

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER
201 West Colfax Avenue, Department 201
Denver CO, 80202**

PREMISES AFFECTED: 2980 South Wabash Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 8, Block 2, Point South Filing #1
APPLICANT(S) Dwight & Susan Lawson, 2980 South Wabash Street, Denver, CO 80231
APPEARANCES:
APPLICANT: Dwight & Susan Lawson, 2980 South Wabash Street, Denver, CO 80231
Two (2) Signatures of Support
OPPOSITION: Macy Conant, City Council District 4 Aide
Eleven (11) Letters of Opposition
FOR THE CITY: Alek Miller, Zoning Representative
Chad Scott, Zoning Representative

SUBJECT:
Appeal for Review of an Administrative Decision denying a Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) for the keeping of household animals (7 dogs requested, 3 dogs permitted); and / or a request for a Delay of Enforcement (up to 6 months) to maintain 7 dogs (3 dogs permitted), in an S-SU-D zone district

ACTION OF THE BOARD:
The request for Review of an Administrative Decision is DENIED. The Board finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence to show that the Zoning Administrator erred in the decision to deny the Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) for the keeping of household animals (7 dogs requested, 3 dogs permitted). The action of the Zoning Administrator is thus upheld.

A 120 DAY DELAY OF ENFORCEMENT IS GRANTED FROM THE DATE OF THE HEARING UNTIL JUNE 10, 2026, under Section 12.4.16 of the Zoning Code to allow the Applicants to comply with the order. NOTE: If this time period is not adequate even with reasonable efforts, a second Delay of Enforcement may be requested by filing a second application with the Board of Adjustment before the June 10, 2026, deadline. Questions regarding a second application may be addressed to Austin Keithler, 720-913-3050, at the Board's office.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Ignacio Correa-Ortiz, Chair

Phillip Williams

Phillip Williams, Deputy Director

THIS ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT IS NOT AN APPROVAL TO PROCEED WITH DEVELOPMENT. PLEASE CONTACT YOUR ASSIGNED REVIEWER WITH CPD TO COMPLETE AND FINALIZE YOUR ZONING PERMIT OR ZONE LOT AMENDMENT APPLICATION. CONSTRUCTION OR ANY OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY IS PROHIBITED ON THE SUBJECT REAL PROPERTY UNTIL YOU COMPLETE ALL ZONING AND PERMIT APPROVAL PROCESSES.

IN THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR ZONING APPEALS OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER
FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

FEBRUARY 17, 2026

CASE NO. 71-2025

PREMISES: 2980 SOUTH WABASH STREET. (Lot 8, Block 2, Point South Filing #1.)

APPELLANT(S): DWIGHT & SUSAN LAWSON, 2980 South Wabash Street, Denver, CO 80231.

SUBJECT: Appeal for Review of an Administrative Decision denying a Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) for the keeping of household animals (7 dogs requested, 3 dogs permitted); and / or a request for a Delay of Enforcement (up to 6 months) to maintain 7 dogs (3 dogs permitted), in an S-SU-D zone district

NOTICE OF HEARING: Premises posted. Public notice given in accordance with Section 2-35(2) and 12-96 of the Revised Municipal Code.

APPEARANCES:

Appellant: Dwight & Susan Lawson, 2980 South Wabash Street, Denver, CO 80231
Two (2) Signatures of Support

Opposition: Macy Conant, City Council District 4 Aide
Eleven (11) Letters of Opposition

For The City: Alek Miller, Zoning Representative
Chad Scott, Zoning Representative

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The appeal was timely filed December 22, 2025, from a Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) Determination dated November 24, 2025. The appeal was heard by the Board on February 10, 2026, at which time it was denied, but a Delay of Enforcement was granted. Final Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were adopted by the Board on February 17, 2026.

2. The Appellants ask for a review of an administrative decision of the Zoning Administrator (ZA) of Community Planning and Development (CPD), to deny a ZPIN for the keeping of household animals for 7 dogs where Code allows 3 dogs by right. They believe that the ZPIN was denied in error for the following reasons:

A. The subject property is a 1966, single story residence, located in the Hampden neighborhood. The Applicants are long term residents in the neighborhood, having lived there since the early 1990's. The Applicants believe that their current issue in front of the Board began toward the end of 2022. At this time, they began a major remodel project of their home. When they began the remodel project, they moved out of the house and into an RV which was parked in front of their home. They had two dogs at the time, and the two dogs were staying with them in the RV. The two dogs got together and had puppies, which the Applicants had not expected. When the mother dog had finished weaning the litter they took her to the vet to get her spayed. The vet said that she was in heat and advised the Applicants to wait until she was out of heat to get her spayed. The Applicants took this advice and tried to keep the dogs separate until they

could get her spayed. Unfortunately, this was unsuccessful. She got pregnant again and had another litter of puppies. After the second litter, they had a total of 11 dogs. After the mother weaned the second litter, in 2023 the Applicants took her and her one female puppy to the vet to have them both spayed. In January of 2025 they took all the male puppies to the vet to have them neutered. With the exception of their 17-year-old Maltese, who is nearing the end of his life, all of the dogs on the property have been spayed or neutered. The Applicants had no intention of ending up with so many dogs and they have been trying to figure out what to do with them. They have reached out to friends and family, and they have managed to rehome 4 of the dogs, leaving them with 7 dogs. Although they did not intend to have so many animals, after having them all for two to two and a half years, they have become family and now they wish to keep the remaining dogs. The Denver Zoning Code (DZC) limits the number of dogs that can be kept accessory to a primary dwelling unit use to no more than 3 dogs maximum. However, there is also a provision that allows the Zoning Administrator to allow the keeping of animals of a number larger than permitted by right through a Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN). The Applicants applied for a ZPIN to keep the 7 dogs on the property on May 25, 2025. They held a Pre-Application meeting with CPD staff on September 22, 2025. On November 24, 2025, CPD issued a ZPIN Determination denying the Applicants request for the additional animals. The Applicants believe that the ZPIN was denied in error and they ask the Board to overturn the determination of the city staff. (Testimony of Susan Lawson. See also Exhibit 1 – ZPIN Determination, Exhibit 5 – Appeal Application, and Exhibit 6 – Zoning Permit Variance Letter 9/8/25.)

- B. The Applicants believe that there has been a substantial amount of misinformation submitted to CPD for their consideration. They believe that the Denver Animal Protection's (DAP) statements about the history of complaints and the history of noncompliance are misleading and false. They also believe that the complaints from the neighbors are greatly exaggerated and that they are to some extent for concerns aside from the animals. This incorrect information gives a false impression of the Applicants which they believe contributed to CPD incorrectly denying the ZPIN.

The Applicants initially received a door tag from DAP in August of 2023. They contacted the inspector shortly thereafter and spoke with him about the situation. The inspector was concerned about the welfare of the animals in the RV and wanted to be sure that they were safe and kept in good conditions. The Applicants assured him that they were kept cool with air conditioning, and that they were kept safe and healthy. There was also some discussion over the number of animals at this point. The Applicants informed DAP that they were looking into relinquishing some of the animals to friends and family if they could. No specific requirement or timeline to reduce the number of animals was discussed with DAP at that time. The Applicants did not hear back from DAP until they received a citation on April 8, 2025, when they were moving back into the house. After this citation, the Applicants began the process of applying for a variance for the additional animals. They would have done so sooner, but they were unaware of the process until that time. They pursued the variance as soon as they knew it was an option. DAP submitted a letter opposing the ZPIN, and they have cited a history of noncompliance as part of their opposition to the request. The Applicants do not believe there is any evidence to support this claim. They also claim that there is a history of complaints extending back to 2005 and maybe earlier, but DAP has not been able to provide any information to support this history. The Applicants do not believe that DAP has accurately described the history of complaints on the property and that this false information has led CPD to incorrectly deny their ZPIN.

Regarding the complaints from the neighbors, the Applicants believe that a large part of the

concern is a general sense of annoyance rather than legitimate concerns about the dogs. The Applicants moved into the trailer while they began their construction project. This was allowed and permitted by the city, but the neighbors have not liked the Applicants living in the RV. The Applicants did not anticipate staying in the trailer for as long as they did, or for the number of dogs kept in the trailer to increase as it did. The Applicants found that many of the complaints submitted to 311 between 2023 and 2025 related to them living in the RV or related to construction and debris. Those complaints related to the dogs were either duplicative or false complaints. Some neighbors complained about animal abuse, which was found to be entirely unfounded. There were also complaints about the number of dogs. While the Applicants did have dogs beyond what was allowed by the zoning code, they were not informed that they needed to reduce the number with any specific timeframe. They successfully rehomed several of the dogs to friends and family but could not find new homes for all of the puppies. Since DAP did not inform them that it was an immediately pressing issue, they did not know it needed to happen in any specific timeframe. 311 did receive some complaints regarding excessive barking of animals during this time. The Applicants note that most of the complaints were repeated calls from two neighbors. The Applicants believe that at this point the neighbors were upset with the construction project and the RV and that many of the calls were from a sense of general frustration. They also note that these two neighbors are friends, and that their relationship with the Applicants has been very strained over the years. The Applicants believe that these neighbors have a general sense of animosity toward them, and that this animosity has led to the complaints more than the actual presence of the dogs. (Testimony of Susan Lawson. See also Exhibit 1 – ZPIN Determination, Exhibit 5 – Appeal Application, Exhibit 6 – Zoning Permit Variance Letter 9/8/25, Exhibit 8 - Appeal Documents 1/19/26, and Exhibit 14 – Applicants’ Rebuttal.)

C. The remodel project dragged on much longer than the Applicants anticipated, but it eventually concluded in April of 2025. At that point the Applicants were able to move out of the RV and back into the home. Since they have moved back into their home, the Applicants have actively taken many steps to work through the issues with the city and the concerns of the neighbors. They have reduced the number of animals kept at the property from 11 down to the current 7. Because they had heard significant concerns from the neighbors, they reached out to a Mediation Company to help them address the neighborhood issues. The Applicants contacted Find Solutions mediation group in April of 2025. It took some time to get the neighbors together but a meeting took place with two neighbors and the mediation group on October 6, 2025. An agreement was made after this meeting which was intended to ensure that external impacts from the animals were sufficiently mitigated. One neighbor and the Applicants signed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), but the other neighbor did not. The Applicants also submitted a Mitigation Plan to CPD staff as part of their information provided in the ZPIN process. The Mitigation Plan outlines the plans the Applicants have in place to address the barking dog nuisance concerns from the animals, the concerns about dog waste, breeding, safety, noncompliance, and animal welfare. The Applicants believe that the Mitigation Plan will allow them to maintain the 7 dogs on the property with no more external impacts to neighbors than if they had only 3 dogs. The Applicants believe that they have proceeded in good faith and that the proposals they have made will ensure that any adverse impacts from the animals will not cause harm to the neighbors. (Testimony of Susan Lawson. See also Exhibit 1 – ZPIN Determination, Exhibit 5 – Appeal Application, Exhibit 6 – Zoning Permit Variance Letter 9/8/25, Exhibit 7 – Mitigation Letter, Exhibit 8 - Appeal Documents 1/19/26, Exhibit 9 – MOU Agreement, and Exhibit 14 – Applicants’ Rebuttal.)

3. The ZA’s staff (or “CPD”) believes that no errors were made in the decision to deny the ZPIN for the keeping of household animals for 7 dogs where Code allows 3 dogs by right, for the following reasons:

A. CPD notes that the appeal concerns their decision to deny a ZPIN for a total of 7 animals, which is 4 more than the DZC generally allows. The Keeping of Household Animals is listed under Section 11.8.5 in the DZC. This section limits the keeping of domestic or household animals as accessory to a primary dwelling unit use. It also states that the ZA may allow the accessory keeping of animals of a type or number other than what is listed in the Code upon a finding that the use complies with Section 11.7.1, General Provisions Applicable to All Accessory Uses, and with the limitations listed in 11.8.5.1.B, 1 through 5:

B. Animals Permitted With a Zoning Permit

The Zoning Administrator may allow the accessory keeping of animals of a type or number other than permitted in Section 11.8.5.1.A above, upon finding that the use complies with Section 11.7.1, General Provisions Applicable to All Accessory Uses, and subject to the following limitations:

1. Section 12.4.2, Zoning Permit Review with Informational Notice, is required.
2. The Zoning Administrator may not approve the keeping of animals otherwise prohibited by federal, state, or other city law.
3. The animal shall be kept solely as a pet; a hobby; for educational research, rehabilitation or propagation purposes; or for the production of food products for personal consumption by the resident.
4. Slaughtering of animals as part of keeping such animals is prohibited.
5. No structure used to house the animals may be closer than 15 feet to: (1) a structure on an abutting zone lot containing a dwelling unit, and (2) a dwelling unit not the residence of the animal keeper(s) and located in a primary structure on the same zone lot.

CPD staff had no concerns regarding criteria 2 through 5. Section 11.8.5.1.B.1 states that a Zoning Permit Review with Informational Notice is required. CPD finds that the process of applying for the ZPIN was sufficient and there were no procedural errors made during this process. The Applicants had an initial submittal of plans on April 23, 2025. They received a plan review notice back from CPD on June 2, 2025. They resubmitted on September 9, 2025. CPD held a Pre-Application meeting with the Applicants on September 23, 2025. The Informational Notice period began on September 29, 2025, and ran through October 29, 2025. CPD requested a mitigation plan from the Applicants on November 5, 2025, and received it on November 10, 2025. CPD completed their staff review and issued their findings on November 24, 2025, which denied the ZPIN for the additional dogs. The notice of the determination was posted on November 28, 2025, with an appeal period running through December 28, 2025. The appeal was filed with the Board on December 18, 2025. CPD notes that the process and timeline follow the requirements of the Code and there are no concerns raised by the Applicants or CPD on the process.

There are three criteria for CPD staff to consider when deciding whether to approve or deny a ZPIN. These criteria are found in Section 12.4.2.5:

12.4.2.5. Review Criteria

The Zoning Administrator shall consider all public comment and the following criteria in making a decision on an application for zoning permit with information notice review:

- A. The zoning permit is consistent with all prior approvals that are regulatory and controlling for the subject property, as applicable. For example, all zoning permits shall be consistent with a previously approved Large Development Framework,

Infrastructure Master Plan, General Development Plan, Regulating Plan, or Site Development Plan.

- B. The zoning permit complies with all applicable regulations in this Code.
- C. The proposal will not substantially or permanently injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties, taking into consideration all proposals for mitigation of such impacts.

CPD staff were able to find that criteria A and B were met, but they were unable to find criterion C to be met. For this reason, they denied the ZPIN. The appeal ultimately comes down to whether the Applicants can demonstrate that CPD incorrectly determined that Section 12.4.2.5. C was not met in denying the ZPIN. (Testimony of Alek Miller. Testimony of Chad Scott. See also Exhibit 1 – ZPIN Determination, Exhibit 11 – CPD Staff Report, and Exhibit 13 – CPD Presentation.)

- B. When considering all the evidence submitted at the time of their decision, CPD was unable to find that the proposed use would not substantially or permanently injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties. CPD took into account materials provided by the Applicants, comments provided by the neighbors, and information provided by Denver Animal Protection (DAP). Section 12.4.2.4.E.1 states that the ZA may refer ZPIN applications to other interested agencies for review and comment as deemed necessary. Because the ZPIN concerned the keeping of animals, the ZA referred the application to DAP to solicit their feedback. DAP noted that they had received complaints about this property all the way back to 2005 and possibly earlier. DAP had received 12 complaints since June 11, 2024. These complaints had come from multiple neighbors in the surrounding area. The complaints ranged from neglectful ownership to the number of animals, to barking. DAP also noted that there had been repeated warnings to comply with the allowed number of animals on the property. The Applicants had not complied with the warnings and DAP had issued a criminal summons. DAP issues very few criminal summons in any given year. This was one of only two criminal summons issued to pet owners in Denver in 2025. Given the history of noncompliance, the complaints from neighbors, and the issuance of the criminal summons, DAP submitted a letter opposing the keeping of the additional animals.

The ZPIN process calls for a public comment period. An email notice was sent out to local Registered Neighborhood Organizations and the City Councilperson for the district. A notice sign was also placed on the property to provide notice for neighbors. The comment period ran from September 29, 2025, through October 29, 2025. During this period, staff received 3 comments in favor of the request and 16 comments in opposition to the request. One of the comments in opposition to the request came from City Councilmember Diana Romero Campbell. Over half of the comments in opposition were received from residents on the same or adjacent face blocks. 10 of the comments received raised concerns about a barking dog nuisance. 7 of the comments were concerned about the disposition of excrement. These were the two primary concerns which CPD found would impact the adjacent residences. CPD notes that they also received comments which did not fall into the scope of their review criteria. Some examples of this are the 5 concerns regarding noncompliance, 4 for animal and neighborhood safety, 3 related to breeding, and 5 related to setting a precedent. After the comment period, CPD contacted the Applicants to seek a Mitigation Plan to address some of the neighborhood concerns. CPD requested the Mitigation Plan on November 5, 2025, and they received it on November 10, 2025. The Mitigation Plan included information on the use of vibration collars, interior gates, window coverings, cameras, and privacy trees to mitigate the barking nuisance. The Applicants also proposed to only allow the dogs out when they could be supervised. The Applicants proposed a regular pick-up schedule for animal waste in the yard.

CPD and the Applicants both noted that many of the complaints stemmed from a time when the animals were living in the RV rather than the house. With the animals now moved into the house, the Applicants believed that many of the concerns would no longer be an issue, and that their proposed Mitigation Plan would further reduce these concerns. Regarding animal and neighborhood safety, the Applicants provided information about interior and exterior containment measures to ensure the animals could not escape. The Applicants also provided spay and neuter records to show that continued breeding would not be an issue.

Although the Applicants provided a responsive Mitigation Plan, CPD was unable to find that allowing the 7 animals to remain in the house would not impact adjacent properties. There had been a documented history of complaints from nearby property owners who had been impacted and who believed they would continue to be impacted if the ZPIN were approved. The ZPIN application had been referred to DAP for their feedback, and they had submitted their opposition to the request. Given the significant opposition submitted by DAP, the City Councilwoman for the district, and by the Applicants' neighbors, CPD was unable to find that approving the ZPIN would not substantially impact the adjacent property owners. CPD was thus unable to find Section 12.4.2.5.C DZC to be met and denied the Applicants' ZPIN. (Testimony of Alek Miller. Testimony of Chad Scott. See also Exhibit 11 – CPD Staff Report, Exhibit 12 – CPD Administrative Record, and Exhibit 13 – CPD Presentation.)

- C. CPD notes that the Applicants raised a concern that there had been duplicate complaints submitted which made the opposition seem larger than it actually was. CPD agrees to a minor extent that there were some duplicate comments submitted during the 30-day notice period. CPD received 16 comments in opposition to the ZPIN during this period. They have prepared a diagram of the surrounding neighborhood showing the addresses where they received comments, and there are only 12 houses identified. CPD notes that they received some comments without addresses listed and some where multiple people at the same address submitted individual responses rather than a single response for the household. There was also a letter of opposition submitted by the City Councilmember for the district. While there were some duplicate addresses included in the responses, there is still a significant showing of opposition from the surrounding neighborhood. To the extent that the Applicants concerns about duplicate complaints were related to the DAP comments, CPD accepted the position letter of DAP but did not examine their records. However, CPD notes that with the significant opposition they received during their comment period and the significant opposition submitted to the Board related to the appeal, that it appears there is real and ongoing concern over the dogs from the neighborhood. Although the information submitted to the Board was after CPD's decision to deny the ZPIN, and thus was not taken into account when making their decision to deny the request, this evidence contradicts the Applicants assertion that there are no ongoing concerns related to the animals at the property. (Testimony of Alek Miller. See also Exhibit 12 – CPD Administrative Record, and Exhibit 15 – Letters of Opposition.)

4. The Board noted that the DZC required the submittal of Clear and Convincing evidence to show that CPD had erred in their decision making process. The Board also noted that they were not the initial body to consider a request to allow additional animals to remain on the property but rather that they were reviewing a prior decision from CPD. The Board's role in the case was solely to review the previous decision of CPD staff. This position left the Board with a high bar to approve the appeal and little discretion to come to a reasonable alternative solution.

The Board noted that in the comments submitted to CPD during the notice period for the ZPIN and in the comments submitted to the Board for this hearing, some comments seemed to objectively address the issues that arise from having a large number of dogs while others crossed a line to be personally disparaging to

the Applicants. For the comments received during the ZPIN notice period, CPD noted that some responses spoke to their review criteria while others did not. The Board similarly found some of the comments to be informative as to the issues involved and other comments to stray from the relevant issues into more personal attacks. It was clear that tensions in the neighborhood had risen but the Board found the personal attacks to be unnecessary and unhelpful with the process.

The Board considered what information CPD staff had in hand when considering whether to approve or deny the ZPIN for the additional dogs. During the notice period, CPD had received 16 comments in opposition to the request and 3 comments in favor of the request. Of the 16 comments received, 10 comments referred to concerns about excessive barking. These comments noted that the issue had been going on for years and that they did not believe that it would be resolved if the Applicants maintained that number of dogs. CPD had also reached out to DAP to solicit their input. While CPD was not obligated to agree with DAP, their input was relevant given that they are the subject matter experts on animal keeping. With DAP submitting a letter opposing the request, and with five times as many letters from neighbors opposing the request than supporting it, the Board is unable to find Clear and Convincing evidence to show that CPD erred in their decision to deny the ZPIN. Absent Clear and Convincing evidence to show that CPD had erred, the Board found it appropriate to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of CPD staff.

As a secondary request, the Applicants asked the Board for additional time to come into compliance with the 3 dog limit permitted by Code. The Applicants asked the Board for as much time as possible, as they wanted to ensure that the animals went to a good home. CPD asked the Board to deny any additional time, or if any additional time were granted to keep it to a smaller duration like 60 days. CPD believed that the issue had dragged on long enough and they wanted to ensure that compliance with the Code occurred swiftly.

The Board noted that although the issues had been ongoing for an extended period of time, that the Applicants would need some time to find alternative homes for the additional animals. Initially the Applicants were seeking out friends and family for homes for some of the animals. While the Board can appreciate the desire to keep the animals around with people they see often, this does significantly limit the pool of interested owners. Hopefully by expanding the pool of interested owners to the public at large, the Applicants will be able to find appropriate homes for the animals. The Board thus found a compromise of somewhere between the 6 months the Applicants requested and the 60 days CPD suggested to be appropriate. The Board thus settled on 120 days as an appropriate delay, with Mr. Correa-Ortiz voting against the motion as he believed the full 6-month delay to be appropriate.

CONCLUSION: The Board concludes that the Zoning Administrator did not err in the decision to deny the Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) for the keeping of household animals. The Board thus denied the request and upheld the decision of the Zoning Administrator. The Board concludes that the conditions set forth in Section 12.4.16 of the Denver Zoning Code do exist, and a Delay of Enforcement is in order.

MOTION #1: The motion by Mr. Haywood to deny the request for the review of an administrative decision and uphold the Zoning Administrator in this matter was seconded by Mr. Rice and was adopted.

VOTE #1: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

MOTION #2: The motion by Mr. Haywood to grant a delay of enforcement was seconded by Mr. Bergeron and was adopted.

VOTE #2: FOR: 4 (Haywood, Rice, DeVuyst, Bergeron) AGAINST: 1 (Correa-Ortiz)

ACTION OF THE BOARD: The request for Review of an Administrative Decision is DENIED. The Board finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence to show that the Zoning Administrator erred in the decision to deny the Zoning Permit with Informational Notice (ZPIN) for the keeping of household animals (7 dogs requested, 3 dogs permitted). The action of the Zoning Administrator is thus upheld.

A 120 DAY DELAY OF ENFORCEMENT IS GRANTED FROM THE DATE OF THE HEARING UNTIL JUNE 10, 2026, under Section 12.4.16 of the Zoning Code to allow the Applicants to comply with the order.
NOTE: If this time period is not adequate even with reasonable efforts, a second Delay of Enforcement may be requested by filing a second application with the Board of Adjustment before the June 10, 2026, deadline. Questions regarding a second application may be addressed to Austin Keithler, 720-913-3050, at the Board's office.