

PARK HILL GOLF COURSE VISIONING PROCESS
COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Source Type	Name	Date	Comment
Email	Harry Doby and Woody Garnsey	1/15/2020	<p>We are writing following up on our letters of October 22, 2019 and November 11, 2019 to the mayor and City Council members and in response to the January 8, 2020 Westword article reporting that the Community Planning and Development Department ("CPD") is planning to initiate a Small Area Plan process for the Park Hill Golf Course land sometime in 2020. We are unaware of any formal public announcement about such a planning process regarding the Park Hill Golf Course land. That said, assuming that there is a factual basis for the Westward article, we strenuously oppose initiation of any such planning process. The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected from development of any kind by the Conservation Easement dated July 11, 2019 between the George W. Clayton Trust and the City ("the Conservation Easement"). The grant of easement states that it is "to maintain the (land's) scenic and open condition and to preserve the (land) for recreational use." The Conservation Easement was created pursuant to and is governed by Title 38, Article 30.S of the Colorado Revised Statutes and it cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned unless a court of competent jurisdiction might determine that conditions on or surrounding the land have changed since July 11, 2019 so that it has become impossible to fulfill its conservation purposes. See C.R.S. Section 38-30.5- 107. If the Westword report is incorrect, please advise us. On the other hand, if the report is correct, please provide us a full and clear explanation as to why it would be appropriate for CPD to initiate a planning process regarding this land while it is protected from development by the Conservation Easement. If the City contends that the Colorado conservation easement statute does not apply to the Conservation Easement, please provide a full and clear explanation of the factual and legal bases for such contention. If the City contends that there is a factual and legal bases for securing a court order terminating the Conservation Easement, please provide a full and clear explanation of factual and legal bases for such contention. As we stated in our earlier letters, we believe that initiation of any CPD planning process regarding the Park Hill Golf Course land while the Conservation Easement prohibits any development of the land would needlessly waste the valuable time and resources of the City and its citizens. Please respond to us at your earliest convenience to the following email addresses: hgdboby@gmail.com and wgarnsey@ecentral.com. Thank you for your attention to these critical matters.</p>
Email	Harry Doby and Woody Garnsey	2/3/2020	<p>We have received Ms. Aldrete's letter dated January 31 in response to our letter dated January 15 in which she confirms that the Community Planning and Development Department does, in fact, intend to initiate a planning process for the Park Hill Golf Course land. Apparently, CPD is prepared to initiate this process despite the fact that the Park Hill Golf Course land is legally protected from any development by the Conservation Easement dated July 11, 2019 that cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order pursuant to Section 38-30.5-107 of the Colorado conservation easement statute. Such a court order would require a judicial determination that conditions on or surrounding the Park Hill Golf Course land have changed since July 11, 2019 so that it has become "impossible to fulfill any of the conservation purposes" of the Conservation Easement. We are extremely disappointed that Ms. Aldrete's letter entirely fails to address the following requests that we made in our January 15 letter: {1} Please provide us a full and clear explanation as to why it would be appropriate for CPD to initiate a planning process regarding this land while it is protected from development by the Conservation Easement. (2) If the City contends that the Colorado conservation easement statute does not apply to the Conservation Easement, please provide a full and clear explanation of the factual and legal bases for such contention. (3) If the City contends that there is a factual and legal bases for securing a court order terminating the Conservation Easement, please provide a full and clear explanation of factual and legal bases for such contention. If the City contends that there is a factual and legal bases for securing a court order terminating the Conservation Easement, please provide a full and clear explanation of factual and legal bases for such contention. We and the general public are entitled to complete responses to these requests before CPD embarks on any development planning process while the Conservation Easement prohibits development on the land. As we have stated earlier, such a planning process at this time would needlessly waste the valuable time and resources of the City and its citizens. It appears that the City administration is doing everything possible to facilitate and advocate for the plans of real estate developer and speculator Westside Investment Partners to develop the protected Park Hill Golf Course land. Why else would the City be proposing a planning process for only the 155 acres of the Park Hill Golf Course land excluding the interconnected surrounding neighborhoods on all sides of the land? Please respond to us at your earliest convenience to the following email addresses: hgdboby@gmail.com and wgarnsey@ecentral.com. Thank you for your attention to these critical matters.</p>
Email	Michael Johnson	2/17/2020	<p>In regards to the Penfield Tate III letter to the editor that appeared in the Denver Post on February 9, 2020, I would like to see the Park Hill Golf Course preserved. I do not mind if there is a little development on the property, but I am not sure that is legally possible. I do not want the golf course to disappear.</p>
Email	Mary Ellen Garrett	3/4/2020	<p>I received your contact information from the staff of my City Council member, Chris Herndon, after asking them what planning meetings are going on regarding the future uses or development of the Park Hill Golf Course. I'm very interested in the future of this important open space in my neighborhood. I know it was sold last year to a private company, but it still has a perpetual conservation easement on it, right? I'm confused as to why this company would have made this investment in the community, unless they're planning to develop it, which isn't permitted under this easement. I hope you've seen the guest editorial by Woody Garnsey in the March issue of the Greater Park Hill News, expressing the strong concerns that many of us in the neighborhood have on this issue. I look forward to hearing what the City is planning, for people to have input into options for Park Hill Golf Course, including any plans to amend or revoke its conservation easement. If some type of deal to override or cancel the easement has already been made with the company that purchased this property, we need to know those details. Thanks!</p>

PARK HILL GOLF COURSE VISIONING PROCESS
COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Email	Sandy Robett	3/24/2020	<p>As I am confident you know, CPD has announced that it is planning to initiate a small area planning effort for the Park Hill Golf Course land sometime in 2020 in spite of the fact that it is protected from development by the perpetual open space conservation easement. Also, in order to tear up the conservation easement, a court would have to rule according to the state statute that changed circumstances on or surrounding the land make it “impossible” any longer to fulfill the “conservation purposes” of the conservation easement. How could it be “impossible”? The Hancock and the City Attorney offer no explanation. It seems irresponsible to go through with a small area development plan when the land can’t be legally developed. I’m attaching an article from the March edition of the Greater Park Hill News that discusses these issues. Please address this issue with the Mayor and CPD. This is not a neighborhood issue. This is a City and County of Denver issue. And a personal thought..During this time of COVID-19, I hope you will reconsider the continued densification of our City. Now more than ever, we and future generations need Open Space</p>
Email	Pastor Del T. Phillips	3/30/2020	<p>As a longtime leader in the Northeast Park Hill community (NE Park Hill) I am asking you to support the small area planning process that the city has proposed for the Park Hill Golf Course. It is deeply concerning to hear members of other communities say that a planning process here is a waste of city resources. Northeast Park Hill is historically an African American community. The residents of many people living there are accustomed to being overlooked and unheard when it comes to changes in their neighborhood. I have remained a committed advocate for those unheard voices and I do not want to see that pattern of oversight continue. Discriminatory practices that began decades ago when my family lived in NE Park Hill have led to this section of Denver becoming a food desert. The community lacks strong employment opportunities and has a higher than average number of people living in poverty. Members of the African American community that live outside of the neighborhood have maintained a strong relationship to this piece of land and we should have the opportunity, alongside the residents still living there, to take part in a discussion about our own community. The outside interests of those without an ancestral connection to the neighborhood and living outside of its immediate boundaries should not influence City Council to disallow a civil discussion on the neighborhood’s future. I strongly urge you to support a small area planning process that is focused on hearing all the voices that are connected to this historic neighborhood.</p>
Email	James Roy II	4/1/2020	<p>First, let me start by thanking you all for your deep commitment and service to the community. I have noticed your efforts and I have deep admiration for each of you. I would also like to wish you and your families good health in these difficult times. I can only imagine how complicated your work has become in the wake of the global Covid-19 crisis. Please, stay healthy and take care. I am writing this letter out of deep concern for a developing situation in regard to the Park Hill Golf Course and the small area planning that is being discussed. I have tried my best to keep a neutral public presence for myself and especially Park Hill Collective Impact (PHCI). The reason for this stance was to act as a conduit to the community’s voice without asserting my personal opinions into the matter. I believe that a community, when partnered with corl have made it my life’s mission to utilize my experience, education, and the urban planning profession to cultivate equity in urban environments by putting people first and ensuring that justice is restored through thoughtful and inclusive practices. I have personal experience growing up in Denver’s historically marginalized communities of Five Points and Park Hill, 10 years experience helping to develop affordable housing and engaging people across Denver, and a 95% complete Master of Urban & Regional Planning (gotta finish that thesis someday!). Unfortunately, I have come to deeply recognize how communities of color have been systemically pushed aside in public processes due to a legacy of issues that have devalued their voices. One of the ways that this systemic oppression and devaluing occurs is through more organized and privileged interest groups that seek to campaign and suppress the voices of the marginalized. Whether modern forms of this are intentional or not is up for debate. rectly, can help to guide truly successful public planning processes that takes into account many different perspectives and ultimately has a positive impact on the equity and growth of a city. This is especially important for historically marginalized communities. As you know, Save Open Space Denver (SOS) has launched a campaign to maintain the golf course as 100% open space, often citing environment protection and legal conservation easements. More recently, the group is seeking to stop the planning process through a ballot initiative for the city. I personally respect the opinions and work of SOS, however, I think that their efforts are undermining the voices of those that live closest to the property, in Northeast Park Hill, Clayton, and Elyria Swansea. These are neighborhoods that, as you know, have (or at one point had) some of the largest communities of color in Denver and a history of disinvestment. Additionally, gentrification and the resulting displacement have added more complexity to the issue as our lowest income neighbors are leaving the area. As you weigh the decision to carry out a small area plan for the community, I hope that you think about the communities that abut the golf course. Their voices are not organized enough yet to broadcast their shared values in the way that SOS has. They haven’t had the privilege of time and resources to spend in showing their opinions, whether they are in support or opposition of SOS. In 2019, Park Hill Collective Impact hosted 22 ParkHillTalks, which are intentionally small community meetings that we had primarily in Northeast Park Hill. We spoke with over 270 unique community members. In these conversations, gentrification and displacement were often discussed. We learned of desires for affordable family housing options, especially around homeownership. As the community continues to change and grow, these opportunities have been thin and don’t look to improve in the foreseeable future. I have heard people speak of the opportunity that the golf course presents for that and a desire to work with people that wish to see open space on the site. Given an appropriate amount of time and resources, paired with an equitable planning process, these communities can speak for themselves. They deserve the opportunity. I ask that you give thought to how the small area plan could be a revolutionary process that elevates the community’s voice and does not fall to the campaigning of more privileged interest groups. It would take a rethinking in the way that CPD usually performs their work, but I have noticed that you all are not into business as usual. I respect that.</p>

PARK HILL GOLF COURSE VISIONING PROCESS
COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Email	Dr. Carol Watkins Ali	5/11/2020	<p>The letter comes with the utmost appreciation for your services to the city of Denver, especially at this juncture as we are greatly challenged by the COVID-19 Pandemic. Greater Denver Interfaith Alliance (GDIA) is a nonprofit organization located one block away from the Park Hill Golf Course. We have served the greater Denver area for twenty years as a catalyst for network development and coalition building across faith contexts and among existing service providers at the local, state and federal level. Our mission has been to coordinate and expand resources to mitigate the disparities facing marginal and underserved populations, especially people of color. We know the history of Northeast Denver well and more importantly the people who have resided in Northeast Park Hill, past and present. Over the years, GDIA has witnessed how special interests groups have united to broker power to influence the politics and systems that ultimately serve to undermine the often disenfranchised residents of local neighborhoods—many of whom who have been displaced as a result.</p> <p>At this point, GDIA's main objective is to advocate for small area planning. Those who live in the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood should give the guiding input to the ultimate outcome for what happens with this land. Special interest groups speak of diversity in terms of age, background and culture in general terms, but rarely mention the racial/ethnic diversity which has been declining as the affluent class moves forward with its agenda, forcing out former residents who can no longer afford to stay. They speak of changing neighborhoods as a given, yet fail to admit that their interests and privilege are the driving forces behind the population change. Now, the more affluent class demands that this particular open space be preserved at all costs, even when there is consideration for multiple-use of this land which could include space for a good size park, attainable/affordable housing (amid a housing crisis for lower income families), and other community needs at the same time. Small area planning is optimal. As long as Westside Investment Properties, Inc. is willing to engage the surrounding community for the purpose of developing multiple land uses that are accountable to the collective needs of this community and accommodating to neighborhood living for the co-habitation of a truly diverse community (across income levels and race/ethnicities), GDIA will be supportive of building a collaborative community partnership. To those pushing for a citywide vote, we see this as a political ploy designed to silence the voices of the residents of the community and a deterrent to having us adequately represented. Therefore, our hope is that Denver City Council will invest in representing the cultural particularities of the people of the Northeast Park Hill community and, therefore, make resources available for small area planning to go forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
Email	John McGuire	4/6/2020	<p>In regard to Westside Investment Partners' Park Hill Golf Course – Reimagined Project, as a North Park Hill community member and property owner, I want to commend Westside's commitment to "to work with the community to reimagine this land for the future as a place for multi-generational solutions to current issues facing Denver and the region." Additionally, I am very interested in actively participating in the proposed, community driven planning process and therefore fully support the City of Denver's Small Area Plan process to ensure that my voice and the voice of my diverse community is not only heard but creates a tangible impact on the outcome of the process. Currently, the voice of the special interest group, Save Open Space Denver (SOS), seems to be the loudest and most influential. While it does appear that their intent is altruistic, I do not feel that this group represents the voice of the NE Park Hill Community. So I am requesting that City Council moves forward with the Small Area Plan process to ensure that the Community's diverse voices are heard and that the outcome is equitable in response to the needs and desires of the community.</p>
Email	Abayneh Turner	4/7/2020	<p>I am writing you in regard to the Westside Investment Partners' Park Hill Golf Course. I would like to start off by applauding Westside Investment Partners for being willing and committed to working with the residents of the Park Hill community in regards to the Park Hill Golf Course – Reimagined Project. In addition, I plan on being an active participant in the proposed, community driven planning process. I am in full support of the City of Denver's Small Area Plan process to ensure the thoughts and ideas of the residents and representatives of the Park Hill community are heard and strongly taken into account. This will also help secure the confidence of the residents and representatives of this community that we have a tangible impact on the outcome of the process.</p> <p>Currently, the loudest and most influential voice seems to be that of the special interest group, Save Open Space Denver (SOS). While it does appear that their intent is selfless, I do not feel that this group represents the voice of the NE Park Hill Community. With that being said, it is my expectation that City Council strongly considers moving forward with the Small Area Plan process. Again this will ensure the Community that their diverse backgrounds are seen and voices are heard, resulting in an outcome that is equitable in response to the needs and desires of the community.</p>
Email	Harriet Norris	4/20/2020	<p>My name is Harriett Norris, owner and operator of Shonnell beauty and barber salon located in the Park Hill neighborhood on 35th and Elm. I have been in the hair business and in business for myself for over 40 years primarily at my family home, that my husband and I purchased in 1978. I have raised my children, foster children, siblings and neighborhood family and friends alike at this home and I am very much vested in this property. My children's father passed away at a very young age and I was forced to be a single mother and make sure that I maintained my household. I have worked extremely diligently through the years to make sure that my legacy lives on and my brand held a solid foundation.</p> <p>It is without a shadow of a doubt that I am interested along with my children, in seeing to it that the future development within our neighborhood will directly reflect what we have established throughout the years and keeping with the culture of Park Hill.</p> <p>I understand that the Park Hill Golf Course has been sold and might be developed. There are many people speaking about the project, and I would like to have information and input to the project. To date I and many others who I know have not been included in conversations. I look forward to hearing from you and working with you in future endeavors</p>

PARK HILL GOLF COURSE VISIONING PROCESS
COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Email	Maria Flora	10/16/2020	First, is the CPD Department is preparing a two-year “small area plan” process for land that includes the Park Hill Golf Course land without any adopted rules or regulations that govern the process? If this is correct, I am astonished. This “small area plan” process will involve, among other things, (1) significant expenditures of taxpayer funds, (2) significant CPD staff time, (3) commitments of significant amounts of time by members of some sort of steering committee and many citizens who care about the process outcome, and (4) preparation of some kind of draft plan to be formally submitted to the Denver Planning Board. How can this process proceed without any rules and regulations? There obviously are many procedural questions regarding such a process. What is the process for the creation of the steering committee? Who will approve any draft plan that might be submitted to the Denver Planning Board? How will those people decide on the substance of any draft plan? Please get back to me with clarification. Second, please explain why a planning process involving the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course land would not be governed by the Large Development Review process set forth in Section 12.4.12 of the Denver Zoning Code.
Email	Maria Flora	11/8/2020	I’ve looked at the initial project webpage, the FAQ regarding the conservation easement and the information on the steering committee. The information on the steering committee does indicate that Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes will make the selections and presumably determine the number of committee members. With that exception, you did not answer my questions. So much for transparency. I’m disappointed that the website is so misleading. There is absolutely no mention of the conservation easement in the text. The FAQ from the City Attorney’s office repeats the same partisan arguments that we’ve been hearing for the last year, i.e. the easement only permits a golf course, doesn’t permit other recreational and open space uses, etc. The website presumes development of the Park Hill Golf Course land, as does the commencement of an SAP process, despite the fact that Westside has no development rights. The process therefore begins with disinformation. It already has the hallmarks of a typical CPD “push” campaign, designed to put the authority of the City behind Westside’s development ambitions. This is so blatantly pro-developer – there’s no way Westside would have purchased the land subject to the conservation easement in the absence of a secret deal with the City to kill the conservation easement and allow development. The SAP process which you are leading will merely serve to legitimize the “secret deal”. So much for protecting our open space.
Email	Lisa Perry	11/15/2020	As a longtime Denver resident and golfer (who was also a “bev cart girl” a ton of years ago at Park Hill GC), here’s my two cents on what should happen to the golf course: Please restore it to a public golf course with driving range, practice greens and restaurant. It’s perfect for First Tee programs that allow kids to learn to be great citizens while learning the game...especially kids who might not have the opportunity to do so otherwise. I once attended a fundraiser at the restaurant. It’s an inexpensive alternative for small nonprofits (when event fundraisers return), as opposed to more expensive venues. Please also continue the tradition of Park Hill GC being the first Denver course to open for the season every spring! The neighborhood needs this golf course, and those of us who don’t live there still love to play, practice and visit. Thank City Council Rep. Amanda Sawyer for this e-mail. The Park Hill GC issue was part of her most recent newsletter. I thought it was sadly a done deal, so had to chime in with an opinion.
Email	Tim Dea	11/27/2020	While the process of trying to develop the Park Hill Golf Course land continues, this is an abuse of power by developers to try to circumvent or dismiss the conservation easement legal agreement. The law is the law, and the golf course needs to remain a golf course under the law. Thank you. Tim Dea (Park Hill long term resident beginning in 1959)

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Source Type	Name	Date	Comment
Email	Ben Ramuno	1/20/2021	<p>We purchased in NE Park Hill in 2019 and have been excited about the PHGC Redevelopment ever since. We are part of a growing number of people having to pay extraordinary prices to live in rather ordinary homes. I am an RN and an Army Nurse Corps Reservist. My wife is an engineer who was laid off due to Covid and began her Masters Degree program this week. I have written to the future developer many times regarding our requests for the site as well as Westword and other media outlets. Park Hill is a great community, but it seems that once you go North of MLK the neighborhood seems to lose some of its luster. The sidewalks are especially small for walking on. There is a NOTICEABLE lack of trees. The amount of trash in the streets and alleys increases. There are some small microparks but nothing to get excited about. The Park Hill Center (specifically Horizon Lounge) has consistently been in the news due to multiple gunshots being fired. It needs to be torn down and rebuilt. Station 26 Brewery seems to be the lone bright spot in this neighborhood where one can simply walk to and have some fun. Housing prices are only going UP, and it is time the neighborhood caught up with the cost of living in this area. We care about improving the quality of this community. What we would like to see is this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A large beautiful park space (Cheeseman-ish) with a nice lake and beautiful trees - at least 80 acres. Sheltered from the traffic of Colorado Blvd. - Retail/Restaurants: Independent shops, restaurants, and breweries. A Rino-esque model if you will. This could easily spill over into the adjacent industrial district north of 38th. - No ugly affordable housing. There are already 3 nearby apartment complexes and a strip mall of junk food and chain shops just north of 40th. This is a chance to improve the quality of the offerings in the area. - We are realistic and understand the developer will want some homes built, but perhaps something similar to Park Hill Commons can be done - Microtownhomes with retail underneath. Or again, something like Rino has done, incorporating restaurants and independent business with contemporary housing. - We understand some people want a grocery store, but there is a King Soopers and a Safeway nearby already. Perhaps a Sprouts or an independent healthy neighborhood market, such as Marczyk. Again, healthy, improvements. - A music venue or state-of-the-Art Recreation Center would be awesome. We see this as a legitimate opportunity to spark progress in this the community and move towards much needed improvements. There is so much opportunity when you factor in the adjacent industrial district and we are tremendously excited. We know and understand that there is pressure to just leave it "open space" or just throw a bunch of affordable apartments and a grocery store at this site, but I hope you understand that there are MANY of us living in this community who would like to see something along the lines of the above bullet points. Progress, Beautification, Walkable fun. A catalyst for the future of NE Park Hill. <p>We have no idea if our opinions really matter or if there is already a plan and a deal in the works, but I would love to discuss this further, hear your thoughts, learn what is being said. I am subscribed to all the relevant newsletters, etc. but I would also appreciate your feedback on our thoughts specifically. Thank you so much for taking the time to read this!!</p>
Email	Jeffrey Hersch	1/27/2021	I strongly wish the conservation easement that taxpayers paid for and wanted honored. The area should be open space, reforested planted. This insatiable drive to develop has to stop, as does mayor Hancock's wink and nod to developers.
Email	Cameron Omlid	2/1/2021	Thank you all for your continuing work. I hope we can reach a situation with this large piece of undeveloped land that benefits everyone in our community. Best wishes to everyone involved.
Email	Kellie Donahoe	2/1/2021	A few questions I have: There is a lot of chatter about how much of the golf course would end up being a park. I realize it's private and therefore needs to be profitable, so what type of commercial buildings would need to be created to ensure a large park? Would a grocery store and a housing complex suffice, or how much would need to be used as profitable land to ensure a quality size park? There are currently a lot of wonderfully aged trees on the property, is there any initiatives in place to keep as many trees intact as possible? Can the park be a part of the entire development (small parks throughout) or does it need to be one solid chunk in a specific area?
Email	James Aubrey	2/5/2021	I am writing to advocate for the Park Hill golf course to become a park, the "open space" option, I guess. Plant some trees, and maybe float a lake? Think like Frederick Law Olmstead ("Central Park" would be an apt name here, too, since it's near former "Stapleton"). I happen to be one of the Park Hill residents who is still disappointed that there was local opposition to the proposed historic district, a couple of years ago. Keep trying to provide vision for this area!

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora, SOS	2/5/2021	<p>As you know, Save Open Space Denver ("SOS Denver") is a grassroots community group that has been working for over four years on issues related to the future of the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land open space and conservation easement. Members of SOS Denver have participated in RNO meetings in which Community Planning and Development ("CPD") has presented a "Visioning Process" and a Small Area Plan Process that CPD is planning to launch, and we now have learned that the first Zoom Steering Committee meeting will take place on February 9, 2021 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. SOS Denver is genuinely concerned that to date this planning process entirely reflects Mayor Hancock's public support for development of the PHGC land by landowner real estate developer Westside Investment Partners, Inc. ("Westside"). As Ms. Aldrete explained in her January 7, 2021 presentation to the City Council Budget and Policy Committee, the announced planning process for the PHGC land is "market driven by a developer." Most blatantly, the pro-development bias of this process is reflected in the following: As Ms. Aldrete also explained to the Budget and Policy Committee, CPD inserted this PHGC land planning process ahead of many other planning projects that had been in the CPD planning queue for several years. Although her District 9 Council District abuts the PHGC land on the west along Colorado Boulevard, Councilwoman Candi CdeBaca, an opponent of development on the PHGC land, has not been afforded the opportunity to have CPD appoint a Steering Committee member from District 9. On the other hand, District 8 Councilman Chris Herndon, a proponent of development on the land, has been able to have CPD appoint his new PRAB appointee Andre McGregor to the Steering Committee. CPD has loaded the Steering Committee with people who will support development on the PHGC land, and they have already publicly taken positions to that effect. The Steering Committee lacks members who identify as representing the Colorado conservation easement community, the environmental health community, or the public health community. All materials posted to date on the CPD website reflect only the Hancock Administration's support for development on the PHGC land. For example, since CPD launched the website, it has prominently featured the pro-development video of the October 23, 2020 Brother Jeff Fard interview identified as "Meet the property owners: Westside Investment Partners with the Holleran Group" and it has failed to post videos that Brother Jeff Fard has conducted with open space supporters Penfield Tate and Tony Pigford. For further example, the CPD website has only included City-produced pro-development documents regarding the history of the PHGC land and its conservation easement without providing any balance by including on its website any documents on these same subjects generated by SOS Denver. Mayor Hancock and his administration to date have refused to answer repeated questions from SOS Denver and its members regarding how the City and Westside intend to deal with the conservation easement termination restrictions of the Colorado conservation easement statute as they move forward with their development plans for the PHGC land. When again asked these questions in connection with a recent meeting of Greater Park Hill Community, Inc., the CPD presenters responded that they could not answer "in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege." Initially, SOS Denver requests that CPD cease moving forward with any "visioning" or planning process regarding the PHGC land. The PHGC land is protected from development by the conservation easement dated July 11, 2019 and recorded on July 12, 2019 at Reception No. 2019090259. The conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order pursuant to C.R.S. §38-30.5-107 that-based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land since the easement was granted on July 11, 2019- it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the conservation purposes of the easement. Since no such court order has been entered, it is premature as of now for CPD to engage in any such "visioning" or planning process for this land that cannot now be legally developed. Doing so will waste taxpayer money in payments to consultants and other third parties and to city employees working on the project. It will also force interested Denver citizens to unnecessarily spend valuable time and effort.</p>
-------	------------------	----------	--

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Email (Cont.)</p>	<p>Maria Flora, SOS (cont.)</p>	<p>2/5/2021</p>	<p>(continued from above) If the City insists on proceeding with this "visioning" and planning process, it should at the very least be done in an authentic, honest, balanced and transparent manner. That is not happening now. To this end, SOS Denver makes the following requests: 1.Prior to launching any planning process for the PHGC land, create a balanced Steering Committee that does not reflect Mayor Hancock's strong desire to support Westside's development plans for the PHGC land. 2.Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of why it is now appropriate for CPD to spend the money and to require expenditure of City staff time on a "visioning" and planning process for this land that cannot be developed without a court order pursuant to C.R.S.§38-30.5-107.3.Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of facts that would support a judicial determination that based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land since July 11, 2019-it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the conservation purposes of the PHGC land conservation easement. 4.Promptly provide SOS Denver and members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website a written explanation of how the City intends to comply with the provisions of C.R.S. §38-30.5-107 in connection with any plan for development on the PHGC land. And, if the City takes the position that it does not need to comply with C.R.S. §38-30.5-107, we request a written explanation of the bases for that position.5.Promptly add content to the CPD website to provide a balanced and transparent discussion of the Park Hill Golf Course land. The CPD website includes the following documents prepared by the City: (a) "GOLF COURSE USE RESTRICTIONS, Conservation Easement on the Park Hill Golf Course, October 1, 2019" and(b) "PARK HILL GOLF COURSE FAQ Updated and Revised: November 4, 2019." For balance, provide to members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website the following additional documents: a.the SOS Denver document captioned "What Is A Colorado Conservation Easement?" (attached to this letter)b.the SOS Denver document captioned "Analysis of the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conservation Easement" dated December 15, 2020 (attached to this letter) Promptly add all the Brother Jeff Fard interviews regarding the Park Hill Golf Course land. As stated above, the CPD website includes the video of the October 23, 2020 Brother Jeff Fard's interview identified as "Meet the property owners: Westside Investment Partners with the Holleran Group." To provide balance, post videos of Brother Jeff Fard's September 2, 2020 interview with Penfield Tate and his December 8, 2020 interview with Tony Pigford. 7.Promptly provide the members of the Steering Committee and post on the CPD website the following additional documents:a.the SOS Denver document captioned "Facts Regarding Denver's Need for Parks and Open Space" updated December 15, 2020 (attached to this letter)b.the SOS Denver document captioned "A Short History of the Park Hill Golf Course Land" dated October 2020 (attached to this letter).c.The SOS Denver document captioned "POSITION PAPER Regarding the Future of the Park Hill Golf Course Land Open Space" dated August 14, 2019 (attached to this letter).8.All Steering Committee members should promptly and publicly disclose the following at the outset of the Steering Committee process: any past or present contractual oremployment relationship with the City or any of its agencies; any past or presentcontractual or employment relationship with or equity interest in Westside and/or any of its principals and/or its subsidiary companies; any past or present contractual or employment relationship with or equity interest in any entity under contract or negotiating a contract or interest with Westside and/or any of its principals and/or its subsidiary companies for the proposed development of the PHGC land; any past or present personal relationships with principals of Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies; any past or present personal relationships with anyone in a senior position with the City; any commitments, promises or things of value received from Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies; any present, promised, and/or anticipatedpecuniary interest in development on the PHGC land.</p>
<p>Email (Cont.)</p>	<p>Maria Flora, SOS (cont.)</p>	<p>2/5/2021</p>	<p>9.Include presentations and discussions in the early meetings of the Steering Committee that address the public health and environmental implications of open space and public park land as it relates to the PHGC land and the local and extended neighborhoods. SOS Denver should be included as a primary participant in such presentations anddiscussions.10.In addition to Steering Committee meetings, all meetings, including CommunityNavigator events such as #ParkHillGolfCourseTalks, should be publicly noticed at least seven days in advance and should be accessible to the public via remote teleconference and should be recorded with the recordings posted on the CPD website for public access. Meaningful time should be reserved at all meetings for public comment and questions and after each meeting CPD staff should post on the CPD website answers to all questions that were asked by participants and attendees and that were not fully answered during the meeting. 11.Allow Councilwoman CdeBaca to appoint a representative to the Steering Committee and ensure that residents of her Council District 9 are fully represented on the Steering Committee.12.SOS Denver has previously notified Ms. Levingston that it was appointing Penfield Tate to be the alternate to Sandra Robnett on the Steering Committee, and we understand that other organizations have also requested appointment of alternates. Promptly provide confirmation that CPD has accepted these appointments of Steering Committee alternates. Thank you for your attention to these issues. We request that CPD promptly provides a copy of this letter and its attachments to members of the Steering Committee.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Cindy Johnstone	2/8/2021	I want to thank you for your work and acknowledge your background and your understanding of the need to consider all things when looking at zoning and development. I was curious when I saw CPD's suggestion to the steering committee to read the "Color of Law". The takeaway for me from the book is that Blacks were denied home ownership which created an economic inequity. Home ownership is a backbone of how our grandparents, and parents attained and passed one to their children the economic advantage white people have today. Believing the takeaway one would have to consider, if this land is developed, how the City would guarantee a reparation to the Black community surrounding the golf course. I would consider at least a 50 percent guaranteed home ownership for Blacks. The ownership would be backed financially by the City. It is a heavy lift for the City. Please give me a little more of your time. I am the City, as you are, and my thoughts are important, there is an need for someone outside of the catchment area to have a seat at the steering committee table. I am not asking to be at the table but the point is obvious. My compass says there is a divergence of thought as to what is best for the City, me. I believe our City is dying because of development without additional open space. As you know this has been a mantra I have advocated for many years. I love that you started in Parks and we have had brief conversations about the importance of open space. I will be dead in 10 to 15 years and really I think I may die before the effects of development begin to significantly hurt you and our younger population. The train has left the station and I have little hope it will be stopped. I have faith that you and your department have the best interest of the City at heart. I don't believe the same of our Mayor. Please think about what I have written to you. I don't know what you can do to make it better, even being an important cog in the City wheel. I hope you have influence to guide the process without bowing to vested interests of the City and the developer. What more can I say. I am sad.
Email	John Cochran	2/9/2021	Given the hard work and expense that has gone into protecting open space in Denver, why does the current administration AND the existing property owner both think that they can consider overturning the existing 1997 conservation easement on the property? Wasn't this easement created by the city in order to specifically prevent and prohibit this sort of upcoming proposed development?
Email	Jacob Southard	2/9/2021	I urge you to keep Park Hill Golf Course as an open space and do not develop the land. The City is in desperate need of more parks and open spaces that help mitigate climate change, air pollution, heat islands, and are healthy locations for people to congregate and exercise. I understand that Denver needs more housing, but there are plenty of parking lots all over Denver that could be developed to provide that housing. Please do not develop Park Hill Golf Course, this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something amazing for the City of Denver.
Email	Chris Johnson	2/9/2021	My family & I reside in nearby Central Park. We strongly support honoring former Mayor Webb's vision of keeping Park Hill open space in perpetuity. Specifically, we prefer for Park Hill to remain a PUBLIC golf course.
Email	Tim Dea	2/9/2021	How is it this is even being considered, given the legal brief on the Parkhill golf course land. Additionally, Denver is so behind the times when it comes to open green space. This needs to be shut down immediately as an option for development. Obey the law and protect open green space.
Email	Leif Thomas	2/9/2021	Why are we planning anything on this land until the Courts have decided that the easement on the land is impossible to maintain? Why is the neighborhood North, East South and West of the property not included in the Vision Planning for this area? Given the Parks and Rec Advisory board said the easement should stand and the city should purchase the land why haven't this recommendation by the citizens of Denver voices been listened too?
Email	Katherine Cornwell	2/9/2021	What is the fair market value of land in central Denver with proximity to light rail, freeway access, the airport, downtown, and abundant community amenities? \$165k/acre is not anywhere close to fair market value. Has there been a study of the fair market value of the land? If so, has it had any public review? Without such a study, how can any decision be made about the disposition of the easement? Is the steering committee prepared to put a value on the conservation easement equal to the fair market value of central city land? The speculative developers should pay the fair market value of the conservation easement if it is to be lifted to compensate the taxpayers for the loss of a strategically negotiated open space agreement. Otherwise the easement should remain the easement should remain in place. If development moves forward will there be any requirements for affordable housing and permanent supportive housing?

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Jeffrey Bennish	2/9/2021	<p>I am incredibly disappointed in the fact that there is no public Q&A in the agenda for the meeting today. A couple of questions I would like to have asked the City and County of Denver hosting this event. How many green spaces the size of Park Hill Golf Course have been added within the city and county of Denver in the last 20 years? How many new green spaces of any size have been added in terms of the number of new parks and new open spaces in the past twenty years compared to how many new high density commercial, residential and retail development projects have occurred? How many properties that were previously developed in Denver have been destroyed and turned into green spaces?</p> <p>A couple of thoughts I would have liked to share. 1. We will never have a green space in Denver of this size and scale to preserve again. 2. Denver green space is shrinking, not growing 3. This property should remain a green space either as a public park, open space or golf course or mixed use green space. 4. There is plenty of property around Denver to build more apartments and retail. Try Colfax from Colorado to Quebec to start. It needs a lot of help. There are so many unused retail and dilapidated residential units that need to be redeveloped. The developer could build 5 Park Hills. 5. This property if it was sold on the open market would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to developers if it could be fully developed. The 25 million dollar price tag these developers purchased the property for is not the real value to the citizens of the city and county of Denver. It is only because its a conservation easement was in place that the price was so low. 6. The city and county of Denver should only do one thing, buy the property back from the developer and remove their seat at the table. This property was never theirs and they should not have a seat at the table. I moved to Denver in 1997 purchasing my first home near DU. I moved here because it was a city with parks. Please preserve this space and reverse the trend. This city is heading in the wrong direction and developing the golf course / green space would be the wrong idea and send the wrong message about what's important to keep this city alive.</p>
Email	Dylan Mackay	2/9/2021	<p>I was just on that Zoom meeting. Trying to raise my hand up and down but was not given a mic to speak. Why is the meeting about the past and race? I live across the street from the golf course. Been living here 11 years. Was told not to live in this neighborhood but did so anyway. LOVE my neighbors. Majority of which are LATINO not black. The blacks have moved in up the street in the low income housing or homeless shelter on the corner of 40th and Colorado or katy corner at Smith Rd and Albion St. There were no black neighbors other than my friend on the corner of Harrison and 39th when I moved here 11 years ago. What a sham. Either way, when the victimhood discussion ends and the discussion on what to do with Park Hill Golf Course begins. Please let me know. There are more people in this neighborhood than just black people.... who'd actually like to be heard by the "committee". And equity? Equity is getting something out from what you put in. Period. Capital produces equity.</p>
Email	John Cochran	2/11/2021	<p>I truly appreciate you taking the time to deal with my question and bring me up to speed with the two links that you provided. Thank you!!! I'm impressed by your efforts going above and beyond!! The links were also well done and very helpful. I'm curious to know if George Clayton, d. 1899, had any land use or land preservation requests in his will regarding this property? I can more clearly now see how this is tricky but I still suspect that it might be a stretch to use this opportunity to open up the property to determine some sort of desired neighborhood development utilizing new building uses. Instead, I had hoped that the land use limitations would have been clearly identified BEFORE this was opened up for community input. (perhaps it was and I am still playing catch up?). It goes without any doubt that the neighborhood would prefer a community inputted set of uses built out (local grocery, community center, etc) all to the detriment of open space. So I fear that the cart is now ahead of the horse, but perhaps not. As you know, once open space is gone, there is no getting it back and this site has the potential to be a jewel of natural beauty for generations to come if properly protected.</p>
Email	Brian and Kathy O'Shaughnessy	2/13/2021	<p>I am a Denver resident living in Hilltop. I am sending in my recommendation to keep the area in question a golf course. No more high rise apartments or retail. That has just been done at 8th and Colorado.</p> <p>We need to increase outdoor activity for our community, especially after this pandemic. Golf interest has increased and I vote that you restore the Park Hill Golf course. That is what the land was intended to be since the beginning. Do not let greedy developers come in and destroy the beauty and peacefulness of that area. Allow Coloradoans the privilege of enjoying our wonderful climate and outdoor facilities by allowing us to socialize and exercise - restore the golf course.</p>
Email	Andrew Sweet	2/14/2021	<p>Got your Email information from an article about the Park Hill Golf course. This surely has been quite the debacle, and quite the process. Yet, this land is really a unique thing here in NE Denver and so I wanted to weigh in.</p> <p>Given our growing city, our diverse population, our problems with housing and transportation, I can easily see all sides of these arguments. I also want to say that the IMMEDIATE community input needs to be the KEY and CENTRAL population who should be listened to. I am now a resident of Crestmoor Park, but for 32 years lived in South Park Hill. When I look at all the constituencies involved, I keep coming back to one theme; GREEN SPACE. You know the statistics on this - we are losing our enviable % of green spaces in the city. We have prided ourselves for years for being outstanding about planting trees, having parks, nurturing people with walking paths, etc. Today I want to reiterate those themes and suggest strongly that PH Golf course remain a green space for ALL PEOPLE in the city. We have paved over enough land. We have built enough community space. We have worked on, and still need to work on transportation for all our residents, but the one thing we CANNOT REPLACE, is accessible GREEN SPACE.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	John Cochran	2/14/2021	<p>In the meantime I was able to find a copy of the 1997 easement, attached. I believe that the easement language is critical and should be readily posted for any that care to know more. I interpret the easement very differently than the two Denvergov summary links that you shared with me and so now want to share my input with you:</p> <p>I see the easement as clearly speaking to and identifying TWO important uses. One for the Land as open space in general and the other as Golf Course in particular. Meaning that for \$2m received, the owner must; 1. maintain the land as open space AND 2. Allow use of it as golf course or other permitted recreational uses.</p> <p>The easement of the Land is preserved for recreational uses (paragraph 2) and specifically permitted for golf as well as other unrelated to golf recreational uses "(...ball fields, tennis courts, etc." (end of par 6a.).</p> <p>In summary, now that I have a deeper understanding of the history and of the easement language I no longer hope or think that the Will might shed some clarity on the situation. Clearly the Will left the farm land to the city as trustee and then the City was allowed to eventually build a golf course for public on the land, 1932. Then in 1997 the CEL as Trustee was willing to take \$2M in return for preserving the land as open space and to continue operating the golf course or to use the land for other recreational open space uses. I also discovered that Mayor Webb and his attorneys in 1997 and forward from that time have clearly believed that the land was to be preserved as open space. Its he that signed the Easement on behalf of the City and then spoke out in 2019 on behalf of preserving this open space from development. I do understand the importance of letting the local residents have input and decision making rights into the future of the Golf course but before that happens I believe that the City has a responsibility to properly and thoroughly interpret the easement that it created and paid for. It stirs the hornets' nest and gives the neighbors false hope to have them involved in the current Zoom process when a court has not yet had the opportunity to rule on how to interpret the easement for future development. It appears that the City wants the neighbors at this time to help lead the process for future development and perhaps this is because the City has decided that the land IS able to go thru a process for limited future development. If so, I respectfully do not agree. I know that you should not have time for all of my input here let alone to respond to it so I sincerely hope that I have not gone too far. I enjoyed your link to the City's success with C. Vientos Park. Well done Denvergov! Three weeks ago I was truly unaware of this</p>
Email	Patrick Lavin	2/21/2021	<p>I live in Park Hill at 29th and Elm, less than a mile from the Park Hill Golf Course. I am writing to ask the City to maintain the conservation easement on this property. It's important that we keep the parks and open spaces available to us for both recreation and our health.</p>
Email	Jennifer Anderson	2/22/2021	<p>I wanted to let you know that I live in Park Hill, and I would like to see the Park Hill Golf course retain its conservation easement, as purchased by the City of Denver for \$2M in the 1990's. I would like the property to become an open space property or park that will have a positive impact on the climate/environment and ensure that residents have a place to recreate.</p>
Email	Jennifer Anderson	2/23/2021	<p>I do know that and think that is why it is perfect for an open space/park. The fact that it is privately owned has no bearing on the conservation easement. The developer knew that easement existed when they bought it, and the price was less because of it. The city paid for the easement with taxpayer dollars, and we must continue to get the benefit of what we paid for.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora, SOS	3/3/2021	<p>We have had no response to our February 5, 2021 letter addressing, among other things, the makeup of the Steering Committee, the posting of only pro-development content on the CPD website, the refusal of the City to address the termination provisions of the perpetual conservation easement, and the commencement of an expensive planning process in the face of the conservation easement which prohibits development. SOS Denver would appreciate the courtesy of a thorough response. Members of SOS Denver observed the first "Visioning Process" Steering Committee meeting and have seen the Agenda, Voluntary Disclosure Form and draft Charter for the second Steering Committee meeting on March 9. From these documents and the conduct of the first meeting, it is apparent that this planning process is, in the words of Ms. Aldrete, "market driven by a developer." It is not authentic, honest, balanced or transparent. It is a sham "push" campaign with a predetermined development outcome. "General issues associated with the legality around modifying conservation easements are excluded from the Steering Committee's scope. While these issues are important and related, they cannot be resolved in this venue." Draft Charter, page 2. Only CPD is allowed to discuss the "legality" of the Conservation Easement, parroting the simplistic and misleading CAO legal theory that the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land always "has to be a golf course" if the Conservation Easement is preserved: "In 1997, a conservation easement was signed between the City and County of Denver and the property owner at the time, Clayton Early Learning, stating that the property would be restricted for use as an 18-hole golf course. In 2019, the property was purchased by a private company, Westside Development Partners. There are some in the community that wish for the property to remain as-is with the conservation easement in place restricting the use to a golf course. Draft Charter, page 1. It is an inconvenient fact from the City's perspective that the PHGC land cannot be developed in the face of the Conservation Easement. That fact is the elephant in the room. Any process that does not include a robust explanation and discussion of the legal issues involved with the Conservation Easement and the benefits of the Conservation Easement is not authentic, honest, balanced or transparent. The Draft Charter requires Steering Committee members to accept ten Committee Member Agreements. They include: "Consider equity as a guiding principal for all the Steering Committee's work" and "Seek solutions to any disagreements that are mutually satisfying for all committee members, considering equity to help guide discussions" Draft Charter, p. 4. SOS Denver is in favor of "equity". Without context and clear definition, however, the term "equity" has no meaning in the proposed Charter. "Equity" should not be used to steer discussion towards a predetermined pro-development outcome or to portray those who disagree with development on the PHGC land as insensitive to "equity." It is certainly not "equitable" to eliminate discussion of the conservation easement or public health and environmental equity. •The draft Charter is silent on conflicts of interest. That is left to the Voluntary Disclosure Form. •The draft Charter does not address the ability of the public to participate in the Steering Committee meetings. Participants from the public are not allowed to see who is on the Zoom call, to comment in the chat or see other participant's comments. CPD should accept questions from the public in the chat and follow up with written responses. Alternatively, CPD should run the meetings like City Council, with a 30-minute comment period before each meeting. Voluntary Disclosure Form. However, we disagree with CDP's narrow approach to conflicts of interest. We also disagree that disclosures should be voluntary and that conflicts of interest will not disqualify a Steering Committee member. Unfortunately, we are already aware of a number of the Steering Committee members appointed by Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes who have actual or potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed to the public and result in disqualification. Steering Committee members should publicly disclose these and any other conflicts of interest: -commitments, promises or things of value received from Westside Investment Partners and/or any of its subsidiary companies;</p>
Email	Maria Flora (cont.)	3/3/2021 (cont)	<p>(continued from above) past and present relationships with Westside Investment Partners as a contractor, subcontractor or equity interest holder; -present or anticipated pecuniary interest in development on the PHGC land; -past or present relationships with the City and any of its agencies, as an employee, contractor or subcontractor; -past or present personal relationships with principals of Westside and/or any of its subsidiary companies; -past or present personal relationships with anyone in a senior position with the City. There are serious flaws in the "Visioning Process" as discussed in our February 5 letter, and the "Visioning Process" should not go forward without those flaws first being addressed and fully remedied. And, the "Visioning Process" cannot possibly be authentic, honest, balanced or transparent unless there is a full and frank discussion of the perpetual Conservation Easement, how it prohibits development, how it cannot be readily terminated and how it could be modified to permit use of the land consistent with the recreation and open space purposes of the Conservation Easement. Thank you for your attention to these issues. We once again request that CPD promptly provide all Steering Committee members our February 5 letter, with its attachments, that CPD fully respond to our February 5 letter and take actions to resolve the issues addressed in our February 5 letter, and that CPD promptly provide a copy of this letter to all Steering Committee members and promptly address the issues discussed in this letter.</p>
Email	Lacie Jennings	3/9/2021	<p>I would like to strongly recommend that the Hon. Candi CdeBaca be included in the visioning process for the 155 acres of the Park Hill Golf course. While I live in District 8, we need to have representation from neighboring areas to ensure all needs are served/ addressed. Please let me know how to ensure the process is inclusive of all area neighborhoods that will be impacted.</p>
Email	Ken Walker	3/9/2021	<p>I was on the zoom meeting yesterday for Park Hill Golf Course and I was configured as "view only" participate mode is their some process that I need do or register for to be able to ask questions? I would like to more involved in any committee regarding the future of the land usage if possible? A little about myself I was born and raised within the neighborhood clayton neighbor still a current resident of 60 years (ouch) I've seen many changes within the community and I would like to hear what other neighbor members thoughts and opinions are and maybe contribute if possible. Little comedy I remember as a kid shopping at King Soopers and Safeway store at Holly shopping center lots of memories</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Harry Doby	3/10/2021	<p>I wanted to bring to your attention an opportunity to fulfill our city's promise to its citizens to provide an equitable, healthy and affordable place to live and prosper. I just read in this morning's Denver Post that the Federal government is planning to sell a large parcel in East Denver formerly occupied by the VA Hospital on the corner of 9th and Clermont. This 8 acre campus is located in a mixed residential, commercial and retail neighborhood within walking distance of an existing grocery store and would be an ideal location for affordable, mixed use development. If the city could work with a non-profit organization to quickly secure this location at a favorable price, it could be transformed into a wonderful place for families to have access to the kinds of health and lifestyle amenities so often denied them."A spokesman for the Department of Veterans Affairs said it has "excessed" 8 acres at the corner of Ninth Avenue and Clermont Street, in the Hale neighborhood, to the General Services Administration."With 8 acres of walkable neighborhood, surely one or two of those acres could be transformed into a green commons area with trees and permeable surfaces to mitigate heat island effects, provide walk paths for exercise, picnic tables for family and social gatherings, and benches for resting and relaxation.If the city has the will to put forth a compelling case to the General Services Administration for the purchase for such a socially beneficial purpose, I think it would be a much more satisfactory solution than yet another "Luxury Apartment" development that has flooded our city in recent years.</p>
Email	Joanna Johnson	3/22/2021	<p>I just submitted the below to The Denver Post as a Letter to the Editor, and thought I'd cc you as well as my support of Park Hill remaining open green space, and a public golf course in particular.</p> <p>'Regarding "We Can't Gamble Away Last Piece of Protected Open Space" I'm surprised that I haven't read and heard more about Park Hill Golf Course's open space visioning process in the local media, as this is virtually the last and largest parcel of open green space that the City of Denver has remaining. Denver acquired this large parcel of land under former Mayor Wellington Webb who protected this green space into perpetuity with a conservation easement requiring the land to remain a golf course open to all. The fact that the current administration is considering developing this land makes me furious. Once green space is developed, one cannot go back. Furthermore, I support Mayor Webb's intention that this land be used a public golf course. I am biased however, as I live nearby, I play golf, and I cannot afford a private golf club.</p>
Email	Maria Flora, SOS	3/23/2021	<p>Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes responded only superficially to our February 5, 2021 letter on March 3, 2021. I am not surprised that they assert that "the Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process ... has been fair, neutral and transparent" and the steering committee is "well-rounded and diverse," while denying that it is a "developer led" process. In fact, the Visioning process to date is far from fair, neutral or transparent. To the contrary, it is increasingly apparent that the Visioning process is, in the words of Ms. Aldrete to City Council, "market driven by a developer" with a predetermined development outcome. Most importantly, the Steering Committee will not be allowed to discuss the Conservation Easement; at the same time, CPD has advanced at every turn the simplistic and misleading CAO legal theory that the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land always "has to be a golf course" if the Conservation Easement is preserved. Any process that does not include a robust explanation and discussion of the legal issues involved with the Conservation Easement and the benefits of the Conservation Easement is not fair, neutral or transparent. The Steering Committee is asked to "consider equity as a guiding principal for all the Steering Committee's work," without context or definition. "Equity" should not be used to steer discussion towards a predetermined pro-development outcome or to portray those who disagree with development on the PHGC land as insensitive to "equity." It is certainly not "equitable" to eliminate discussion of the conservation easement or public health and environmental equity. Despite our requests, participants from the public are still not allowed to see who is on the Visioning Zoom calls, to comment in the chat or see other participant's comments. We again ask that CPD accept questions from the public in the chat and follow up with written responses, or alternatively, run the meetings like City Council, with a 30-minute comment period before each meeting. The Steering Committee is not "well-rounded and diverse." We are aware of a number of members who have actual or potential conflicts of interest. We agree with CPD that "disclosure of any potential conflict of interest promotes transparency and public trust." CPD, however, improperly insists that disclosures should be voluntary, narrowly defines conflicts of interest, and states that conflicts of interest will not disqualify a Steering Committee member. The selection process pointedly excluded the District 9 PRAB appointee, yet includes several members who are in leadership positions with facilitator DMCI, or Smart Growth Initiatives. Smart Growth Initiatives' board includes Holleran Group principals Norman Harris and Ty Hubbard. The Holleran group is a "partner" of Westside Investment Partners. Ms. Aldrete and Ms. Haynes purport to be conducting a "community conversation about the future of this property." However, only pro-development content is posted on the CPD website. All presenters to the Steering Committee to date are either City employees or City contractors. We have had no response to our request to schedule presentations and discussions regarding the public health and environmental implications of open space and public park land as it relates to the PHGC land and the local and extended neighborhoods, with SOS Denver included as a primary participant. This is in no way a community conversation, but a sham "push" campaign by CPD with a predetermined development outcome. During the week of March 9, CPD mailed a survey to homes within a mile of the Park Hill Golf Course land. The Steering Committee was not provided with the survey before it was mailed and had no say in its design. THE SURVEY OMITTS ANY MENTION OF THE CONSERVATION EASEMENT. Question 3 asks: What statement do you most agree with? (SELECT ONLY ONE.) a.Keep the Park Hill Golf Course site as 100% golf course, or b.Use the site to provide a variety of open space, recreation and/or other community- serving uses The survey perpetuates the lie that the land must be used as a golf course under the conservation easement, creating a false premise. For that reason, it is fatally flawed from the outset and should be rejected in any fair, neutral and transparent process. The "Visioning Process" cannot possibly be fair, neutral or transparent without a full and frank discussion of the perpetual Conservation Easement, how it prohibits development, how it cannot be readily terminated and how it could be modified to permit use of the land consistent with the recreation and open space purposes of the Conservation Easement. Thank you for your attention to these issues. We once again request that CPD promptly provide all Steering Committee members this letter</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Elliott Joern	3/24/2021	I am on the Board of Denver Squid - Aquatics Club, the largest LGBT+ aquatics club in Denver and we need badly a Natatorium that this city could be proud of and be of great use to the adults aquatic community / underserved communities. What's great about the Park Hills location is that the area is: On the RTD A-Line and is close to a station, which gives great access to downtown and travel from the airport. This access from the airport is great for tournaments / events / swim meets. Would help serve lower income areas who do not have the same privileges/access to proper aquatic facilities like the Metropolitan area. Would provide easier public transportation by rail and bus to LGBT+ communities Is located near I-70 that would easy access by car. I would love to share Ideas and get involved as I also have an architectural background and have an interest in planning / public transportation.
Email	Kathryn Jantz	3/24/2021	Has there been any thoughts about using some of the space for a long course swimming pool? There is a huge shortage of swimming options in Denver and no indoor fifty meter pool open to the public
Email	Stephanie Haskett	3/24/2021	Please consider a pool with multi uses including a competition pool. Pools are expensive I know and because we have so many aging pools around they are being closed up without renovating and this is leading to a lack of pool space. Learning to swim, swimming for enjoyment or exercise, kids honing their swimming skills is important for our community. Competition pools can be money generators if thought through to offer what's needed. The swimming community is a tight knit community and would appreciate your thoughts on providing more opportunity for swimming space.
Email	Crystal Polis	3/24/2021	I just wanted to voice my support for a 50 meter pool as you consider options to redevelop Park Hill Golf Course. I saw a notice on Facebook to send comments to you. There isn't a good 50 meter pool in Denver and with so many competitive swimmers here, it would be utilized heavily. Also, it could become a destination for meets and competitions and help positively impact the economy in the surrounding neighborhood.
Email	Michelle Bergen	3/24/2021	I am a Denver resident and a life-long competitive swimmer. I have been swimming at DU on their Masters team for 18 years. As Masters swimmers, we are down the priority list for DU as they focus on their student athletes and younger kid teams. Since COVID hit, we have not been able to swim at DU at all. All members of our team are dispersed and have had to scramble to find other alternatives for swimming. This is made even more difficult because the Denver rec centers remain closed. Additionally, I am a resident of Congress Park and that 50 meter pool is currently planned for construction/expansion and will not be back open until 2022. There is easily enough room on the (Park Hill Golf Course) land being considered for redevelopment for a recreation center and an indoor 50 meter pool. Benefits to the City from this investment: Creating a destination Aquatic Facility! •Big swim meets mean bookings for hotels, meals for hundreds of hungry swimmers and transportation to and from the meet. With the close proximity to the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station, swimmers, coaches and spectators can stay and support local businesses near any of the rail stations on the Denver Metro mass transportation system. •This pool would serve an underserved community by including pool access with learn to swim lessons for children and adults, swimming development programs. •Support for athletes on the USA Swimming Olympic track. •Building this facility would provide a landmark place to host the Denver Parks and Recreation summer/winter league championship. •Providing long course meters (LCM), short course yards (SCY) and short course meters (SCM) access will help the Denver swimming community, including year-round swimming leagues, Denver high schools and college swimming leagues. There are over 38 USA swimming teams based out of Denver metro area who need LCM lanes in the summer. With good scheduling, this facility could be booked and generating revenue for Denver Parks and Rec all day long, just about every day! Beyond our local community needs, an indoor LCM pool will draw in swimming programs with elite swimmers from all over the country who are looking for high altitude training venues for their swimmers early in their competition seasons, much like when La Alma was rented for Missy Franklin and Clark Smith's (both former Olympians) and their swimming teams in 2009. The revenue from renting lanes at this facility can be scheduled year-round as different programs ramp up for different swimming seasons. In your review for this planning and visioning, please consider an indoor 50 meter swimming pool to serve Denver and surrounding areas. It's very difficult to find a place to put in our practices and laps and this pool is very needed by the community.
Email	Dr. Michael J. Kosnett	3/25/2021	Will there be a formal assessment by environmental and public health professionals of the environmental and public health impacts of all potential options possible for the former PHGC, ranging from partial development and a 60 acre park, to complete use of the entire 155 acres as open space or parkland? Why or why not?
Email	Geoffrey Chappell	3/25/2021	Thank you, Courtney, for the wonderful presentation. Both my partner and I watched the entire show and we're very hopeful for an outcome that will please the residents of Park Hill. My partner grew up here and is very invested in Park Hill's future. I attended most of the meetings at Holly Square with Gerry Grimes and company. I hope to better understand the process as it moves along. I appreciate what you are working so hard at on our behalf.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Email</p>	<p>Andrew Levasseur</p>	<p>3/25/2021</p>	<p>There are a lot of factors and stakeholders involved with planning and steering this project. I truly believe that just about everyone’s needs can be met. Consider going bigger rather than smaller. Benefits for the area and city in building a large comprehensive recreation center and regional aquatic complex: There will be major tax revenue for the city generated from increased usage of Airbnb’s, hotels, restaurants and service businesses when large events are hosted at the facility. This facility will create job opportunities for our youth, trainers, coaches and sports program facilitators as well as administrators. Having new state of the art meeting rooms and community center area with in the facility will build support for and with the residents of the area. A nine hole par 3 training golf course could be maintained on the land and used by the Rec center for teaching golf. The recently rebuilt City Park golf course is a short distance away and will provide a state of the art 18 hole championship golf course for the advanced youth golfers, high school teams and adult leagues. There is room on the land for athletic fields for soccer, football, baseball/softball, tennis and frisbee golf all of which could be supported and maintained by instructors and staff from the Rec center. There is still room to leave open space and a groomed park at the north end of the property where there is a pond with abundant wildlife and a recently built very large retention reservoir to alleviate street flooding in the area. The Rec center needs to include the following: ParkingAdministration and staff officesMeeting and exercise roomsA main cold water 50 meter swimming pool with bulkheads to allow for SCM, LCM and SCY configurations with the ability to host swimming, water polo, diving and underwater hockey. A secondary 25 yard warm water pool to be used for swim lessons, senior sneakers and water fitness classes. A child aqua play zone with a slide, 0 depth entry, fountains and sprays and a lazy river. There should be a gymnasium suitable for indoor basketball, volleyball and other hard court games.A weight room with free weights, weight machines, tread mills and ellipticals. Several multipurpose rooms for fitness classes that can be used for dry land training, yoga, spin class and other physical activity classes. Low income, minority and underserved communities should be afforded a state of the art recreation center and the opportunity to be immersed in aquatic and land physical education programs as they grow up in a welcoming and nurturing environment in their neighborhood and all within biking distance and close to the 40th and Colorado commuter rail station for increased access to youth and adults from all over the CityIf you build it, they will come! The planners and steering committee need to know that the needs of the swimming population are not being met by continuing to build facilities that are not conducive or safe training or competition in swimming, diving or water polo. Our current inventory of 50 meter pools is Congress park. Due to the fact that the shallow end is only 3 feet and the pool of an unusual shape, it cannot really be used for swimming training, water polo or diving during the 2 months in the summer when it is open.We need something better!</p>
<p>Email</p>	<p>Nancy Ulrich</p>	<p>3/25/2021</p>	<p>Who is on the steering committee? who presently owns the property.what is the status of the City's easement and what does it mean for the process going forward. Why does this have to be voted on by all the city residents? The name change from Stapleton did not have to do that.</p>
<p>Email</p>	<p>Robyn Fishman</p>	<p>3/25/2021</p>	<p>It was stated in the open house that 100% development is not allowed- but, what is the MINIMUM park/open space that would be required? Could it be 95% developed? 75%? Only 20%? Is that specific to what the easement vote change would be?Your survey feels highly manipulative. Question 2 asks us to choose a statement we agree with most:1. 100% golf course2. Use the site to provide a variety of open space, recreation, “and/or other community-serving uses”-I am concerned that answering yes to #2 will be used to say “X% majority of people want to see it serve the community such as a grocery store and housing” when really they might want ONLY open space that ISN’T a golf course.Why isn’t there an option for people to answer they want to see the conservation easement changed to provide for a park/wildlife preserve or 100% open space but NOT specifically limited to a golf course? -Is the 3 year visioning process a minimum or a maximum? I think I heard conflicting info tonight</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Michael Kosnett	4/5/2021	<p>Thank you for your Email of March 26 responding to the question I submitted for the Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Meeting of March 25. I sincerely believe your Email was not responsive to my query. There has never been a question as to whether the City of Denver general in considers "community health" important. My question inquired specifically whether the City will have environmental and public health professionals consider the environmental and public health impact of specific future options for the future of PHGC. For example, consider two of several potential options that have been discussed: Option 1: 155 acres of open space or parkland Option 2: 60 acres of open space or parkland, and 95 acres of residential and commercial development. The impact of these two respective options can be examined and compared in a formal impact assessment. Potential outcomes subject to assessment could include, but not be limited to:</p> <p>a. The impact of each option on recreational and exercise opportunities for the residents of Park Hill and the City of Denver, and indirectly, the relative contribution that each option might have on the physical and psychological health of these populations based on reasonably predicted usage rates. For example, if one option yielded an estimate of X number of person hours of outdoor physical exercise for community members, and the other option estimated Y person hours of outdoor physical exercise, this could pose a differential impact on health outcomes influenced by outdoor exercise, including obesity and cardiovascular disease, among others.</p> <p>b. The impact of each option on climate and outdoor air quality in the vicinity of the former PHGC. The options may have different impacts based on levels of projected vehicular traffic and emissions, climatic implications of different acreage of paved areas and greenscape, differential effects on water run-off and sewer system infrastructure, and so on.</p> <p>c. The impact of each option on ambient noise (in decibels) in and around the former PHGC site. Ambient noise has been shown in several studies to have an impact on physical and mental health. Each of the above impacts can be assessed in terms of monetized and non-monetized metrics. Environmental and public health professionals are skilled in making these assessments. The process is similar to formal Environmental Impact Statements that for decades have been required for federal projects in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The future status of the 155 acre site of the former PHGC in the Park Hill neighborhood will have major implications for the residents of Denver. Accordingly, I consider it essential for any decision making process that will influence that future status to be informed in advance by a formal environmental and public health assessment of specific options.</p>
Email/letter	Jerome Grosskopf	4/7/2021	<p>I am very grateful to have a voice in the planning for the Parkhill golf course space. I realize that the parks department and the community planning and development hold a difficult space in meeting the needs of the growing Denver community. I applaud your efforts in working to fulfill that responsibility in the midst of a polarized community. I filled out the survey and mailed it. Thank you very much. My name is Jerome Grosskopf and my wife is Martha Grosskopf. We have been part of Northeast Parkhill for seven years. We enjoy the community very much. Part of my context and values is that we are senior citizens so to speak. I have spent most of my life in area of sales, negotiations and mediations. I just wanted to write this letter as a means to assist you in the success of creating new spaces for the greater good of everyone in the community including the developers. Some of the principles I use in mediation are values, realities, agreements and strategies. I have included my template. Collect the values of the whole together space no matter who is present in that together space. (Which seems to be a part of your survey) Treat that together space as the most important space. Treat all values as equal and part of the whole solution. Collaborate with individuals and their values to work toward the all important together space that will give the greatest fulfillment. It has been my experience the greatest happiness comes from individuals and their unique contributions working toward that together space. The alternative to not collaborating is misery and polarization where the valued individuals/ groups clash with the values of other individuals/groups. Usually the ones with the most power and money triumph over the ones with least power and money. And as you may realize also that the reverse is as equally miserable where the minority values would rule over other values in the group. This is why I believe in the together template that I use in all my negotiations. The other part of the together template includes realities. There are realities of time, limited money and resources, realities of a growing Denver population, realities of the actual physical space, realities of previous historical agreements for the use of that space, realities of a political system that introduces our own biases and political agendas, there also is the reality of my own unalignment and pride that impacts the greater whole to name a very few. There also is the unique reality of having such a large tract of land and what that uniqueness contributes to the greater together space of Denver. As an example, I would like to highlight the uniqueness of the jewel of Denver- City Park- which is hard to quantify in terms of pure economic value but the power, healing influence of that space is felt through the greater Denver community. It is a unique together gathering space of diverse individuals that normally would not congregate together. So when considering values of the whole- I would urge reflection on what this park hill tract of land would contribute to the greater whole for future generations that a building, education facility, athletic facility, business, homes is not able to contribute to the well being of the together Denver space. I would also ask you to consider the realities of the past violence and healing needed in this neighborhood as you consider strategies for this park hill tract of land. I am always impacted by the history of the burning of Holly Square and the gang wars of crips and bloods and still desire healing for members of this community. Thank you.</p>
Email	Brooke Benson-Redpath	4/13/2021	<p>I am writing this Email in regard to the city of Denver's visioning process that is currently underway for the Park Hill Golf Course. I was born and raised in Park Hill and currently still live in the area.</p> <p>As I understand, the group Save Our Open Space is attempting to be the "voice" of Park Hill. They are stating that the most efficient use of this land would be 100% park/open space. I believe that as our city continues to grow we as a community need to provide affordable housing, resource centers, grocery stores and amenities to every resident. Those residents with median household incomes or below bring diversity, culture and enrichment to our community. These households should not be forced out of the city. It is important to hear multiple ideas and options from government officials as well as respected developers. This will allow us as a community to decide what is best for the area we reside and to be a part of the process.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Stefanie Bell	4/13/2021	I am beyond irritated. (Recollections of how the East Area "planning" went relative to residents' input!)You all have the registration info from the last meeting. Is there any justifiable reason why you didn't Email the participants from that meeting about the meeting tonight? Especially since the committee just sent out an Email that info from the last meeting is now available?The only info I've seen is courtesy of a poster on Nextdoor!
Telephone	Stefan Drewes	4/16/2021	Consider 18 hole daily fee golf course and allowing one or two days a week daily fee 18 hole disc golf course. The conservation easement does not specify golf or disc. It should be up to the neighbors in that area to determine if they would like some sort of development on the site but we do need more parkland in the city.
Email & Webpage form	Bill Boortz	4/28/2021	Thank you for your service. As a Denver resident, I have been following the Park Hill Golf Course situation. I am a real estate appraiser, and I regularly appraise perpetual conservation easements and property encumbered by perpetual conservation easements. I am shocked that the City and County of Denver would even consider amending or extinguishing the Conservation Easement conveyed to Denver by the George W. Clayton Trust. Clearly the Trust acted in an attempt to fulfill the wishes of George W. Clayton. Denver acquired this Conservation Easement in perpetuity. Perpetuity does not mean only until a better way to make money comes along. I've read the documents. The Conservation Easement is valid and very specific. The Property shall be used as a golf course in perpetuity. That was accepted by Denver. To change course now would be catastrophic in many ways. If the Conservation Easement is somehow invalidated, it will open up the possibility for serious litigation. No one will trust Denver to protect their wishes. The implication upon other conservation easements held by the City or State will be a disaster. Any entity, at any time, will look to this instance as precedent to destroy the good will and hard work of so many. There are countless areas in Colorado that are protected from just this type of money grab by PERPETUAL conservation easements. The sanctity of perpetuity must be protected. If it is not, so many critical protected areas will again be at risk. I realize that Western Investment Partners has invested a great deal in Denver. The list of political contributions made by this group obviously matters and has some impact. I realize that this issue has many layers. The issue should not be whether the community needs affordable housing or a golf course with greater urgency. The issue is honoring the will of donors, living up to Denver's part of the bargain, maintaining respect and trust for Denver and not bowing to today's political will or economic return. Do the right thing. Golf course. In perpetuity. Like Denver promised. Anything else would be a horrible disaster. Thank you for reading this.
Email	Leslie Ratley-Beach, Land Trust Alliance	4/30/2021	I am writing on behalf of the Land Trust Alliance concerning the proposed amendment or extinguishment of a conservation easement by the City and County of Denver on land located on the Park Hill Golf Course. The Land Trust Alliance is the voice of the national land trust community, representing about 1,000 conservation organizations dedicated to supporting the efforts of land trusts and government entities to conserve land now for future generations. As the national leader in conservation policy, standards, education, training and law, we provide information to government agents, attorneys and other professionals on the many aspects of safeguarding protected land in perpetuity. The City and County of Denver holds conservation easements that were granted solely for the public benefit. We hope that you will review the following information and the legal regimes governing conservation easements as you consider Denver's responsibilities to the public in continuing to safeguard conservation of this property. Most conservation easements are granted "in perpetuity," meaning they are intended to protect forever the land they encumber for the conservation purposes specified in the deed of conveyance. Placing land in a conservation easement is a promise that it will not be converted to another use. By funding the purchase of this conservation easement the citizens of Denver have invested in the conservation of their land-based heritage and affirmed the importance of conserving this property. Conservation easements keep land in private ownership and on the tax rolls while preserving resources that are vital to the public interest. As a public investment, they are a more affordable alternative to outright purchase. For private landowners, conservation easements are an opportunity to protect land from development with the added benefit of income from the sale or tax savings from the donation of the easement. Landowners, and their successors, retain the right to possess and use the land consistent with the conservation purpose of the public promise of permanent land conservation. easement, and to sell the land, also subject to the easement. Many conservation easements are donated in full, as a charitable gift to government agencies or nonprofit land conservation organizations. Recognizing the public value of this investment, 49 states and the District of Columbia have enacted some form of legislation that removes the common law impediments to the creation and validity of conservation easements (the "easement-enabling statutes"). Congress enacted Internal Revenue Code Section 170(h) and the accompanying Treasury Regulations, which provide significant tax benefits to individuals who donate (or who receive a portion of the purchase price for the conservation easement and then donate the remaining value) a qualified conservation easement to tax-exempt organizations. The Internal Revenue Code and Treasury Regulations make it clear that to be tax deductible, a conservation easement must be "granted in perpetuity" and its conservation purpose "protected in perpetuity." Easement holders, whether land trusts or government agencies, are responsible for permanently upholding their conservation easements and protecting them against all challenges regardless of whether the easement was donated, purchased or exacted. Easement holders are also required by regulation to have the resources to defend their easements and ensure their permanence. The federal Tax Code requires that the termination of any conservation easement, including purchased easements, be reported to the IRS. This ensures that tax-exempt organizations operate in accordance with their missions, and that they do not convey impermissible private benefits in administering their easements.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Email (Cont)</p>	<p>Leslie Ratley-Beach, Land Trust Alliance (cont)</p>	<p>4/30/2021 (cont)</p>	<p>The past several decades saw an increase in conservation easements as a public policy solution for the protection of land. The evidence for this is in the enactment of easement-enabling statutes, the generous federal (and, in this case, state) tax benefits offered to easement donors and the dedication of taxpayer money for easement purchase programs. This public investment is not only direct, with tax incentives granted and public funds appropriated for easement purchase programs, but also indirect. The public invests in conservation easements by funding government entities that hold and enforce easements; by approving tax-exempt status for more than 1,363 land conservation organizations across the nation; by supporting substantial tax deductions and credits for easement donations, land donations and cash; and by funding oversight of the administration and enforcement of easements on behalf of the public. Dozens of charitable foundations and corporations and thousands of citizens have donated millions of dollars to land trusts for land conservation over decades. This investment must be honored. The most important asset of a land conservation organization – or any government entity holding conservation easements – is public confidence in its mission. When easement holders fail to defend their conservation easements; when governments condemn land or easements by eminent domain; when adverse judicial decisions and statutory changes weaken the laws upholding conservation easements, these losses erode confidence in conservation efforts across America.</p> <p>Extinguishing a conservation easement to promote development contravenes the state enabling statutes and federal regulations. It undermines public confidence in the conservation easements themselves and in the entities charged with the permanent protection of important conservation lands. It thwarts the landowner’s voluntary choice to permanently protect private land from development. America loses a football field worth of forests, grasslands, ag land, deserts, and natural places to development every 30 seconds.¹ This amounts to approximately 1.39 million acres per year of natural areas, wilderness, historic sites, farms and forests, resources that are critical to our economic future, our public health and our quality of life. Federal and state lawmakers across the country have enacted laws and adopted policies supporting the permanent protection of our rapidly diminishing yet critically important natural capital of clean air and water, wildlife habitat and natural lands. Conservation easements are key to these efforts. They serve a vital public need that has been recognized by lawmakers, scientists and scholars. In comment (a) of Section 7.11 of the Restatement (Third) of Property - Servitudes, the American Law Institute explains that the importance of conservation easements, “underscored by statutory requirements that they be perpetual, will continue to increase as population growth exerts ever-greater pressures on undeveloped land, ecosystems, and wildlife.” The Land Trust Alliance is dedicated to the defense of land conservation efforts and stands fully prepared to meet challenges to the integrity of conservation easements, including the abuse of tax incentives, hostile interpretation of state law or the tax code, conversion of conservation values to development or taking land held by land trusts. To support these national conservation interests, the Land Trust Alliance has created a Conservation Defense Center that assists land trusts in defending the permanence of their conservation easements. Ten prominent law firms committed to provide pro bono litigation services to defend easements. We also have a conservation defense fund to pay for costs associated with intervening in cases such as this. It is our hope that you will carefully consider the public costs of extinguishing these conservation easements and choose instead to preserve and keep the land they protect intact. Thank you for your time and consideration of these critical public benefits of conservation.</p>
---------------------	--	-------------------------	---

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Maria Flora, SOS	5/11/2021	<p>The Community Planning and Development Department ("CPD") announced on May 5, 2021 that it has appointed Dr. Ryan Ross to replace Dr. Nita Mosby Tyler as the "Steering Committee" facilitator for the CPD planning and development process regarding the Park Hill Golf Course ("PHGC") land. With all due respect to Dr. Ross, we must object to his appointment to fill what should be a neutral facilitator position. In the May 5th Email announcement to City Council, CPD attached a biography of Dr. Ross as Chief Operating Officer of the Urban Leadership Foundation of Colorado but failed to disclose that Dr. Ross and Norman Harris are teammates in the Five Points Development Corporation ("FPDC") with Dr. Ross being identified with FPDC's "Business Development" work and with Mr. Harris being identified with FPDC's "Community Engagement" work. FPDC identifies itself on its website as "an active owner, developer and manager of several properties in Denver, Colorado." FPDC identifies the Urban Leadership Foundation of Colorado as one of "Our Partners." See https://fivepointsdevelopmentcorporation.com/about/. What's wrong with this appointment? First, Dr. Ross--through his position as a "Business Development" "team" member of FPDC --is actively involved in the real estate development business. Such involvement by itself disqualifies Dr. Ross from legitimately being considered as a neutral facilitator for CPD's planning and development process for the PHGC land. The threshold issue in this process is whether there should be mixed use development on the land or whether the land should be preserved for open space and recreational purposes consistent with the 2019 conservation easement's conservation purposes.</p> <p>Second, Dr. Ross' FPDC teammate Mr. Harris is an equity owner in two active companies doing business under the name "Holleran": (1) Holleran Property Management & Development LLC (also dba The Holleran Group) and (2) Holleran PHGC Holdings, LLC . One or both Holleran companies is a partner with Westside Investment Partners, Inc. in Westside's real estate development project for the PHGC land. See https://www.parkhillgolfcourseimagined.info/story/ . We have no reason to doubt Dr. Ross' integrity, but his work as the FPDC "Business Development" "team" member and these business and personal relationships cast serious doubt on his ability to serve successfully as a neutral facilitator for CPD's planning and development project regarding the future of the PHGC land. It would be difficult for Dr. Ross to be completely neutral regarding a plan that would be contrary to the pro-development financial interests of Mr. Harris, the Holleran companies, and Westside--and potentially himself, since we do not know the full nature of the relationships but can only rely on what they chose to disclose publicly. At the very least, this appointment creates the appearance of a conflict of interest that undermines the ability of Dr. Ross to be viewed properly as a neutral facilitator in this planning and development process. We must also once again challenge this entire pro-development CPD planning and development process regarding the PHGC land. The City is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars and committing many hundred hours of City employee time and energy to invent a public narrative supporting Westside's real estate development plans for the PHGC land. And the City is taking these actions despite the fact that the land's 2019 open space and recreational conservation easement protects the PHGC land in perpetuity from any such development. Under the circumstances discussed above, we demand that CPD immediately removes Dr. Ross from his new position as CPD's "Steering Committee" facilitator and that--if CPD chooses to continue this wasteful planning and development process--it at the very least can appoint a replacement who can truly be neutral regarding the competing issues between preservation of the PHGC land as open recreational space, on the one hand, and mixed use development of the land by Westside and its partners, on the other. We request that you fully and promptly provide substantive responses to this letter and our February 5, 2021, March 3, 2021, and March 23, 2021 letters. Save Open Space Denver</p>
Email	Caroline Cammack	5/17/2021	My opinion is to leave the golf course as open space, with a few amenities such as restrooms, picnic tables, area for food trucks and a small field for sports. We do not need any more development in this city. We do not need condos and shopping areas. When I moved to Denver 21 years ago, I marveled at all of the green space. However, these spaces have been gobbled up by greedy developers. We need to stop slapping concrete everywhere and be kinder to the earth by keeping open space.
Webpage comment form	Ben Ramuno	5/3/2021	We are homeowners in NE Park Hill and we want a large upscale park space with restaurants, cafes, small locally owned retail, entertainment venues, etc. Lots of trees and walking paths. We would like to see the area developed similar to RINO or WASH PARK.
Email	Bill Boortz	5/17/2021	I had a bit of time and checked in on the Park Hill Golf Course situation today...sigh. I watched some of the Community Steering Committee meetings and the Open House. I also read the announcement that Dr. Tyler had stepped down and Dr. Ross is now involved. I looked for an Email address for Dr. Ross but could not find one that seemed to apply directly to him. Gosh, Courtney...thank you to you and everyone involved. It is obvious that so many people have invested time and effort with regard to this cause. While I consider myself an interested party, Denver resident and hope for the best...it is clear that the fate of the Park Hill Golf Course Property is important for significant reasons. I have to be on a ranch west of Canon City all day tomorrow or I would plan to tune in to the meeting planned for tomorrow night. I don't want to be negative, and really would like to help if I can, but I admit I was very disappointed with the City and County's legal take that kind of opened the door to just changing the Conservation Easement at the will of the City Council. From the discourse I saw it seemed that "some development" was a given and the golf course alone was not given any real support or consideration. I get it, but....gosh. Of course I have much more experience with conservation easements than most, but that take just seems like it could lead to a lot of frustration. To travel a long way down the road toward whatever the final recommendations might be, only to discover later that the Conservation Easement can't really be changed...or can't be changed in a way that would afford any private benefit (as I read the law), would seem to eliminate a lot of the options being considered. Again, I don't want to be a wet blanket or provide bad information. Maybe there is a way to legally change things that I am not aware of. My prevalent interest is not endangering the many wonderful places that are protected via perpetual conservation easements in Colorado. I fear that a bad precedent, or loophole exploited by Denver, might create a major problem for other natural resources in this state. I always advise my clients to be very careful and make sure they are getting language they can live with in any conservation easement they consider. Perpetuity is a long time. Conservation easements really are meant to lock in a set of conditions forever. Changing, amending or extinguishing them is not easy.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Webpage comment form	Courtney Hysaw	5/17/2021	Will affordable housing and business opportunities for displaced residents of north park hill be seriously considered?
Webpage comment form	Andy Cushen	5/17/2021	When you consider the possibility of mixed-use development on this spot in the city, more affordable housing, housing close to high-frequency transit: it feels like a no-brainer that this process of redevelopment goes forward. I like the notion of open space for all, but the site as it is currently is not an open space, it's retained for specific uses. I've biked by the Park Hill Golf Course and never really noticed it was green before, mostly noticed it was flat and empty and blocked my ideal bike route. 40th and Colorado is a pretty sad LR station right now, and I can see wonderful new transit-oriented development in that area, it makes more sense to me than the status quo.
Webpage comment form	Karen Kropa	5/17/2021	I live on 34th and Birch St. I would like to see the former PH golf course land developed similar to Lowery, Central Park and Northfield. Our community needs a grocery store, restaurants and mixed housing as well as dog park etc. We don't need a a golf course.
Webpage comment form	Woody Garnsey	5/17/2021	(1) When will Save Open Space Denver receive complete substantive responses to its letters dated February 5, 2021, March 3, 2021, March 23, 2021, and May 11, 2021? (2) When will the answers to questions submitted on-line at the first community meeting be posted on the CPD website?
Webpage comment form	Daria Jouzdani	5/17/2021	I live north of the golf course and while I appreciate plans to keep part of it open and a park, I also believe the community is in need of an accessible grocery store. I am fortunate enough to have a car, but I know that is not true for the whole community. Also affordable housing and employment opportunities for the youth in the community through small businesses would be an enormous help in my opinion.
Webpage comment form	Karen Kropa	5/17/2021	I am requesting the City modify the easement to allow the developers to develop the land and NOT be required to make it a golf course. The demographic of my neighborhood does not support a golf course. Affordable housing, restaurants a grocery store will give an opportunity for residents to work and to utilize these services. In addition, sales tax and property tax revenue will greatly benefit the City. My question is: If the land owners walk away from the land and City takes it over, will the City then be required to construct an 18 hole golf course when they already have a public course a mile away down Colorado Blvd--City Park? This makes no sense to me.
Webpage comment form	Mark Marshall	5/18/2021	As a member of the Park Hill neighborhood, I fully support the plans to open the Park Hill Golf Course for some level of development. The City of Denver is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis that been going on for years, and has now been worsened by the pandemic. When the conservation easement was put into place on this land, no one could have envisioned the current state of housing instability that we're experiencing not only here in Colorado, but across the country. There are those who don't necessarily live in the neighborhood, who prioritize the tranquility they experience when driving by the current open space, over the ability of vulnerable Northeast Park Hill residents receiving access to the wealth of community stabilizing resources that could be possible with the redevelopment of this site. I find it difficult to understand and appreciate that type of value system, which is based on entitlement and exclusion. While many homeowners are seeing the value of their homes appreciate at an historic rate, many of our City's lower-income and more vulnerable citizens are being priced out of the neighborhoods and communities that they and their families have called home for decades. By opening up the golf course for responsible development that includes; a significant amount of affordable housing among the overall income-mix; business and employment opportunities; services and amenities; recreational spaces and open park land, we are ensuring that current residents not only have an opportunity to stay in the neighborhood, but have the ability to thrive. The forces of gentrification are at work across the City of Denver and the Northeast Park Hill neighborhood is no exception. Providing more affordable housing at PHGC helps to mitigate one of the most negative effects of these forces - involuntary displacement. Stable housing opens to the doors to many opportunities, including better educational and health outcomes. Responsible development at this site could also be the catalyst for opening the doors for Black-owned businesses to serve the neighborhood in which they live.
Webpage comment form	Ann K. Long	5/18/2021	Park Hill Golf Course property was purchased by Denver to fulfill the goal of no change, ever. I support any plans to maintain the entire property for citizens. Fifty years from now, this open space will show the foresight citizens in 2021 had for those who follow them in 2071.
Webpage comment form	Michael Shannon	5/18/2021	My question is "Will the current developer (or future developers) be seeking any city or urban renewal financial incentives for this project". This question might be early, but should be a part of the upcoming discussions.
Webpage comment form	Elisha Novak	5/18/2021	Please do not develop this land! We need it to remain an open space. The push poll that was sent out was leading and deceptive. We do not need "affordable housing" that will not be affordable or accessible to current residents.
Webpage comment form	Ben and Kim Ramuno	5/19/2021	My wife and I are homeowners in NE Park Hill. We want change, revitalization, and LOTS of green space. We wants something that encourages community cleanliness and pride. Large 80+ acre park space, some breweries/cafes/restaurants, maybe a small market (Marczyk), and maybe some local small retail. Art, trees, walking trails. An offset to the busy Colorado Blvd so we aren't screaming over traffic while in the park. Perhaps an elevated pedestrian bridge that crosses Colorado for safety walking westbound. This would be an excellent opportunity to expand into the adjacent industrial district north of 38th. Elevate the entire neighborhood. larger sidewalks, more trees, less litter. We hope our voice is heard. Be like RINO, WASH PARK, CHEESEMAN. =) We have lots of ideas and would ove to discuss.Please NO ugly large chain grocery stores or affordable housing, and MINIMAL if any housing, period.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Webpage comment form	Adrien Horton	5/22/2021	I think the golf course should have a community center with free showers, mental health resources, art classes, career development resources (like resume workshops), printers, computers, and a community garden.
Email	Eli Katz	5/24/2021	Has a Phase 1 ESA already been commissioned or completed for the Park Hill Golf Course site?
Webpage comment form	Jake Houston	5/25/2021	Is it normal to allow city wide votes on small area plans, i.e. residents of other neighborhoods? It seems unfair to allow individuals from properly developed/planned neighborhoods to weigh-in and impact the development of a historically underinvested neighborhood.
Webpage comment form	Gloria Kochan	5/25/2021	I wonder if there is a way the city can guarantee that home values around PHGC won't go down. I'm about ten years to retirement and worry it will end up mostly affordable-housing-that-does-not-build-wealth and that that will bring down my property value. I think the developer may promise all kinds of good stuff and we will change zoning etc., then nothing we want will come to fruition and all we will get is whatever makes the developer the most money. You know if you stand in the right place on PHGC you can see both the flame from Suncore and the 170. In another place you can see three gas stations while the exhaust from the traffic on Colorado Blvd. whips back your hair. I want PHGC to be an air cleaning green space that is healthy for mind and body. I know we aren't rich in this neighborhood so it will probably be paved over, etc. It's too bad. Nature heals and we need it. We deserve to have nice things, too, even if we are poorer than average in Denver/underserved. Like clean air and nice sidewalks, for example.
Email	Rae McCall-Hunn	6/8/2021	What is the reason the Golf Course cannot remain? Other than the fact that the developers want to make Billions of dollars?
Email	Merry Davis	6/8/2021	Park Hill Golf Course has been an important component of the Park Hill Community for many years. It offers an opportunity to golf at reasonable cost, gather with others and preserves the open space (via the purchased land conservation easement). These are the things that contribute to the high standard of living here, and what makes Denver special. Why not leave it as a golf course? Second, how is it possible to maintain the integrity and intent of conservation easements if the easement can be reversed?
Email	Georgia Garnsey	6/8/2021	I served on the Clayton Visioning Committee and your process is very similar. For over a year I and many others attended meetings, filled out sticky notes, played games devised by CRL and at the end of the day a Recommendation Report was published that reflected what they (Clayton and the city) wanted from Day One, despite the views of those who wanted the 155 acres to be open space for the community to benefit from and enjoy. They even ignored their own survey that showed a significant majority of respondents wanted open space and recreational space. Eleven members of PCAC issued their objection to the report. That didn't matter either. I have no doubt watching these proceedings that you know right now exactly what the Recommendation will look like. I am alarmed how this city administration continues to manipulate the public to get what they want. Who are you serving? I'm afraid I know. And it's bety disillusioning.
Webpage comment form	Jeanne Granville	6/9/2021	This is a follow-up to a comment I submitted on 6-08-21 regarding Committee member attendance at the Steering Committee where I was very concerned so few members were in attendance. At the end of the meeting, I realized there were probably more than the 6-7 who were visible on the screen. This is either a problem with the Webinair format or the way it is being set up as there was no way actual way to determine the committee members who were in attendance. I think the format you used barely meets Sunshine policies so I am suggesting that either you reformat the webinar so that all of the Committee members who attend are able to visible/known or on the Webpage following the meeting, publish a list of Committee members that attended. This is important work, the Committee selection process was very competitive, and it's important for the public to be aware as to who is attending, participating and making decisions for the future of PHGC and Denver. I would still also like to know how questions/concerns that are raised during the public comment will be acknowledged and addressed. Understandably not all of the issues/concerns can be solved but they need to be acknowledged and a rationale given at some point for CPD/Committee's disposition in relation to the work they have undertaken. Thank you
Webpage comment form	Rachael Barabak	6/27/2021	Disc golf course - tennis courts
Webpage comment form	Emily Stone	6/27/2021	It would be amazing to have some sort of off-leash space for dogs! Community stores, grocers, or even a little "Park Hill Downtown" would be amazing additions to the area.
Webpage comment form	Matt S.	7/6/2021	I live a mile from Park Hill Golf Course, but it was the nearest open space to me larger than 1/2 square block. If you look at a map of the city, a park or open space belongs here. That's why the city paid 2 million dollars in the early 90s; the planners then knew this area needed open space. Whether a golf course or a park, leave this space open. Stapleton/Central Park is less than a few miles away, continue to pour new homes into that relatively open area (with bountiful parks). Dont gobble up the few remaining open spaces in the interest of corporate profits going to non-Colorado based firms. Development here makes zero sense.
Webpage comment form	Shawn Gomex	7/6/2021	why dont you turn the golf course into a nature reserve to help reintroduce the wolfs that are supposed to be reintroduced to our environment and eco system.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Webpage comment form	Kristen	7/24/2021	Grocery stores, local shops, dining opportunities
Webpage comment form	Andy	7/25/2021	It seems disingenuous to say “ over 50% of “ said they wanted outdoor space preserved. The tabulated data push that number OVER 70%!!!!Why fudge? Call this what it is- a majority! An overwhelming majority! Nuff said
Webpage comment form	Gloria Kochan	7/29/2021	I'm just listening to NPR about urban heat https://treecanada.ca/resources/canadian-urban-forest-compendium/3-benefits-of-urban-forests/
Webpage comment form	Christine O'Connor	8/3/2021	(1) Who sees my questions? (2) specifically "where" in the planning process are we? I have not been involved in other meetings. (3) why are you collecting so much personal data on the following pages? Who has access to that data or summaries? I am not giving feedback here, I am asking questions that I would appreciate answers to. Thank you.
Email	Harry Doby, SOS	8/16/2021	First, we are writing again to express our continued objection to the CPD planning and development process for the Park Hill Golf Course (“PHGC”) land that cannot be legally developed without a court order pursuant to the Colorado conservation easement statute. The statute mandates that the PHGC land conservation easement cannot be terminated, released, extinguished, or abandoned without a court order that—based on changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land—it has become impossible to continue fulfilling the open space and recreational conservation purposes of the conservation easement. We have made this position clear in our prior letters and more recently in the lawsuit captioned Save Open Space Denver, et al. v. City and County of Denver, et al., 2021CV31982, Denver District Court. Second, we are writing to object to CPD’s apparent current plan for some kind of recommendation and final report to be made by Dr. Ross apparently regarding moving forward to another phase of a CPD planning and development process. On August 12, 2021, Dr. Ross wrote the following to the Steering Committee regarding the upcoming non-public August 17 “small group workshop session” and a planned follow-up meeting: The presentations and information you provide will be the artifacts I use to create a final report summary and recommendation. The summary and recommendation will be comprehensive, including the vision of each perspective. Additionally, we object that the public is not able to attend and observe this August 17th meeting, as our understanding is that all steering committee meetings are open to the public. It would be premature at this time or any time soon for any legitimate recommendation or report to be made to move forward to another phase of a CPD planning and development process because many critical issues have not yet been discussed with the Steering Committee including, but not limited to, the following: a. the public health and environmental benefits of preserving the full 155 acres of PHGC land b. the expected dense residential and commercial infill development that will take place on presently underutilized land near the PHGC land including most importantly in the area near the 40th and Colorado light rail station (we have identified two developer groups that together have assembled approximately 35 acres of land in that area and there undoubtedly are other developers who have purchased land for the same development purposes in that area); c. the actual situation regarding the current availability of fresh food in neighborhoods surrounding the PHGC land (the only presentation related to food issues has been Patricia Iwasaki’s July 27 short lecture without any Steering Committee discussion whatsoever in which she failed even to mention the excellent Park Hill Supermarket located at 40th and Jackson Streets); d. the Save Open Space Denver interpretation of the PHGC land conservation easement which differs from the interpretations that have been provided to the public and the Steering Committee by the City Attorney’s Office and CPD; e. a critical analysis of the CPD’s invalid “push survey” f. a critical analysis of the report provided by Denver Metro Impact regarding its “Community Navigator” project; and g. the availability of existing affordable housing in the area and planned new affordable housing in the area. Finally, it would seem that this is an attempt to produce an incomplete and artificial narrative by withholding or ignoring key facts (e.g., the information identified above; the lack of any large format grocery store chain’s plan to build even if the land is developed; the fact that the city’s own survey revealed only 3% of responding Northeast Park Hill residents feel market rate housing is a priority – of which the developer would likely build one to two thousand units, sacrificing hundreds of mature trees in the process) and asking the Steering Committee members to provide some form of input in an attempt for CPD to claim to have listened to the community, while in reality serving the interests of the developer.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Email	Melissa Daruna on Behalf of Keep it Colorado Policy Committee	9/7/2021	We are Keep It Colorado, a statewide coalition of conservation organizations including land trusts, public agencies, open space departments and conservation professionals. Our members extensively use conservation easements to help landowners across Colorado protect land in perpetuity. We are writing to share information and concern about perpetual conservation easements as they relate to the City and County of Denver's perpetual conservation easement on the Park Hill Golf Course. We would like to better understand the City and County of Denver's approach to the potential amendment or extinguishment of this perpetual conservation easement, as it will have sweeping implications for the treatment of perpetual conservation easements across the state and beyond. Our concerns about the standard used to address the perpetual conservation easement stem from a series of communications by and with City of Denver staff and the property owner. In a February 9, 2021 Denver Post article, "Denver launches planning process for 155-acre Park Hill land protected from development," Assistant City Attorney John McGrath suggested that the City of Denver could invoke "home rule" authority to allow City Council to change the perpetual conservation easement. In subsequent public community visioning meetings, there has been discussion about amending or terminating the easement without any clear explanation about the process the City plans to take to achieve that outcome. This position was made explicit in the City and County of Denver's recent Motion to Dismiss filed in Save Open Space Denver, et. al. v. City and County of Denver, et al. Mot. to Dismiss, p.11. In recent conversations with Westside Investment Partners, the current landowners, they expressed an understanding of the state statute cited in the perpetual conservation easement that requires a court ruling to terminate an easement but were not able to comment on the City and County of Denver's inclination to follow that standard related to this easement. In some of these meetings and discussions, we have also been led to believe that there may be a question as to whether the easement on the Park Hill Golf Course is, in fact, a perpetual conservation easement as outlined in state law. In addition to these discussions and media reports, we understand that there are two ballot measures that will go before Denver voters related to conservation easements. If used as a new or different standard for the City and County of Denver to follow, apart from state law, when addressing perpetual conservation easements, we have a strong concern about the implications for both measures. We would like to provide some perspective as a collective authority on perpetual conservation easements and the applicable state statute. The current conservation easement was placed on the property on July 11, 2019 and cites the enabling state statute for perpetual conservation easements (C.R.S. §38-30.5), and as such should be held to the same standards required by that statute for amendment or termination. The current statute allows for termination but requires a judicial process (C.R.S. §38-30.5-107), a standard which is accepted best practice by the larger conservation community. Based on the above-mentioned communications, we have concern that the City and County of Denver may be considering different means or standards for this perpetual conservation easement. This causes us deep concern and creates unnecessary confusion, putting the conservation easement tool at risk across Colorado and beyond. An inconsistent approach not only poses a threat to the broader conservation community, but it also damages the public's trust in this critical conservation tool. Conservation easement holders, whether they be local governments or land trusts, are required to uphold the easements for the public benefit. Protecting the public's investment in perpetual easements is especially critical in ensuring the tool can be trusted and relied upon by landowners and the surrounding community. We want to emphasize that we are not interested in taking a position on what should or should not happen with the Park Hill Golf Course property. Our interest and concern focuses narrowly on the treatment of the conservation easement. We urge the City and County of Denver to adhere to state law, which provides standards and a clear process for amending or extinguishing perpetual conservation easements. Landowners and conservation organizations across Colorado rely on this tool to protect land in perpetuity and thereby create healthy thriving communities into the future. We must ensure that when organizations use the tool they use it in a consistent manner and follow the
Webpage comment form	Dan	9/4/2021	I like the Thursday food trucks, the music playing at 8am was very uncool to wake to.
Email	Shane Murphy	9/14/2021	I find it concerning that this committee was to be made up of individuals who leave in the Parkhill community. Why would Mr. Ho be allowed to be on the committee when he does not even reside in the community? This has been a question on my mind for a long time and decided tonight was the night to ask I guess.
Webpage comment form	Angela Burns	9/16/2021	We already have affordable housing less than a mile in all directions from the park...why can't we have more than 60 acres of open space...we don't need another Grocery store we have 5 or more within a mile..we don't need anymore liquor stores or cannabis shops .I live one block from Park hill golf course you will impact our lives horribly with what your trying to do..
Webpage comment form	Guadalupe Lloyd	9/14/2021	I want to speak on behalf of Westside Investment Partners. They are developers that bought the Loretto Heights campus in Oct. 2018. I share the backyard fence just north of the 72 acre Loretto Heights campus and have spent the last 3yrs going to monthly community meetings, in person and now zoom and continue to as our area plan is ongoing and continuing. The project includes homes, town homes and apartments with affordability across a wide range of household income. Some of the homes will be among the first built under the sustainability focused "Denver Green Code". Original zoning of land allowed for 13 story buildings on all land equaling more units per square feet. Westside listened to the community's desire to have more green area thereby reducing the number of units per square feet it could have made a profit with. Westside has encompassed the historic core of Loretto Heights campus by preserving the Loretto Heights Academy building, Chapel, Priest's house, Library, Machebeuf Hall, May Bonfils Stanton Theatre and Pancretia Hall. Our community consensus made it a priority that the site retain the feel of a campus district and Westside has complied that most homes, single and family and town home units would face open space rather than streets. Dying and dead trees were removed at the suggestion of Denver's arborist with the promise to populate the campus with trees upon development. 1,000 plus trees of 2", 3" and 4" caliber will be planted. The 74 units of Pancretia Hall, which is set to be done in December 2021 are (2) 4BR's at 1500 to 1700SF, (15) 3BR's at 800 to 900SF, (20) 2BR's at 600 to 700SF, (31) 1BR's 500 to 600SF and (6) studios at 350 to 400SF. as with any negotiation, there is always give and take and Westside Investment Partners listened to the desires of the community, RNO's an interested parties who attended the monthly meetings to brainstorm the project together. Thank you.

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

Webpage comment form	Angela Burns	9/16/2021	We already have affordable housing less than a mile in all directions from the park....why can't we have more than 60 acres of open.space...we don't need another Grocery store we have 5 or.more within a mile..we don't need anymore liquor stores or cannabis shops .I live one block from Park hill golf course you will.impact our lives horribly with what your trying to do...
Webpage comment form	Efe Egbeighu	10/17/2021	Will part of this become a park and a grocery store? The nice neighborhoods of Denver have both, and I fear that they won't convert part of it into a park. Our neighborhood needs a grocery store.
Webpage comm	Kyle Peplinski	10/22/2021	Put a disc golf course on the property!
Webpage comment form	Pauline P. Reetz, Conservation Committee Chairperson, Denver Audubon	12/2/2021	<p>Denver Audubon supports the preservation of the conservation easement of the Park Hill Golf Course consistent with the Guiding Principles of the City's 20 year Game Plan for a Healthy City. Denver Audubon sees the value in adding businesses that advance the public's use and enjoyment of the park to the perimeter, which should not require more than 10% of the remaining 130 acres.The City purchased 25 acres for construction of a storm water detention basin, a component of its Platte to Park Hill flood control project. Conservation of the remaining 130 acres would significantly advance the following important social and environmental objectives:</p> <p>First, Northeast Park Hill is known to the City to be an underserved community in High Need of walkable access to a park. Increasing the 91 acres now available to the surrounding communities by the entire 130 acres available here would still only bring these communities up to just over one-third of the acreage available to the communities of Berkeley, Gateway-Green Valley Ranch and Washington Park. Denver formerly had one of the highest ratios of open space per resident – we were a leader in that field! Now, however, Denver ranks 12th out of 15 of the nation's largest cities with only 170 sq. ft. per person, compared to 1,023 sq. ft./person in #1 Atlanta (1).</p> <p>Second, the Denver region is a part of a principal route of the Central Migration Flyway used by millions of migrating birds in spring and fall. A multi-agency study discovered that North America has lost over 25% of its birds, some 3 billion, over the past 50 years. (2) The widespread loss and degradation of habitat is the biggest driver of bird population declines. Audubon considers 113 species using this Flyway to be highly vulnerable to changes from human activity and climate changes here. Preserving large intact areas of habitat is crucial to the survival of North American bird species. Our failure will bring on Silent Spring, merely by a different means.</p> <p>Habitat size matters to migrating bird species for a number of reasons. Species that can only migrate over restricted corridors cannot afford to lose opportunities to stop, rest and refuel when they pass over Denver. Loss of this stop-over habitat, caused by humans and by climate change, constitutes a serious threat to species survival. These types of species tend to have fewer individuals and tend to be less abundant than species that can make use of a wider variety of habitats over wider corridors, which further increases the risk of extinction for those species. Also, as habitat size increases, habitat health increases, as damage occurring along habitat edges, caused by interface with human activity, decreases relative to total habitat size.Third, the value to Denver's residents of preserving a single, large block of open space has important, and different, benefits from any commercial advantage to be enjoyed from development. As The Urban Institute concluded many years ago, (http://web.archive.urban.org/publications/900719.html) , city parks advance important urban policy objectives, such as job preparation for youths and adults and stronger neighborhoods. Parks, their research showed, can advance the community's objectives to help children develop physically, intellectually, psychologically and socially. The COVID-19 pandemic has clearly demonstrated the importance of natural areas close to home for residents' physical and mental health.</p> <p>Finally, transformation and reforestation of the golf course supports the City's ongoing efforts to restore the urban canopy. The Office of the Denver City Forester is charged with responsibility for improving the overall quality of Denver's urban tree canopy to add shade which reduces the heat island effect of streets, parking lots and buildings, traps and removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and cleanses air-borne pollutants from the air we breathe.</p>
Webpage comment form	Pauline P. Reetz (comment cont. from above)	12/2/2021 (cont.)	<p>Denver's canopy presently shades about 19% of the city, which the City Forrester calculates to provide some \$122M in benefits to all Denver's residents. (3) Presently, the golf course has some 440 trees providing a canopy shading approximately 7% of the acreage. Undivided preservation and reforestation of this site presents a substantial opportunity to add shaded land to counter record heat that the entire City experiences. Each tree-shaded acre will weaken the heat-trapping greenhouse effect at the source: removing 80 to 200 pounds of combined air pollutants, removing more than a ton of carbon and storing an additional 40 tons of carbon per acre, annually.</p> <p>All these factors strongly suggest that at least 90% of the Park Hill Golf Course should be retained as open space, as natural as possible, using native plants for any necessary revegetation. Well-planned development around the area's periphery can create opportunities for "buy-in" by adjacent neighborhoods that would support a sense of stewardship and conserve area resources.</p> <p>(1) The Allocation of Space in US Cities. www.geotab.com/urban-footprint/. July 9, 2019. (2) Rosenberg, Ken et al. 2019. Decline of the North American Avifauna. Science 366: 120-124, 4 October 2019. (3) The Park Hill Golf Course Technical Assessment cites average tree canopy of 24.6%, at p. 24.</p>

Park Hill Golf Course Visioning Process - Comment Log

<p>Email</p>	<p>Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison, David Martin, Sandrea Robnett</p>	<p>12/12/2021</p>	<p>We are members of the Park Hill Golf Course Steering Committee (SC), and we have met consistently since February 9, 2021, for eight Steering Committee meetings, two Open House sessions, one Community Workshop, and one Working Group. We also had to prepare for these meetings and were issued Study Materials in preparation for the meetings. Together, we have invested over 270 hours of our own time in hopes that our voices would be heard, that our opinions would be respected, and that our participation would be fairly and accurately represented in any official communications from the Community and Planning Department (CPD) of the City of Denver (the City). Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Visioning Process overall, nor the Summary that was published by CPD on its website. Specifically, we have the following issues with the Summary as published:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The composition of the 27-member SC is heavily weighted in favor of development. In fact, the “Visioning Process” of “public engagement” really amounts to a public relations campaign to push the developer’s agenda. Nevertheless, we have tried to advocate for open space as a tiny, five-member minority. 2. The City’s clear and proven bias in favor of Westside and its development plans has negatively impacted the entire process. 3. Those of us who participated in the entire process did not have an opportunity to review or comment on the final Vision Summary sent to us on November 8, after it was already posted on the CPD website. 4. Although there were two community Open House sessions, the community was not provided an opportunity to give public comment. The lack of public engagement in this process was problematic in general. CPD attempted to quiet those in the community whose visions differed from theirs and those of Westside by not allowing public comment at all during the SC meetings. But through our protest, CPD eventually allowed a mere 10 minutes after each SC meeting for public comment. The lack of public engagement seen in public -- not behind closed doors in what CPD referred to as community navigator sessions -- shows a lack of respect for the residents of Denver and further demonstrates a flawed visioning process full of bias and favoritism for the developer Westside. 5. The attorney-expert invited by the City of Denver to discuss conservation easements clearly explained that the fundamental purpose of a conservation easement is to perpetually preserve and protect the land’s conservation values. Unsurprisingly, CPD continued the visioning process with predominantly pro-development narratives. As well, CPD and the City of Denver did not address whether it is “impossible” per Colorado statute, due to changed conditions on or surrounding the PHGC land, to continue fulfilling the easement’s open space and recreational conservation purposes. 6. There has never been serious discussion on the SC of the value of 155 acres of open, green, park space to urban life. Its role in cleaning our air, water, and soil; restoring natural habitat; cooling the planet; offering residents access to nature and healthy respite from the stresses of modern, urban life; have never been considerations of the SC. The developer’s agenda and interests have always dominated and guided the discussions.
<p>Email</p>	<p>Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison, David Martin, Sandrea Robnett (comment cont. from above)</p>	<p>12/12/2021 (cont.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The SC has never considered the future development that will inevitably occur near the 40th/Colorado RTD station, and its TOD possibilities; nor near 38th/Holly; nor land surrounding PHGC. There will be a huge increase in residents around PHGC: Why has the need for open space for all these new residents not been considered?8. We know there is affordable housing planned at 40th/Colorado and 38th/Holly. These planned affordable housing projects should be part of the SC discussions, but never have been. 9. There are many more severe flaws in this process and the Summary that are too numerous to detail here. <p>We are citizen-representatives volunteering our time to be on this SC because we care passionately about our neighborhoods and this great City. We are deeply concerned about the way this process has unfolded, and the misleading and false representations made by CPD in the Summary. Furthermore, it is apparent that CPD is doing the bidding of the developer, Westside, and consciously ignoring, sidelining, and dividing residents surrounding PHGC, and residents of the City of Denver as a whole. This is evidenced by the recent election results for Initiatives 301 and 302, where Denver voters clearly stated their concern about developing existing open space with a conservation easement. And yet, it seems the City and Westside are doubling down to push their development plans, ignoring the lessons from November 2. Sadly, the Summary in its current form furthers their agenda. It is our sincere hope that CPD and the City administration will respect and fairly represent our voices in this important discussion about the future of this vital area of Denver. We insist that our comments here be included in official City documents for this project, including posting on the City’s web page for this project. These comments must be part of the official record and documentation for this project. Thank you for your consideration, Drew Dutcher, Rachel Coates, Shanta Harrison David Martin, Sandrea Robnett</p>