Gaylord Street are historically designated. To allow their backyards to potentially be developed according to the guidelines of community and regional centers of an Urban Center would negatively impact the historic feel of these homes and neighborhood. Please designate that area - the area from 1st Avenue north along University Boulevard - as Urban Edge. I believe that this would ensure that this area does not develop into something that causes conflict with the historically designated neighborhood that it borders.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>On the places map, the region along Sheridan between 16th and 17th changed from a 'Local Corridor' in the original draft to 'High Medium' residential area, which is still described as generally supporting '5 story' buildings. This is incredibly frustrating that the plan still seems to justify 5 story buildings given the current configuration of the neighborhood and overwhelming neighborhood sentiment that 5 story buildings are entirely inappropriate here.</p> <p>As you know, the entire 'low residential' neighborhood surrounding these properties is fighting an effort by those property owners along Sheridan to upzone from their current 2 story residential property zone code to allow for 5 stories, and surrounding neighbors also provided significant feedback about the previous draft maps seemingly still justifying this scale of high density redevelopment in the currently low density neighborhood. So, it seems the change to 'High Medium' in this new draft is still largely ignoring the sentiment of the surrounding community about these properties, and what neighbors found so objectionable about the earlier draft.</p> <p>Neighbors were not so much upset about potential mixed-user / commercial development along here, but were outraged at a plan that could be used to justify construction of potentially 50-70ft tall buildings and 100's of units separated by just a narrow alley from a neighborhood of largely 1 story, single family homes. Even in a 3 story zoning code, the slope of the street could be leveraged by a developer to get an extra above ground floor and an extra 12' feet above the already generous 45' foot height restriction. It is ridiculous to consider construction of that scale as respectful of the adjacent properties, who would have their view of the sky and foothills entirely blocked and their back yard privacy ruined.</p> <p>Furthermore, and almost more significantly, the properties along Sheridan here do not have direct access to Sheridan, and so the burden of increased traffic and parking would fall to the adjacent neighborhood streets. The properties along Sheridan are no more equipped to handle high density than the properties along Zenobia, so why are they being singled out for 'High Medium' residential redevelopment at the expense of established low density neighborhood that they are in.</p> <p>It's like CPD is applying an oversimplified formula of 'Sheridan is a busy street', so let's allow them to build tall buildings, without even considering how traffic flow into and out of those properties would work, or how tall buildings there would do nothing but diminish the surrounding properties and quality of life for the established residents. Having spent so much time trying to gather this input from the neighbors, and to provide this input to CPD both in person, and in written feedback to the surveys, and through RNO letters, it is now incredibly frustrating to see that CPD has ignored this input and has released a new draft plan that still justifies 5 story, high density development here.</p> <p>Given the details of the surrounding properties, the topology of neighborhood streets, and the overwhelming sentiment of the surrounding neighborhood, these properties should be low, or low-medium places as most in this plan. A place type designation of low, or low-medium would still allow development of higher density row homes or small apartments, like what has been done closer to the light rail station. However, a place-type designation that seemingly justifies 5 story buildings, is ridiculous and is not reflective of neighborhood input to these plans.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a longtime resident and now business owner in the Uptown/City Park West neighborhood. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would allow my neighborhood to be rezoned to change the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>The residential area bounded by Colfax, 17th Ave., Park Ave. West, and York needs to remain limited to three stories, with front setbacks respected. This area needs to maintain a diversity of housing stock, which includes housing for families, which includes front and back yards. In addition, the impact of future development along 16th Ave. must consider the impact on the 16th Ave. bike lane, one of the most heavily used bike lanes. In particular, developments that shade the bike lanes in the winter, which can render the bike lanes unusable, should not be allowed.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The commercial area along 1st Avenue and Josephine Street should be identified as Urban Edge, not an Urban Center. Erasing the the final feet of privately owned land of a city neighborhood with tall business edifices blocking the sun, and dominating multi-story shadows overlooking into the privacy of properties extending westward for several blocks, all add up to the expected development greed and bottlenecked traffic that awaits. Why has the city encouraged historic neighborhood investment and preservation of our neighborhood communities only to degrade the adjacent neighborhoods with grotesque commercial growth on steroids? Consider the future of the citizens who have invested in the adjacent neighborhoods over the past decades and those family oriented citizens of the future. Again, this is the titillation of Blueprint 2040 designers and salivating developers - largely individuals who don't live in the adjacent neighborhood - to prioritize tax revenue over quality of life issues of their fellow citizens.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>This comment is on behalf of Regis University in regard to the current Place Type designation proposed in the 01/07/2019 Public Draft of Blueprint Denver Update for the eastern edge of the University's property. The designation in question is along the western edge of Federal Boulevard, between W 52 nd Avenue and W 50 th Avenue. It is our strong belief that the appropriate designation for this area is Campus – District, not Community Corridor.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I understand when looking at a whole city, some areas will get "pinched" off on a general scale. But in a neighborhood, half a block may be the key to keeping the circulation of a neighborhood going versus pinching of a part. In our neighborhood in the north portion of UHills, classifying the west side of S Ash between Wesley and Iliff as part of the "commercial" corridor will constitute that pinching off - single family residences serving as a bridge to the neighboring townhome/ multifamily apartment units will be lost. Can the sense of neighborhood continuity survive with a single block strand of single family residences - or will it cut off the multifamily portion, thereby losing the diversity, inclusiveness of the neighborhood, splitting it into "dense, multifamily TOD only" and "single-family residence only" areas ? It'd be good to make sure the two remain connected. I really appreciated the notations of changes between the drafts.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>For the area of East Iliff Avenue between Colorado Boulevard and Dahlia the current draft does not take sufficient account of new developments. Specifically single family suburban zoning is not in line with new development and changing age demographics. Also this zoning is not optimal for the transit oriented nature of this area. Although some areas of change did not experience new development under the old blueprint this is in part because other development was slow between the purchase of land and the constructions of new buildings. The completion of these projects, however, has created a startling and disruptive transition between higher density townhouse and apartment / commercial buildings, on the one hand, and single family on the other hand. This discontinuity makes new single family development less desirable, calling for more flexibility in building forms as well as some smaller minimum lot sizes. This would create a smoother transition between developments to the north and single family areas to the south. Also this would take account of the changing demographics as the neighborhood increasingly attracts younger professionals and their families. Many of these new residents are attracted to the urban nature of this area which has been increased by light rail and change in land use. However, many of the suburban homes on Iliff appear somewhat out of place in the new environment. This makes reinvestment in new or updated single family homes less likely.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Statement Regarding Definition of "Other Parks and Open Space" in 3rd Blueprint Denver Draft Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding "Parks and Open Space." It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of "Other Parks and Open Space": "subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land."G Among the properties identified as "Other Parks and Open Space" in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust ("Clayton") in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is "to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space...." Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton's earlier decision to terminate it--Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land "as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public...." The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of "Other Parks and Open Spaces."</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Great updates to Villa Park! Thanks for taking our feedback into account!</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I fully expect the Villa Park Neighborhood Association to oppose the designations for higher density in the neighborhood. Rest assured that that group does not accurately represent the opinions of the majority of the neighborhood residents. Most of us in the area appreciate the vision to increase density and the opportunities for development near transit that could result. Their insistence on minimizing and preventing development has caused stagnation and deterioration in areas that are primed for exciting opportunities. When you get negative feedback from the VPNA, know that they do not speak for the majority of residents in the area. Thanks for helping us move toward a brighter future, and not returning to the 1991 Villa Park Neighborhood Plan that the VPNA views as scripture to this day!</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”:</p> <p>“subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G</p> <p>Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267.</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.”</p> <p>It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding thefollowing at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”:</p> <p>“subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”</p> <p>Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No.9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that-</p> <p>-upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....”</p> <p>The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267.</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I would like to endorse this statement regarding the unique status of Park Hill Golf Course:</p> <p>Statement Regarding the Definition of “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 3rd Blueprint Denver Draft Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft. This document should be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....”. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”:</p> <p>“subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G</p> <p>Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267.</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Statement Regarding the Definition of “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 3rd Blueprint Denver Draft</p> <p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”:</p> <p>“subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G</p> <p>Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267.</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I like the updated zoning to allow for greater density south of Paco Sanchez Park.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Statement Regarding the Definition of “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver Draft Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that- -upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that- -upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>This important document be further augmented in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”G Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that- -upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3 rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”: “subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.” Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2 nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that- -upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding “Parks and Open Space.” It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Space”:</p> <p>“subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land.”</p> <p>Among the properties identified as “Other Parks and Open Space” in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that-upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it- Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the City. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of “Other Parks and Open Spaces.”</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>For purposes of clarity, please add the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of "Other Parks and Open Space": "subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land." The Park Hill Golf Course land is unique among the properties identified as "Other Parks and Open Space" due to the perpetual open space conservation easement that the City purchased from the Clayton Trust in 1997 in exchange for \$2 million.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>The stretch along University from 3rd Ave to 6th Ave should be deemed as Urban Edge rather than General Urban. This stretch is more part of a neighborhood than the Business Improvement District, as it is all residential.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I'm a big fan of the BRT project(s), but am fearful the traffic from Colfax will move onto 13th and 14th - which already have too many fast-traveling cars flying through neighborhoods. I also think Denver would benefit from changing much of the first few lots surrounding City Park from G-MU-3, which limits builds to 3 stories, to G-MU-12 or G-MU 20, which would allow up to 12 or 20 stories, respectively. Major urban parks are typically surrounded by high-rises (sort of like the northern parts of Cheesman are now, or how parts of Sloan Lake now have C-MX-12 zoning), and it blows my mind this opportunity isn't seized by Denver. Buildings of that height are also great because they can build parking into the first few stories of their buildings. Adding a large stock of condo and apartment inventory in that area would also ease prices elsewhere in the city, and help businesses along Colfax just 2 blocks south. With Rapid Bus Transit going in, it will benefit Colfax to have more density up on 17th where it makes sense. Besides, there are already two towers grandfathered in by old hospital zoning there. It makes sense to create more density. For preserving historic neighborhoods, Denver's on the right path with things like U-TU-C zones, which allow for multi-unit housing but only within a certain restrictions (lots have to be 5,500 sq ft, height restricted to 30', etc.). As far as biking goes, there's no safe way to get from my house to Union Station. Bikers don't want to go uphill from Congress Park through Cheesman Park, nor do they want to go out of their way up Steele through City Park. A way up Columbine/Elizabeth past East HS and onto 16th is preferred, but it's hard to cross speeding cars on 13th/14th.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>The Blueprint Denver is definitely more fine-tuned than the old draft. However, I'm miffed as to why Sheridan Blvd has been downzoned somewhat. This is especially surprising as it is a major transportation corridor, promoting connectivity, especially in the area from 17th and Sheridan to Colfax and Sheridan and to the light rail station. Here, there is no sidewalk, and the houses along the street are either empty lots or in a poor state of repair. I feel that the planners might have been unduly influence by neighbors on Zenobia St who refuse to acknowledge Denver's growth and the necessity of change!! Please let more people enjoy the park, mass transit, affordable housing - and don't let the single family homeowners over-influence the new blueprint. I.E., stay the course, and don't downzone along major transportation corridors. Thank you for your consideration!! David Weber</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I'm concerned that the proposed General Urban language greatly mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Park Avenue, the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor. It describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" although there's only ONE older building above 3 stories in this entire zoning protected residential area! The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, completely untrue and putting at risk the zoning-protected green space and walkability designed into the historic setbacks of 30' to 40' on each side of all its north-south streets and which guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, also untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single home residential, with some duplexes, and very occasional, usually historic multi-units. Overall, by mischaracterizing the neighborhood, the proposed language puts at risk the hard-won historic neighborhood character protections in the current 2010 zoning code, there through the hard work of Councilmember Hiawatha Davis, the Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, Denver City Planning staff, and neighborhood activist/then City Councilmember Carla Madison.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Higher density allowed along Colfax in the La Alma Lincoln Park neighborhood makes sense due to the fact that Auraria campus light rail stop is across the street and the retail along Colfax is dated and no loner serves the community. This is a perfect spot for dense multifamily housing to create affordable housing, student housing and possibly even teacher housing.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I'm concerned that the proposed General Urban language greatly mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Park Avenue, the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor. It describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" although there's only one older building above 3 stories in this entire residential area! The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, completely untrue, especially for all of its north-south streets, thus putting at risk the zoning-protected green space and walkability designed into the historic setbacks between 30' and 40' deep each side of the street. Those guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, also untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes, and very occasional nearly all historic multi-units.</p> <p>Overall, by mischaracterizing the neighborhood, the proposed language puts at risk the hard-won historic neighborhood protections in the current 2010 zoning code, won through the hard work of Councilmember Hiawatha Davis, the Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, Denver City Planning staff, and neighborhood activist and later City Councilmember Carla Madison.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>It is very offensive that the new 'Blueprint' dismisses or seeks to change the hard fought for 3 story height restrictions for mixed residential neighborhoods East of Park Avenue. Your gross misrepresentation of "generally 5 stories" for the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Park Avenue, the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor appears to be the opinion of a property developer. Seemingly city staff has never walked this residential neighborhood or has no empathy for the actual low scaled quality of the neighborhood.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I'm concerned that the proposed General Urban language greatly mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Park Avenue, the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor. It describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" although there's only one older building above 3 stories in this entire residential area! The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, completely untrue, especially for all of its north-south streets, thus putting at risk the zoning-protected green space and walkability designed into the historic setbacks between 30' and 40' deep each side of the street. Those guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, also untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes, and very occasional nearly all historic multi-units.</p> <p>Overall, by mischaracterizing the neighborhood, the proposed language puts at risk the hard-won historic neighborhood protections in the current 2010 zoning code, won through the hard work of Councilmember Hiawatha Davis, the Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, Denver City Planning staff, and neighborhood activist and later City Councilmember Carla Madison.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>it needs to accommodate more density along Colfax. With the BRT being planned this part of town is perfect for that.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I'm concerned that the proposed General Urban language greatly mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Lafayette St., the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor. It describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" although there's only one older building above 3 stories in this entire residential area! The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, completely untrue, especially for all of its north-south streets, thus putting at risk the zoning-protected green space and walkability designed into the historic setbacks between 30' and 40' deep each side of the street. Those guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, also untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes, and very occasional nearly all historic multi-units.</p> <p>Overall, by mischaracterizing the neighborhood, the proposed language puts at risk the hard-won historic neighborhood protections in the current 2010 zoning code, won through the hard work of Councilmember Hiawatha Davis, the Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, Denver City Planning staff, and neighborhood activist and later City Councilmember Carla Madison.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>As a resident of City Park West, I am concerned and somewhat perplexed at the proposed language for the General Urban designation . The draft language describes City Park West as "predominantly multi-unit structures" where "buildings are generally up to 5 stories in height". This is a misrepresentation. Buildings, in the main, are not "close to the street" as described in the draft but are set back from the street. The designation of residential areas between 18th and Colfax (some of which already have historic neighborhood protection) as General Urban Low-Medium needs to be reviewed, as the language describing these areas in the draft is clearly inaccurate. Buildings and residences in this area are generally up to three stories in height, not the overstated 5 stories in the draft language.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Hello,</p> <p>This is regarding the new zoning language of my city park west/uptown neighborhood. I believe the new language does not protect the character of the neighborhood due to inaccurate descriptions of the neighborhood and vague language.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed 'General Urban' label mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Lafayette Street, 17th Avenue, York Street, and Colfax. 2. The new zoning language describes this residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" which is absolutely untrue. There is only one older building above 3 stories in this entire residential area! 3. The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, which is also untrue. The historic setbacks are 30' to 40' deep each side of the street. 4. The proposed language also describes my neighborhood as a predominantly multi-unit residential, which is untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes. And most of the neighborhood consists of historic buildings. <p>I do not want the character and walkability of my neighborhood eroded, but this inaccurate language will enable just that.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am very concerned with the language that appears to allow building heights of up to 5 stories. This height negatively impacts existing neighborhoods with one and two story homes. I am a resident of the Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District . The current zoning regulations for my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I'm concerned that the proposed General Urban language greatly mischaracterizes the entire zoning-protected residential neighborhood bounded by Lafayette Street, the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor. It describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" although there's only one older building above 3 stories in this entire residential area! The proposed language also describes it as having 'shallow' setbacks, completely untrue, especially for all of its north-south streets, thus putting at risk the zoning-protected green space and walkability designed into the historic setbacks between 30' and 40' deep each side of the street. Those guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, also untrue. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes, and very occasional nearly all historic multi-units.</p> <p>Overall, by mischaracterizing the neighborhood, the proposed language puts at risk the hard-won historic neighborhood protections in the current 2010 zoning code, won through the hard work of Councilmember Hiawatha Davis, the Humboldt Street Neighborhood Association, Denver City Planning staff, and neighborhood activist and later City Councilmember Carla Madison.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District resident. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District resident. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would allow my neighborhood to be rezoned to change the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I live on the 1600 block of Humboldt in an 1893 house in the Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I strongly object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>The nonprofit organization I run is a long-time Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District resident. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would allow my neighborhood to be rezoned to change the existing building height and setback restrictions. I believe this change would be severely detrimental to the character and culture of the neighborhood, and request that the current regulations stay in place.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I am a resident of the Humboldt/Park Ave. Historic District. I object to any plan that would diminish the fabric of the intact neighborhood between Lafayette and York; Colfax to 17th Avenues. This community consists of historic structures, many with multiple units of housing and some containing thriving small businesses. The need to increase density beyond three stories is unnecessary when the ability to develop 5 stories and above exists on the major thoroughfares of Colfax Ave. and 17th Ave., which is absolutely appropriate. We must place value on a neighborhood that has worked hard to achieve stability after many years of challenges - what we have now is right!</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a West City Park resident along 16th Ave. Too much history has already been plowed over by carbetbagger developers who are not interested in the fabric of our community but only in a quick buck. Blueprint Denver is just a new packaging for the Skyline Urban Renewal Project that stripped our city of most of it's history. Developers routinely push if not break the current codes because they know CPD will not or cannot enforce them. Plus, with many in the city council getting their pockets lined by these same developers, i.e., Mr Brooks...why should they care. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Historic District resident. Current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." I object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am 32 year Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District resident. The current zoning regulations governing my neighborhood prohibit buildings over 3 stories and require new construction to match setbacks of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver classifies my neighborhood as "General Urban Low-Medium Residential," which contemplates building heights of "generally up to 5 stories" and "consistent, shallow setback[s]." These changes would obliterate the charm and intimacy of our block and turn it into one of the horrible Highlands nightmare blocks. Setbacks and low-rise buildings are integral to the historic nature of our block and I object to any plan that would put my neighborhood at risk of rezoning the existing building height and setback restrictions.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>Statement Regarding the Definition of "Other Parks and Open Space" in the 3rd Blueprint Denver Draft Thank you for making the important changes regarding the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land that are reflected in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft on pages 143-4 of the Future Places map and pages 152-3 regarding "Parks and Open Space." It is critical, however, that this important document be further augmented in the 3rd Blueprint Denver draft by adding the following at the end of the final sentence in the definition of "Other Parks and Open Space": "subject to unique applicable land use restrictions such as the perpetual open space conservation easement covering the Park Hill Golf Course land."G Among the properties identified as "Other Parks and Open Space" in the 2nd Blueprint Denver draft, the PHGC land is unique because it is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust ("Clayton") in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is "to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space...." Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the PHGC land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton's earlier decision to terminate it--Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the PHGC land "as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public...." The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. For purposes of clarity, a unique land use restriction such as the PHGC land perpetual open space conservation easement should be identified in the definition of "Other Parks and Open Spaces."</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey
<p>I am a long time resident in the City Park West neighborhood and Humboldt Street/Park Ave. Addition Historic District. Our neighborhood was zoned G-RO-3 in 2010 and contains two historic districts which make up around 40-50% of the neighborhood.</p> <p>In the proposed Blueprint Denver draft, the Neighborhood Context labeled "General Urban" the language greatly mischaracterizes the entire neighborhood bounded by Lafayette St., the 17th Avenue business corridor, York Street, and the Colfax Avenue business corridor because it describes that residential neighborhood as "generally 5 stories" and as having 'shallow' setbacks, which is an inaccurate representation, especially for all of its north-south streets. The language of "General Urban" thus puts at risk the zoning-protected green space and walk-ability designed into the historic setbacks between 30' and 40' deep each side of the street. These guarantee the neighborly line of sight designed into every block of this residential neighborhood. The proposed language of "General Urban" also describes this as a predominantly multi-unit residential neighborhood, another inaccurate representation. These residential blocks are predominantly single-family or single-office residential homes, with some duplexes, and very occasional nearly all historic multi-units.</p> <p>I think the language of Blueprint Denver should be strengthened in some way to reduce or eliminate the risk of zoning amendments or waivers/exemptions of existing zoned properties for larger infill projects by developers being inadvertently or intentionally approved by planning thus violating the character and authenticity of this neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p>	Places Mapping	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Concerned about zoning implementation section - especially language on pages 62, 66, 72. Very concerned that the neighborhood context map does not match neighborhood contexts in the zoning code. In particular, 25% of city is in the FC 59. We need legislative rezoning for areas to get into DZC . Concerns with how many Plans that Denver curenly has - we will become the queen of the plans instead of the queen of the plains.	Places Mapping	Planning Board Listening Session
Development creeping towards single family areas is problematic. Should re-evaluate the area of stability line in West Wash Park	Places Mapping	Planning Board Listening Session
The map colors are still hard to read, especially on the future places map	Places Mapping	Task Force
Above what is said via NPI, Would like to see more explicit in the plan that as the transportation investments are prioritized/made, then the map will be updated.	Places Mapping	Task Force
Some neighborhoods are still shown as low density? How is it supposed to support increased density?	Places Mapping	Task Force
Language is not strong enough for how to add density in residential low areas. Maybe use verbage "all neighborhoods must increase in density"	Places Mapping	Task Force
Map seems to be as things are and is not aspirational. Are any residential areas mapped aspirational?	Places Mapping	Task Force
ADUs and missing middle housing is aspirational. Increased density should be sensitive to context	Places Mapping	Task Force
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclassify Morrison Road from Arterial to Collector o Modify Blueprint Denver Street Typology to Main Street Collector (the Westwood Neighborhood Plan includes "Study the benefits and impacts of reclassifying the road to a collector" on page 30) Change functional class with City Traffic Engineer 	Street Types	Email
Change street type abbreviation for Mixed Use from MU to MX. Definitely on pages 164-165 at a minimum and check for others	Street Types	Internal
In street type variables, move Residential Collector icon to slower speed (group with others)	Street Types	Internal
S Colorado Blvd change from Commercial to Mixed use between	Street Types	Internal
8th Avenue between Broadway and Logan -- change to mixed use from main street (keep as arterial)	Street Types	Internal
2nd Avenue between Josephine and Adams -- change to main street from mixed use (keep as collector)	Street Types	Internal
3rd Avenue from University to alley between and Steele and Adams - change to main street (keep as collector)	Street Types	Internal
Cherry Creek Drive North from Colorado to Alameda -- change to mixed use (keep as collector)	Street Types	Internal
Add note to street type maps and modal priority maps: explaining it includes existing streets at of Blueprint adoption. As streets are built, or as they are planned through future small area plans, they will be added to the map.	Street Types	Internal
Remove streets in FNE that are not already built -- all street types and modal priority maps. FNE team will give Sara W a map of what to change	Street Types	Internal
Washington St between 46th and I-70 (north boundary of city) -- change to main street from mixed use (keep as arterial)	Street Types	Internal
Fox St between 40th to 38th should be changed to mixed use arterialst	Street Types	Internal
Sheridan between 17th & Byron change to Arterial (fixing a mistake)	Street Types	Internal
31st between Umatilla & Tejon change to Local	Street Types	Internal
Knox between Ellsworth & W 2nd change to MX collector	Street Types	Internal
Irving between Nevada & Cedar change to Residential collector	Street Types	Internal
1st ave, extend MX to alley past Meade	Street Types	Internal
Change Temple Drive from S. DTC Blvd. to S. Yosemite to Residential Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Change S. Tamarac north of Eastman Ave from Commercial arterial to Residential Arterial.	Street Types	Internal
Univeristy from Ohio to Exposition should be changed from Residential Arterial to MS Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Extend MS Arterial Street type 1/2 block east of Pearl on E. Alameda	Street Types	Internal
Colorado Blvd from I -25 to Alameda should be Commercial Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Yale from Colorado to S. Clearmont change to MX arterial, Yale from Clearmont east should be Residential arterial	Street Types	Internal
Change Jackson Street between 40th and Smith to Mixed Use Arterial	Street Types	Internal
E. Evans. Pull MS Arterial thru to alley between University and JOsephine.	Street Types	Internal
E 35th from Central Park Blvd to Boston should be Residential Collector	Street Types	Internal
E 26th Ave should be a residential collector from N fulton street to Peoria	Street Types	Internal
Extend MS Arterial along Pearl from Louisiana to Buchtel/I-25	Street Types	Internal
MS Collector on Louisiana from Buchtel to alley between pearl and penn	Street Types	Internal
On Tower at 45th Ave and South - CHANGE TO COMMERCIAL ARTERIAL	Street Types	Internal
N. Tulsa Court between Albrook and Andrews - CHANGE TO RESIDENTIAL COLLECTOR	Street Types	Internal
Albrook Drive between Crown Blvd and Carson Street - CHANGE TO RESIDENTIAL COLLECTOR	Street Types	Internal
Kittredge Street between E. 45th Place and GVR Blvd - CHANGE TO RESIDENTIAL COLLECTOR	Street Types	Internal
51st Ave/Cathay St. btwn Tower and Argonne St. - CHANGE TO RESIDENTIAL COLLECTOR	Street Types	Internal
SEE MAP OF STREETS TO BE REMOVED (RED INKED MAP)	Street Types	Internal
Change Franklin from Race Ct to northern City border (in Globeville) to Mixed Use Collector	Street Types	Internal
Change Vasquez Blvd between 47th and 48th (in Elyria Swansea) to Mixed Use Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Change Colorado between Smith Road and I-70 to Mixed Use Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Change York from 38th to 49th to Mixed Use Arterial	Street Types	Internal

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Check street type for Lowry Blvd. Lowry should be mixed use arterial from Monaco to City limits	Street Types	Internal
Montview between Colorado and Yosemite was a collector in 2002 and now is arterial. Change back to collector. Same issue for 17th, 13th, and 14th east of Quebec...change to collector	Street Types	Internal
Central Park Blvd from MLK to 56 needs a street type - MLK to 35th Residential Arterial, MX arterial from 35th to 51st, Residential Arterial from 51st north to city limit.	Street Types	Internal
Unita from 56th ave to 47th ave to res collector	Street Types	Internal
Compare our maps in GIS with GIS data for all existing streets to make sure we aren't missing any streets that have been built recently	Street Types	Internal
E 53rd/East Prairie Meadows Drive/E 51st from Quebec to Dallas to Residential Collector than Industrial collector to city limit	Street Types	Internal
Missing 61st and Pena Station Streets, once added, should mirror MapIt Street Types (MX Collectors)	Street Types	Internal
SEE MAP OF STREETS MISSING PER MAPIT (BLUE INKED MAP)	Street Types	Internal
Dallas from 47th to 56th as industrial collector and north of 56th to 61/62nd to res collector	Street Types	Internal
Change 56th Between Spruce and Dallas Mixed Use Arterial, Dallas to Havana Residential Arterial	Street Types	Internal
Check Street Type descriptions (particularly LUBF) for opportunities for preciseness. For example: Main Street and Mixed Use. Revise images accordingly	Street Types	Internal
On mixed use streets, add lawn in addition to planting areas. In suburban contexts continuous lawn and planting areas are appropriate along mixed use streets	Street Types	Internal
change 12th to local in GT	Street Types	Internal
E Evans from Monroe to Colorado Blvd should be changed to a Commercial Arteria;	Street Types	Internal
E 40th from Franklin to Clayton should be changed from Industrial to Mixed Use	Street Types	Internal
Josephine from 43rd to 40th change from Residential Collector to mixed use	Street Types	Internal
West 31st Avenue is a narrow local street serving primarily residential uses. It is neither a Collector nor an Arterial street. We request that the map be changed from Mixed-use Arterial to Local Street. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF STREET TYPES MAP	Street Types	Letter
<p>Add critical items to the description of how street design and operation vary by street type: Allocation of space, street width, and mixing of modes. A new, more context-sensitive street typology is an essential tool for implementing Blueprint Denver, and we strongly support the typologies identified in the draft plan. However, as we pointed out in our comments on the previous draft, the "Street Types" diagram on pages 164 and 165 (in the updated draft) fails to mention a few key elements of street design and operation that should vary across type. We are disappointed that these elements were not added to the updated draft, as we expect them to be important topics of discussion in the update of Denver's Street Design Guidelines called for in Blueprint Denver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of space in the public right-of-way to cars (driving lanes, on-street parking) versus other uses. The Blueprint should aim to minimize space allocated to cars, particularly in high-volume pedestrian areas. • Street width (between the curbs), which relates directly to pedestrian safety/exposure and travel speeds. The Blueprint should aim to minimize street widths, particularly in residential areas and on local streets. • Mixing of modes. In areas with very high pedestrian volumes and/or low vehicular volumes, street designs should facilitate mixing of modes through very low speeds (20 3 mph or less). On streets with higher vehicular volumes, the City should separate modes by speeds, with designated spaces for people walking/using assistive mobility devices (5 mph), people biking or using other small vehicles (15 mph), and people driving personal vehicles (20 - 30 mph). 	Street Types	Letter
P157 (Map) Every street is not "aspirational" as an arterial. The downtown grid should mainly be identified as collectors with some arterials on grand boulevards (Speer, Broadway/Lincoln, Colfax)	Street Types	Letter
P158 (Downtown mobility description) Revise third sentence to say "High focus on pedestrian and bicycle connectivity."	Street Types	Letter
Street Types do not include Parkways. Two of Highland's boundaries are Parkways. Federal Boulevard and Speer Boulevard are the west and south boundaries of the Highland Neighborhood. They are shown on the map as Commercial Arterial, Residential Arterial, and Mixed-Use Arterial, depending on location. Since each street type has different Public Realm designs, we believe that a consistent approach is needed for both designated Parkways, and that the Parkway designation deserves its own category to align with City requirements. Our request is to change this map to add a Parkway street type along with appropriate design criteria. PARKWAYS ARE NOW NOTED ON PAGE 163 OF THE WRITTEN PLAN; THESE SHOULD BE MAPPED ON THE MAPS. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF STREET TYPES MAP.	Street Types	Letter
Zuni Street and West 29th Avenue are now shown as Mixed Use Arterials. However, we believe the Residential Arterial designation fits better with the primarily residential nature of these streets, particularly when looking at future uses that are likely to add substantial residential density to this area. We request that the Residential Arterial designation be shown on the map for the entire length of these streets in Highland. SEE HUNI REDLINE OF STREET TYPES MAP.	Street Types	Letter
P154-155 Seems like industrial should be the highest/most intense land use – more emphasis on freight speed and larger vehicles. Consider moving to far left of Downtown (p154)	Street Types	Letter
P158 (Downtown land use description) Revise as "Surrounded by intense land uses and high density development including hotels..."	Street Types	Letter
Measures for the mitigation of inequitable outcomes of street design should be included in the plan	Street Types	Letter
Hard to see the streets types because of city border	Street Types	Office Hours
Why is Montview an arterial from Colo to Monaco? It is just two lanes with bike lanes -- seems like it should be a collector! Same as comment 71	Street Types	Office Hours
mixed use street on COolorado south of Evans	Street Types	Office Hours

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Looks great- a few things. Can we have more 4 way stops in residential neighborhoods? People fly through whittier, cherry creek, etc., and it feels unsafe to walk around. What are the specific timelines for completion of this plan? Without benchmarks or secure funding sources, will this sit on a shelf? This is critically important to include. Otherwise it looks very nice, thanks for all of your efforts.</p>	Street Types	Online Survey
<p>Commercial corridors speeds are labled so far to the right,(so fast), it seems to be in conflict with vision zero plan. Please revisit.</p>	Street Types	Task Force
<p>Is the transit line along northern part of Welton with three T's for stops supposed to be future? It's not there now. Other streets going through Curtis Park are arterials?</p>	Street Types	Task Force
<p>Traffic calming measures should be included in the section about pedestrians</p>	Street Types	Task Force
<p>The diagram on page 164 of Blueprint Denver suggests a huge difference in lane widths between most streets (DT, R, MU, MS) and commercial & industrial streets (I,C). This is inconsistent with the Vision Zero best practices. 10-foot lanes are sufficient in nearly all cases, and to suggest that commercial streets need much wider lanes is misguided and directly contradicts the need to design for safer speeds. We recommend eliminating the "Lane Width" line from the diagram entirely. If staff is unwilling to do that, then the fallback position is to move the I and C boxes far closer to the remaining boxes on the left edge of the diagram, signaling that any difference in width is minor, and that all lane widths are envisioned to be smaller, which is has been shown to be safer in practice.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>The diagram on pages 164-165 of Blueprint Denver continues to send a concerning message on speeds, given the unlabeled horizontal axis. It still appears as if commercial and industrial streets should be very fast-moving streets, contradicting the Vision Zero Action Plan. We recommend condensing all streets on the left hand side of the range for the Design Speed lines, even if the box clusters remain in the same order and relative distance from one another. That would send a powerful message that street design speeds vary, but intra-city streets go at much slower, safer speeds than limited-access highways (which could be the suggested/IMPLIED speed of the right edge of the lines).</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>The same diagram on pages 164-165 of Blueprint Denver continues to send a contradictory message about the frequency of curb cuts in commercial and residential areas in light of contextual zoning changes in 2010 and improvements in DPW policies and practice since then. We recommend making two lines (using the vertical space freed up by eliminating the Lane Width line), with one for Suburban contexts showing the type of spread currently shown, and the other showing all other more-urban contexts in which driveways/curb-cuts are Rarely Allowed on all street types. This would be consistent with the intention of the Denver Zoning Code and hard-won safety practice that we should not backslide from. The type of backsliding implied currently is contrary to safety and offensive to the notion that pedestrians are the priority throughout the city.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Smith Road as Industrial from east of Sand Creek to where it's already Industrial</p>	Street Types	Internal
<p>I believe the overall concept is good, but it does not adequately address the need for greater density and transportation besides cars. It also does not adequately address more realistic and flexible zoning to allow for the missing middle and equality in housing. We cannot let the NIMBY crowd control the city, discourage growth, and preserve inequality and racial separation. We do not want to be St. Louis or other cities that did with out growth. I strongly support the letter and recommendations of the Denver Streets Partnership.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>This document should not go forward. While many of the ideas concerning preservation, active and engaging streets and transit oriented complete neighborhoods are commendable, even aspirational, the document accurately reflects an administration that is over committed to development, under committed to ensure that the Denver of the future is the equal or better than the Denver of the recent past. From a parks perspective alone, and measure by the City's own published standards, Denver now faces a park and open space deficiency of one thousand acres calibrated against a population of 700,000 people. Yet, there is no evidence from the document or this administration to show that meeting that deficiency is a priority, only lip-service. That the citizens have voted to take this challenge on independent of the administration should sound an awakening alarm within the planning and development structure that the claimed panacea of densification is wrong headed. This is NOT a balanced plan. While the plan appropriately identifies a character for areas, even streets and corridors for services and development, there is nothing in this plan that identifies the scope and location of open spaces and parks, parkways and trails (a crucial piece of green infrastructure) to anchor and serve those expanding communities. In fact, to the contrary, the plan is a shot-across-the-bow to Denver's neighborhoods signaling that additional development is coming regardless of the appropriateness of neighborhood structure, tradition and amenities. Not even lip-service is paid to the necessity of balancing development and transformation of 'under utilized' sites to replicate the level of amenities that some citizens have enjoyed, and that all citizens should be provided in the future city. This plan and this administration is one that values the residents of growth over present residents. There seems to be no understanding that the addition of every new citizen without a concomitant, proportional expansion of transit, parks and open spaces and other amenities, services, and schools, diminishes the quality of life of every resident. Growth as such is inversely proportional to quality when it is not governed by an intelligent, integrated strategy. Guidelines for growth are in these documents, as they should be - but this document is only part of the necessary guide and strategy for a outcome that could truly be described as a healthy city. (continued...)</p>	Vision	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>(Continued from previous due to length) For example, growth is happening today. And while that growth is currently explosive, the administration is not allocating the necessary resources to immediately provide neighborhood planning and planning assistance to ensure that truly 'complete' neighborhoods will result across the urban framework. In fact, it puts the idea of neighborhood planning on the table, only to put these absolutely critical planning activities in a time frame that is some fifteen or twenty years hence. As it stands, the already strong neighborhoods will survive the best - the most vulnerable and fragile stand to suffer the possible onslaught of ill-guided development. Some neighborhoods across this city have already suffered the irreparable harm of development fostered by planning and zoning development guidelines in a manner that was inadequate, indifferent to consequences, or incompetent, lacking in understanding of the intent and requirements. This is a pattern that is being repeated by a lack of commitment of needed planning and development resources to ensure positive outcomes. This is simply not acceptable. The envisioned multi-use nodes and corridors, transit access, trails and other elements of a truly connected vital city will not happen by themselves. The problems and the opportunities are here now for a city-wide transit and traffic initiative that could move the city forward and provide the basis, along with parks and other necessary infrastructure, for growth conscious development. But, again, there is no commitment to act in any way that could prepare the city for the next several decades of expansion and transformation. The many initiatives for improves bike access and connectivity are welcome, certainly, but the most urgent needs for many now and future Denverites is transit, the most enabling component of multi-modal systems. Efforts over the recent past are sadly indicative of future prospects: transit use is down as is availability and affordability, while single occupancy auto use is on the rise. This plan/administration puts only lip-service behind transit initiatives, while its singular 'shiny-penny' mobility investment and 'improvement' is a highway project (I-70 expansion) that is summarily devastating disadvantaged neighborhoods and moving the City of Denver backwards to the cutting edge of the 1950's while providing years of further disruption and congestion. Many of our city's primary corridors are in desperate need of revitalization to enable those existing lifelines to adequately function as the truly multi-modal circuits and centers essential to the city's future functional health. And, these planning and infrastructure development efforts are crucial, a necessary component of the city-wide neighborhood planning effort which is recognized by Blueprint Denver - but without commitment. In my view, it is neither a responsive nor responsible position to move this current plan forward without the thorough, timely (concurrent) integration of these critical activities. While this document (in total) has been touted from the beginning as complete and integrated, it is sadly half the story. And as evidenced by past efforts such as the recent zoning revision, it is deeply flawed in needed measures of guidance and governance. That, too, provided a 'promise' which quickly dissipated when challenged by 'push-back' from development interests. This plan has many aspects which are positive, correctly aspirational even, but it should not be an adopted standard of any kind until it adequately provides safeguards for our present while guiding the future. Unsupported guidance for our growth experience will, too, ring hollow.</p>		Online Survey
<p>There is not nearly high enough density in the vast majority of the county and the allowable mix of uses is also not sufficient.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>The current draft is strong. The process has been extensive. I think there needs to be EFFORT in the last part of the work to really help this plan to reflect the times and the current problems facing and changing our city. There is not enough about the affordable housing crisis and the great thinkers, tools, and amenities to address that crisis. The land use and transportation policy of this city is too important NOT TO BE A PART OF THE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS that are changing the look, feel and occupants of our neighborhoods.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I am Gisela Boderke, I have lived in the North West corridor/Federal Blvd./ District 1, for 20 years and in Denver since 1970. I am a member of the Federal 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 adding 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 lanes.</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? Denver is not an island, it needs to connect with bordering Counties and communities.</p> <p>Thank you, that is what I have to say.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>•I don't know what the "346" refers to on page 53 for the traffic-related deaths and serious injuries. Is that 2017 annual traffic deaths and serious injuries? We've had a terrible time getting a count of serious injuries from any department (e.g. police) because of deficiencies in how that is tracked. Has that been solved so now we can track the progress on achieving the overall goal?</p>	Vision	Email
<p>For the intro on page 21, consider revising background language to match the Climate Action Plan: "Climate change impacts are not just a coastal problem. Denver has already experienced hotter and harsher summers, extreme weather patterns such as drought, floods, severe storms, and dangerous heat. Without intentional action at the local and global level, additional escalating impacts will likely result in devastating impacts to our environment, health, economy, and quality-of-life. The recommendations throughout this plan help address water needs, mitigate climate altering emissions, and better prepare Denver for climate change and help make the city more environmentally-friendly and livable."</p>	Vision	Internal
<p>Page 53: DDPHE supports the inclusion of a metric tracking "access to healthy food and parks" on an annual basis through 2040. Page 54: DDPHE approves of the phrasing used here to describe the metric for access to healthy food "Access to fresh food: percent of residents within ¼ mile (10 minute walk) to a full-service grocery store" and this is a consistent metric that DDPHE uses to track healthy food access, among other metrics</p>	Vision	Internal

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
The city taking an active role in providing technical assistance for mitigation efforts is not called out in the plan - Mobility Policy #10	Vision	Letter
P52-53 – what is the basis for these goal numbers? Without a clear rationale they seem arbitrary.	Vision	Letter
Add "+" to projection numbers on growth map	Vision	Office Hours
<p>I do not want ambiguous language to continue Denver's car dependence. Denver would benefit if the plan explicitly put the movement of pedestrians first, then bicycles, then transit, the very lastly, cars. Denver needs to make real, bold progress on Vision Zero, on reducing greenhouse gasses, on reducing the socioeconomic discrimination that car ownership causes.</p> <p>I would also like to see more transit promoting efforts, like taxing parking even more, or congestion pricing, in the most urban neighborhoods.</p> <p>Additionally, Minneapolis has recently made waves by banning new gas stations and single family housing. Denver, being very similar in size and appeal compared to Minneapolis, should not be left behind. Denver certainly has enough gas stations, and we should stop encouraging driving by building even more (I understand the DIA neighborhood is still being built out, so I would be completely fine with still constructing a limited amount of new gas stations there). Also, Denver needs to start expanding its urban density to address our housing crisis, and most of it is already full of single family housing. A ban on new single family houses would not only create stronger and iconic neighborhoods by lining our streets with affordable row homes, town homes, duplexes and condo buildings, but would prevent the all too common practice of a house being bought from a poor family and rebuilt into another single family home by a rich family.</p> <p>I do not want to see Denver to continue to be another American city spread out and ravaged by the car, but instead I want it to be a beautiful, romantic, urban walkable, trendsetting, and iconic city like it once was. I believe these few things would be the most bold and important things your committee could do, and beyond that, any zoning or transportation policy outlined by the Congress for New Urbanism would be a game changer for our city. Please do not consider what American cities have been already, but consider what a world class city could be.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I understand that Areas of Stability and Areas of Change needed work... but I expected those ideas to be replaced with something that made it crystal clear where future growth belongs... the plan is filled with aspirational language and seriously lacking in specific, unmistakable direction for City Council, CPD, developers, RNOs and the public. This will not serve to reduce conflict about how Denver grows. It will make things worse.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I am eager to see even more support for increasing density and improving transit in the plan, as well as more about varying the functions of buildings within neighborhoods even if they aren't dense (stores next to houses, etc). I am especially keen to see these changes happen throughout the city, so that all neighborhoods can take on their share of change and increased density instead of concentrating it on one neighborhood that becomes completely gentrified and displaces most of the people in it. That would also help with "retaining residential character" and other stated values while accommodating the projected growth, because if dense development were encouraged throughout the city more single family homes can remain in a single neighborhood as pressure to redevelop spreads throughout the city. While it's important to increase density along transit corridors, we can't expect all of the population growth to be absorbed in these places. I would like to see more focus on densifying and diversifying neighborhoods throughout the city to handle the density and improve the lives of the people in those neighborhoods - everyone benefits from walkability.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I worry that this document in it's current complexity will continue to leave less sophisticated denverites who are typically young, poor, and non-white out of the conversation.</p> <p>As a young poor denverite, I also worry that this plan will continue to promote single family housing (America has been addicted to it since the invention of the automobile) at the expense of future generations who will have to pay the environmental, social, and economic costs of our currently built environment that heavily favors car dependent development. There are many neighborhoods in Denver where you literally cannot get a cup of coffee or the groceries without using a motor vehicle. Maybe we can let small owner occupant businesses (bakeries, coffee shops, grocers, small retail) back into the first floors of our massive 5000 sq. ft. homes for 2 people, and prevent a lot motor vehicle trips, while also cutting back on the top 10 causes of death in America upon which 7 are linked to lifestyle diseases and causes that involve a lack of exercise and social belonging. Additionally walkability and access to amenities has been shown to increase the values of neighborhoods, so this appears to be a win-win-win situation economically, environmentally, and socially. Please begin to address the issues that will haunt my generation and generations to come.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I'm very disappointed in how the vast majority of growth is planned for a very small area of the city in the Growth Strategy section. Focusing all our growth in certain areas is sure to increase displacement for those without political power, while wealthy neighborhoods remain unchanged for decades. It is also sure to lock those unchanged areas into car dependence as they will never reach the level of density required to become walkable and support frequent transit service. This plan makes low-income neighborhoods accessible to the wealthy, and locks everyone else out of the wealthy, single-family home areas. Every neighborhood deserves the right to grow, and has the responsibility to accommodate growth. Wash Park and Hilltop should get just as much new development as Five Points. Single-family only zoning needs to go away completely. These neighborhoods become enclaves for the wealthy if they are not allowed to add more housing as our population grows.</p> <p>Under Mobility, this statement must be taken seriously, "On all streets, prioritize people walking and rolling over other modes of transportation." I hope this means at no time will vehicle capacity, speed, or delay ever be considered a priority of any sort on our streets. Streets that are safe and accessible to all requires that private cars be restrained in the space they occupy and the speed they travel. Public streets belong to all, when cars are prioritized our streets become privatized and off limits to those that do not drive. Children must be free to play in public again without fear of cars.</p>	Vision	Online Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Attempting to freeze Denver in place and make single-family neighborhoods immune from growth is unrealistic. Denver needs to plan for 900k residents and needs to be a city that is built for the future with neighborhoods! By allowing flexibility and growth, missing middle economic, environmental, and social success for all residents in all all of our neighborhoods we can create vibrant, beautiful, and sustainable housing, accessory dwelling units, parks, and small businesses back into neighborhoods for all to enjoy. As every "big" city knows, cars and traffic have limits and we need to plan near transit, more local businesses integrated into our neighborhoods, for future growth with an efficient multi-modal city with options to live and comfortable pedestrian and bike environments, so that cars aren't the only viable option. When you build for cars, you get more cars. Please preserve Blueprint Denver's call for parking maximums in downtown and in urban center contexts as noted on page 108 of Blueprint Denver. Denver needs to provide diverse housing options - including filling the gap of "missing middle" housing options that fall between high-density and single-unit houses. Denver Zoning Code should include ADUs everywhere and 2-4 unit building forms in low support growth along transit corridors and parking maximums. density areas that promote quality of urban design. We should Let's implement and fund Denver Moves and Vision Zero! Today we need a COMPLETE city, where people can improve their own property with a variety of housing options and access fresh food, parks & rec centers, affordable active transportation options, high quality transit, and civic amenities for all people. Most importantly, encourage lifestyles that will environmentally allow note examples of how your neighborhood is not COMPLETE based future generations to enjoy our beautiful planet as we have. Please on the targets in Blueorint Denver on page 51.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>I support the draft of Blueprint Denver and I like the concept of complete neighborhoods. I believe that Denver needs MORE housing of all types, in ALL neighborhoods. Please ensure that this recommendation is carried forward in the plan.</p>	Vision	Online Survey
<p>Plan is vague and at a high level, and it is difficult to understand. When you leave these elements to future plans, it pits neighbors vs. residents. We would like to see more certainty.</p>	Vision	Planning Board Listening Session
<p>Climate as a theme-doesn't seem to "pop" the same as equity for example, as you read throughout the plan. Lots of things are related to climate, but could be called out and referenced more specifically ie. walking and biking are the greenest option (alternate opinion: the city already has a climate action plan. Climate adaptation and mitigation is where there is opportunity to be more specifically called out)</p>	Vision	Task Force
<p>The absence of any "big move" opportunities identified in this 20-year plan, such as for highway, viaduct, or cloverleaf removals in order to tame traffic and reconnect neighborhoods is a significant missed opportunity. Not even the Colfax/Federal cloverleaf was called out for study. Perhaps identifying "big moves" or big opportunity sites to rethink the design of the street network was felt to be outside of this document's scope – but if not here, where? Intention needs to precede action, and we need to highlight intention in a few big moves. Will an update to the Strategic Transportation Plan take on this strategic role, even though big moves will also have big land use implications?</p>	Vision	Email
<p>Here is my feedback for the second draft of Blueprint Denver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I support Blueprint Denver's goal for the city to accommodate 900,000 people in the next 20 years. - I support the complete neighborhood concept for every neighborhood. This includes diverse housing types, retail within a 10 minute walk of every residence, housing diversity, parks, and robust multi-modal connectivity. Policy changes, including rezonings, should be carried out to make this concept a reality. - I support allowing duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes in all low intensity neighborhoods. I would go further than just corner lots however. I would allow them everywhere, similar to what Minneapolis has adopted in their comprehensive plan. I strongly support allowing single family structures to add units or be converted to multifamily. Regulatory barriers (including zoning and building code) to converting a given house to multifamily while preserving the outer structure should be reduced. This will incentivise the preservation of existing historic structures. - I support allowing ADU's in all neighborhoods, in both single unit and multi-unit zones. - I support the intensification of all transit corridors as well as all arterial roads with more than four vehicle lanes. I believe at least five story buildings should be allowed on all such arterial roads. - I support parking maximums in downtown and in urban centers. I would also eliminate parking requirements citywide. The free market can handle parking. Developers often build more than what is required anyways. We should follow in the footsteps of Minneapolis and Buffalo. The city should not regulate it. Parking requirements subsidize car use and are counterproductive to Denver's adopted sustainability goals. If parking requirements are eliminated, the city should implement a reactive pricing scheme for on-street parking to ensure at least some spaces are always available (See Donald Shoup: The High Cost of Free Parking). - I support substantial city investments to build out the bicycle and transit network. I believe the City should purchase additional service from RTD, build the necessary BRT infrastructure, and increase the frequency of nearly all routes to once every 15 minutes at least, especially those that travel through densely populated neighborhoods or major employment centers. I support any mechanism to help buses travel more quickly and increase on time performance, even if it comes at the expense of automobile traffic flow. - I am skeptical of rail investment (eg streetcar). I love streetcars but given fiscal constraints I think enhanced buses offer more bang for the buck. - I support building out the entire sidewalk network to ensure both sides of every block has a wide sidewalk in good condition. - All intersections in urban or general urban contexts should have an automatic pedestrian signal phase, not a button. - I support increasing revenue from public parking and using the funds to support car alternative transportation infrastructure. - I support allowing affordable housing in every neighborhood, including wealthier ones. - I support density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing. - I oppose the removal of language that said the existing pattern of development could be taken into account when requests are made to rezone. Many neighborhoods have nonconforming duplexes for example. As they are the context of the neighborhood, their presence should support two unit zoning. 	Vision	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I'm surprised that the city planners are giving, 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. 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 most 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.</p> <p>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>	<p>Vision</p>	<p>Email</p>