

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Email	Georgia Garnsey	1/19/2022	My question is: Why was the voice of Save Open Space Denver (SOS) excluded from the Community Steering Committee? SOS representative, Sandy Robnett committed dozens of hours of her time to the Community Steering Committee and was told she could not name a replacement when all other members who made that request were allowed to do so.
Email	KC McFerson	1/19/2022	You run a good meeting. I wanted to send a quick note that I'm very excited about your process and am hoping this project will be a case study for a number of strong approaches for our state's communities. I'm sure you get a number of comments on a wide spectrum so I wanted to make sure you heard some strong support for how well you presented the information and the care that you're putting into this process. I'm deeply grateful for your dedication and your very apparent care for the sentiments and priorities of your residents (combined with just solid land use planning, of course).  Best, KC McFerson
Email	Elaine Granata	1/20/2022	I've been an occasional observer of the steering committee meetings for the Park Hill Golf Course and am distressed by the rancor and polarization, as I am sure you are, too. As a trained facilitator I don't see a way forward that has integrity and transparency. I wish you luck. I'm writing to ask a question that puzzles me, more so now after the vote in November for 301. Since that vote will result in another vote this coming election in which the fate of the conservation easement will be determined, why is your department taking staff time, resources and community good/ill will with a visioning process that may likely be not adter the election this coming November? I wonder, if I were a member of the steering committee, how I could take the task seriously knowing that it might be for naugh. Is it good practice to raise expectations of the community then have them dashed by the vote in November? It seems to me that is a recipe for creating cynicism for public involvement processess. Also, per the agreement between Westside and the City , I understand that Westide is obliged to return the land to the operation of a golf course, presumably this summer, when the 3 year is exemption is up. How does this factor in your decision to continue with the plan process? I'd appreciate a respnse to these questions. Thank you for your consideration.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	<p>Thanks for accepting my questions. I am a Park Hill Resident and a business owner in north Park Hill and have a few questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issue of the easement is never mentioned in this discussion. Based on the massive increase in land value in Denver, I estimate the easement to be worth well over \$100,000,000. Is there any plan to make the citizens of Denver whole by requiring the developer to pay this amount? The city paid around \$2 million in 1997 and should be rewarded for this investment. For example Apple stock was worth .16 around this time, it's \$170 today.</li> <li>2. The fact that the committee may be suggesting development on this land implies that the easement must be removed. Has the committee been instructed not to examine the financial aspects of removing the easement? Do they have the ability to make a recommendation under the condition the developer reimburses the citizens? Or are they prohibited from doing so? Can the committee examine how much affordable housing could be built with \$100,000,000?</li> <li>3. Has the committed examined the concept of putting the easement out to bid to other parties to maximize the return on investment to the citizens of Denver?</li> <li>3. Have all members signed a declaration of interest or a "non-conflict" of interest statement where the member declares that there's no financial/personal interest or belief that could affect their objectivity regarding their recommendation? If not, are you aware of any potential conflicts where a member would directly benefit from funds tied to the developer, or to future payments from the developer if development moves forward?</li> <li>4. Why do the recommendation not include numbers? It feel like members will make a mixed use recommendation no matter what they discover. Have they been instructed not give specifics such as percentage of land for open space, percentage of land for housing, percentage of supermarket, percentage of land for spots activity, etc.? It seems like the members should add these types of numbers to their recommendations, otherwise it seems like they are being used to simply make a development recommendation. Have members been instructed not to make specific percentages? If not, can they do so?</li> <li>5. Is the committee aware that the developer has spent in excess of \$500,000 on the 301 and 302 campaign to invalidate the conservation easement? How has the city wide vote changed the committee's opinion?</li> <li>6. Is the committee aware of the Park Hill citizens of Denver vote, where Park Hill citizens both North and South heavily support Open Space? Thanks for taking the time to respond to my questions</li> </ol>
Online Comment Form	Dorothy Spears	1/17/2022	I am ready for a grocery store and gas station and more shopping centers there I have to travel several miles to a store or gas station
Online Comment Form	Lynn Milton	1/12/2022	Thank you for posting in Nextdoor. Excellent and very well written and laid out.
Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	<p>Dear Committee members,</p> <p>Thanks for accepting my questions. I am a Park Hill Resident and a business owner in north Park Hill and have a few questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issue of the easement is never mentioned in this discussion. Based on the massive increase in land value in Denver, I estimate the easement to be worth well over \$100,000,000. Is there any plan to make the citizens of Denver whole by requiring the developer to pay this amount? The city paid around \$2 million in 1997 and should be rewarded for this investment. For example Apple stock was worth .16 around this time, it's \$170 today.</li> <li>2. The fact that the committee may be suggesting development on this land implies that the easement must be removed. Has the committee been instructed not to examine the financial aspects of removing the easement? Do they have the ability to make a recommendation under the condition the developer reimburses the citizens? Or are they prohibited from doing so? Can the committee examine how much affordable housing could be built with \$100,000,000?</li> <li>3. Has the committed examined the concept of putting the easement out to bid to other parties to maximize the return on investment to the citizens of Denver?</li> <li>3. Have all members signed a declaration of interest or a "non-conflict" of interest statement where the member declares that there's no financial/personal interest or belief that could affect their objectivity regarding their recommendation? If not, are you aware of any potential conflicts where a member would directly benefit from funds tied to the developer, or to future payments from the developer if development moves forward?</li> <li>4. Why do the recommendation not include numbers? It feel like members will make a mixed use recommendation no matter what they discover. Have they been instructed not give specifics such as percentage of land for open space, percentage of land for housing, percentage of supermarket, percentage of land for spots activity, etc.? It seems like the members should add these types of numbers to their recommendations, otherwise it seems like they are being used to simply make a development recommendation. Have members been instructed not to make specific percentages? If not, can they do so?</li> <li>5. Is the committee aware that the developer has spent in excess of \$500,000 on the 301 and 302 campaign to invalidate the conservation easement? How has the city wide vote changed the committee's opinion?</li> <li>6. Is the committee aware of the Park Hill citizens of Denver vote, where Park Hill citizens both North and South heavily support Open Space?</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for taking the time to respond to my questions.</p> <p>Regards, Basil</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Basil Sabbah	1/18/2022	I have submitted a series of question and never received a confirmation email. Does this system work? How do I know that you are receiving the questions?
Online Comment Form	Noni horwitz	2/4/2022	The election was abundantly clear that the community and overall city recognize that Denver needs open space. This city per capita has less green space than most others. SOS requires to be at the table and represent what was clearly the will of the people to acknowledge that legally an easement exists and cannot just be ignored.
Online Comment Form	Amy Harris	2/8/2022	Why is the small area planning process only contemplating the Park Hill Golf Course land and not taking into consideration the neighborhoods surrounding the land? When contemplating development, it is crucial to consider the development that is already planned and underway, especially with the impact this planned development will have on the already strained park and open space resources in the area, very poor air quality, and traffic.
Online Comment Form	Frederick Klann	3/1/2022	The City should buy the space for a park. Denver has fallen woefully behind in green spaces per capita. Pocket parks are overcrowded. I am shocked that the 301 group was excluded from the planning process after the city voted overwhelmingly in favor of the initiative. Denver is being ruined by overdevelopment. Planning that discriminates against the popular majority is non transparent and useless.
Online Comment Form	Idelle Fisher	3/4/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course should remain open space as the city voted for. I am not sure why development is still being discussed when we clearly voted that we want it to remain open space.  Denver is quickly turning into a concrete jungle, and we need to preserve any of the last remaining open spaces for residents to use and enjoy. Open spaces also help cool the city and trees and plants help remove the toxic air pollution that we are burdened with. I'd love to see if some community garden space was added, and native plant/natural areas so that we can all thrive here, humans and wildlife included. Please don't build on one of the last large swaths of open space Denver has, once it's built on it's gone forever.
Online Comment Form	Kevin Marchman	3/23/2022	We no longer have housing crisis of affordability quickly moving towards a emergency. Many Denverites can't afford winter coats if they are paying 50% of take home pay for housing. We don't need another large park if people can't house themselves.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Ben Waldman	3/23/2022	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I have a couple of comments regarding the planning process of the Park Hill Golf Course:</p> <p>1) Site planning is premature as we haven't developed any mechanisms to enforce the prevailing vision of all housing being affordable and commercial development being local and primarily owned by people of color. I support these array of goals but am hesitant to support any planning that doesn't start with setting up the proper mechanism to achieve and enforce the prevailing vision.</p> <p>2) The conversation easement and the ballot initiative still hang over this parcel. Again, it is premature to be going through a site planning process when these large barriers hang over the park. We are all spending time and the city money in a process that might end up being voted down by the city as a whole or City Council.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to review my comments.</p> <p>All the best, Ben</p>
Online Comment Form	MARIA FLORA	3/24/2022	<p>Denver needs the open space on the Park Hill Golf Course now, more than ever. The City should be protecting the perpetual open space conservation easement which the citizens of Denver purchased with bond money. The planning process led by Community Planning and Development is being conducted without regard to development plans in the works surrounding the land, as if it exists in a vacuum or bubble - there has been no discussion of the dense development that will occur surrounding the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station, increased traffic, heat island effect and other environmental impacts of development, and Denver's growing park deficit.</p> <p>At the March 23 community meeting, many residents were of the opinion that none of the maps were acceptable (traffic, noise, pollution, loss of greenspace, worsening the heat island effect, obstructed views, nearby high density development coming across the street and near the train station, oh, yeah, the small matter of the taxpayer-funded conservation easement!</p> <p>I have attended ALL the CPD meetings on the Park Hill Golf Course land, and it is clear that it is a developer-driven planning process with a predetermined outcome of development rather than preservation of open space. This started with the City Attorney and the planners parroting the big lie that the conservation easement restricts the use of the land to a golf course. It has carried forward with a "push" survey and a visioning document that does not reflect the position of the steering committee. Now the City-drafted visioning statement is used by CPD to promote three development plans for the land, none of which include the open space vision that was prevalent on the steering committee. Open space advocates have been systematically excluded from the steering committee, while Westside and City cronies on the committee push for a small park and lots of development to line Westside's pocket.</p> <p>We must insist that the City preserve the conservation easement and purchase the land for parks, community gardening, and natural open space. Otherwise, Westside is in the driver's seat and we lost our precious open space.</p>
Online Comment Form	Harry Doby	3/24/2022	<p>Is the going to be a privately-owned park? Or will it become a city-owned park?</p> <p>The city could buy the entire 155 acres today for \$20 million or less, thanks to the conservation easement. But if taxpayers have to pay market rate for only part of the property to become a city-owned park, the cost without the conservation easement would skyrocket (\$50 million?).</p> <p>The strongest advocates for tearing up the conservation easement and gifting the developer with a tax-free increase in property values are term limited, and will be out of office next year. Why should they be allowed to determine the future of this property by ignoring 63% of Denver voters that want to keep the conservation easement's protections, or 97% of neighborhood residents that told the city they do not want to sacrifice this green space and replace it with luxury apartments and expensive townhomes?</p>
Online Comment Form	Ryan Hyatt	3/25/2022	<p>Just want to say we support Plan 3, followed by Plan 2. We do not support plan 1.</p>
Online Comment Form	Roger Harvey	3/25/2022	<p>Zero of the concepts in framework plan meet the prevailing vision and what the voters voted for in 301. A significantly sized park #1 desire. Your definition of what is a significantly sized park is not arbitrarily based on other parks and neighborhoods, the voters based it on the existing acreage. A significant sized park utilizes a significant amount of the acreage. 60% min. or more. 2 Concepts are below 50% for Parkland. 85 acres - highest amount is 54% Will vote against it as will many others. Create three new concepts of 95 acres and more of Parkland. Delete all 3 shown.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	John Brink	3/25/2022	<p>I am unalterably opposed all three of the development concepts presented at the recent community meeting. The Golf Course property should be kept as recreational open space for all people in the metro area to enjoy. The way the city of Denver government has worked hand in glove with the developer to undo the easement on the property and undermine the vote of the people is a travesty and a waste of taxpayer money. Any elected official who supports this corrupt process deserves to be punished at the ballot box. Please include the following letter to the editor of the Denver Post in the administrative record for your planning process: The letter writer (Whose open space?, October 10, 2021.) and Westside Investment Partners, the developer behind ballot measure 302, want to remove protection of the former Park Hill Golf Course to make way for "mixed use" development, with some as-yet-undefined open space within it. They say their plans were conceived in response to input from the local community and that voices of the rest of Denver's citizens should not be heeded.</p> <p>On the contrary, the fate of the former golf course is a matter of great interest to all citizens of Denver. First, Denver taxpayers paid for the easement protecting it back in 1997. Neither the Mayor nor City Council should be able to give it away or trade it for non-open space development without our consent. Second, if protected, the site can be a city-wide asset on par with Denver's other major parks and serve as an oasis of open space in a quadrant of the city where parkland is sparse and recreation facilities have suffered years of neglect.</p>
Online Comment Form	John Brink	3/25/2022	<p>Westside and its allies campaign on behalf of measure 302 under the guise of protecting "local choice and local voices." This followed a carefully crafted, narrowly focused community involvement process that gave Westside the answers it wanted regarding the site's future. Another voice that was no doubt heard was that of the "independent expenditure" committee Andrew Klein, Westside's founder, bankrolled to the tune of \$400,000 to help re-elect Mayor Hancock in 2019, the same year Westside purchased the property.</p> <p>The "local voices" Westside and Denver's pliant elected officials don't want to hear include the board of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., which overwhelmingly voted last month to endorse measure 301 and reject measure 302. In May 2020, Denver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted unanimously to recommend the city purchase the Park Hill Golf Course property for a park, using funds from the voter-approved 2019 bond measure for new parks and open space. Westside knew about the 1997 easement when it paid \$3.55 per square foot for the land in 2019. That's about one percent of the price other developers are spending on developable property in Denver these days. No one should think for a moment that Denver "owes" Westside a penny either for the gamble it took when it bought the property intending to redevelop it or for the money it is spending to ensure that only the voices of those who support its development aspirations are heeded. The answer to the question "Whose open space?" is unequivocal; it's ours and measure 302 should be defeated. Also, please note that measure 302 was resoundingly defeated in November.</p>
Online Comment Form	KC McFerson	3/25/2022	<p>(1) I am concerned about the Mixed-Use Commercial in the NE corner of the development (SE corner of the intersection of 40th and Colorado). Will this include surface parking and effectively encourage more auto-dependent lifestyle &amp; development in the area? I hope the answer is "no." The NE &amp; NW corners of that intersection are a sad sight. Pls don't replicate.</p> <p>(2) I love that everything that'll be developed for commercial/res is mixed-use. Way to be flexible!</p> <p>(3) Thank you for including residential in general. We need housing and we need A LOT more density, especially so well located to transit. Well done.</p> <p>(4) I love seeing the development &amp; changed use along Colorado b/c driving past open space that's hardly used is so depressing. And this will finally activate that area.</p> <p>(5) This is probably outside of your scope, but could Colorado be updated to have bus rapid transit? We really need to take advantage of the congestion on that ROW and dedicate 2 lanes to BRT. Car travel needs to be intentionally deprioritized for us to make progress on the transit that we need to, and the coming electrification of autos is only going to encourage us to feel like we've made progress and so rest on the issue while the land use impacts from excessive auto use will remain. BRT! BRT!</p> <p>(6) Given the location &amp; transit access, could you eliminate parking requirements for this? I know you've got your code, just throwing out some support for the idea. Just can't help myself because our travel lanes in the neighborhood are already massive, hate to add to the expanse.</p> <p>(7) Well done on your engagement process. The times I've been out of the loop on this project have 100% been my lack of paying attention.</p>
Online Comment Form	Jacquelyn Dekker	3/25/2022	<p>First of all, I think it is an absolute shame that you are doing away with the golf course. It was the only affordable club in Denver city proper, and now that's gone. Now, the only clubs available in Denver city are exorbitant country clubs that only the very wealthy (and connected) have access to. I am disappointed that we would take away an accessible recreation opportunity, leaving access only to the elite. Denver residents will either have to move to be closer to more affordable golf clubs, or plan on lengthy commutes. Again, shame on you.</p> <p>Shame on you further for taking our green spaces and developing them. We do not need more commercial use. We need more residential spaces, but why not pave a parking lot instead of a green space? Shame on you. The only reasonable option is #2, City Grid. Both option #1 and #3 take up too much of the green space for development. Option 3 would turn the corner of 35th into an ugly, jammed, busy mess, much like the corner of 38th is now. Option 1 would just make the intersection at 38th and Colorado untenable. Do you even look at traffic flow when making these "plans"? Option 2 would at least allow for a nice entrance into the green space that doesn't jam up our intersections. If you must choose between these, for the sake of local residents, PLEASE select Option 2.</p>
Online Comment Form	Deirdre	3/25/2022	<p>The preservation of established green space in the form of a park or golf should stay intact. The developers should look for land that is not green. This is not what is preferred for our neighborhood. This neighborhood is already boxed in by roadways, traffic, concrete, and pollution. The green space at the Park Hill Golf Course offers a much-needed refuge for the community. Is it correct that Denver voters voted to preserve that open space?</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Kris Gisoni	3/25/2022	I want to see the entire former golf course made into a public park. I do not want to see any housing or business development in this open space. Northeast Park Hill needs a public park not more housing or business development.
Online Comment Form	Getabecha Mekonnen	3/25/2022	A Plan with VISION and Agreed Upon GOALS should guide the development. We as a community should learn from the Central Park ( former Stapleton) Green Book plan that helped carry the VISION and GOALS. The VOTE by the citizens of Denver should be informed by the a clear plan and this process that has started should work for such outcome. The Land Use Plan Town Meeting workshops were good start, and should continue to be the foundation that builds on the community input and stakeholders participation going forward. I suppose the "executive committee" will take on this mantle.
Online Comment Form	Angelina	3/25/2022	The option that commits the most space to affordable residential is the best option. Also, commercial space that includes a grocery store is second priority for me as a community member.
Email	KC McFerson	3/25/2022	Hi Courtney,  Thank you for managing such a large and involved engagement process. I think you & the city are doing a very nice job trying to get people involved and taking comments to heart, while keeping within the bounds of best planning practices. Well done!  Thanks,  KC
Online Comment Form	SujataC	3/26/2022	Love the layout of parkway concept most . Its evenly distributed maintaining a work life balance .
Online Comment Form	Ashley Murphy	3/26/2022	I am putting all my questions in one response, please respond to all questions.  1) I am not sure how come we are planning for building on an area that has a conservation easement on it and the people of the city voted to be able to weigh in on. Can you help me understand this?  2) How come the city is paying for this rather than the developers?  3) Are all the costs going to be paid for by the developers since the people of Denver have clearly spoken that they do not want development? (Except for the push poll done by the city with no option to have all open space)  4) Please help me understand the density impacts this will have on traffic, pollution, heat island effect, and other environmental concerns. It seems the environmental impact is being swept under the rug.  5) The mending roots forest is planted in an area that is planned for development in one of the renderings. How come the developers can move this with their "non-profit" when really it is just a tree farm that they got to have tax ride offs for? If it is a forest, how come they are not keeping it?

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Taylor Boone	3/26/2022	I definitely prefer the city grid option, and do not like the Parkway option. North Denver deserves a premier park along the lines of City Park or Washington Park. While my overall preference would be to turn the entire area into such a park, I believe of the three frameworks presented the city grid option comes the closest to creating a truly premier park option for North Park Hill and the Clayton neighborhoods.
Online Comment Form	Thomas E. Roberts	3/27/2022	The land should be kept as open space & public park. Let others build businesses in the area on their own dime. Acquire the fee in the land with eminent domain and pay the owners \$1. That is all the compensation they are due. Their purchase was speculative. They had no reasonable expectation of being able to develop it. They may have had promises (winks and nods) by city officials but those are not enforceable. The title is, and remains, subject to an easement. I know whereof I speak. I have written books on the topic of eminent domain. One dollar is all that is due. Contact me and I will provide you with citations of authority.
Online Comment Form	Reven Marie Swanson	3/28/2022	Proposal 2 is the most desirable because it doesn't put roadways through open space. It centralizes structures and commercial use to the perimeters.
Online Comment Form	Andy	3/28/2022	The commercial section doesn't look big enough for a main grocery store. There are no close grocery stores to this location.
Online Comment Form	Laurel Clark	3/28/2022	Option 02 is the best of the options provided - but ONLY because it preserves more open space and park space than the other options. That said, the ENTIRE Park Hill golf course should remain as open/park space - AS DENVER VOTERS CLEARLY WANT. Where was THAT option? City leadership should do what the voters want and not what large developers and their lobbyists tell them to do. Large already-developed commercial areas exist along the Colorado Blvd corridor that are better targets for redevelopment than the open space in the old Park Hill golf course. Open space is a scarcity in Denver compared to other cities - especially in neighborhoods of color. Denver should look first to repurpose existing structures. If new development is needed - then it should be located where there are pre-existing structures. Open space needs to left open. Period.
Online Comment Form	Florine Nath	3/28/2022	I was in the camp of leaving the golf course as a golf course - in order to preserve as many trees and green space as possible, and also preserve the heritage of the course. That said, if development is now inevitable, it only makes sense to make the retail portion accessible to the most number of people as possible. That means the major retail needs to be at the 40th street intersection so it is most accessible by light rail.
Online Comment Form	Elaine Granata	3/28/2022	As Denver's population increases the ratio of people to parks is decreasing. Once land is paved over, it is not likely to be "un paved" when we discover we need more open space/permeable land to accommodate the needs of a growing population for recreation and heat island mitigation. There is lots of heat being generated from the expansion of I-70-- green space is needed to counteract this. All 155 acres should remain in open space/park land.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Christina	3/29/2022	This should be undeveloped, open park space for everyone to enjoy. No one should not be profiting from this open space. Denver has a great parks system and we could use another on this side of town. If you insist on developing the land (really it should just be open space), please create opportunities for small and/or minority businesses, and not corporations. And if you insist on developing the land, please create realistic affordable housing solutions for Park Hill residents. Please invest in this community, please give community members a chance for survival and stop gentrifying Denver.
Online Comment Form	J>Breese	3/30/2022	I cannot understand why this planning process does not have an option for preserving the entire area as open space, in violation of City residents' wishes. Every option requires large portions of the land to be filled with housing and commercial uses. This is not giving City voters the choice they wanted. How did this happen. I thought we voted against these types of plans.
Online Comment Form	Tom Fahres	3/31/2022	None of these concepts are viable as they do not address the perpetual conservation easement's impact.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	3/31/2022	I am confused and do not support this whole process. The former Park Hill Golf Course land is under a perpetual conservation easement. The use for this land was decided when the leaders and taxpayers of Denver put this conservation easement in place. It was to prevent the very thing that you are trying to do, develop this land. The citizens of Park Hill were promised this open space and it is an outrage that this process has even been allowed to take place. Furthermore, initiative 301 passed by a 3:1 margin to preserve this open space and protect it with a vote. I am a resident of Northeast Park Hill and will fight t o keep this last piece of open space for future generations. I welcome you to reach out to me for further discussion.
Online Comment Form	Margie and Larry Feinberg	3/31/2022	Denver voters sent a strong message about preserving open space and denying developers free reign in Denver. The Mayor and others are ignoring this. Preserving open space for generations to come is imperative. We are very discouraged about the process going forward as it is now.
Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	3/31/2022	It seems to me that the "prevailing vision" is the one expressed by voters to keep the space green. You seem determined to plow ahead despite that vote. He developer's contributions to the Mayor's campaign seem to be paying off.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Maria Tweed	3/31/2022	<p>Feel your next page questions are discriminating by each category you are asking</p> <p>City of Denver brought this up at the last meeting why are we doing all this planning (taxpayer monies?) when ballot 301 had an overwhelming vote to a yes, you heard from your voting Denver citizens on this. City of Denver has allowed CPD to direct their own Steering Committee without any members of SOS participation for the Citizens of Denver interest and has allowed this Steering Committee to be backed with pro-development supporters (which I have noted names of these people from various media outlets)</p> <p>City of Denver has to face the issue that there is a conservation easement on the Parkhill Golf course (Denver taxpayers paid for). City of Denver are you aware that a scientific survey done by the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association which clearly reflects that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park, when CPD continues to say that the community supports development (I live 3 blocks from the site and have never seen any CPD/contract interviewers or communication left on my door regarding a survey) of the land completely ignoring the vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement and destroy our chance of creating a full-scale park for the expanding neighborhood.</p>
Online Comment Form	Maria Tweed	3/31/2022	<p>City of Denver what about our current neighbors on both sides of Colorado Boulevard from the Parkhill Golf Course that will experience major residential and commercial development that they do not want it and CPD's own survey found that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods confirmed this and what about the metro district needed to develop this land and the cost of that on future homeowners seems to be ignored . City of Denver I personally have brought this up at several meetings with no prevail that there have not been any traffic studies done as Colorado Boulevard is already at its maximum traffic capacity (just imagine, all the housing and retail contributing to the current traffic). City of Denver have not heard if there have been any studies done to show the environmental impact it will have on our neighborhood by losing greenspace, as you are aware Colorado is way behind on open space verses the population and the fact that Companies large and small located northwest of Park Hill spew all their pollution which mainly blows directly on to our community</p> <p>Last meeting had heard a lot of questions asked of the presenters and they were unable to answer</p> <p>Signed Denver Native, Maria Tweed</p>
Online Comment Form	Frank Sullivan	3/31/2022	<p>Why is the City using tax payers' money for this process? It seems to me that is the owners' (of the land ) responsibility.</p>
Online Comment Form	Alan Hsu	3/31/2022	<p>I'm confused on why this process / committee is moving forward with any plans without addressing the Conservation Easement or the survey(s) that were done or even the vote that was had in November. These seem to be elephants in the room that CPD and the committee want to ignore. Any steps taken without discussing these issues seems to be ignoring the public and very sketchy/shady at best yet the steps seem to be taken regardless.</p>
Online Comment Form	S Johnson	3/31/2022	<p>As a native Denverite and longtime voter in Denver, I am vehemently opposed to any mixed use commercial or residential development of the former Park Hill Golf Course. Residents in Park Hill and surrounding neighborhoods have previously expressed their desire to maintain the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space and prevent further building and development. As the population in Denver soars and the city becomes more and more congested, preserving and protecting precious green space, such as the Park Hill Golf Course, should be one of the priorities of our city planners. Acting now is critical to ensuring a healthy and wholesome quality of life for future generations.</p>
Online Comment Form	Joseph Demko	3/31/2022	<p>Please do not develop the land formally known as Park Hill Golf course for any reason other than open space. Open space is one of the few things that you cannot redo in our society and it is important to preserve what little open space we have.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Douglas F Tweed	3/31/2022	<p>I don't understand how this development is moving forward and PHGC is not being planned as open space. The voters of Denver, overwhelmingly, voted to have PHGC become open space by decidedly passing proposition 301.</p> <p>Who is paying for the committees that are consulting on the commercial development when that is not what Denver voters approved? Their plans seem to be missing many of the issues in this project. What about parking, water and sewage, and traffic access to the property. There should be no plan! Voters stated they want PHGC to be open space!!! Please be sure to address my questions.</p>
Online Comment Form	nick nossaman	4/1/2022	<p>I don't understand how you can be ignoring the voice of the people regarding the proper use of the Park Hill golf course--open space and green space--a park. If you hold the power and cave in to the developers I can only beg you to think twice about making such a mistake. Please</p>
Online Comment Form	Judith Cohen	4/1/2022	<p>I attended a planning meeting last week for the Park Hill Golf Course. I thought that the passage of 301 meant that any development had to be approved by the voters lifting the conservation easement. Meanwhile, the City Planning Department has hired a consultant who has created three development scenarios including commercial and residential development of the site. This seems to me to be ignoring the decision of the voters as well as wasting City money. Everyone in my breakout group favored no development over the three concepts submitted. I suggest that CPD rethinks its approach to this development.</p>
Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	4/1/2022	<p>CPD continues to say that the community supports development of the land completely ignoring the vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement and destroy our chance of creating a full-scale park for the expanding neighborhood. CPD is ignoring the neighboring land on both sides of Colorado Boulevard that will experience major residential and commercial development. There has been no traffic study and attempts by committee members who have asked for one are ignored. There has been no environmental impact study to understand the cost of losing irreplaceable greenspace. Discussion about a metro district needed to develop this land, and the cost of that on future homeowners if the space is developed, is "parked" and not allowed to be discussed. CPD's own survey found that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods DO NOT want to trade open space for luxury apartments and townhomes. Denver voters sent a strong message about preserving open space and denying developers free reign in Denver. Let's make sure their voices continue to be heard.</p> <p>The City continues pretending that development is a "done deal." Please take this opportunity to ask why they are ignoring the conservation easement we paid for. Denver needs to protect our open space as other developments surround the PHGC land.</p> <p>Sacrificing our existing trees and green space is a huge mistake!</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Michele Swenson	4/1/2022	It is unacceptable for Denver Community Planning and Development to disregard the will of the neighborhood people, reflected in the overwhelming November vote that defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement on the area that was Park Hill Golf Course, and favored maintaining the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space or park area. While ignoring the perpetual conservation easement on the former Park Hill Golf Course, CPD has also chosen to disregard the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association scientific survey demonstrating that fully 77% of the people in neighborhoods surrounding the former Park Hill Golf Course desire that it remain open space or be transitioned into a regional park. The former golf course represents a rare bit of irreplaceable greenspace that has been radically reduced in relation to development within the city of Denver. It is urgent that we preserve and protect precious remaining green spaces, instead of granting developers free reign to pave and develop them. There are other places for residential and commercial development. Denver leadership should heed the will of the people instead of putting aside the people's wishes to serve the bottom line and presumptions of developers.
Online Comment Form	Janet Feder	4/1/2022	It seems that CPD has already decided on the development of the Park Hill Golf Course by denying the acceptance of comments regarding the perpetual conservation easement and also disregarding the fact that 97% of the adjoining neighborhoods have already stated they don't want to trade away this open space for luxury apartments and townhomes. So what, really, is this "planning process" when the community has already expressed what they want through voting, and the development is going ahead anyway?
Online Comment Form	Ruth Abram	4/2/2022	Please leave the golf course alone. A city needs all the open space it can save.
Online Comment Form	Erik Stark	4/2/2022	What is CPD, this Mayor, and the City of Denver doing? This is a disgrace. I am extremely upset that the actual "will of the people", including people in Park Hill, is being ignored in this pro-development-at-all costs approach. Evidently, this Mayor and City think they can disregard actual voters, ordinance outcomes, scientifically done surveys (as opposed to contrived, developer concocted "visioning" processes and "outreach") to force what the developers want onto Denver's neighborhoods and citizens. Wrong! What is going on has finally made clear what a sock-puppet for developers this Mayor truly is. Be clear that the more this process is crammed down the citizen's throat, the more of a backlash there will be. We are tired of our city only being open for business for the money-boys and their profits, under the distorted narrative that "affordability" is what is driving the process. Nothing could be further from the truth. You don't need to destroy our last open space for affordability, shopping, grocery stores, or any of it. The entire north end of Park Hill between 38th Ave and I-70 is mostly commercial land, with numerous warehouses and small-scale commercial buildings, with vast potential for housing, apartments, condos, grocery stores, and more. The land is relatively cheap, and because of low industry, relatively unpolluted compared to the land west of Colorado Blvd. and above 38th Ave. Affordability could be built-in (20%-30% of all housing, apartments, condos, at cost) which would take an affordability mandate, which would take changing current state law, which would take leadership and vision, all of which is missing from this Mayor's character. Not to mention desire since he's opposed to anything which would trample on the profits in any major way of any developer. He's got his next cushy job to think about, after all. But the affordability propaganda being put out by the City and Westside regarding Park Hill Golf Course is spin and misdirection at its finest. There will be almost no affordability, and in relation to the very expensive homes that will dominate the landscape, affordability will be a farce. And a lie, as usual. I am calling on CPD, the Mayor, and the City of Denver, to stop lying to the public about Park Hill Golf Course. I don't think you will stop, but your methods are transparent, your motives clear in blocking all dissenting voices, and your lies obvious. You aren't fooling anyone. Time to actually support the people for a change, including providing affordable housing, grocery stores, and all the things the people in North Park Hill actually do deserve, without the big lie that you can only do it by destroying Denver's last big, and important (and protected) open space.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Mike Fernandez	4/2/2022	I attended a community forum was shocked that there was no consideration of preserving the entire space as parkland. What happened to that idea, which was favored by the vast majority of voters and local polls? Please let me know.
Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	4/3/2022	None of the three proposals has enough green/park space. I would like to see more green on the maps; housing better on middle plan. I have many concerns about the increase in traffic. Has an transportation or environmental impact study been done for the area? Has future development of commercial and retail space in the surrounding area been considered? Perhaps that would be a way to increase park space. Has the perpetual conservation easement issue been completely resolved? Is there any representation in the discussions of plans by those who are not enamored with CPD's current plans? Please don't railroad this through the planning process.
Online Comment Form	Jessica Toll	4/3/2022	As a Park Hill resident I have several significant concerns with the draft. Above all else, I believe that the Denver taxpayers deserve to keep the bargain of the perpetual easement and preserve the land as open space. The citizens of Park Hill need to be heard by allowing full participation of SOS and by paying attention to the survey of the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association which states 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a park. An even higher number of the adjoining neighborhoods want it to remain open space and not to become high end condos. How exactly do you claim to be for Environmental Justice and support this plan? We had an election on this point and the Mayor and the developers lost. The people have spoken and yet the politicians refuse to listen which is disappointing and disingenuous. Even if you were to ignore the very clear views of the citizen and consider development it is ill advised and will harm Park Hill. Park Hill already has terrible highway access to the South. Have you ever tried to drive from Park Hill South on Colorado to I25? It is a nightmare. By developing the golf course, you will make it equally impossible for us to access I70 to the North. Have you done a traffic study on this? And last, I just have to say, that I am continually disgusted by the actions of Mayor Hancock and his developer cronies to pack the steering committee with developers, ignore the opinions of the neighborhood and the Denver votes and generally treat "Westside" as the client instead of the Denver citizens. We all deserve better. We deserve open space.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Michael Jacobsen	4/3/2022	<p>Having lived in Denver since 1984 I have seen many changes to our beautiful open spaces. Our many parks are the jewels of this great City. With so much development going on now it is difficult to see the Park Hill Golf Course converted into developers plans for the destruction of beautiful open space and turned into a large scale housing development of parking lots and large scale housing projects; contrary to the easements in effect disallowing the development beyond open space and a golf course. I feel the benefits to the environment, City and neighborhoods surrounding the present Park Hill Golf Course are better served as the open space that it is at this time.</p> <p>Neighbors have voted in favor of this position. Will the City deny the will of good intentioned voters?</p> <p>Years ago, citizen efforts saved the City Park Pavilion from becoming City office spaces. The pavilion truly is a crown jewel in our park system for everyone to enjoy. These same like minded voters have good intentions for the preservation of the Park Hill Golf Course; not willing to allow developers to profit from the destruction of this precious open space. Save our Open Spaces!</p>
Online Comment Form	Kristen Andersen	4/3/2022	<p>I would have really loved to see a plan included that would preserve the entire golf course as a park! It would be really wonderful to have such a big green space in this part of the city, and would really help with the heat island effect and the pollution we already experience up here in NE Park Hill. The views across the golf course to the mountains from the streets south and east of the golf course are part of what makes me feel connected to the mountains and nature beyond the city living here.</p> <p>It would be great to see the needs in our community for more affordable housing, a local grocery, and small businesses be met on already developed land and the vacant lots scattered around the commercial and industrial areas nearby.</p> <p>Of the 3 limited plans offered, none of them seem to offer a view across the park to the mountains from the south and east, which is part of what is so nice in this area now. I like the green park buffer around existing neighborhoods of the 3rd plan, but not the way it breaks up the park space with development in the center.</p> <p>In the first plan, I like that it says it tries to preserve high value trees, but it looks from the plan like all the large trees along Colorado Boulevard and many of them along 35th are now in areas marked for development. I'd prefer to have those large trees also protected.</p> <p>It is nice in the first 2 plans to have any commercial development concentrated in the northwest or southwest corner of this area, so that it would be nearest the existing concentrations of housing. If the central part of the this space along Colorado Boulevard was left open, that could preserve our neighborhood views of and connection to the mountains.</p> <p>In short, protecting as much of the land as natural open space, with mature tree cover and mountains views, is really important in mitigating the heat island effect and pollution we already live with in this part of Denver, as well as our being otherwise surrounded by industrial and commercial development. Please consider making the entire area a great park and focusing development on other lots in the area that are not currently natural open space. We deserve as amazing a park as the people who live near City Park and Wash Park have, and it would be a really beautiful entrance to Denver off of I-70. Thank you.</p>
Email	Michele Swenson	4/6/2022	<p>It is unacceptable for Denver Community Planning and Development to disregard the will of the neighborhood people, reflected in the overwhelming November vote that defeated the city and Westside's plan to remove the conservation easement on the area that was Park Hill Golf Course, and favored maintaining the former Park Hill Golf Course as open space or park area. While ignoring the perpetual conservation easement on the former Park Hill Golf Course, CPD has also chosen to disregard the Greater Park Hill Neighborhood Association scientific survey demonstrating that fully 77% of the people in neighborhoods surrounding the former Park Hill Golf Course desire that it remain open space or be transitioned into a regional park. The former golf course represents a rare bit of irreplaceable greenspace that has been radically reduced in relation to development within the city of Denver. It is urgent that we preserve and protect precious remaining green spaces, instead of granting developers free reign to pave and develop them. There are other places for residential and commercial development. Denver leadership should heed the will of the people instead of putting aside the people's wishes to serve the bottom line and presumptions of developers.</p>
Email	Carly Erickson	4/6/2022	<p>My husband and I live next to the Park Hill Golf Course and we've been attending the meetings of the visioning process for the last few years. We were able to attend the latest meeting with our newest addition and we took a photo to commemorate the baby's first civic meeting! (We're the second photo from the left.) I know the city gets a lot of flack for the visioning process from certain groups but we are thrilled to be able to participate and hope to pass on the value of civic participation to our little one. Thanks to you and your team for giving us the opportunity to show him the importance of loving where you live and participating in the process. (Also, I'm sorry we couldn't get a better picture of you there but it already took us several tries to get one where his eyes were open/our eyes were open/he wasn't crying.)</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Email	Alan Hsu	4/6/2022	<p>Hi Courtney,</p> <p>I appreciate your response and explanation! I do remember those surveys coming out so I guess that's where my confusion was. To check my understanding regarding the November election results, the ultimate decision comes down to a vote with the City Council and Denver voters? So the planning process is essentially to set something up for that vote? In other words, the vote isn't "do we develop or not" but more like "do we approve of this plan or not?"</p> <p>Thank you, Alan</p>
Email	Dan Danbom	4/6/2022	<p>I guess I'm confused. The survey showed people wanted development, the vote on 301 essentially said they didn't -- including votes from people around the PHGC. Does the survey result trump the vote? Do meetings trump the vote? And if the visioning process is continuing, isn't it doing so in the hope the conservation easement will be lifted? Why does this feel like the developer is running the process?</p> <p>Thank you. Dan Danbom</p>
Online Comment Form	Kara Walsh	4/4/2022	Does the Greenway Concept allow for more housing? It appears to but I can't quite tell.
Online Comment Form	james w. rodgers,DDS	4/4/2022	the city owns an easement which states the city park golf course will not be used for development....i hope that easement will be honored.....
Online Comment Form	Sandrea Robnett	4/4/2022	This land, which is protected by an easement,should not be developed at all. It is despicable how eagerly this organization is to help a developer and completely ignore the desires of Denver voters.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	4/4/2022	<p>I am submitting these comments regarding CPD’s ongoing planning process for the Park Hill Golf Course [PHGC] land that is protected from development by its conservation easement. Purchased by Denver taxpayers in 1997 for \$2 million, the PHGC conservation easement preserves this invaluable land in perpetuity for open space and recreational conservation purposes.</p> <p>Despite the conservation easement, the Hancock Administration and Westside Investment Partners are moving forward with their plans to develop the PHGC land open space using a seriously flawed planning process directed by CPD and paid for by Denver taxpayers.</p> <p>The current CPD strategy includes using its hand-picked, heavily pro-development Steering Committee to continue the flawed 2021 “Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process” under the new name “Park Hill Golf Course Area Plan Process” while denying any Steering Committee discussion of either the conservation easement or maintaining the full 155 acres of open space. CPD is planning at least six more Steering Committee meetings through September designed to develop a mixed use commercial and residential development plan for submission to the Planning Board and eventually City Council.</p> <p>The following are my more specific and detailed comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City documents establish that CPD considers Westside—not Denver taxpayers and citizens—to be its “client” in the planning process. CPD and Westside have been collaborating on developing the land since soon after Westside purchased the land in 2019.</li> <li>• In early 2022, CPD refused to allow Save Open Space Denver to appoint a replacement for its designated Steering Committee member who needed to withdraw. CPD had previously allowed a registered neighborhood organization to appoint a replacement. CPD advised Save Open Space Denver that its continued participation “would result in further discord within the community and would not be a valuable use of the committee’s or your organization’s time.”</li> <li>• CPD refuses to allow any discussion of the conservation easement that protects the land from development in perpetuity.</li> <li>• Under the Colorado conservation easement statute, the conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become “impossible” to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the easement. CPD refuses to explain how the City intends to comply with the statute.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	4/4/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD's planning process continues to ignore the factual issue about whether any conditions on or surrounding the land have changed so that a court could make a finding of “impossibility” under the state statute.</li> <li>• CPD ignores the scientifically valid survey commissioned by the Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. neighborhood association which clearly reflects that 77% of the people living in the neighborhoods around the former Park Hill Golf Course want it to remain open space or turned into a regional park. Instead, CPD relies on its commissioned survey that is an invalid “push” survey designed to support development of the land.</li> <li>• CPD has packed its Steering Committee with vetted pro-development supporters in order to assure a pre-determined pro-development “prevailing vision” outcome.</li> <li>• CPD continues to say that the community supports development of the land completely ignoring the 301/302 vote in November which overwhelmingly supported open space and overwhelmingly defeated the City and Westside’s plan to remove the conservation easement protections in order to facilitate the development of a mixed use commercial and residential project on the land.</li> <li>• CPD’s planning process can best be described as “planning malpractice” for many reasons including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o CPD’s planning area myopically only includes the 155 acres of the former Park Hill Golf Course while ignoring neighboring land on both sides of Colorado Boulevard that will experience significant commercial and residential development</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>with no plans to perform any kind of environmental impact study, CPD has failed to address the public health and environmental benefits of preserving the 155 acres of open space CPD has failed to perform a meaningful traffic study regarding the impacts of commercial and residential development on the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to address the metropolitan district or districts that will be needed to develop the land’s infrastructure and the cost of metropolitan district taxes on future homeowners and renters.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Kathleen Stewart	4/4/2022	I definitely support plan 2 above the others because it has the largest area of contiguous park and and most comp[act] areas of business and residential. I also allows more area for drainage which fosters great bird and plant populations when managed appropriately.
Online Comment Form	kathleen stewart	4/4/2022	I also see plan 2 as preserving the most trees.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	chad kenney	4/6/2022	The Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) should stay open space! I recently took part in a "PHGC Visioning Process" which was facilitated by the Denver's Community Planning and Development (CPD). What a disingenuous sham! It was presented as an opportunity for community input into future of the PHGC. It was not! It was intended to create the illusion that the was community support for the development of PHGC. There is not! Michael Hancock and Westside Investment Partners are using CPD to promote their version of the Visioning process, which only includes development. As part of the "Visioning" process, this was presented, as if a forgone conclusion, that PHGC would be developed. Community members were offered three maps for development as if the decision to develop the PHGC had already been made. This is wrong and pharisaical. The mayor, Westside, and CPD are unable to remove the conservation easement without the approval of Denver voters, so they are developing a plan that favors development that they could use to entices the voters to approve. But this is just show. There is not a Visioning Process that allows meaningful input from people who are not in favor of development. The people who might not agree with the development have been systematically excluded from meaningful inclusion in the visioning process, so to create the impression that there is agreement from the community for the development. There is not! This is wrong!
Online Comment Form	Georgia Garnsey	4/6/2022	I think the Prevailing Vision you speak of is the vision of the Planning Department and Westside Development and the consultants and hangers-on who are benefiting from Westside's insistence on developing the last large parcel of green space left in Denver, a city with a park deficit, pollution, heat island effects, high ozone levels and more. It shocks and saddens me to know that you, CPD, will manipulate the public's true wishes to serve developers' interests instead. The greed and deception involved in your planning process has alarmed me. I do not feel that the health of our city concerns you, nor the health of its citizens. The fact that you are pushing forward on a plan to develop the Park Hill Golf Course land when it is illegal to do so is alarming. The land is protected by a perpetual conservation easement and nothing has changed that. You have not shown how it is "impossible" to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the conservation easement as is required by the State Statute in order to terminate, extinguish, release, or abandon the conservation easement. Instead, you believe that it is your right to silence citizens' voices who want to preserve the land and to disallow mention of the perpetual conservation easement in your "visioning process." Did you know we live in a democracy, my friends - freedom of speech and all that? This is a grave disservice to the public you have sworn to serve. The fair market value of the protected Park Hill Golf Course land is about \$6 million. The City of Denver is being handed a wonderful opportunity to purchase the land at a bargain rate to be used for a regional park that would truly benefit Denver citizens, but instead you squander our taxpayer dollars on fake visioning processes, push polls, glossy mailers and more - all to benefit your client, Westside Development instead. It's all about the money, not about planning a beautiful, livable, healthy city for all its residents and you to be proud of. Very sad indeed.
Online Comment Form	KC McFerson	4/7/2022	Could you hold a wider variety of meeting times? The times are always right during dinner & kid bedtime and I'm really interested in participating but haven't been able to.
Online Comment Form	Steven Noble	4/9/2022	Is extremely important to include sports fields in the development, including fields that can accommodate multiple sports like Australian Football which is a popular community sport in Denver, however there are no specific facilities for them. And Denver also lacks fields with lights so it would be great to add light so the fields can be used in the evenings during spring and fall.
Online Comment Form	Dylan Braun	4/11/2022	Create an Australian football field! This can also double as a cricket field.
Email	Fritz Klann	4/8/2022	Hi Courtney: Thanks for your response. From that it appears that the current plan contemplates 55 acres of development. My feeling remains that Denver needs more park space. Once a leader in park space per capita , in my opinion with the aid of the current administration, developers have run rampant and now Denver trails the national average of park space acres per capita. Stapleton has engulfed huge areas. Bluff Lake used to have light use and is now crowded with people seeking space. How many people will the proposed project add? Will we fall even farther behind? Not that it matters much but that's my two cents. Thanks for your time and consideration. Fritz
Online Comment Form	Steve McVicker	4/12/2022	My preference for development would be the Greenway or City Grid options. Both retain the most green space, which is sorely needed in the immediate area. Larger green spaces for large athletic events such as australian football, ultimate frisbee, soccer, rugby and other big turf sports would be ideal. Any plans that break the green space into smaller units end up limiting the overall utility of the park. I also want to mention that the City Grid option appeals for the mixed use commerical development - I could see restaurants/bars with patios that offer a great view of the sports and other activities happening in the green space, and that being a big attraction for the neighborhood as a whole (something not many other parks in Denver can offer).
Online Comment Form	Ben Marcum	4/12/2022	Denver needs a large dedicated open space to support it's local Australian Rules Football team, the Denver Bulldogs.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Susan Bruce	4/12/2022	This is the perfect area for an Australian Rules Football field! The Denver Bulldogs has been searching in vain for years for a field that is the appropriate size, and the course would serve that endeavor well!
Online Comment Form	Alexis Cralley	4/12/2022	The city needs more large green spaces for sports practices. Part of the space should be dedicated to Fields large enough for Australian football and Gaelic football. These are growing international sports in Denver, and Denver hosts tournaments yearly with national visitors supplying tourist funds. Currently, Arvada hosts the national tournament and reaps the financial benefits, but a location central to Denver would benefit Denver tourism and the players.
Online Comment Form	Matt Howell	4/12/2022	Australian Rules Football needs a designated field in Denver! There are over 35 Australian Football teams across cities in the USA and the Denver Bulldogs are THE most successful team since the leagues beginning...yet they don't have a designated field to play on yet! The field could of course be multi purpose and used for other sports like Soccer & Rugby.  Here is a link the the national league; <a href="https://usafl.com">https://usafl.com</a>
Online Comment Form	Richard Mann	4/12/2022	m a member of the Denver Bulldogs Australian Football Club. We are the biggest, most successful men's and women's club in the US. We have hosted not only local and regional games, but also regional tournaments and the USAFL National tournament ( the largest in the world, which brings in over a million dollars of economic impact to the host city). I strongly feel if you can make this space as flat, open and multi purpose as possible, you will have optimum usage levels and exposure. Our typical field ( oval) can run 180 yards long and 130 wide, so obviously, the bigger the better. With the advent and expansion of sports such as lacrosse, rugby and ultimate frisbee, the more flexible this space can be , the better. This will also allow you to even out the wear and tear vs locking the city into set soccer/rugby fields where areas in front of goals/ through middle of field etc will wear excessively ( Australian Rules Football is extremely spread out and doesn't unduly wear one area of the fields vs other sports) .
Online Comment Form	David Villani	4/12/2022	Would love an area that has multi use soccer fields and Australian rules football fields
Online Comment Form	Jeremy O'Connell	4/13/2022	I would love to see an allocation for multi purpose athletic fields. In particular with large field allowance for growing sports like Cricket and Australian rules which require a much larger area than soccer rugby or NFL. Cricket is a fast growing sport with a thriving competition in and around Denver, and Denver is home to the largest Australian football mens and Women's club in the USA.
Online Comment Form	John Clayton	4/13/2022	I think it would be great to have a small facility to practice golf short game(100 yards and in). Also be great to have a sports field for Australian Rules Football/cricket/soccer and any other large field sports.
Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	4/19/2022	Will there be any water features (ponds, waterways, etc) in the new park space?
Online Comment Form	Michael Fernandez	4/19/2022	Will you commit to a specific percentage of conserved permeable space in the Park Hill GC?

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Joseph Karas	4/19/2022	I would like to advocate for a large, mixed-use athletic field capable of hosting Australian football and cricket! Fields large enough for these activities (roughly a 170yd wide circle) are very difficult to find in the U.S., as most soccer or baseball complexes are divided by drainage infrastructure, fences, lighting, etc. This would be a boon for a number of local amateur sports groups (including the 14x national champion Denver Bulldogs and Lady Bulldogs Australian Football teams!) and also, obviously, be a great space for any activity, festival, etc.
Online Comment Form	Bernadette Kelly	4/19/2022	Denver needs a conservation burial ground, an environmentally friendly and natural alternative to embalming and placed in an expensive coffin containing chemicals and man-made materials or cremation which burns energy and pollutes the air.
Online Comment Form	Erin Sullivan	4/20/2022	A level ground park for space am Australian Rules football field, which can double as a rugby or cricket field - with a shared space community clubhouse and storage area for equipment would be fantastic.
Email	Maria Flora	4/25/2022	<p>Section 38-30.5-107 of the Colorado conservation easement statute provides that a conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the protected land—if has become impossible to fulfill the conservation purposes of the easement. The conservation purposes of the 2019 Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land conservation easement are “to maintain[the land’s] scenic and open condition and to preserve [the land] for recreational use.”</p> <p>Having carefully followed this CPD planning process since early 2021, we note that there has been no substantive discussion regarding either the PHGC land conservation easement or any facts that would support a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land—it has become “impossible” to fulfill the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the easement. Please advise us as to when CPD intends to address these threshold issues in this planning process and, if CPD does not plan to address these issues in this planning process, please explain the reasons.</p> <p>Furthermore, on CPD’s “Park Hill Golf Course—Next Steps” website, the only mention of the Colorado conservation easement statute is buried in subparagraph 8D of the Park Hill Golf Course FAQ updated December 9, 2021 found by first clicking on “Resources” on the opening webpage and then on the new webpage by clicking on the words “FAQs on the property background, etc.” under the heading “Legal History.” This subparagraph states that there is a “clear legal path” for dealing with the Colorado conservation easement statutory requirements, but it fails to provide any explanation about what the “clear legal path” is.</p> <p>We must request once again that CPD explain this “clear legal path.” Additionally, we must request that CPD advise us and post on its website information about when in this process the City plans to seek a court order under the Colorado conservation easement statute authorizing termination, release, extinguishment, and/or abandonment of the conservation easement. Nowhere on the CPD website, including the timeline “Park Hill Golf Course Planning Process,” is there any mention of the required court action pursuant to the statute.</p>
Email	Maria Flora	4/29/2022	<p>We are writing in response to Ms. Levingston’s email to Maria Flora dated April 25, 2022 which responded to our letter of the same date.</p> <p>Our letter addressed issues regarding CPD’s “Visioning/Area Plan” process and compliance with the Colorado conservation easement statute’s requirements regarding termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of conservation easements. Fundamentally, we asked the following two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When does CPD plan to address the factual question as to whether--based on changed conditions on or surrounding the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land--it has become “impossible” to fulfill the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the PHGC land conservation easement and, if it does not plan to address these issues, why not?</li> <li>2. What is the “clear legal path” that the City and CPD have for dealing with the mandates of the Colorado conservation easement statute regarding termination, release, extinguishment, and abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement?</li> </ol> <p>Despite the fact that these questions are not answered anywhere on CPD’s website and have not been answered in CPD’s “Visioning/Area Plan” process, Ms. Levingston merely responded to these questions stating that CPD has “no further information to share”. Without giving answers to these threshold questions, it is unreasonable for CPD to complete an expensive and time-consuming “Area Plan” for the PHGC land and for the City to drag Denver voters through another election regarding the issue of breaking the conservation easement and allowing residential and/or commercial construction on the PHGC land.</p> <p>Finally, we must note that--contrary to implications in Ms. Levingston’s email--CPD has refused to allow a thorough discussion of the PHGC conservation easement in its “Visioning/Area Plan” process. CPD did allow an Assistant City Attorney to explain the City’s and Westside’s interpretation of the conservation easement. That said, CPD has refused our repeated requests to present our interpretation of the conservation easement and CPD even refused to allow its own retained conservation easement law expert, Larry Kueter, to explain his interpretation. As a consequence, CPD’s Steering Committee and the public are left with the incorrect belief that preservation of the conservation easement would require permanent golf course operations on the PHGC land.</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Email	Bernadette Kelly	4/27/2022	If the golf course gets developed, which is inevitable, (I've been involved in zoning, development as a rep for Greater Park Hill Community for 14 years.) This development needs to address the true needs of the community: affordable housing, affordable rents for POC businesses, sustainable development - an example to the world of zero carbon development from ground breaking through facility maintenance. Another Central Park of cheap construction for the middle and upper class would be a failure. Our professional survey of residents in Park Hill overwhelmingly indicated that Park Hill Golf Course should remain as open space. We all know that isn't going to happen. We have a developer that paid millions for the land. The planning stage is our last chance to get it right - address societal and environmental issues with the last large tract of land in Denver. I am a third generation Denver native. When my grandmother was born in 1912, her family lived at 2550 River Drive (same as Dennis Gallagher's mother's family). My mother was born in Denver and she attended Loretto Heights College. I was born in Denver at St. Joseph's Hospital. I attended Machebuef High School on Montview and Elm in the early 1980s and now live 6 blocks north. Sincerely, Bernadette
Online Comment Form	Amy Harris	5/7/2022	Regarding affordable housing in Northeast Park Hill: 250 units of affordable housing are slated to be built at 38th & Holly in 2022. Another affordable housing project at 40th & Colorado is in its beginning stages (supported by ULC). 3-4 market-rate units are going to be built on the lot of the historic Robinson House on Albion Street right across from the Club House. Please make this and other information available to steering committee members so they aren't considering development of the last open space parcel in Denver through a myopic lens. More residents are coming to NEPH - thousands more. We need a regional park, open space, and public amenities to support them and the current residents. Thank you.
Online Comment Form	Anna Hergt	5/15/2022	I rode my bike through this park today and there is a variety of wildlife that make this park their home. I didn't see anything about conservation efforts in the most recent meet's pdf slides. Will there or has there already been a survey of the land done to assess impact on wildlife? If you walk around here as well, I think you will find that untouched land like this in the city is extraordinary rare and beautiful. Preserving as much of the natural land is so important, especially with the views of the front range and benefits of old growth trees to filter the air from the nasty purina factory nearby! Thank you so much for considering.
Online Comment Form	Stuart Hayden	5/24/2022	I'm concerned CPD is spending too much time and effort planning an easement-restricted property. Not only will it be a total waste if the easement is not lifted, but it is ethically questionable. It makes CPD look partial to, and invested in lifting the easement. The burden of proposing alternative plans should fall on the owner. In no other circumstance does CPD do the owner's work for them. City architects don't design a new building for an owner interested in demolishing an existing structure to construct something else, especially when an easement or landmark designation prohibits exterior alterations to said building. To the public, CPD continuing to plan this development as if the easement has been lifted does not feel informative. It feels disenfranchising, disinterested in whether or not the community wants to lift it, and disingenuous. Please stop planning until the easement is lifted. Please stop doing the owner's work for them. CPD should be demanding maximum community-beneficial concessions from the owner, not subsidizing large private developers. CPD's time would be better spent processing the backlog of building applications sullyng its reputation, or pursuing policies that increase density without destroying existing resources like open space and buildings.
Via email	Susan Jorgenson	6/6/2022	I vote no!!!! The poor home owners in the 13-1700 blocks! After years of paying mortgages and living a small footprint...now we are punished! Try this in some other neighborhood! Not mine!
Online Comment Form	Christine Dea	6/9/2022	Pursuing the overturning of the current, legal easement against the PHGC should NOT be done. What does the law mean, anyway? Really, what does it mean? That you can justify changes based on the push of developers who have contributed to the current administrations pockets? And, just because the City wants more tax revenue and owes favors to this developer is not in the public's interest. We need open space! The City administration and all of the employees pursuing this illegal scheme should be embarrassed and lose in court. Drop this effort.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Theresa Johnson	6/9/2022	As a Park Hill resident from 1989 to 2007, and a Skyland resident since 2007, I am disappointed and upset that the Park Hill Golf Course may be developed beyond open space only. The percentage of open space areas in Denver is very low when compared to all other major cities in the US. Denver citizens paid for an easement forbidding development and I am appalled the Hancock administration is trying so hard to overturn/ignore that. I strenuously vote no on the development!
Online Comment Form	Mary Domenico	6/9/2022	While I am beginning to think this administration does not care about citizen voices who do not represent big business, I want to again voice my opposition to the proposed development of the Park Hill Golf Course. We need open space in this city. The residents of Park Hill and Denver want it and deserve it.
Online Comment Form	Alison Walczak	6/10/2022	There is no logical reason, other than greed, that the land of the former Park Hill golf course should be developed when there is a current, legal easement forbidding development. I oppose this development.
Online Comment Form	Charlene Parris	6/14/2022	Honor the conservation easement and the will of voters - DO NOT DEVELOP OR PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARK HILL GOLF COURSE.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Trevor Wafer	6/15/2022	In the coming redevelopment, please consider keeping the golf course driving range on the new property as a recreation opportunity for people in the downtown area. The driving range at City Park GC is the only range in the downtown area and almost always filled to capacity with people waiting and sharing the hitting stalls. The next closest options for a public driving range in the area is either Overland Park GC or Common Grounds in Aurora, both far outside of the general downtown/city park area. The current driving range location in the southeast corner of the Park Hill GC property already has the infrastructure of safety nets on one side. The range should provide a good revenue stream to maintain the rest of the property/park space as the operation costs of a driving range is generally low. Leaving the driving range on the property would maintain the open space goals of the city and provide an option for members of the community to enjoy outdoor activity.
Online Comment Form	Christine Mohr	6/15/2022	I am opposed to breaking the conservation easement and constructing a dense mixed residential and commercial development on the Park Hill Golf Course land.
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	6/21/2022	When will CPD post the video replay of the June 14 Steering Committee meeting?
Online Comment Form	Liane Morrison	6/21/2022	As a Denver resident, I have voted on many issues that are not in my neighborhood so I find it inconsistent that one of the City positions is that the topic of the Park Hill Golf Course should be decided by only the people within a certain proximity to it. For example, applying that position to whether to expand the National Western Center would have meant that only residents in Globeville, Elyria-Swansea would have voted on it.  I am perplexed that the City is hosting the June 30 forum in a space that is so small that it limits the number of people who can attend. That seems to go in the opposite direction of inclusivity and a desire to hear from as many residents as possible.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	6/27/2022	There is currently a perpetual conservation easement on this property. Furthermore, this easement is protected by several items including a state statute as well as the need for a city-wide vote to agree to end the easement. Why have you not invested taxpayers' dollars developing a plan for this very likely outcome that 100% of this land needs to stay 100% open space with zero development? A plan that includes only open space usage? Where is this open space plan currently? If it does not exist at this point it certainly will be available to voters alongside the current plan for development? It would be extremely biased on your part to leave this open space plan out of the public eye.
Online Comment Form	C Dea	6/27/2022	The former Park Hill Golf Course land should be FULLY kept as open space. Why is Hancock et al. (as in your department) against the will of the entire city as voted on last November? The answer is self-serving and the people have voiced what they want. this continuing effort is simply ridiculous, as is your carefully crafted spin of a response.
Online Comment Form	Chloe Pulliam	6/27/2022	Why is the city of Denver continuing to push the narrative that development of the PHGC land is necessary and inevitable? We need more large regional parks for the constantly growing population of Denver. Developing this land that is under a conservation easement that Denver tax payers already voted on and paid for would be a great mistake. This land should become a park. The city has millions of dollars collected from the tax payers that is designated for exactly the purpose of expanding parks in our city.
Online Comment Form	Theresa Johnson	6/27/2022	I don't understand why this mixed use development is still being pushed when 2/3 of Denver's voters voted for open space, and when there is a conservation easement on the property. At least, that is my understanding.
Online Comment Form	Mary Domenico	6/27/2022	Again, I want to stress my opposition to the proposed development of the Park Hill Golf Course. I am a long-term resident of Park Hill and, like most of my neighbors, I know that the developers and the mayor's office are turning a deaf ear to the community. We need and want open space!
Online Comment Form	Anna McCaffery	6/27/2022	WHY ARE YOU CONTINUING TO PUSH DEVELOPMENT ON THE PARK HILL GOLF COURSE WHEN THAT WAS VOTED DOWN BY RESIDENTS OF THE CITY???????
Online Comment Form	Eric Eisenbud	6/27/2022	I'm a Denver native and have seen the dedicated park space significantly diminished over the last 50 years to the point that Denver now has only 20-30 % of open space of other major cities in the US. Despite of the vote of the people in Ballot initiative 301, the city is moving forward with high density development of the Park Hill Golf Course, and we won't let this happen!
Online Comment Form	Jeff Aldrich	6/27/2022	I have reviewed the new "proposal " from the City of Denver for the PHGC development and am dismayed that the City is ignoring the overwhelming vote of Denver citizens to not place high density developments on this property. No means No! Listen to the citizens, not the developers.
Online Comment Form	Tim Dea	6/27/2022	Here's what I think. Ballot 31 last November supported parks and open space. Voters overwhelmingly supported open space. Now it appears there will be another "process" in an attempt to overturn the voters. This is simply wrong. The easement "in perpetuity" has been law. DO NOT break the law nor the voters mandate.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Susan Young	6/27/2022	<p>We live .9 miles from Park Hill Golf Course according to my computer map and we did NOT receive a form to provide input on the development of the golf course. We are opposed to development when there is so much planned development in the near area.</p> <p>This is precious green space to be enjoyed by all. Park Hill Supermarket is conveniently located to the golf course neighborhood with fresh produce, fresh fish and meats, plus canned goods. We need more green space, not more development. 25 acres of "greenspace" that cannot be used because it is planned as a retention pond, this is so typical of developers.....bait and switch.</p>
Online Comment Form	Keri Cordova	6/27/2022	<p>As the voters requested the gold course should not be developed in ANY way. Here is why we need the open space 8% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement ☐ 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021 ☐ The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own ☐ The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong ☐ Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy) ☐ Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly) ☐ Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developer- run Metro Tax District ☐ At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park ☐ Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? ☐ The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. ☐ The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision.</p>
Online Comment Form	Sharon Kermiet	6/27/2022	<p>I completely oppose the development of the Park Hill Golf Course. There is a lawful easement, and in addition, the voters have spoken. The Park Hill Golf Course must become a city park. No development!</p>
Online Comment Form	Marianne Rinehart	6/27/2022	<p>I am a concerned resident of Park Hill. Please do not develop the Park Hill Golf Course. Sacrificing green space to development instead of making it into a park is not only a terrible idea given our climate crisis and rising temperatures, it is unnecessary, given the nearby available properties that need reinvigorating and redevelopment without sacrificing mature trees and permeable soil for clean air and water.</p> <p>Also, the \$2 million we taxpayers invested in the easement in 1997 is now worth at least \$60 million. If it is terminated we don't get the \$60 million -- the developer does. That is a giveaway by the city to the developer, who can then turn around and sell off portions of the property at the much higher market value since the easement no longer suppresses the fair market value. Honestly, this is shameful and I am surprised it is legal.</p>
Online Comment Form	Bridget Walsh	6/28/2022	<p>What part of "NO" do you not understand. GPHC survey found that over 70% of Park Hill residents want regional park , not more cement on the Park Hill Golf Course. The voters of Denver also told you "NO". Yet you persist. We know that Westside Development delivered \$400,000 to Hancock for his campaign that unfortunately, with the help of the dirty tricksters at CRL, succeeded. Denver has some of the dirtiest air in the nation. It's urban hot spot is one of the top in the nation. We need green open space. Go put your so called,"affordable housing" on all of the parcels owned by Hancock cronies. Hancock should be in jail for his abuse of women... not sitting in the Mayor's chair. Go away.</p>
Online Comment Form	William Dresser	6/28/2022	<p>I find it outrageous that this plan is being put forward in DIRECT opposition to the will of the voters. I will certainly do all I can to oppose this miss guided use of public funds to benefit of a private developer.</p>
Online Comment Form	Donna Krentz	6/28/2022	<p>To the City of Denver and CPD, The VOTERS have spoken and 2/3rds of Denver VOTERS agreed to NO to development ON the PHGC land. STOP ignoring the voters in the attempt to circumvent that which the voters have already told you. STOP wasting taxpayer MONEY on these ill-advised attempts and trying to make Denver an over-developed cement jungle!</p> <p>There was overwhelming support for Initiative 301 that voters told the city and the developer that we need to protect the perpetual conservation easement and the PHGC land from development. It passed in nearly 300 precincts, barely losing just 7 precincts – none located close to PHGC land! Community Planning and Development is a TOTAL SHAM PROCESS that continues to waste taxpayer MONEY! Why We Should Build Around The PHGC Land, Not On It 68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021 The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy) Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly) Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developerrun Metro Tax District At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	D Aubin	6/28/2022	When the developer who purchased the old YMCA in Skyland was trying to get the lot re-zoned, we went through this same process. The neighborhood was led by our district rep and the developer to think that there would still be community space, setbacks, and density/street parking wouldn't be an issue. We were naive. No community space, high density, and issues with street parking. No outdoor areas for residents except for a small dog area. It's not the type of building that adds to community. I don't think Park Hill zoning should be changed or that the conservation easement should be lifted. Voters spoke already, and we've learned that developers aren't required to follow through with the promises they make to you.
Online Comment Form	John Lietz	6/28/2022	To the City of Denver and CPD, The VOTERS have spoken and 2/3rds of Denver VOTERS agreed to NO development ON the PHGC land. STOP ignoring the voters in the attempt to circumvent that which the voters have already told you. STOP wasting taxpayer MONEY on these ill-advised attempts and trying to make Denver an over-developed cement jungle! There was overwhelming support for Initiative 301 that voters told the city and the developer that we need to protect the perpetual conservation easement and the PHGC land from development. It passed in nearly 300 precincts, barely losing just 7 precincts – none located close to PHGC land! Community Planning and Development is a TOTAL SHAM PROCESS that continues to waste taxpayer MONEY! Why We Should Build Around The PHGC Land, Not On It 68% of the neighborhood surrounding the PHGC land voted FOR protecting the conservation easement 63% of all Denver voters rejected development of the PHGC land in November 2021 The perpetual conservation easement (paid for by Denver taxpayers) has grown in value from \$2 million to \$60 million in today's market. The city wants taxpayers to give \$60 million away to its developer partner by canceling the conservation easement WE own The developer spent over \$636,000 claiming to speak for the neighborhood, and were proven wrong Hundreds of income-restricted residential units will be built just across the street from the PHGC land (Urban Land Conservancy) Hundreds more income-restricted townhomes and apartments are being built down the street (DelWest at 38th and Holly) Unlike a development at PHGC, neither project above will impose a private property tax surcharge on homeowners or businesses to pay off high-interest bonds issued by a developer run Metro Tax District At least two developer groups have bought up 34 parcels around the 40th and Colorado Train Station for high-density development. That means over 50 acres within walking and biking distance of the PHGC land are already primed for mixed-use residential and commercial redevelopment without cutting down any of the 440 PHGC trees or sacrificing the environmental and recreational benefits if the PHGC land were a full service, regional park Hundreds more residential units are already planned along 40th Avenue, won't they need open green space? The city's hand-picked Steering Committee is dominated by pro-development advocates. Their claim that the city speaks for, and is listening to, the community is disingenuous at best. The city's predetermined "Prevailing Vision" is short-sighted, and absolutely lacks vision.
Online Comment Form	Jerry Doerksen	6/28/2022	I'm wondering why the City is continuing to explore ways to create Park Hill Golf Course into a gigantic housing development when voters convincingly indicated this is not a desired purpose. I think the desire of Denver residents is to retain this property as open space. Please explain why alternate options are being pursued.
Online Comment Form	Dan Danbom	6/28/2022	The city is ignoring the will of the voters by proceeding as if there never was a vote. As a 71-year resident, I find this whole process infuriating.
Online Comment Form	Karen Libby	6/29/2022	I am opposed to development on PHGC land. I am asking that you keep what little is left of open space in the city of Denver free from the proliferation of development of apartments and other buildings. Great cities need green open space and planners should keep the wishes of their constituents in mind when making decisions. The voters clearly spoke and seem to be ignored in the planning process. As a long-time resident of Denver, I believe that development should not overshadow the need for open space.
Online Comment Form	Margaret Case	6/29/2022	After the election, I truly do not understand how this question is still being debated. How is that possible?
Online Comment Form	Frederick Klann	6/29/2022	The City has disappointed me more on this subject than anything since I moved here in 1979. The City has ignored the clear message from the 301 vote. People want open space and parks not more development and congestion. The City could pay the developer a fair price and use the space wisely. Instead, the City is trying to ram through what the developer's wants and acts as though this is what people want. The moderators have avoided directly dealing with the view that no development is the popular wish. Not so. This project will impact a much larger group of people than the small group that the City alleges supports the development of the property. Former Mayor Webb said that the City made a deal with the developer long ago and it sure seems that way. The city calls the developer its client. That's wrong. The people of the City are the clients. The developer doesn't even live in Denver. This is politics at its worst.
Online Comment Form	Georgianna	6/29/2022	Please hear me and hear me well!! I am sick and tired of all these non-progress meetings and I am about to resolve the issue. To have the investment (new owner) "Resale" the Park Hill Golf Course. Advertise the sale of PHGC in numerous golf and sports magazines in Colorado, all over the US, including other countries to buy, invest, and retain as a golf course, and nothing else. Thank you for your time.
Online Comment Form	Carly Lenderts	6/29/2022	Please support housing development in conjunction with part of the land being developed into a park. Denver desperately needs more housing, both for-sale and for-rent, to mitigate the impact of rising housing costs. A park that provides better pedestrian and bicycle access to the 40th & Colorado RTD station along with housing would be a great improvement for this under-utilized land. Grocery store would be great, too! Even if it's a small one.
Online Comment Form	Tom Romine	6/29/2022	What is the regional detention area?

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Martha Foxhoven	6/29/2022	In the November ballot of last year 63% of Denver residents voted against development of the Park Hill Golf Course and for open space conservation. Currently, Northeast Park Hill is an urban heat island. Will this development just compound the issue by increasing the infrastructure of buildings and roads and the elimination of mature trees and vegetation? What is the cost to the community in deteriorating air quality, higher heat index, and poor quality of life? 8% of Denver's 155 square miles is designated parkland compared to 21% in New York. Regarding development, there is already designated housing planned for 38th & Holly by DelWest. It just seems that high priced developers yield more influence and power in this city than the communities, who have to live with their decisions and the environmental impact of development.
Online Comment Form	Susan Young	6/30/2022	Here is the language used by the city for their questionnaire on the development of Park Hill Golf Course: "A paper survey was mailed on March 8th and responses were tabulated through April 16th. 100% of respondents live within one mile of PHGC. Results from this survey are referred to in this report as the "mailed survey" or "mailed invite." The mailed survey is statistically valid." We live .9 miles from the golf course and were told tonight at the Open House at the Club House, the questionnaire was mailed to those .8 miles from the golf course. You wonder why people don't trust the city and Westside Development, this is a perfect example. Technically true, but misleading. Why not say it was mailed to those .8 miles from the golf course. Give an inch, take a mile. That is what I see.
Online Comment Form	Terri Hobart	7/1/2022	This is an opportunity to create a development model of justice oriented gentrification. I would like to see the city work with the developer to focus primarily on the needs of the current surrounding neighborhoods. I do not feel the strategies have enough details to know if they will be effective. I am concerned that the strategies and programs identified to protect current residents and businesses or not sufficient. The plan needs built-in funding sources and longterm protection guarantees. The Development Agreement should require the establishment of a green fund based on the amount of green pace that will be developed. This green fund could be used to plant and water trees in the surrounding neighborhoods. This would lower the temperatures in North Park Hill and Clayton, create healthier neighborhoods and help accomplish the City's canopy goals. I believe that the Developer should be encourage to employ green and sustainable building practices and materials in return for the City giving up substantial green space.
Online Comment Form	Susan Weinstein	7/5/2022	I am opposed to any development of the Park Hill Golf Course land except as a public park. I understand that housing is an important issue, but there are other properties in the nearby areas that can accommodate those needs without ruining one of the last, if not the last large open space area for a park in NE Denver. The dispute over the easement has not been resolved yet and I hate to see my tax dollars being spent on developing a plan which may not even be adopted. The Urban Land Conservancy is building hundreds of income restricted residential units just adjacent to the open space. There are other areas nearby which can be developed similarly. Once that open space is gone, it is gone forever. In this fractious times, the mental and physical health of Denver residents out weighs the need for development of this particular property. The people voted and approved protecting the conservation easement. Listen to your constituents and not to the developers who will make a financial killing developing this property. And read the article from Sunday's (July 3) Denver Post Business Section, front page. Our problem is not unique and there are groups across the country trying to protect large parcels from development and there are developers challenging those groups. Let's make a decision that is environmentally sound and people oriented.
Online Comment Form	Marc Nelson	7/5/2022	Can we look at putting a large pickleball facility? There is not facility in Denver that more the 4 courts
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	Here are my overall comments on the Community Planning and Development Department (CPD) Sham Process: CPD's June 30th "Community Open House" is a continuation of the sham planning and development process conceived and implemented by CPD with the predetermined outcome of supporting the residential and commercial development plans of CPD's real estate developer "client" Westside Investment Partners. CPD has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars and devoted thousands of CPD staff hours in support of Westside's development plans. Starting soon after Westside purchased the PHGC land in July 2019 subject to its perpetual open space and recreational conservation easement, the Hancock Administration began working with Westside on plans to break the conservation easement and construct a mini-city of residential and commercial buildings on the PHGC land. CPD began the formal planning process in early 2021 by forming a "Steering Committee" to engage in a "visioning process." Working for its "client" Westside, it's not surprising that CPD's hand-picked "Steering Committee" was primarily composed of pro-development supporters. In late 2021, CPD ended the "visioning process" by unilaterally declaring that the "prevailing vision" for the PHGC land would include substantial mixed residential and commercial development. And, in early 2022, CPD directed its "Steering Committee" to begin discussing a formal "area plan" that CPD will draft and likely present to the Planning Board and City Council for approval later in 2022. The next hurdle for the Hancock Administration and Westside will then be for the Hancock Administration to submit a ballot measure to Denver voters in accordance with Ballot Initiative 301 that passed city-wide in November 2021 by 63% to 37%.

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<p>The Hancock Administration/Westside ballot measure will seek voter approval for breaking the PHGC land conservation easement and allowing residential and commercial construction on the land. Presumably, the Hancock Administration and Westside will use CPD’s “area plan” in their campaign to support their ballot measure. Why CPD’s Planning Process Is a ShamThe CPD planning process is a sham and it’s irresponsible for CPD to move forward with its effort to secure approval of an area plan for the PHGC land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why should Denver citizens trust a planning process conceived and implemented by CPD when CPD considers Westside to be its “client” —not Denver citizens and taxpayers?</li> <li>• CPD has failed to allow meaningful discussion of the conservation easement that protects the PHGC land from development.</li> <li>• CPD has committed “planning malpractice” by single-mindedly only including the 155 acres of the PHGC land in the geographic boundaries of its area plan. Why is it legitimate to prepare an area plan that fails to include areas near the PHGC land that are appropriate for hardscape development and that undoubtedly will have massive dense residential and commercial development in the future? Importantly, these excluded areas include properties on the west side of Colorado Boulevard near the 40th and Colorado A-Line Station where SOS Denver has identified over 36 acres that have been assembled by two real estate development groups. And, this acreage is likely just a small portion of the land that real estate speculators have been acquiring in that area that is ideal for future high density residential and commercial development without sacrificing the protected 155 acres of the PHGC land urban green space.</li> <li>• Since unilaterally declaring in early 2022 that the “prevailing vision” for the PHGC land was a substantial mixed residential and commercial development, CPD has prevented any discussion about preserving the 155 acres of the PHGC land for the open space and recreational purposes of its conservation easement.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to study the traffic impacts of a significant mixed residential and commercial development project on the PHGC land.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has failed to include meaningful discussion of climate change and the health and environmental benefits of maintaining the 155 acres of the PHGC land as open space.</li> <li>• CPD’s survey was an invalid push survey designed to support pro-development outcomes. In addition, CPD has ignored the valid professionally prepared neighborhood survey commissioned in 2019 by the now 66-year-old Greater Park Hill Community, Inc. registered neighborhood organization. This survey found that 77% of Park Hill respondents supported preserving the PHGC land as some kind of green space/park or a golf course.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion regarding the Metropolitan Tax Districts that real estate developers such as Westside utilize to build needed infrastructure for development projects on properties that have no existing roads, sidewalks, utilities, etc. These developer-controlled taxing entities finance needed infrastructure by issuing bonds that are purchased by investors, including the developers themselves, and that saddle property owners directly and renters indirectly with the additional real estate tax costs of paying off the principal and interest on the bonds.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any meaningful discussion about planned affordable housing projects near the PHGC land (DelWest on 38th and Holly and the Urban Land Conservancy north of the PHGC land) where hundreds of affordable townhouses and apartments will be built without imposing Metropolitan Tax District tax burdens.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Woody Garnsey	7/6/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD has fundamentally ignored its own commissioned “Environmental, Parks, Open Space &amp; Recreation Technical Assessment” dated April 2021 addressing park and open space needs in the statistical neighborhoods of Clayton, Northeast Park Hill, and Swansea-Elyria. This study concluded that all three of these neighborhoods “are far below national and City averages for park acres per capita” and that--in order to meet national averages—the City would need to increase total park acres within these neighborhoods by 183.5 acres. The PHGC land is the only significant open space land in these three neighborhoods where this critical need can be meaningfully addressed.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that if the City were to purchase the PHGC land for a designated park it would pay no more than the approximate \$5-6 million fair market value of the land as encumbered by the conservation easement. Such an acquisition would be consistent with the purpose of the 2018 taxpayer-approved sales tax increase Measure 2A that was sold to voters as a parks and open space acquisition fund.</li> <li>• CPD has failed to include any discussion of the fact that breaking the conservation easement would be a multi-million dollar gift from Denver taxpayers to Westside. The conservation easement which Denver taxpayers bought for \$2 million in 1997 is now worth well more than \$60 million (the difference between the fair market value of the land with and without development rights).</li> <li>• CPD hand-picked the “Steering Committee” to have a significant majority who from the beginning have supported breaking the conservation easement and having the land developed. And, in this “area plan” phase-- despite having previously allowed an RNO to appoint a replacement “Steering Committee” member--CPD prevented SOS Denver from replacing its appointed “Steering Committee” member who needed to resign.</li> <li>• CPD is wastefully putting the cart before the horse conducting an “area plan” process at this time. The Colorado conservation easement statute prevents termination, release, extinguishment or abandonment of the PHGC land conservation easement without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the land—it has become “impossible” to continue fulfilling the easement’s open space and recreational conservation purposes.</li> </ul>
Online Comment Form	Vicki Kelley	7/8/2022	<p>The city of Denver needs to HONOR THE WISH OF VOTERS and citizens and stop trying to steal this land away. Park Hill Golf Course is a beautiful monument to the city itself, and WHY this mayor/city council continue to try and deceive its citizens is disgusting. Just for once in this Hancock administration is it too much to ask they conduct themselves with some honor and integrity. Leave the conservation easement ALONE.</p>
Online Comment Form	Amy Golden	7/8/2022	<p>We voted, clearly, to protect the easement and honor our city’s need for green space. The mayor and the developers have moved forward as though we haven’t voted, resoundingly, against their plans. What gives? Why is the city pursuing plans and overriding the people’s will?</p>

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Dina	7/8/2022	The park hill golf course is far larger than most people realize. Far bigger than city park. There is space for both thoughtful conservation and affordable housing and access to a grocery. North park hill residents have had limited access to fresh food and need additional affordable housing to remain in their community. These are also directives to fulfill by the city's strategic plan. There can be a solution on this land that helps support all of these needs.
Online Comment Form	Mary Maguire	7/8/2022	Developing the site will mean the the cutting down of hundreds of old growth trees not to mention to the loss of critical open space and parkland at a time when our available space for greenscape is rapidly decreasing. Denver's Game Plan calls for increases in Denver's tree canopy and the acquisition of more parkland in areas are lacking, which includes this area and surrounding neighborhoods. Denver's park access of 9 acres per thousand residents is well below the national average of 13.
Online Comment Form	Concerned Denver Resident	7/9/2022	Please consider preserving this land as a park for the citizens of Denver, in a neighborhood that would truly benefit from the cooling, aesthetic, and recreational benefits. Denver is approximately 8% dedicated park area. NYC is 21%, by comparison. Even LA is 13%. It is understood that affordable housing is a national crisis, very much afflicting Denver, but giving up the last remaining opportunities for significant, low water, adaptive species parks for residents that will support the ability of this city to exist into the future is quite definitely not the solution.
Online Comment Form	Edward Yoo	7/13/2022	I would use the golf course to create a big park, something similar to wash park. The safety of this neighborhood needs to be improved overall and more parks need to be created for the neighborhood
Online Comment Form	Edward Yoo	7/13/2022	I think it's really messed up that I didn't get any mail or email regarding the park hill golf course poll. I found the poll link from one of the news article and the poll has closed already. I seriously question if the city is interested in getting feedback from from the actual residents when there was no notification sent out to the neighborhood. Very poor way to collect feedback.
Online Comment Form	Robert Goppelt	7/17/2022	20-40 % reduction in open park We need More affordable housing. Make a Dense Urban forest. Use fruit trees of all types. How about a wild flower open park, less wasted on grass. A water park at the new rec.center. A anchor Grocery store for the local population. A farmers market area. A 10-15 acre working urban farm.
Online Comment Form	Ingrid Hewitson	7/18/2022	I can't believe the city planners are continuing to go against the wishes of the voters and working to develop the golf course. Not only is this a waste of tax payer money it also makes it pretty clear who's pockets you are all in. We have less green space than most large cities, the residents want more green space and you continue to disregard this. We voted to protect it! It's disgusting!
Email	Janet Rahmani	7/25/2022	Forever and ever now I have been hearing about the Park Hill Golf Course land. And it's always how the City wants to work with the developer who bought the land to develop housing on the site. Then somewhere in the article there will be mention of the conservation easement by the way. While I know that housing is a big need in Denver, especially affordable housing, I also know that there is a severe shortage of green spaces and tree canopy. Given that there is an existing conservation easement on this land and given the dire need for more green space, which, as this planet warms, will be even more essential in urban areas, it should be clear to you all that development should not happen on the Park Hill land. Comply with the conservation easement and preserve this precious space. Too bad for the developer who should have been fully cognizant that the easement existed.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	7/20/2022	I would like to express my concern with the "partner" chosen to work on the community benefits agreement for this project. How is James Roy, who presented in your meeting last evening, and his organization DMCI qualified to carry out this task? What was the process used to evaluate them against other possible partners for this? I have attempted to research ANY similar work that they have done and really any of their accomplishments and have not been able to. Can you help me understand their qualifications? Furthermore, I question the professionalism and stability of Mr. Roy. He was visibly frustrated with any common questions that were asked of him in last night's meeting, and even stated " I don't like you" to a member of the steering committee. This is highly unacceptable and reflects his level of ability to carry out such an important task.
Online Comment Form	Michael McCumber	7/20/2022	To be clear, I expressed similar concerns about Mr. Roy and DMCI's qualifications to engage in the community navigator program, which is now well-known to be fraught with inherent bias and missed the mark on engaging with the larger community. This also seems to bring up a conflict of interest issue given his longstanding and continued involvement with this process. I look forward to your response.
Online Comment Form	Adriene Callahan	7/20/2022	Hello, why does the City have an entire planning/development committee already in place when this clearly has to go to public Vote (the conservation easement). The City has vastly under-estimated the general public concern for : The lack of Water to Sustainability for a Development of this size. Doesn't the developer have to prove that there is a 100 years of sustainable water to support this development? Where is the Water going to come from? LESS people need to move to Colorado, NOT MORE. THERE is not enough water to sustain this kind of GROWTH. So please answer this question, Where is the water going to come from?
Online Comment Form	Kevin Standbridge	7/20/2022	What percent of the proposed park/open space area will be used for stormwater management purposes? Are those stormwater management areas indicated on the plan?

**Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log 8/1/2022**

Online Comment Form	Naomi Grunditz	7/21/2022	Hi! I've been following this and intended to do the survey and attend meetings but life gets in the way. Please record my opinion as in support of the draft plan to both develop and preserve open space. It's a win-win. In terms of the arguments that Denver needs more park space, it's true, but as our population grows we will NEVER be able to catch up to the "ideal" ratio and it's a distraction to focus on this when quality counts as much if not more than quantity. In addition, this area is close to a TOD and is an opportunity to bring much needed housing and services, as well as a park, to the area as WELL as provide housing for people who can then have access to the park. I live three blocks away in Clayton. In casual conversations with my neighbors, half of who are relative new-comers, and half who are long time residents (15+ years), none of them want to see the entire area preserved as a park and don't understand why some people are so adamant about that. One thing I do see missing in the current proposal is preserving some of the amazing mountain views from this park, which will mostly be blocked by the plan to develop along Colorado Blvd. I know the chances of establishing a new viewplane is zero, but its the only place near me I can go for a panoramic mountain view and I can't deny that I will miss that.
Online Comment Form	Hanna Aharonov	7/24/2022	We just bought in the park hill community. We are curious to see the time frame for the project and expected building start dates.
Online Comment Form	John DiMattia	7/26/2022	I'm happy with the current plan. I would have preferred more dense infill housing though, it's a shame the voters have to approve such a common sense thing for the city to do (replace golf courses with housing in a housing and climate crisis)