

# Meeting Transcripts: DenverCityCouncil

## Summary Information

**Organization:** DenverCityCouncil

**Number of Meetings:** 113

**Date Range:** 2014-01-13 to 2022-07-18

## Included Meetings:

Meeting ID	Date
DenverCityCouncil_01132014	2014-01-13
DenverCityCouncil_03102014	2014-03-10
DenverCityCouncil_03242014	2014-03-24
DenverCityCouncil_04072014	2014-04-07
DenverCityCouncil_05192014	2014-05-19
DenverCityCouncil_07142014	2014-07-14
DenverCityCouncil_10272014	2014-10-27
DenverCityCouncil_11172014	2014-11-17
DenverCityCouncil_12082014	2014-12-08
DenverCityCouncil_12152014	2014-12-15
DenverCityCouncil_01052015	2015-01-05
DenverCityCouncil_01122015	2015-01-12
DenverCityCouncil_02232015	2015-02-23
DenverCityCouncil_03022015	2015-03-02
DenverCityCouncil_03162015	2015-03-16
DenverCityCouncil_04132015	2015-04-13
DenverCityCouncil_08312015	2015-08-31
DenverCityCouncil_10052015	2015-10-05
DenverCityCouncil_10262015	2015-10-26
DenverCityCouncil_02012016	2016-02-01
DenverCityCouncil_02292016	2016-02-29
DenverCityCouncil_03292016	2016-03-29
DenverCityCouncil_05092016	2016-05-09

DenverCityCouncil_05312016	2016-05-31
DenverCityCouncil_06202016	2016-06-20
DenverCityCouncil_07252016	2016-07-25
DenverCityCouncil_08292016	2016-08-29
DenverCityCouncil_09262016	2016-09-26
DenverCityCouncil_11212016	2016-11-21
DenverCityCouncil_11282016	2016-11-28
DenverCityCouncil_12192016	2016-12-19
DenverCityCouncil_01032017	2017-01-03
DenverCityCouncil_01092017	2017-01-09
DenverCityCouncil_01172017	2017-01-17
DenverCityCouncil_01302017	2017-01-30
DenverCityCouncil_03202017	2017-03-20
DenverCityCouncil_04242017	2017-04-24
DenverCityCouncil_06262017	2017-06-26
DenverCityCouncil_07312017	2017-07-31
DenverCityCouncil_08072017	2017-08-07
DenverCityCouncil_08142017	2017-08-14
DenverCityCouncil_08212017	2017-08-21
DenverCityCouncil_09112017	2017-09-11
DenverCityCouncil_09182017	2017-09-18
DenverCityCouncil_10232017	2017-10-23
DenverCityCouncil_10302017	2017-10-30
DenverCityCouncil_11132017	2017-11-13
DenverCityCouncil_12182017	2017-12-18
DenverCityCouncil_01082018	2018-01-08
DenverCityCouncil_01292018	2018-01-29
DenverCityCouncil_02122018	2018-02-12
DenverCityCouncil_03052018	2018-03-05
DenverCityCouncil_03122018	2018-03-12
DenverCityCouncil_03192018	2018-03-19
DenverCityCouncil_04092018	2018-04-09
DenverCityCouncil_04232018	2018-04-23
DenverCityCouncil_05212018	2018-05-21
DenverCityCouncil_07092018	2018-07-09
DenverCityCouncil_07162018	2018-07-16
DenverCityCouncil_10012018	2018-10-01
DenverCityCouncil_10082018	2018-10-08

DenverCityCouncil_10292018	2018-10-29
DenverCityCouncil_12172018	2018-12-17
DenverCityCouncil_01072019	2019-01-07
DenverCityCouncil_02042019	2019-02-04
DenverCityCouncil_02112019	2019-02-11
DenverCityCouncil_04012019	2019-04-01
DenverCityCouncil_04222019	2019-04-22
DenverCityCouncil_05132019	2019-05-13
DenverCityCouncil_06242019	2019-06-24
DenverCityCouncil_07082019	2019-07-08
DenverCityCouncil_08052019	2019-08-05
DenverCityCouncil_09092019	2019-09-09
DenverCityCouncil_11252019	2019-11-25
DenverCityCouncil_12232019	2019-12-23
DenverCityCouncil_01272020	2020-01-27
DenverCityCouncil_02102020	2020-02-10
DenverCityCouncil_02182020	2020-02-18
DenverCityCouncil_03162020	2020-03-16
DenverCityCouncil_04202020	2020-04-20
DenverCityCouncil_05112020	2020-05-11
DenverCityCouncil_08032020	2020-08-03
DenverCityCouncil_08102020	2020-08-10
DenverCityCouncil_10122020	2020-10-12
DenverCityCouncil_11022020	2020-11-02
DenverCityCouncil_11232020	2020-11-23
DenverCityCouncil_11302020	2020-11-30
DenverCityCouncil_01192021	2021-01-19
DenverCityCouncil_02012021	2021-02-01
DenverCityCouncil_02082021	2021-02-08
DenverCityCouncil_04052021	2021-04-05
DenverCityCouncil_05102021	2021-05-10
DenverCityCouncil_05172021	2021-05-17
DenverCityCouncil_06142021	2021-06-14
DenverCityCouncil_07122021	2021-07-12
DenverCityCouncil_08232021	2021-08-23
DenverCityCouncil_08302021	2021-08-30
DenverCityCouncil_09202021	2021-09-20
DenverCityCouncil_09272021	2021-09-27

DenverCityCouncil_10042021	2021-10-04
DenverCityCouncil_10112021	2021-10-11
DenverCityCouncil_10252021	2021-10-25
DenverCityCouncil_11012021	2021-11-01
DenverCityCouncil_11222021	2021-11-22
DenverCityCouncil_01102022	2022-01-10
DenverCityCouncil_03212022	2022-03-21
DenverCityCouncil_04112022	2022-04-11
DenverCityCouncil_04182022	2022-04-18
DenverCityCouncil_05092022	2022-05-09
DenverCityCouncil_05232022	2022-05-23
DenverCityCouncil_06062022	2022-06-06
DenverCityCouncil_06272022	2022-06-27
DenverCityCouncil_07182022	2022-07-18

## **Consolidated Transcript (All Meetings)**

12 eyes. 12 eyes. The bill is has passed. Now we come to our last public hearing. And Councilman Herndon, will you please put Council Bill 950 on the floor for final passage? Yes, Madam President. I move the council to a95 will be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. I will open the public hearing and ask for the staff report. I'm back. David is with community planning development here, this time with 61st and tenure. A stationary plan up for adoption. Tonight, just to give everybody a little context of where we're at and why we're doing a stationary plan out in the gateway. The East commuter rail line is scheduled to open up in early 2016, and the initial environmental document that RTD produced did not include a gateway station. Since that time, the city negotiated with RTD to return one of the gateway stations that were initially, you know, conceived back into an environmental document with that idea, released a request for proposals for an aviation station in the Gateway in 2012, and the 61st pumping station advanced as the station of choice. This is in the east corridor. Mayor likes to call it the quarter of opportunity. So a quarter that has an opportunity to connect a lot of existing neighborhoods and future residential and job opportunities with existing job centers connecting downtown in Union Station with DIA and also the Anschutz Medical Campus is just one stop away in the 2025 line out of our existing plan, say about 60% Panya Generally speaking, they really don't acknowledge a station area or a rail station at 60 versus Panya, so there's not a lot of plan support for the type of two D development, a transit oriented element that we'd like to see at this location. The planning process with the station area plan is been parallel track almost with a general development plan that will be approved hopefully in the near term here in 2014. And then later this year, an official zone map amendment will come back in front of council to rezone this property. The plan concepts that are present to you tonight have. Detailed input from the four major property owners within the station area, as well as input and review from multiple city departments. We did have a joint city and RTD public meeting in July that was well attended out of the Green Valley Ranch Rec Center, as well as an additional public meeting this November. The location here is bordered on the west by Panther Boulevard, north of Future 64th Avenue East, the existing Tower Road, and to the South 56th Avenue . As you probably know, there's nothing really out there right now. And just to give you context, that 382 acres that are in the station area plan overlaid over downtown would really encapsulate the entire downtown area. So it's a very large area which will require multiple phases over a long period of time for for a full buildout. With all our stationary plans, where I always establish a vision and key principles and what we say here ab

out 60% Panya is that the station will serve as a vibrant, compact urban center for the regional aerotropolis. A world class, transit oriented community catalyzes development and connects people. And four key ideas that we take out of that vision statement is that it's going to be a transit community, which is something that Rocky has been pushing as a term that we're gradually graduating to, that it will be well connected, it will be a vibrant, compact, urban place, and that will be catalyzing development, sustainable development in the Gateway area. That strategy framework, we take those four key ideas and do our plan recommendations based off of those categories. I'll run through those relatively quickly in the transit community section. We focus on the next few uses. The big idea here is that the Transit Orange development is near the station. It's the most intense development pattern and inside the the Telluride Loop, which is this new arterial that will go into place to the east of Telluride, is two mixed use areas, one focused on employment to the north, one focus on residential to the south , and then along tower and 56, a little more arrow oriented land uses with the commercial corridor in a town center. In combination, we have recommendations on the scale of development. Again, we're focusing on the taller buildings with higher densities near the station. The purple in the map you see there is up to 12 stories in heights. The light blue is eight and the yellow farther away from the station is five. This Building Heights map promotes a very building height throughout the station, trying to focus on the view corridors and and a good scale for development throughout the entire area . We have recommendations to preserve those front range views through the open space corridors and key rights of way and as well as recommendations on the transitioning from those higher density areas closer to the station to the lower density, more residential areas further away. Our connected section focuses on the mobility

aspects of the plan as a sort of blueprint a Denver Street classification map. I'll run through a few street cross sections after this, but the two key ideas here again to look at is Telluride, which would be a new arterial street that would cut through the stationary north to south and have this larger loop. This is a concept that the stakeholders in their proposal presented as a way to increase the pedestrian oriented area of the TOD. Moving a busy arterial farther away from the rail station itself. And then the Key Street here is a local main street aviation place, which is almost like a festival street for the community. That's what's illustrated right here, actually. See, there's two lanes of traffic, but on three parking, very wide, generous pedestrian zones. Three trees to two blocks to reach that connects the transit station to an urban park and could function as a place for community gathering and the like. Telluride Th

e major, major arterial, has a very wide 50 foot green space in the middle kind of a park parkway type design also allows a necessary gas pipeline to cut through that area. We have mixed use collector 62 avenue here shows the bike lanes on 60th as well as Salinas and other mixed use collector without the bike lanes again relatively local streets with wide pedestrian zones. We also have recommendations talking about how to connect. To the rest of the gateway and beyond. The key here is the regional bike connections. First Creek. The bottom left of the map. There's a major open space corridor that while the bike path which already is actually being designed and built and that connects down to Green Valley Ranch as well as the wildlife refuge, which is just to the west of Panama of the blue game. A drive to the north is another open space bike path as well as local on street bike facilities on Yampa in 60th. And also a facility that connects the two regional bike paths to the station running along the transit corridor. That's a key recommendation that we added at Ludy was a recommendation to really make sure that we're examining all future bicycle facility types. That facility, there could be a bike path or but it also could be a cycle track or other enhanced bicycle facility when it's developed. A parking management's. Another recommendation that we have focused on having a strategic approach to parking here will be critical. The station has kind of a unique situation of being a interline station for commuters that are wanting to reach downtown or other job centers, but also accommodate parking for people trying to get to DIA, as well as the phased development approach that is necessary to transition from surface parking to structure. So we'll be working with the stakeholders to figure out a parking plan here at the Transit Plaza, another key urban space right next to the transit station and is kind of the gateway to the station area. We have urban design recommendations, including active edges and building frontages. The active edges are red on this map and building frontages are the blue. I really focus on Aviation Place and Aviation Park. I also have recommendations on appropriate block sizes and implementing design standards and guidelines as we move forward with development and then our vibrant catalyze concepts . This map kind of show the Open Space Network. I've already mentioned First Creek as a major open space corridor as well as blue a draw from a neighborhood park perspective. There's a five acre neighborhood park just north of First Creek, as well as, I believe, about two acre parks embedded within the mixed use neighborhoods east of Telluride . The key urban open space is right in the center of the map. That's Aviation Park. And again, that's an opportunity for a community gathering place. You can see that at the bottom of the screen here. I think you could imagine it's similar to the open space at 49th Avenue Town Center. We have

a recommendation of three states excluding streetscapes. And finally, with the catalyze section, we do have recommendations on economic development. Speaking of how this is a kind of a jumpstart for our development in the kind of regional aerotropolis and setting the stage for this sustainable development pattern. And that's more pedestrian friendly, multi-modal in nature. We also have recommendations on the jobs and housing balance, the plans that are being done in isolation. And of course, there's other planning efforts along these corridor, including Dr. COGS Assist Corridor Initiative. So as development starts to occur here, we'll be working with the Stakeholders Development Team to make sure that we're trying to capitalize on existing partnerships with local, affordable housing advocates and providers to take advantage of those opportunities. Because I think they share the city's viewpoint that having a diverse mix of housing types is essential for this project to be a success. But that the planning board did see this in November. They did find that it was consistent with all of our adopt plans. There was an inclusive public process. I mentioned this through public meetings even. There's no one living here. We actually probably had over 50 people attend those meetings. The Wild Horse Ranch Condo

Association just east of Tower, they were very active in those meetings. And there's a long term view for the station area of the 20 year plan horizon. But since it's a pretty fluid development area that we'll be looking to review the plan before that and make sure it's still applicable. And our requested action tonight is that you consider adopting this point of supplement to the Denver Comprehensive Plan. Thank you very much. We have four people signed up to speak. I'm going to ask you to come up to the front pew, Dan Charamba, Rick Wells, bird bells and say coo. Please come up to the front pew and I'll call on Dan Paramo to to the podium. Madam President. Council members. I'm Dan Caramba, the managing director of Airport City Development at DIA. And I'm just here to affirm that DIA has been heavily involved in what the other three property owners in the creation of this plan. And we have worked very closely with community planning and development on it. We strongly support a plan. We look forward to the next steps, the general development plan and the zoning. And I think those concepts will be consistent with what you've seen here tonight, and we've enjoyed working with our fellow stakeholders on this. Thank you very much, Mr. Trevor. Rick Wells My name is Rick Wells. I'm here to be available to answer any questions by the council, if any come up that I can help with. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wells, for Bell's. Good timing. Third Bells 11 2517 Street, Denver, Colorado and Happy New Year. I am representing all the other landowners besides DIA and we have 382 acres and it's a pretty massive development, but we're excited about it. I want to say

that everyone's worked very hard on this and we spent a lot of time. It's hard to craft a plan from a wheat field, but the opportunity with the rail stop and DIA in the city picking us to have that rail stop has created this opportunity. We see this as a great plan. We think it'll be a great development. I think it will be a catalyst for the region. And we really believe that it will allow development to coalesce around this site and really become kind of a community center for out there. We've reached out to many of the surrounding neighborhood groups and the developments around. They're all excited about it and we're excited about it and we ask for your support. I would like to thank CPD for their vision and their tireless effort. There's a lot of moving pieces and a lot of things to consider, and they've been open throughout the process to all of our thoughts and they've done a great job. So thank you very much. And I'm available for questions. Thank you, Mr. Bell's Sekou. Sacred Black are action movement for self-defense representing poor. Working, poor homeless people. I'm reminded of the words of Frederick Douglass abolitionist, who said that the slave starts being the slave when he says no. And many times we become slave of old habits that are institutionalized in government, where it's more convenient to go along with the status quo in what appears to be good for the majority of the people, when in fact for those that are going to be adversely affected, are not considered. And so here we go, stamp this area plan being a part of a larger plan called the comprehensive plan for the city and county of Denver. With most of us sitting up here have never read page by page and have not even read this page plan page by page. We've given some kind of summary thing from the planning quote, and the devil's in the details. But I'm telling you, we read the plan and we read this plan, and you see that white only, white only because all of the people are going to build it. Those people are going to make the money off of it. Those are the people going to occupy the land. And do you remember last year when somebody came in here and created ten metropolitan districts on 300 acres out there? Maybe I'm just crazy, but it doesn't. Ain't this it? Now, here we go. Here comes the details. Step one. Step two. Step three. Step four. And now we go to segregated town all over again. In the 21st century. And we participated in it consciously because we refused to say no, no more. This is done. So tonight I ask you, in the spirit of Douglas Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, say, no, no. So we can get on with it, too, right? Liberation of the city. So it becomes a city for everybody. And not just a city for white only. And now white only for rich. White only. Thank you. Okay. That ends our speakers. Are there questions from council and. Oh, Councilwoman Ortega. I'm not sure who to direct this to, but I wanted to ask about. I understand

. You know what we're doing here. But I want to know what kind of conversations are going on with regard to affordable housing as one of the values that is being talked about for the development out here. And I understand that at one point we had one area where the LDA noise contour was, and that's been shifted a little bit and it will allow rental housing to exist. So can you speak to both of those points? The the existing overlay that is in place allows my multi-family up to 60 seconds but not north of 62nd and does not allow a single family north of 56 in this area. And that overlay still

exists. And the plan was written to be able to be an effective plan, whether that regulation stays in place or is changed at a future date with the land use and building heights concepts. So I think that might answer your second question. The first question about what I guess, what how does the plan speak to affordable housing? Correct. Is. I think twofold. You know, I think it tries to address affordable housing at this micro level in the station area. Speaking to the opportunities to work with local affordable housing providers, we have a unique opportunity here having writing a stationary plan with a development team that will be actively pursuing it to build out here, and we'll have opportunities to make those partnerships happen. And then also, I think from the macro level, we have to look at how that works within a citywide policy discussion about, you know, affordable housing throughout Denver. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman and Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega, for your question. I appreciated seeing this in there. And I also appreciate that this team has actually been willing to spend some time exploring different options and meeting with different experts. And so I do hope that that all comes to fruition. My question was actually a little bit broader, which is when we originally put out the RFP, when DIA put out the RFP, I appreciated that they took some input from council on thinking about connectivity to existing neighborhoods and which station, you know, might provide more of that. I was just curious whether any ideas emerged that anyone wants to share. I mean, we learned some lessons with the Stapleton project where, you know, I don't think that Northeast Park Health feels as connected to Stapleton as we would like. Quebec has turned out to be quite a barrier and just hasn't been as seamless of old and new. And it's kind of hard to refer to Green Valley Ranch as an old neighborhood, but in this case it will be the older the older cousin, if not the uncle, to this neighborhood. And so I was just curious if any ideas emerged that are in this plan to really have more connectivity between existing and new. And they may not be like written in stone, but just did that conversation go anywhere? I think there's two concepts, especially from a North-South perspective.

ve. One is the regional bike trail that's going to be actually happening on First Creek. So that's a real opportunity to actually have a real legitimate, very high ease of use, bicycle facility connecting Green Valley Ranch up to the station area as well and into the wildlife refuge and also Yampa or excuse me, Telluride as a mixed use arterial. So not just a commercial arterial that's just moving people through. But if we build Telluride the right way here in the station area, as it would then extend south and north for that network and particularly south. That could be a really great street that's, you know, serves multiple modes of transportation and it does connect to the high school that's in Green Valley Ranch. So I think from those two perspectives, we also have recommendations, you know, on Tower Road on and how that eventually gets built out and is done in a way that isn't a barrier in that the town center land use designation around 16/61 is kind of a gateway into the station area, can serve as a kind of a neighborhood center that everybody in the gateway can access. So thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennish. I see no other questions, so I'm going to close. One more. I just have one more. All right. And this is for the city attorney. David, can you just tell us? Whether all of the proposed uses that are on any portion of the desert land that makes up part of these 300 acres is in conformity with the idea. I might ask Dan to comment on this, but I it's my understanding that the only portion of what you've seen depicted on these maps as affected by the IGA is directly adjacent to where the platform is, where the transit stop would be. And there were special provisions made originally in 1988 along the transportation quarter there to have a greater diversity of land use from the get go. And Dan, would you confirm if that land is in the transportation corridor area or what your familiarity is with this issue? We've looked at the uses relative to the idea. And generally this land since is south of 72nd is relatively minor impacts from the. Generally speaking, all of the uses are consistent. We believe these entitlements are entirely consistent with the idea. And is that particularly because they are on one of the transit corridors? It's because it's addressed in the ACA. The transit corridor is addressed both the transit corridor and the land within the transit corridor that is south of 72nd Avenue, which is a very significant boundary within that agreement. Thank you very much. And if I could add, Madam President, the something else to be said about this is that most of what you see beyond the platform is all private property. And some of the land use restrictions that existed in the IJA were only on city property that's under the jurisdiction of the manager of aviation. So when we annexed this major portion of land from Adams County in 1988, it did include some pr

ivate properties that just are free to be developed. There were no lands in land use restrictions as applied to the private property portions of the annexation, as contrasted with the property that's owned and under the management of the manager of aviation. Okay. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Premiere. Thank you, Mr. Bradwell. I see no other questions. So now I will close the hearing and ask for comments. Councilman Herndon. Thank you, Madam President. As, as first said, one of the speakers, you know, it's difficult to create a station from a wheat field. And I would second that and even say it's difficult to create a station from a wheat field when you have multiple landowners and then you take into account what's important as a city. When we develop a station as well, and I have been a part of all these dialogs for a very long time since being elected. And I just want to commend you all. For. What this project that you are putting together and hearing the interest of councilmembers at the last land use meeting when there were some quiet concerns and questions about bike lanes. And I want to thank David and his team as well for incorporating incorporating as well, because we've taken a lot of time into putting together a product that I think fits everyone's needs. Very excited to see this begin to move forward. I think it was a great and the right decision to make in choosing this station first and looking forward to future stations being built, that one close to the air and also preserving those view, those beautiful views that we have on the mountain, on the far northeast. And it was a great community input that was received during this. So I'm very supportive of this and certainly hope that my colleagues will support it as well. Thank you, Councilman Herndon and Councilman Shep Shepherd. Thank you, Madam President. I promised further I would have a robust dialog going on on bike issues, so I don't want to disappoint you, for know. So when this item came to committee, we had a pretty robust discussion over two sessions regarding the whole bike lanes and potentially protected bike lanes, usage of the site and council. President Susman and I were quite adamant at the time that if we were, you know, creating this community from scratch, you know, and there wasn't any of the right away restrictions that we often experience in other parts of town as we are trying to plan and build for the future. Why shouldn't we? From the bat, you know, include these protected bike lanes because we know that they're in such high demand across the city and across the country. And that led to a really informative discussion with public works that helped educate us on when exactly protected bike lanes specifically might be warranted based on traffic counts and speeds and safety issues in certain corridors. And I think that was a really good discussion and very eye opening. But I do want to thank CPD for listening to that discussion and for, you know, in between the first and

second time that it came to committee to incorporating additional language, you know, into the plan about how we might address these issues going forward. But finally, you know, one of the things that I brought up was around implementation. And, you know, this we have many gorgeous plans sitting on shelves across the city. And I guess one of my concerns is that, you know, there's a bit of a disconnect between, you know, what ends up getting implemented in, you know, things getting lost in translation between the planning process and about what actually ends up on the ground as these communities are being planned. And I just want to take this moment to re-emphasize that, you know, I really hope that the opportunity to, you know, really focus on moving people as opposed to cars at this incredible site is a great focus. CBT You've acknowledged that, but I hope public works, you know, takes that you know the full step going forward and I just really want to emphasize that that we don't want to squander those opportunities to really make this a multi-modal city as we do plan out these incredible opportunity sites, especially when we are starting from scratch. So, you know, this is my hope that things don't get lost in translation in between planning and implementation. And again, I do want to thank you for including some specific language in the plan around that. And I just want to send a message to public works that this is a huge priority, as they well know for myself and this body. So thank you. And I am supporting the plan. Thank you, Councilwoman Shepherd. Well said. Are there any other comments? I see none. So let's go ahead and do that. Roll call. Herndon I can eat lemon. Lopez All right. Montero I love it. I. Ortega Hi, Rob. Shepherd Hi. Brooks Hi. Madam President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Close the vote and close the. What is it? Let's have the count of the vote. Oh, my word of advice. 12 I civil faces. Congratulations, Councilman Herndon. Now I have no pre adjournment announcements, therefore seeing no business before no other business for this body. This meeting is adjourned. Denver 80. View your city, your source. Denver eight is about your city. Tell us what you think. I enjoy watching your program because they explain everything thoroughly. The show really. Keeps me current with the

city government. I think the Denver News show. That you have each weekend both an informative and concise time to. Talk back to your television. Call or email. Us for your. Direct connection to Denver TV. Moved in second in the public hearing for council Bill 35 is now open. May we have the staff report? Good evening. Chris Glasner Community Planning and Development Constable, 35, is a proposed rezoning at 1465 South Colorado Boulevard. This is from B.A. three, another former Chapter 59 Zone District two, CMCs three and CMCs 12, or a mixed use three story and a mixed use 12 story zone district. This is within Council District six in the Cary Mayoral statistic

al neighborhood. This is located on the west side of Colorado Boulevard at Arkansas. The site itself is about three and a quarter acres. It's currently B.A. three, as I mentioned. The reason it's still a three is it's part of a planned building group of PGE. And that was one of the subsets of properties that we did not rezone with the citywide rezoning. So this is an applicant driven proposal to bring this into conformance with the current Denver zoning code. The site itself, when folks think about it, it's they either remember the courtyard by Marriott Hotel that's there or they remember the Shamrock Gas Station that's at Colorado Boulevard. That's the general location. We're talking about the gas stations and actually not part of this rezoning. You'll notice when you look at the map that's contained within your packet, there seems to be a little chunk left out along Colorado Boulevard. That is the existing Shamrock Station. That's not part of it. The applicant is represented by Bob Golic, who's here for comments and questions. The rezoning, as I mentioned, is to come into the Denver zoning code and again will be rezoning from V3 to a mix of CSX three along Colorado Boulevard and see a mix 12 deeper in the site where that 12 story hotel exists today. The general character of the area is a mixed use corridor. Recent development pattern is trending more toward an urban center. Mixed Use Development Pattern. This was kind of an interesting piece during the review of this rezoning application because you'll notice a lot of the ground around the area is the suburban context, and this proposal is actually an urban center context. The street block and access pattern, all of our access is along Colorado Boulevard at the Arkansas Avenue alignments. And again, our mobility along Colorado is quite good. It's ten minute peak service with 15 minute off peak service. So we do have quite good access to this site. The existing context I talked about is really shown well in this slide. It's kind of amazing. If you think of the older development along Colorado, it is a little bit more of that set back parking lot in front of it where we've seen newer development patterns that are really coming up, addressing the street, creating a wide tree lawn, wide sidewalks and walkability. Granted, we have to grow into that, but we do see that is the pattern for all the recent development we've seen along the corridor, which is why we do find that urban center context to be appropriate, even though it is a pretty big jump from the suburban context that exists on parts of this area. The existing context, as you'll note, is a mixed use district up and down Colorado. That's not a surprise to anyone. It exists in a variety of scales from small individual tenant shops to larger multi-tenant kinds of pieces. Planning for did review this. The applicant has conducted their public outreach. You do have a letter of support in your packet from the adjacent registered neighborhood

organization who walk through consistency with our adopted plan, starting with conference plan 2000. Specifically land use strategy to A is to initiate comprehensive review and detailed revision of the Denver zoning ordinance. We don't often get to pull this one out in our staff reports, but it's kind of interesting because this does directly speak to the new Denver zoning code that we have, as well as land use strategy for encouraging , mixed use transit oriented development, making effective use of existing transportation infrastructure. That's why it's so important that we do have that high frequency bus service along Colorado. The land use concept for this is an area of change and a commercial corridor. This does intend to orient development to the heavily used arterial streets, in this case Colorado. It does share similarities with the pedestrian shopping corridors, which was how we know that it is supposed to develop in a pedestrian friendly manner. And looking at street trees, wide sidewalks, pedestrian activities is really some of the goals that are set out for that commercial corridor. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Boulevard plan. This is a jointly developed plan with Glendale and the city of Denver, recommending office and retail uses on the site, identifying the benefits of promoting a mix of uses along the corridor, especially as it relates to traffic patterns and continuing a pattern of compatible redevelopment, which we do think this will do of uniformity of district regulations rezoning this site will result in uniform regulations across the site and redevelopment of the site will further the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding

neighborhood justifying circumstance . Is this a change of conditions changes including the creation of that form base Denver zoning code and the pattern of reinvestment along Colorado Boulevard necessitate this rezoning. And finally, we do conclude that the existing conditions in the properties are consistent with both the urban center neighborhood context and the Cmax Zone District purposes and intense planning board did unanimously recommend approval and CPD also recommends approval. Thank you. Mr.. I. We have two speakers this evening for this film, Mr. Garlic and Mr. Sekou. So Mr. Garlic feel free to take the podium. Mr. President, pro tem members of Council. Good evening. My name is Bob Garlock and I'm here this evening representing the owners of the property in Council Bill 3530 2014. Sometimes I look at this rezoning and I kind of think it's almost akin to taking out one of the giant redwoods up in the northwest. The site plan goes back 44 years on this site. The hotel's been there for over 53 years and the zoning on the site goes back to 1953. It's one of the original zoning in all of Denver. So I think it's probably right up there with some of the sequoias and some of the redwoods with some of those old zoned districts did. And this one in particular to be a three. Contro

lled density through a zone lot coverage. In this case, we can't have more than 30% of his own lot covered with the structure. So we've done that or they did that back in the fifties. But that leaves nothing but an enormous sea of parking with nothing else you can do on there. We have over 400 feet from the edge of our building to the curb on Colorado Boulevard, more than a football field. And in this development plan, we have 1260 parking spaces. We need about 520. So taking this out of the bay, three will leave the hotel just the way it is. That's why I see him. X 12 The Courtyard Marriott is a c a mixed 12 structure and it'll allow us to do some small commercial uses in front of the hotel facing Colorado Boulevard, where some of this vast parking is. And that's why it's a mixed three along that frontage. So if you recall the project that's on Colorado Boulevard, right where Cherry Creek Drive meets Colorado, there's a Hilton Garden in there and there's a couple of restaurants. There's a real a garbanzo that's the same property owner and the same concept that we'll be doing on this site. So Planning Board recommended unanimously approval. The Corey Merrill neighborhood sent a letter of support. CPD recommends approval. I hope you'll do the same. Thank you very much. Thank you. Mr. Garlic. Mr. Sekou. Yes. Chairman Sacred Black Action Movement Advocate for working for home people. We are enthusiastically support the journey. The only change for this particular project for a couple of reasons. One, the space is underutilized represents an opportunity to be utilized as a place where construction can happen for residential assistance for transitional families who have suffered under a downturn for the economy. Now, these are regular, everyday people who have become poor because of economic conditions. And so one of the things we want to do is to resettle them in the area where they already at. So when they do come up, there's some kind of continuity with the education for the kids, the very people and their friends and that kind of thing. And one thing that we're confronted with in the city is that we got poor displaced people all over the city. They're not just on the east side and they're not just downtown. They're not just in the five points over there, all over the city. And they represent a diverse population of all kinds of folks. So now we've got to put some consideration. As a matter of fact, we put we should put most consideration to these families that when they are under stress and they are sent to these places temporarily transition, they split up the families and then social services come in , they split up the kids, and now there's kids in foster homes and it's all crazy. So crazy. So crazy, man. And it don't have to be this way. See, I know we can do better than this. We got to do better than this. Otherwise, who are we? Who are we? Who are we? And what kind of city are we? Because the city's greatness is in the greatness of the peopl

e. And it comes from the inside out, not from the outside in. So who are we? We choose to be because in these kind of things, yeah, we have to be creative in finance. Yet the account has got to make sense. You know, and I'm glad you brought up those issues about the money. So we real clear that it ain't like that. It's not like that. And thank you very much for bringing that to because I'll hope somebody else is going to say that, you know. But the money is there. But we have to reorganize the priorities, man. We got we got we got to really lift up the bottom of this boat that's got a big hole in it. So you build the boat from the bottom up, not from the top down. And I'm not concerned about who's going to be the captain, because that's going to come from the shipbuilders. If we're going to put the shipbuilders to the boat to say, who's going to be the captain so we can get a break now with the captain thing, we got to get busy with construction and construction to build a

boat whose hold a double hold so that no matter what happens with emergencies, weather, whatever. We're there and we can weather the storm. Kind of like a Noah's Ark. Say two by two. We come in two by two. So we're taking this thing two by two, because I can't see how if you can't do the little things, the ones he chooses when we're playing Jackson's kids, how you gonna do the sweep on all ten and be Mr. Psycho Jacks? So let's not drop no more Jacks. Let's get in the game for the people. And thank you very much for your consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That concludes our speakers. Do we have any questions from members of council? Seen none. The public name for Constable 35 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Council Member. Thank you, Mr. President. I support the rezoning. And by the way, this is South Colorado. Boulevard and I think we can all agree is a very strange sight, especially to see all the asphalt with no cars park. It's it needs help. And I think this will be an asset to South Colorado Boulevard. And I will encourage your support. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brown, do we have any other comments by members of council seen on Mr. secretary? Roll call from brown. I thought i. Laman hi. Lopez. Hi, monteiro nevett. Hi, rob shepherd. Mr. president. Hi. Mr. Secretary, please close voting and announce the results. 99099809 accounts. About 35 has passed. There is no pre adjournment announcement, so seen no other business before this body. This meeting is adjourned. Denver eight TV. Your city. Your source. Denver eight is about your city. Tell us what you think. I enjoy watching your programs because they explain everything thoroughly. The show really keeps me current with the city government. I think the Denver News. Showed that you have each weekend an informative and concise. Time. To talk back to your television call or email us for your direct connection to Denver TV. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Your motion to adopt. Madam President, I move for the

adoption of Proclamation 205 series of 2014. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you. Madam President, I served on the council with Councilwoman Ramona Martinez when this proclamation was brought forward, and I had the pleasure many years ago when I worked for Councilman Sal Carpio to meet Cesar Chavez, who was here during one of the the boycotts that they were doing. And, you know, they were traveling across the country trying to convince people. Why it made sense for communities all across the country to participate in the boycott, to ensure that the working conditions were safe for the workers. And when the working conditions were safe, then they could have access to bathrooms and clean water. Then they were going to be dealing with the food in a more sanitary way as well. And it was just such an honor to be able to meet such a humble man who gave so much of his life to the cause of ensuring that the farmworkers in this country had safe working conditions. Just as a quick sidebar, I don't know how many of you have had an opportunity to see the the play, the Ludlow Massacre. But in that play, it depicts some of the same working conditions that the coal miners had to live in, that the farmworkers experience. And so it really took a huge effort. And this this man paid the price with his life for all of us to be able to have the safe food that we are able to put on our tables. And over time, the working conditions did improve, the living conditions improved, the wages improved, and it took that organized effort to make all of that happen. So I just want to encourage my colleagues support of this proclamation, will have some folks who are part of the organizations come up afterwards. But I am honored to bring this forward on behalf of the Latino community. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega, Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Madam President. And thank you to my colleague for bringing this proclamation forward. One of the first community activism that I engaged in in my neighborhood when I moved to Denver many years ago is petitioning for the renaming of the Cesar Chavez Park and learning about the history and the connections between Denver and the agricultural issues. Unfortunately, so many years later, so many challenges still exist for the people who grow our food. They are still exempt from many of our wage and hour protections nationally. A lot of susceptibility to abuse from employers by holding immigration status over them while also benefiting by paying them low wages. So, you know, our Colorado Legal Services does a lot of work still protecting farmworkers and carrying this legacy forward. But what I love about Cesar Chavez, as well as MLK Holiday is, you know, watching these holidays through the eyes of a child who asks, who is that and going to the park. And so every time I take my son to my neighborhood park, you know, we get to have a conversation about fighting for people's rig

hts. And it's amazing how each each year he kind of understands a little more sophistication about what that meant to join together with other people and why, you know, that work continues today. And so I am so appreciative that this city was so forward thinking in, you know, renaming a park and having a holiday dedicated because it creates that conversation. On everyday dinner tables, just like these films create and these events create big community conversations. So thank you, councilwoman, for accounting that history so eloquently. And to those of you who continue to carry forward work on behalf of workers who still struggle for their equal rights in our country, in our state, and in our city. Thanks. Thank you. Council. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to thank my council. Woman And she is my councilwoman. Technically, I get to vote for you. I wanted it and think I'm Councilwoman Debbie Ortega for bringing this proclamation forward. And I also wanted to say she mentioned it and I actually wanted I wanted to say this, but I wanted to actually thank her for her leadership when this was an issue. And also because Councilwoman Ortega worked really hard to dedicate 38th Avenue to Cesar Chavez Boulevard a long time ago. And I want to make sure that she understands that, you know, those of us in the West that are really inspired about that and we haven't forgot about that , I think it's amazing when we are able to recognize somebody who was so humble, never made more than \$13,000 a year, and his whole life dedicated himself to that cause. And he was and always Cesar Chavez is a great book. It's called Conquering Goliath. And it was Cesar Chavez, his life, you know, as told by Fred Ross and who was with him around the time. It's such a wonderful book and it really talks about, you know, a person, a regular person who grew up in an. In the ghettos of outside of the South spoilers, which is get out if you can, this exact translation of the community you lived in and just begin by doing voter registration. And there are so many people who are just waiting for someone to knock on their door to get them involved. And that is how a person like so that Chavez began. That is how a woman like Dolores Huerta, who was a co-founder of the union, who had 11 children and still found it to be one of the most you know, she is one of the most primary incredible activists that a woman in our lifetime who was still alive, still organizing in the day I saw her on Sabado Gigante which those of you know that it's like it's basically price is right but Spanish at night with crazy music and all kinds of crazy stuff going on. She was on there talking about the cause still, right. And she still makes her way to Denver because she has family and and where she still, you know, always had the opportunity to sit down and eat with her. You know, one of the best times is one of the best memories of sitting with her was in Washington, D.C., in a and a

bar where she drank all of us under the table. And she said with the you know, Paul. She says Cesar Chavez loved being in Colorado. And it is a shame today that even though he visited it, even though they were big supporters, even though folks in Denver, from Denver to Chicago to Florida to New York, all boycotted grapes to support the union. Farmworkers in Colorado still cannot organize, not because they don't have the right to, not because it is illegal for them by Colorado law to form a union. And if all you have to do, if you really support this are Chavez and I'm going to really talk about was say sure quote It's one thing to say I support Cesar Chavez. I support that. I remember back in the day and I boycotted grapes. Right. Well, in the year 2014, all you have to try all you have to do is drive up I-25 or drive up 80 all the way north to Greeley. And you'll see those same farmworkers bent over picking crops in 110 degree weather. They deserve to have those same rights that farmworkers in California do. Our farm workers in Texas do. And it is up to us to apply those lessons that we have learned in the past, especially those civil rights and human rights lessons now. And it's one thing and I'm going to say, this is what Cesar Chavez said. Right. Quote unquote, talk is cheap. It's the way we organize and use our lives every day that defines who we are and what we believe in. And kind of paraphrased there. But that's exactly what this holiday means. So it's not just a high as the people take a day off. It's a day of service. As Martin Luther King Jr. Day should be a day of service. A day of action, not a day of leisure. And so, you know, I'm very proud to see this proclamation come through these council chambers read by a councilwoman who was very integral, along with Councilwoman Ramona Martinez, and making sure that this holiday existed. And it was Denver City Council as a whole. And I believe this. I remember the day that they adopted it. I was sitting right there in the pews. So anyway, I love these proclamations. I love being able to celebrate this day. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman Monteiro. Thank you. Madam President, I also want to thank my colleague, Councilwoman Debbie Ortega, and Councilwoman Ramona Martinez. If you're out there watching, hello to you and your family, one of my favorite quotes from Cesar Chavez is when you have people

together who believe in something very strongly, whether it's religion or politics or unions, things happen. And his clarion call of Si Se Puede has probably resonated with so many people that believe in their cause and believe in how they think humanity should be equal in our society. Each year that we've done this, this proclamation, it never fades and it never pales. The words that are said in these proclamations, because each year they become stronger. To me, because of the times that we live in, it's so easy for people to sort of overlook one another when t

imes are good, and it's really easy for people to look over, overlook each other when times are bad. And when we have holidays like this, there are remembrance of the legacy that many of us live by. And to be able to be rooted in, connected to that history, to that philosophy and that time of United States history is very, very important. So thank you again, Councilman Ortega, for sponsoring this. And I will be supporting. Thank you, Councilman Monteiro. And looks like we're ready for roll call, Mr. Secretary. ORTEGA Hi. Rob Shepherd. I'm Brooks Brown. I thought I. Herndon. I can teach. Lemon Hi. Lopez I can tell you, I never I and I'm president. High counselor, in fact. So that's. That's fine. And please close the voting and announce the results. 39, zero and. 13 as it passes unanimously. Councilman Ortega, is there somebody you'd like to ask up to the podium? Yes, there is. I want to ask Cecilia Flores and others who are okay, the Sanchez and I'm sorry, I don't know your name who are here with the AARP group, if you would come to the podium. Those of you who I don't know if you could introduce yourself, I would appreciate it. And let me just say, while you're doing that, that Cecilia Flores, her dad, knew Cesar Chavez very well and worked very closely together. So I thank you. I'm here on behalf of this estate, Chavez Peace and Justice Committee of Denver. My name is Amr Gonzalez. Thank you, Madam President, and current and past city council members for recognizing the annual Cesar Chavez March and celebration. With the commitment of community and and politicians, Denver residents to acknowledge and celebrate a true American hero says that each others yes as who Chavez is an American citizen and recognition of Cesar Chavez holiday, the Cesar Chavez Peace and Justice Committee of Denver, cordially invite City Council citizens of Denver to join us as we honor this American hero during the 13th annual Cesar Chavez March and celebration this Saturday, March 29th. This Ussery Chavez Peace and Justice March has been celebrated for 12 years here in Denver. Its purpose is to educate the general public relative to the many contributions that Cesar Chavez made in the area of social and human rights. In this country in general and the farm workers in particular, in order to to continue his legacy, because the struggle of that of the United Farm Workers, we're engaged in American society. Farm workers now have more benefits, more decent working conditions and a better wage. The event is also a celebration of in honor of this American hero. The event begins with a Catholic mass followed by a march, then a celebration. During the celebration, speakers, poets, dancers and musicians share the legacy of society. Chavez and his work toward human rights and social justice. Thousands of Denver citizens were instrumental in the position needed in naming the Street Chavez Park in 2006. As a great leader once said, We cannot seek achievement for ourselves and forget

about progress and prosperity for our humanity. Our ambitions must be broad enough to include the aspirations and needs of others for their sake and her for our own society. Chavez. Arcilla Victoria. My name is Cecilia Flores. And thank you, Madam President, and council people. I really do have a word to prepare, but I would just like to say that through my father, Tim Flores, I did get to meet Cesar Chavez twice and have met the laws with them numerous times. But he was such a humble man and he listened. And I know my father was inspired by him. And I think Cesar was inspired by my father because my father worked in the fields. I did it for one week. And that was because my think my father wanted to make sure we went to school. He says this is the alternative. And so I so I never I almost cut my thumb doing onions. But I didn't. But we did also I to there is the movie on Friday but it is a movie but on Monday at and I'm going to see this wrong sorry, sorry. Theater, which is next to the terror cover on Colfax. And Elizabeth, we will have a documentary on surfers last fast at 7:00. So you are invited to go to that? I have seen the previews of that. It's wonderful. So thank you. And thank you again for this powerful emotion. Councilman Ortega, thank you so much. Thank you, Ms.. Flores. Hello, R-Truth. Rick Sanchez and I would. Say are we are on the AARP. Advisory Latino Advisory Committee called. El Comité. It is our duties, responsibilities to. Bring the voice of the. Latinos, what their needs are and their concerns, and to carry that out. So I feel privileged to be here. Cesar Chavez every time I look at a lettuce or grape and I get very emotional.

I really appreciate. The work and the sacrifice that they have brought. So that we can have this. Wonderful food at our table. So thank you, Councilman. Woman Debbie Ortega thank you all city council for your service and work in the city of Denver. Thank you for your service. Not quite finished yet. Councilman Lopez, you had a comment. You know, I forgot to make this announcement during the announcement, so I may do it. And it ties right into the Cesar Chavez holiday. The one person who would always do the math for the holiday, for Cesar Chavez, the march. Father Tomas Fraley. Oh, because he passed away last week. Yes. And he was the founder of Saint Catches in church going out. So from when it got closed down at an area to make way for the college campus, a lot of those folks got displaced. The residents got displaced. The church got this place. So there's two engaged in churches, one in the Lower West Side and one on the Upper West Side over there. Father Tomas would always be very happy to do this math. And when he did this mass and talked about the farm workers, talked about Cesar Chavez, and remember and it's all these stories , you just kind of came alive. What are these these social justice times? And they were always very spiritual people. Right. And so it's fitting that we also recognize the

work of Father Thomas Friday, who worked very hard for the people in West Denver and was just an amazing, amazing leader who touched so many lives. I could tell you from cradle to council, he was my spiritual guy. And so it goes hand in hand with that kind of work that that was being done on behalf of all those people. So, you know, in memoriam and in his memory as well to you know, want to recognize that. Thank you. Guardsman Lopez, so nice memorial. Okay, we're moving on to the next proclamation. Number 248. I'll be reading this one, thanking Dr. Nita Mosby Henry for her service to the city and county of Denver. Whereas Dr. Anita Moseby Henry stars your job as executive director of Denver's Career Service Authority Office. On January 17th, 2012, the first African-American woman to head the 59 year old Denver Agency, having served nine years on the Career Service Board, appointed by Mayor Webb and Mayor Hickenlooper. And. Whereas, she immediately set about overhauling the agency an update signified by her successful campaign to change the name to the Denver Office of Human Resources. And. Whereas, Dr. Henry designed a major agency redesign focused on delivering invaluable service, launched the Inclusivity Project, and made the city more inclusive and integrated in the communities it serves and paved the way for the city to become a true learning organization through the development of Denver City Employee University. And. Whereas, she has received national recognition for her work with companies and organizations in health care and service delivery. She is the founder and director of the Kaleidoscope Project, a community based organization designed to increase social and health equity within Denver communities. And she serves or has served several organizations, including one Colorado, the Local and National Human Rights Campaign, the Colorado Tobacco Review Committee, the Black Health Collaborative Education Committee, and the Disparities Action Committee. Whereas Dr. Henry is leaving the City of Cancer to pursue other opportunities and continue her service to the community. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, this section one, the Council hereby recognizes Miss Nita Mosby, Henry, and thanks her for her work in Denver and the strides she has made in updating the Denver Office of Human Resources Section two that the Clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest affixed the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy be transmitted transmitted to Dr. Nita Mosby. Henry so I move that this proclamation be adopted. Second. And it has been seconded comments. I just want to thank Dr. Mosby Henry for I always want to call you Mosby, but for all your service to our city and I wish you great luck in your future endeavors, I know that you'll be just as great there as you have been for us. Appreciate it. Councilman Brooks. Thank you, Madam President. Dr. Henry is not only

, you know, a friend, a community leader, but also an incredible transformative leader in this city. And how I kind of define leadership is consistency of message. And one thing that I've heard consistent from what Dr. Henry has done is inclusivity. Diversity is no longer the standard. It's about shared values, it's about inclusivity. And it's been amazing to see her transform this agency. But also, you know, I was just with some members of the sheriff's department. I had no idea she was training them in inclusivity and they were raving about, you know, the time spent with Dr. Henry . And so, you know, we we were privileged to have her for just a short time. And, of course, I wish we could have. I think we all wish we could have a little bit more time with her in this position. But I am

I'm very confident that at Children's Hospital she's going to continue to make a difference. And she's still the neighborhood president at Whittier. So I know she's going to be transforming things in our neighborhood. So I want to thank you so much for your service, Dr. Henry. I can't see you because there's a computer, right. And you look beautiful over there. And thank you for just for that message of inclusivity and impact in my life and the way that I talk about what it means to truly have shared values and lead from that perspective. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brooks, Councilwoman Fox. Thank you very much, Madam President. Well, I will really miss your advancing, bold ideas in personnel reform. That was very important to do. I've really enjoyed our conversations, and I know you have a great commitment to mentoring. I mean, I can list so many things that I just have admired so much of. Children's Hospital is lucky. We will look forward to seeing great things for you there. Thank you. Councilwoman Fox, Councilman Levitt. Thank you, Madam President. I feel weird calling you Dr. Henry Moseby. Moseby. But Moseby like Cher, maybe. Anyway, Nina Henry, we barely knew you. And the loss is ours. You've done a lot in the short time that you've been here. The city. I wish you weren't going, but certainly wish you well. I've enjoyed every minute of working with you while you were here, and I look forward to additional opportunities in the future to do the same. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Madam President. It's funny, we do a lot of community proclamations from this dais, as well as retirements or folks departing the city. And when I think about UNITA, I think about so much. We could be doing just a community based proclamation. You know, the work that you did making civil unions happen in a state by helping to create and grow one, Colorado is going to forever be lasting and the equal rights history of this state. And so for me, that was that was high on the list when I heard you were leaving the city. It's funny, because the first thing I thought is, where else could she go? Because, you know, she's and I thought, health, it's health. And

of course, such a passion of yours. And you've really made it into not so much a delivery system, but a cult of engagement, which I just think is really amazing. And that legacy also lives beyond you in the community. And so I know that the legacies that you created internally in a department that, you know, had had some bumps and its confidence level in the city will also live beyond you. And so for those reasons, I can accept saying goodbye because I know that all of that that loop, that path that you leave behind you benefits us in so many ways. And because, like others have said, I know that we'll continue to see you. So thank you so much for your contributions here and elsewhere and good luck. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennish. Councilman Herndon. Thank you, Madam President. I just it is a it is a sad day because the city is losing a true champion, though her impact will continue to be felt because she will still be active in the community making change. And I just want to say thank you for our personal conversations, your candor as someone who always tells it like it is. And that is certainly something that is needed throughout all levels of government through the community. So I really appreciate those conversations and I'm sure our paths will cross always. Thank you, Native, for all that you've done. Thank you, Councilman Herndon. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. I want to ask that my name be added to the proclamation. All right. Neither. I want to thank you for all your contributions. You will be missed. And I want to wish you the best of luck in your new endeavors. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. I said. All right. Looks like it's time for roll call. Hi. Brooks Brown. I thought I. Herndon. I mean, I am in Lopez. Hi, Montero. I never I fatigue. I rob. Shepherd. And Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Matt. Mr. Secretary, I keep one and call you madam. Mr. Secretary, would you please close the voting and announce the results? 13,013 10 nays. It passes unanimously. Dr. Henry, would you like to come up to the podium and say a few words? Thank you, Madam President and council. Rarely am I speechless, but I'm a bit speechless today since I didn't know what this was. I'd like to first thank my staff. You know, this is a bittersweet transition. It's one thing to have a job and leave a job. It's quite another one to have love and leave love. And that's what this experience working in the city and county has been for me. It's been filled with love to the point where. It hasn't felt like. Work. I really have been fortified as a leader from this experience with the city and county of Denver, and that's something that I think I can take with me wherever I go. I'm very thankful for being blessed with this role to lead the Office of Human Resources at this time. I think this was my time, and I think now it's the time for other leaders to take it to the next step. I'm very grateful to this mayor and to this council and to this wonderful

team called the Office of Human Resources for believing in Me at a time where all of the details weren't there yet and the team went with me anyway. I'd also say to you that it's been. A gift to have. Been a part of an agency that has the city's most tenured employee in it, Albertine Sellers, who is in her 59th year with the city and county of Denver. And to be able to be blessed enough to be the leader of an agency with that type of history in it, in and of itself. Was a gift. So thank you for recognizing me in this way. Thank you for all of this wonderful journey that we've. Had together. And know that I'm with you, but from a different seat. Thank you very much, Dr. Henry. Okay. Moving right along. And in the spirit of taking things out of the order, I forgot to make an announcement which was to congratulate Councilman Herndon on an excellent, inspiring, inspiring speech as a keynoter at 40 under 40 at the Denver Business Journal last Friday. Just want to thank you for great representation of the council and for your wonderful speech. Good. Well, well done. We are ready to move on to the resolutions. Mr. Secretary, will you please read the resolutions. Thank you very much. We look forward to it. Thank you. All right. We have a third proclamation, proclamation number 247. And I would call on Councilman Montero to read the proclamation. Thank you, Madam President. Proclamation number 247. Well, concerning the reconstruction of Interstate 70 through Northeast Denver, whereas while the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea communities are already endowed with a vital constellation of unique community assets from school and recreation facilities such as Swansea Elementary School and Swansea, the Park Argo Pool and the Colorado Miners Recreation Center to resource providers such as Clinic Byock Focus Point, Family Resource Center, Street Kids and Valdez, Perry Library, the many historic churches to community gathering spot such as the Grow House and the Global Community Center. The reconstruction of I-70 has a potential to better connect local families and children to these assets and better leverage the important resources already available within the community for its residents to build upon and improve their quality of life. Whereas Denver City Council acknowledges the generations of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea are residents who help, who have endured the daily disadvantages imposed by living in the shadow of the elevated I-70 Viaduct and supports furthering the work of the many stakeholders and residents and business owners who have been diligently collaborating for several years to determine the best possible design for the now deteriorating 50 year old transportation facility. And. Whereas, it is a vital function of the I-70 corridor to continue to serve nearly 700 local businesses, including many large freight distribution centers and other freight dependent enterprises. Maintaining direct and convenient highway access to the National Western Co

plex, which is vital to the long term success of the National Western Stock Show, and for providing safe and swift vehicle passage between downtown and Denver International Airport. And. WHEREAS, these concerns are supported by many adopted city goals and neighborhood plans, including the revitalization of specific neighborhoods, with the understanding that it's important to facilitate moving people through various means of transportation rather than just vehicles and reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions through appropriate environmental standards. And. Whereas, in 1964, I-70 was designed through the neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea are having a devastating impact on the neighborhoods from the loss of homes and residents, the loss of sustainable resources and access to resources within the community, and the overall loss of values of homes. And. Whereas, Federal policy says that if a program will have a disproportionate, disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low income populations, that program may only be carried out if further mitigation measures or alternatives avoid, minimize or mitigate this disproportionately high and adverse impacts. Some of the adverse effects on the minority and low income residents in Globeville areas. Swansea should be mitigated and include air quality fumes and emission noise and traffic counts, displacement of residents and loss of overall housing and residents to the community. Connectivity and quality of place and jobs and education for residents to rebuild the community. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. That section that the city and council, that city that the Denver City Council stresses the importance of all stakeholders to work together to identify land and resources to replace housing lost to the project in the neighborhood at similarly attainable prices, to ensure residents of low and moderate income can continue to live near the new amenities far into the future. Section eight that the Denver City Council and the City of County of Denver in court in partnership with the court, will continue to explore additional options in order to enhance connectivity and to strengthen existing neighborhood historical fabric and finding alternatives to

improving the quality of life, environment and economic vitality of this area in conjunction with balancing the overall transportation needs. Section seven. That the Clerk of the city and County of Denver shall attest and fix the seal of the city and county of Denver . To this proclamation and that a copy be submitted to Don Hunt, executive director of the Colorado Department of Transportation. Thank you, Councilwoman Monteiro. Your motion to adopt. Thank you. Madam President, I move the proclamation to 47 V adopted. It's been moved and seconded. I have a Councilwoman Ortega. Madam President, I move to postpone consideration of Council Proclamation 247 to Monday, April

I 14, 2014. And I'd like to explain why. If we have a second. Go ahead. I ask for a courtesy public hearing tonight on the I-70 proclamation to allow the residents of Globeville, Swansea and Leary and other interested citizens to be heard. It's not unusual for a city council to extend this courtesy to the public and has done so in the past. But unfortunately that request was denied. Council is being asked tonight to adopt a proclamation in support of replacing the current I-70 viaduct with a below grade covered highway. Executive Order 12898 Implementing the Civil Rights Act makes it clear federal agencies must assess whether programs, policies and activities in this case increasing the width of the highway 113%. And we're trying to put up a slide that shows you what the width of this corridor would look like, that it has disproportionate impact on minority and income residents in these adjacent neighborhoods. Actions to avoid and minimize or mitigate the adverse health, environmental and other impacts must be taken. The same order also ensures the full and fair participation by all potentially impacted communities in the decision making process. In the spirit of the executive order and tenants of environmental justice, I view providing the community an opportunity to speak tonight to be a small step towards allowing those impacted by the decision to participate in the decision making process. The Colorado Department of Transportation has asked for a proclamation of support from City Council for the project prior to the completion of the Supplemental Environmental Environmental Impact Statement to assist them as they seek federal funding. Although many in our community are encouraging court to take another look at rerouting the highway, CDA is not considering that option based on the work done in conjunction with their original environmental impact statement on the project. I want to make it clear that I have been generally supportive of the concept because I think there are incredible benefits that the community can see from this particular concept that's on the table. However, I'm not I've not seen detailed information on what those costs entail for the alternative that others have been proposing. I believe this proclamation goes much further than just looking at the preferred alternative that is on the table. I see that I'm being asked tonight to endorse the cities, the city teams design, vision and detailed planning as spelled out in the proclamation. However, I believe the city is still in the process of defining the vision and the planning is not complete. In the past three months, I have seen several visions for the project. The vision has included a cap over the highway near Swansea, a school with a park or designs that the community will come up with. The vision has included a second cap with commercial space for stores such as a hardware or grocery store to serve the neighborhood. It has included roundabouts. And we're going to show you

ou what that potentially looks like. Councilman Ortega, it sounds like you're making comments about the bay. It's about why you are proposing. Yes. That there will be opportunity to speak to the proclamation. I'd be glad to have you talk about the postponement. Well, that's what I'm getting to, if you will. Let me finish here. Go right ahead. Think you can get to the postponement? So the vision has included this second cap. However, we're not sure exactly what's going to happen at this fast cost corridor, because now the afternoon that many of my colleagues attended a meeting, there was this concept that talked about roundabouts very similar to those that are at I-70 and Pecos. So my point here is there are too many unknowns that have not been worked out. And for us to do a proclamation tonight, they don't have these things clearly spelled out. And to do it before the environmental impact statement, which will define all of these details. I think it's a little concerning and premature. Okay. So in the vision, the vision means growing the highway from 117 feet to 250 feet. So if it means that right now I'm not there. If the vision includes building a cap without provisions of funding, and who's going to maintain those improvements? I'm not there yet. If the vision is for roundabouts at Vasquez, that removes the land that was previously discussed with the community about being available for redevelopment. I'm not there. So the purpose of the Environmental Impact Statement is to study the positive and negative environmental effects of the proposed highway. So let's wait for the year and get more details nailed down before we adopt the

proclamation and with a broad statement of support for the undefined vision. If we need to say that we generally support the below grade replacement of the viaduct, let's just say that and move on and not take the steps to deal with all of these other in-depth issues that are spelled out in the proclamation without knowing exactly how we're going to mitigate the impact and where some of the roads are going to be and those kinds of things. So this is our chance to get it right for these neighborhoods who have been burdened with this I-70 project for the last 50 years. And I hope that city council will adopt a strong position on the major elements on this \$1.8 billion project that will, as we've been told, the largest construction project in the state and will take approximately five years of construction that these neighborhoods and anybody that travels this corridor would have to be dealing with. And so by allowing the community the opportunity to weigh in, I think it gives us the assurance that we're looking at all of the issues before this body adopts a proclamation. So that's why I am asking for a postponement for one week to allow us to have a public hearing and allow the voices of the people who will be impacted by this project to weigh in. I know we had public comment at our committee meeting, but those are me

etings held during the day. These are working class neighborhoods where generally people can't get off of work and come to meetings during the day. So I respectfully request your support in allowing us to have a one hour courtesy public hearing next Monday night. Thank you. Let me be clear about about. Thank you. A motion to postpone takes precedence over the motion to go ahead with the proclamation. So we add that motion to postpone to next Monday has been seconded and watched and we are only voting on the motion to postpone. It is not a motion to have a public hearing. If it's postponed, that can be a second motion. But we have the motion to postpone and it has been seconded. We've heard comments already from Councilwoman Ortega about the motion. I'll call on others who may have comments about the motion to postpone. Councilwoman Kenney. Thank you. Madam President, I support this proclamation. I cosponsored it, and I'm ready to stand behind that. But I think that my colleagues know that. I also believe that it should not be up to the whim of one person whether or not there's public hearings before this body. And so I, I, I feel that we will have a community debate on this proclamation. And it's it behooves us to allow that to occur in our chambers where we can then engage. I feel like there's a number of areas where I disagree with those who disagree with this proclamation, and I want the opportunity to share why and how I disagree. And I realize that that will be long and perhaps arduous, but I believe that that is part of our duty, our duty as elected officials. So without at all diminishing my support and the reasons why I think this proclamation is the right way to go. I do believe that we open ourselves up to unnecessary criticism by failing to allow a hearing to occur. So I will be supporting the motion in order to support the principle for which I have stood since I was elected, which is that if people really, really, really want a hearing before this body, there should be a mechanism for which that can occur, whether that be a majority of this council, whether it be a petition process or whether it be some other mechanism. I think we are missing a piece of democracy by not having met. So I need to support this motion tonight. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. CORNISH Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Madam President. It's not my position as the district councilwoman to say there's been extensive outreach on this. What I do know is the process has been going on for 12 years. Admittedly, our proclamation has not been debated for 12 years. I am wondering if there's someone here and I don't see Kelly lead. So it might be Diane Barrett or maybe, sir, if Rebecca White is here from it is Kelley here some 32. Vetoed here from. Yeah I just would like an explanation of why we are doing this now, how it fits into the timeline. It does fit. Madam President, into debating the postponement. It as for debating the postponement, it's not something we usual

ly do for proclamations, but we're debating the postponement. Okay. Let's start by saying that. Whichever one of you was to speak. Madam President and members of council. I'm Tony to Vito. I'm the regional one transportation director for Seaboard. So this alternative that we have been working with has been out for the last two years and we have been hundreds of meetings, night times, weekends in the neighborhood talking about this alternative. As we move through this process and we're ready to publish the supplemental draft this summer. We have to be cognitive of the steps that are take with our Transportation Commission to start looking at how do we take on the magnitude of a \$1 billion project. And that's where our Transportation Commission is. Our Transportation Commission represents the entire state of Colorado, and that is where they're at right now. And that is why we've been asking council to identify where is the city so we can report

back to our commissioners. So when when do your commissioners meet? I mean, in terms of a timeline of last week, we heard there was a desire to do this by April 1st and now we're in April what, seventh? What are we today? April 7th and now we're talking April 14th. How does that fit in the timeline? I know we're getting down into details. Commission meets monthly, the third week of the month, Wednesday and Thursday. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb.

Councilwoman Shepherd. Thank you, Madam President. I am I seconded this motion because I am in favor of more public input. This is an extremely complex process with a lot of moving parts, a lot of moving pieces. There are multiple jurisdictions involved. I've certainly heard a lot from my own constituents regarding this situation, many of which are in the audience this evening. Thank you for your vigilance and your engagement. And I, you know, I, I never I don't think less process is better. We need more transparency here. We need more engagement. I would like to hear from other members of our community as well. I was at a meeting this past Saturday where my very own state senator Lucio Guzman, stood up and said that it would be egregious if this body were not to defer and listen to members of the public on such an important issue. And therefore, I'm supporting this request, this motion. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Shephard Katz, I want to take you already comment. I just want to. Make one very brief statement, and that is, in the 30 plus years that I have worked for the city of Denver and had extensive involvement in many, many projects on 25, from Alameda to the city limits on the north and I-70 from Colorado Boulevard up to Pico Street. This is the first time I have ever seen the city of Denver move to do a proclamation prior to the environmental impact statement coming out from the Department of Transportation. I understand the importance of the private participation because of the shrinking federal dollars that are that are no longer avai

lable to ensure that we have the resources to expand our highway system across this country. And we're seeing these private participation partnerships across the country. But I just think that it's critical to allow the community to weigh in. And so that is why I've made my request. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. All right. We have a motion we have a motion on the floor to postpone the proclamation until next Monday. Madam Secretary. Roll call. Ortega Yes. Rob Pass. Shepherd, I. Brooks No. Brown No fights, no. Herndon, no carnage. Lehman No. Lopez, I. Monteiro has never. I. Rob. Oh, wait a minute. Like right. I get that here from my buddy here. No, I'm. Monteiro. No. Madam President. No. Oh. Wait a minute. We have to. Pass. I was sort of in the queue to vote and then Councilman Nevett revolted or something. Rob, I think it was Councilwoman Rob, you had passed. I was coming back to you. Would you like to make a vote? I will vote I. And Councilwoman Monteiro, you have. Made a past. You want to vote by vote? No. No. All right. We have we need you to push your button. Okay. All right. Counts. Madam Secretary. Close the voting. Announce the results. Six ice, seven days. Seven days. There is no postponement of this proclamation. All right. We are back to the motion to adopt the proclamation. Councilwoman Monteiro has made that motion and it has been seconded. Comments by members of Council Councilwoman Monteiro. Would you like to go first yet? Yes, Madam President, I would like to go first. First off. All right. I want to begin by thanking everyone who has been here tonight and all the people that have had conversations, all the knows and all the yeses and all the maybes. It's it's time for us to take the next step forward. And as Councilwoman Ortega has said, she's not there yet. Well, we have to be somewhere and I can't be nowhere. And so I think that it's time for us to be at the table. What is going on here tonight is that the proclamation before us talks about the reconstruction of Interstate 70 through northeast Denver. The portion that I represent of I-70 is the part that goes through Globeville, Elyria, Swansea. This proclamation supports the reconstruction of I-70 in its current location and alignment, and places a new structure below grade between Brighton Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard. This alternative is known as a partially covered, lowered alternative, the PCL. This proclamation does not speak to the once proposed second capping cover that was at the Steele and Vasquez intersection, which I believe is no longer on the table. Creation of the so called second lid at the Steel Vazquez, designed for the second Laird, will not be part of the I-70 East Project due to the fact that stakeholders, which are the Colorado Department of Transportation, city and County of Denver, Adams County and Commerce City, are still working on refining the details of this important intersection. I want to be clear to everyone that if passed, this p

roclamation is by no means an open ended contract given by the city and county of Denver on behalf of the residents of global all areas once here as an open ended contract. And it does not, in

my opinion, weaken the leverage of the Globeville, Elyria, Swansea neighborhoods for the city and county of Denver. In fact, I believe that it elevates the conversation around the mitigation members. It measures that have been talked about for so long. The act of making a condition or a consequence less severe. The idea of us being strong about the mitigation. City county of Denver has the insurance. The intentions of that are to expand the benefits to Elyria and Swansea and global communities as well as the greater region through this catalytic transportation project. Sierra has mentioned many times their expertise is creating highways, not communities. By acknowledging and accepting this limitation. They have agreed to work closely with the residents who will be impacted by I-70. And again, I want to speak for the area that I represent, and that's Globeville, Elyria, Swansea. It is important to remember that the renovation of I-70 is crucial and long overdue because of its current state. The viaduct is unsafe, which makes this reconstruction mandatory. Having this in mind, see, that has already begun the work necessary for right of way purchasing of homes and businesses to those residents which will be relocated. There are people already receiving the notices of eligibility for relocation assistance, which puts the owner in direct contact with sports liaison Curtis Morrison as a councilwoman for these neighborhoods. I acknowledge and painfully understand many of the many of the concerns of the residents that I represent in Globeville, Elyria, Swansea. I have actively advocated for Sea-Tac to work with the city of Denver and the global Elyria Swansea residents to work in an honest and diligent manner towards making the reconstruction of I-70 less severe on the people from Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. I want to share with you the things that have been said to me by the people that I represent in Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. Here are some of the things that they have. They're not limited to only certain things. But here are a few of the things that keep coming back to me. People in Globeville, O'Leary and Swansea here want to minimize the number of lanes for the design of the highway. People in Globeville, delirious once a year, want to minimize the number of residential and commercial properties that will be relocated by the project. People in Globeville, O'Leary and Swansea here want better North-South connectivity. People in Globeville, in Swansea, Elyria want the measure of air quality during and after construction. People in Global Delirious wants you want noise, quality mitigation. People in Global and Swansea area want better access to I-70 interstate for residents and industry. People in Globeville and Swansea. Malaria want to create ways

to expand the affordable housing stock in the areas people in Globeville, Elyria and Swansea want to create a better environment where they can live, work and actually have a life and play like the rest of Denver residents do. People of Globeville, delirious once here, want to expand the number of acreage for community gathering spaces. People are global. O'Leary and Swansea here want to redirect heavy commercial vehicular traffic away from residential areas. People from Globeville, O'Leary and Swansea want assurance that the project follows the EPA and Title six requirements. All of these mitigations are very important and have great value and need to these communities, and it is important that we continue to hear their voices and to pray to prioritize their needs. It's important that the city and county of Denver and CDOT that we all continue to make them a priority and to have their mitigation issues heard. In conclusion, I do believe that this is the best option for the people in Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. It's unfortunate that these three neighborhoods have become sort of the center of other conversations and other forces that are working their way around them. But for the people in Globeville and Swansea and Elyria, it's important that these mitigation issues be listened to. It's important now, that is, we're doing this heavily that CDOT work with us and help us get to the remedy for these neighborhoods that have, it's no surprise, have lived with the environmental justice issues of the past. So it's my hope and believe that the city and county of Denver will continue to be an important partner as this as we go forward in this next step, should this proposed proclamation pass and that we continue to work towards all of the things that people in this neighborhood, in these neighborhoods that I represent would like so that they can go on and enjoy their quality of life the way that probably other people do. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Monteiro. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. I know how hard Councilwoman Monteiro has worked on this project. She? She is my friend. We've worked together for many, many years and she spelled out all those issues that she has been working on alongside the city staff from Public Works and our planning department and the folks from the Colorado Department of Transportation . I'm I'm reluctant to support this proclamation for moving forward because our mayor has already submitted a letter pledging Denver's support to this preferred

alternative. Alongside with Mayor Ford from Commerce City. So Denver's already been on board saying they support this concept. And I'm not willing to give up city council's leverage to ensure that we look out for these neighborhoods and make sure that all these details get worked through. And it's in this the environmental impact statement where we get to see those details. As I said, many of which are still being worked out, they're not they're not complete. S

o we don't know what we're being asked to vote on. Other than saying we support this new preferred alternative, this as many in the community are referring to as the cut and cover concept. We don't know what's going to happen at vast squares. We don't know exactly where the road that will connect Globerville, Swansea, Elyria, the gets removed when 46th Avenue is gone. That's their current connection because not everybody uses the elevated highway. And so having that connectivity is is vital to these communities. It's vital for the people who live there and the businesses to get in there now, as well as the emergency responders being able to serve these communities. So I you know, I'm not I'm not there. I cannot support this tonight, given that these issues are still up in the air and unresolved. And we don't know exactly what we're being asked to support other than the cut and cover concept without details on all these other aspects that are yet to be resolved. So thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank everybody for coming out. I, I don't support this proclamation, and I don't support this proclamation for a lot of reasons. But for the main reason I do not support this proclamation is because in 2003, I was one of the one of the outreach folks going door to door. And we hit every door, every household as part of the environmental impact statement and an outreach effort that was unprecedented. And I've since seen have not seen an outreach effort like was like was done in 2003. And from about June to December, a lot of us who were community organizers in the neighborhood who had understood how to canvass, went door to door and had an extensive survey that asked about the neighborhood, about the highways, impact on the neighborhood and the future of the highway in the neighborhood, and asked folks that opinion about what they thought would be the best idea and the best alternative. Just open ended question. There were rumors of a double decker highway going through the neighborhood. That wasn't going to happen. I can't tell you how many times I heard from Globerville all the way to Green Valley Ranch from 56th, all the way down to Martin Luther King Boulevard. Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard. How many times folks said, get this highway out of our neighborhood. This highway is killing us. I remember vividly going in the swamps here where my mom taught at Swansea Elementary School a long time ago when I was a kid, and we would always feel the ground shake every time a tractor trailer would roll by. I remember going in the backyard just off Saint Paul where my God brother had lived and a woman saying, Let me show you the impact of the highway. She goes to the back, takes her laundry off of the clothesline and shakes it off. And you see dust come off. This isn't dirt from her yard. This is break dust. This is debris. This is particles falling into her yard. This is a drop

zone or hundreds of thousands of cars roll by here. This is where my friends who grew up in this neighborhood suffer from asthma. All of them. I can't tell you which one doesn't. They all have asthma in this neighborhood. This is the same neighborhood where an incredible activist by the name of Lorraine Granado defended this community and taught me how to organize and taught me to the meaning and the virtue and. The importance of fighting for the underdog. And around that time it was I think it was a news article that came out in the post for the Rocky Mountain News. God, I miss those. I must be in a two paper town where they had said that the zip code was the most polluted zip code in the state. I think it's important for us to realize our place in history, whether it's ten lanes or eight lanes or actually down the middle where they put a cap and cover or two caps and cover. It's still a highway through a neighborhood. And then there is an alternative. There is an alternative that nobody talks about. Nobody looks seriously at. And that is the reroute and the reroute through to 70, which most of the residents in this corridor from Green Valley Ranch all the way down had supported. Thousands of doors. Eight months on the doors. And this is what we heard it. Nothing has nothing to do with the folks who are working at Sierra and, you know, making their, you know, doing the best that they can. I know I've been approached. I know they've been really honest with me. I know they've been very professional with me. I they mean well, this isn't their decision. This is a political decision. This is a once in a lifetime project. It's a it's a project where we can correct history, where we can correct a very bad thing in history that cut these

neighborhoods off from the rest of Denver. We have the opportunity to correct that. We have the opportunity to do the right thing. And the right thing would be to take this highway out of these neighborhoods. There are no houses or elementary schools under 270. There are no kids playing street racquetball football around 270. It's a hot potato. It's a very big political issue. And you know what? There is a lot of validity to the argument that there's no connectivity to so many that we'd have to go back and rebuild all that infrastructure. Which is true. But where is Denver going to be 50 years from now, 100 years from now? Where are those neighborhoods going to be? Where are those children going to be? Where are the children and the folks that have asthma going to be? Are we going to look back and say, well, did we do the right thing or did we miss the opportunity to do the right thing? This is it. This is the point in history that we have to make this decision. We are at it. Here it is. Whether it's a city council passing a nonbinding proclamation or seat on. In our lifetime, we're going to have some issues to deal with. Health wise, environmental wise. And if we don't do anything about it now, we're going to regret

t it sorely in the future. And Out of everybody in this room. And I'm not trying to one up everybody when I say this, but just sincerely, I wish you could have heard what was on those doors. I think maybe there's one other person. Jenny from Globeville. They did organizing with me and Lorraine. I wish you could hear what was on those doors, because you would vote completely different on this. You would not support this one bit. So, Madam President, I, I wanted to end my comments, but I wanted to give my \$0.02. I know this vote may not be in our favor. I know we're going to be a minority losing vote. We've gotten used to that on this council. But there's a right thing to do. And from the bottom of my heart, from somebody who was part of the yellow shirt brigade, reroute this highway. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Okay. Councilmember us. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to let folks know and my constituents know why I chose not to have more public input on this proclamation. And, number one, we did have a conversation in Lodi that was open to public comment. But number two, which is really important and hasn't been mentioned yet, is every third Wednesday in Globeville or in Swansea, there is a meeting held by Seedat where you will get between 30 and 60 residents voicing their opinions of what is going on in this neighborhood. That is critically important for us as council folks to hear. And it's important for the people in this room to hear as well. These meetings will continue going on for the next two years. These meetings will go on until the final IRS release in recorded decision in March 2016. So while it is important and Councilwoman Kenney eloquently put this, it is important that we're hearing more and more feedback. The folks that I'm concerned about the most are the folks who live six blocks from me in Globeville or Swansea. I want to hear what they're saying about all of these issues. Let me just touch on the reroute, because, you know, in a perfect world. Yes. Let's do the. I live in the neighborhood. I'm six blocks away. But here's the reality. We have some complex jurisdiction issues and we have had Adams County Commerce City write letters of opposition against this. And this is a regional political hot potato. That's one. Two. If if we did in a perfect world, see that did reroute. Who is going to deconstruct I-70 from the Mousetrap to Colorado Boulevard? The city of Denver. And who is going to pay for that? You. So it's things like that that we need to begin to think about. And lastly, we would have to open up a whole new year, which is another ten year process. Now, I got to give a lot of credit to that because I met with that two years ago and he began talking to me about this. Now, although we disagree on this, one thing that I love more than anything is consistency and faithfulness. And that's what you've been in this whole in this whole deal. But I disagree w

ith the overall outcome, but I do agree that there are some major issues when it comes to air quality, some major issues when it comes to 5 to 10 lanes, which, by the way, you are this proclamation does not touch on. This is a macro level perspective saying we generally support. The cap and cover. Which if you've studied this in other cities, 80% of this is in high income neighborhoods. And it's really well done. And we're getting it in our neighborhood. Is it the best that we would ever want? No, but it is an option that we need to take advantage of. And let me say, I want to remind people how far we come from, because I remember when the east had us looking north and south and getting a viaduct. The community has continued to work and push Cedar to a place. Well, now we have the underground option with the covered piece as well. We're not done yet. There's still two years of work to be done, and we as a community can come to the table. And begin to talk about this. Let me say specifically some of the issues that I'm looking at. This

proclamation kind of generally gives the approval. And to see that to say, yes, we support the cap and cover, but there are some micro issues that are not worked out that I believe we need to work on. IMO you would see that and say how can we begin to get some of these issues that have been laid out eloquently by are the council folks? How can we address these issues? We must address these issues. The RFP has not been released. The RFP has not even been drafted yet. And I have information today that that we will have some members on our public works team that will create the criteria for our RFP. There's so much work that can continue to be done where we can work, we can see if we can get points for the design elements and things like that. That I think is incredibly important. The other pieces and I had a conversation with a community leader today and, and she said, Alvis, you know, one of the things that's so frustrating is the economic inequality. How will we know that minority contractors will have a seat at the table? How will we know that there will be some revenue sharing with these neighborhoods? And these are all issues that I want to advocate for and work on. Now, we don't need to get all of those issues worked out in the proclamation. Those issues need to be worked out in some sort of IMO you with Don Wit see that to make sure that we can begin to look at some of these things. I am. I'm supportive of this. And I know that there's a lot of a lot of angst about what can happen. And I will say that each of the council members up here should feel the weight, because this is a 100 year, 100 year highway. And there will be a lot of responsibility weighed on each and every one of us. But the responsibility. It shouldn't be up here while we're grandstanding. It should be in the next two years working to get the best project possible. Angle over Larry Swanson for the city of Denver. And so I hope that we wi

I'll be able to do that. And I hope that we can come together and figure out some ways to make that effective. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brooks. Councilman Nevitt, Councilman Monteiro. We'll go because she's been sick for so. Go ahead. I'm. I'm sorry. You're next. Oh. What do you know? Thank you. Oh, I understand. Thank you, Madam President. First off, I just want to thank Councilwoman Monteiro for. Being such a warrior for the neighborhoods through which I-70 goes and for being such a steadfast warrior on this project. This has been something that she has had to grapple with, deal with for the entire time that she's been on council, which is an amazing and amazing enterprise. And I think she's shown. An astounding combination of leadership and listening and caution and courage and has struck the balance between those and has had to over and over and over again. So I appreciate all of those qualities that she's shown over the last decade and more to bring us here to this point where we as a city, the city council with the mayor's office are saying we have made a decision about how to deal with this facility, I-70, and we're going to move forward with this plan and make it as good as possible. Now, all that said, of course, the objections from some of my colleagues are I think I'm right on the money. We don't we don't we don't have a clear or at least a perfect. We don't have perfect clarity of what this cut and cover project will ultimately look like. This process is a little backwards. It would be nicer to have this completely done and have the design completely done before we say, Yeah, we're in. That looks good to us. Unfortunately, we don't have that kind of time. We're facing a shortage of time and a whole lot of work to do and an opportunity to execute on a over \$1,000,000,000 project that will transform North Denver for 100 years. And we could blow it or we could get it right. And we I concede this. We do not have 100% certainty that we're going to get it right. We have to move forward with uncertainty or elect to do nothing, in which case the facility will sit there for another several decades, poisoning the communities that it runs through . That's not an option that I want to take. So, again, this is a judgment call for all of us. And Councilman Brooks put it well when he said this is this is a really big deal. I know I take no umbrage and find no fault with colleagues of mine who say, I do not know enough. I'm not willing to move forward. I'm not willing to say yes at this point. But for me, everything that I've seen so far, all the progress that I've seen in the conversations with CDOT, in working with SeaTac by public works and CBD, all the changes that have been made to the design, beginning with the abandonment of the reconstruction of the viaduct itself and reintroducing the cut and cover as a concept that was enormous progress. All the things that I've seen, all the progress that I've seen us make and the work that Seerat ha

s put in tells me that we have a very we have a high likelihood of achieving something. That is what I want. And that, I think will be of enormous benefit, not just to the communities of global Elyria and Swansea, but for all of Denver. So with that uncertainty, but with sufficient confidence to say, yes, I want to say yes, we're in the cut and cover is the way to go. And we will continue to work with the

community and with that to make this the best project we can possibly make it, to restore connectivity through the neighborhood, to recreate the streets so their neighborhood streets, to provide access to the community and to industry, to I-70, and to make this city a better place. So I'm in I'm willing to say yes and move forward. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Shepard. Thank you, Madam President. But in the last 48 to 72 hours, I've heard a tremendous amount from constituents citywide. But about 60% of the e-mails that I have received in that time are actually from folks that live in northwest Denver. And I know a lot of you have all been quoted on them as well, because I know that they were sent to Denver. And I've had a lot of conversations with people. I've had multiple meetings with Mr. Texas as well, who I'd like to thank for his unflagging vigilance to this issue. A lot of the folks I've talked to in the last few days were actually around when I-70 was originally built and have witnessed firsthand, both at the time that it was built and since, the immense amount of destruction that it has caused to Denver and to North Denver specifically. All night I'm sitting here looking at Mr. Bob May's sign, which says, No vote before a public input. Those of you who are not able to read it, you know, and I'm sitting here looking at it and I'm thinking to myself, yeah, you know, you know what's in the phrase cart before the horse comes to mind, right? We have already determined that, you know, we're going to get the results of this in July. So why are we jumping to throw our support behind something, as I've mentioned, that is so complex with so many moving parts, so many other jurisdictions involved, so many details that we don't even understand yet. Why are we jumping to offer our support at this point for something that we have so few unknowns about? Now, I don't want to be clear that I don't think anyone has bad intentions here at all. And, you know, good folks from Seattle, I'm looking at you in the back row. I've had multiple meetings with all of you. I don't believe you're bad people. I don't believe you're trying to, you know, hurt anyone or further endanger a community. But it concerns me when my one of my colleague, Councilman Nevett, says we don't have the kind of time to listen to what the results of the earth are before we decide whether we're going to support it or not. It's \$1,000,000,000 project, a two year project process for the IRS and a ten probably multiple year buildout. I think we've

got the time to wait for a few months personally. You know, folks from that I know we've had multiple meetings. You have heard me out. I appreciate that. And Judy, tonight has spoken. Councilmember Mattera has spoken eloquently about Globeville, Elyria, Swansea. But I also have neighborhoods that border I-70 directly. And I'm going to name those specifically Sunnyside and Berkeley Regis. And they're not that. Although they may not be direct stakeholders in this process, they're not all that far away, distance wise, from where this project will be happening. And there's still so many questions and there's not a lot of trust. There really isn't. It is very, very hard for folks from my community to hear that we need four managed lanes in each direction compared to what we already have. For them to hear that and for us to talk about adding cars, building for cars, building for all this future traffic, and for them to believe you when you say that it's not going to affect folks west of the mouse trap. And I know I'm going to get, you know, box for saying this later. But when two people are holding on to a rope and there's a lot of tension and pulling on one side, that is all the way down to that rope and you feel it on the other side. It doesn't just dissipate into the air. So I can really understand, folks, that's concern, you know, about the need for these extra managed lanes and then why people are so worried when they hear that only 4% of traffic will be heading west on I-70 from the mouse trap. So I really sympathize with those concerns. I stand up every month. I spend some of my office hours at the Willis case golf course, and I look out over that beautiful area down into Berkeley Park, and I try to imagine what it was like long before that freeway came there. And it's beautiful now, but I'm sure it was 200 times more beautiful back then. I'm a doubting Thomas. To use another metaphor, I need to see to believe we're being asked to wrap our brains around an incredibly complex, difficult project that we've never seen before, that we have no knowledge of. Like, I just. I'm not there yet. I'm not there yet. Many of us will be on a trip in June to Seattle, where we're going to have an opportunity, I hope, to see another freeway in this country that has been buried. And I really want to continue to do due diligence on all of this and to see, for example, that particular submerged highway and see, you know, how that worked out, learn more about the process. And so, like I said, I'm not there yet. I'm not ready. I can't support this proclamation tonight. I still need to learn more. And thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Shepard. Councilwoman. Thank you. Madam President, let the council speak. Go ahead, Councilwoman. Thank you, Madam President. Really very valuable debate tonight, I

think. Here's my perspective. I think there are a couple of things that everyone in this room and outside this room agrees with. So let's identify those.

One The existing highway is horrible. We don't want it to stay like it is a minute longer than it has to. And in spite of the fact repairs were made, you know, to help stretch a little more life out of it. It didn't make it a long time bridge. It is still a deficient bridge. It still needs to go and it still is harming the quality of life in that neighborhood. So I think we all agree on that. Second thing I think we all agree on is that the details of this project aren't even close to final. I think we all agree. I heard it from every colleague up here. I heard it in every email that I got from those again in the room and not in the room. So we agree. So if we agree on those things, what is it that we disagree on? First, I think we disagree on what happens if Denver rejects this design. Now, I think some people believe that if we say no to this design, that magically a reroute will occur and that we can take some time and that the money will still be there and that the opposition can be worked through. I want to give you I think one of the things that's important in any debate is to make sure everyone has the same information. So I'm going to share some information that I have. I sat at a statewide transportation funding table representing the city and county of Denver for more than two years. At that table, I saw slide after slide in the decline in capital improvement dollars that the state of Colorado has for new projects, the vast majority of it goes for maintenance, repaving. All the things we'd want them to do to keep the existing roads in existence. And then I heard list after list and project after project of the demand from places across the state. And I also heard SeaTac get beat up at every meeting about how all the money comes to the metro area. Folks, make no mistake, there is opposition to funding big projects and investing more in Denver and in the Metro. I think that is misplaced analysis based on the tourists we deliver to the rest of the state through our airport, based on the commerce and industry, based on the products that pass through here. I think it's misplaced, but it's real. And I think that we are sorely underestimating the potential to lose the funding we need to make this project a reality. If we don't support the general concept of the cut and cover and give that signal. And that really is what it is. It's a signal in order, frankly, for CDOT to do what they need to do, which is to continue to push back against all those other project demands and say because of the tourists that this corridor delivers to the rest of the state, this is a good statewide investment because of the commerce and industry. It's a good statewide investment. And so what we need from Seattle is we need dollars. We don't just need them for the core projects, but we also need them for all of the other mitigation. So I want to get there next. So I think that, again, just to share with the information I have is and why I feel that this is a risk

y proposition to try to reject a bird in hand for a distant hope that I think is is not going to happen for something else. The second thing I think we disagree on is whether we're not we get more out of CDOT without this proclamation or with it. It's so simple. Right. But I really do think that is one of the fundamental disagreements that we have. And so I want to share why I believe and my expectations for both our city departments and CDOT. I believe that we get more out of that by signaling our support because there is enough certainty then, frankly, for my staff and our staff to turn the screws. And here's a list of all these potential mitigation items. Here's what I expect. Instead of a bullet that says improve sideways and pedestrian crossings, I want to see a bullet that says pave X number of feet of sidewalks, redo X number of pedestrian crossings instead of saying, you know, explore improvements to surrounding housing. I wanted to say replace windows, replace foundations or whatever on X number of homes. I expect us to negotiate that level of detail with CDOT following this proclamation. I expect us instead of saying. Saying, you know, air quality monitoring to say air quality mitigation or other types of specifics. And if we don't get to those places with DOT. What I want our city to say is sorry, we're not ready to sell you that piece of right away that you need. Sorry. We're not ready to provide that development approval that you need. Sorry, we're not ready to work with you on that piece. I expect and I think many of us up here, maybe not as strongly worded, expect those types of things to occur after this proclamation. And if they don't, I expect us to not let the project go forward in the myriad of other ways that we have as a city. So please don't take this proclamation and at least my vote for it as any kind of acquiescence that we're okay with vague items or that we're okay with where we're at in the negotiations. We do have a ways to go. Those things do need to be in detail. Some of them legally need to be in the air. For example, I expect to see that to pay for a good portion of these covers and other things that we are talking about. And there may be things like housing that are more for Denver to pay for, but things

that need to be in the air will need to be in the air. And even after this, if we're not down to the number of feet of sidewalks, we should get there shortly afterwards. So. So I just I think that I respect people and my colleagues view that that that this is is early. I just simply believe strategically that we will get further on the list of demands. Less of requests. List of needs. List of civil rights. Scale mitigation. By signaling our support for this option. And so for those reasons, I recognize we won't get to consensus, but I believe strongly that we'll be leaving this proclamation with a work plan that many, if not all of us, will be happily continuing to babysit and shepherd and watchdog. And so that'

s my commitment to you as I vote yes on this proclamation tonight. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennish. Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Madam President. It's always a privilege and intimidating to follow Councilwoman Kanis, who made very cogent arguments in a very logical way. So I'm not going to go through a lot of it, since I agree with much of what you said, except to say, yes, it's premature. I don't think waiting three or four months will even give us the details we need. At that point, a lot will be in the air. Several still be a lot to work out afterwards. Yes. To Paul Lopez's point, it is definitely political. And I think because we have a city election coming up in 2015 and we probably won't have the record of decision by or it will be close. I can understand why county commissioners don't want to take the risk on just the mayor's letter because maybe someone here and I'm not I'm not trying to start a rumor, but maybe someone here will be running against the mayor. So it is political. And the only other thing I wanted to say, I am concerned about the environmental concerns. I know when T-Rex was done, there were concerns. Environmentally, they sound there's air pollution, there's the ambient dust, which is part of air pollution. But I will tell you, if we put a fifth in, I read this in an email from someone in Globeville leery of swans here, that it actually wasn't an email. It was a blog that Councilman Brooks forwarded us today. If we had a 50,000 car boulevard through Global Elyria, Swansea, it, you got to believe there's going to be a good deal of dust and air pollution and emissions right at grade, right where people are crossing, right where people are walking. I've seen it from living near Speer Boulevard. I don't live near Santa Fe, so that's my brief comments. And they lasted longer than I thought. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. Okay. I think that we are probably ready for the vote. Madam Secretary Montero I never i. Ortega rob. I. Sheppard, no. Brooks, i. Brown I. Fights i. Herndon I can each five. Layman I. Lopez. No. Madam President, I. Madam Secretary, to close the voting, announce the results tonight. Three days. Ten eyes, three nays. The proclamation does pass. Councilwoman Monteiro, is there somebody you'd like to invite to the podium or to answer? Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Mr. DeVito, would you like to come back up to the podium? Madam President and Members of Council, I am very pleased to accept this proclamation on behalf of the Colorado Department of Transportation this evening, and I express my thanks for your leadership and partnership. I've enjoyed the opportunity to personally brief most of you on this project and appreciate the many difficult questions that you did ask me. 2014 is an important year. It marks the 50th year since the I-70 viaduct was opened to traffic. It also brings CDOT into a second decade of our now 11 year study to determine the future of this interstate.

In that 11 years, we are achieve where we're going above \$20 Million on this study. This proclamation comes at an important juncture. CDOT is poised to take the next step towards completing this and developing a plan for financing this project. This is the biggest project we have ever undertaken. This proclamation provides certainty for us to move forward with the partial covered, lowered alternative as our preferred option. And as I said earlier, which we first presented to the public two years ago, it gives our Transportation Commission the certainty they need to take the next steps on behalf of Colorado taxpayers. Knowing that the city is united in support of this billion, billion dollar investment, perhaps it's just important for me to note again what this proclamation doesn't signify. It does not signify the end of our close collaboration with Denver City staff, the DCC and you, the Council. We have significant work yet to accomplish and expect our Denver partners to be closely involved as they have up to this point. It doesn't signify any change to the course of this or to the significant environmental justice mitigations that we as a department have committed to. These commitments are a defining feature of the year, and their importance cannot be understated. Neither neither does this proclamation change the city's ability to hold us to our commitments or to continue negotiations as we move toward a final record of decision, which is the legal binding contract for CDOT and FH CWA, and it doesn't signal signify any abatement in our

public outreach process, which will continue to be as robust as it has been. As I mentioned before, the magnitude of the I-70 East Project is unprecedented for CDOT. So too is our level of our partnership with the city of Denver. This proclamation continues that partnership and brings us closer to removing this viaduct and to bringing long overdue improvements to this part of Denver. Thank you again. Thank you, Mr. DeVito. Okay. Moving right along. We need to have Madam Secretary read the resolutions. We do have three proclamations this evening, and I'd like to call on Councilman Lopez to read proclamation number 403. Thank you, Madam President. I want to welcome this. Proclamation is a proclamation we do every year, and it's a proclamation recognizing May 2014 as Hepatitis Awareness Month. And this is proclamation number 403. So the 2014 whereas today is national hepatitis testing day, hepatitis C is recognized as the most common blood borne viral infection in the United States . And. WHEREAS, Hepatitis C has infected an estimated 85,000 Coloradans, as many as 4 million American residents, nearly two out of every 100 persons and more than 200 million people worldwide. And. Whereas, it is a leading cause of cirrhosis and liver cancer and the number one reason for liver transplants in the United States. And. Whereas, most Americans die of hepatitis C than from HIV making hepatitis C one of the top preventable cau

ses of death in the United States. And. Whereas, approximately 15,000 hepatitis C related deaths occur annually in the United States and is expected to triple in the next 10 to 20 years. And. WHEREAS, people born between 1945 and 1965 are five times more likely to be infected than any other adult. Nearly three in four people with hep C were born between 1945. And 1965, and many remain unaware of their status without participating in screening efforts. And. WHEREAS, the incidence of hepatitis C disproportionately affects minority communities. And. WHEREAS, 75% of infected persons do not show any signs or symptoms leading to the Hep C virus to cause poor health outcomes and be labeled as the silent epidemic. And. Whereas, new drugs were approved that significantly increase the cure rate among hep C patients seeking treatment and even more effective treatments are on the horizon. And. Whereas, risk factors can be evaluated, evaluated, hep C can be prevented. Testing can detect the Hep C virus infections and early diagnosis and treatment can save lives, money and resources. And. Whereas, Hep C connection is available as a local resource for education testing, linkage to care and support. Now therefore being proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. Section one. The Denver City Council agrees that preventing and treating Hep C is an important public health initiative that will improve the quality of life for all Denver residents affected by the virus. Section two of the Denver City Council proclaimed proclaims the month of May as Hepatitis Awareness Month and recognizes July 28, 2014 as World Hepatitis Day . Section three that the Clerk of the city and County of Denver's our test and Fix the seal of the city and County of Denver to this proclamation and a copy be transmitted to Nancy Steinfurth, the executive director of the Hep C Connection. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, your motion to adopt. And I'm president I move that council proclamation number four of three series of 2014 be adopted. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Comments by Council. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Madam President. I have the honor, like I said earlier, to carry this proclamation every year. I think almost since for the last six years, I think six or seven years. The first year was traditionally Councilmember Garcia used to read this. He was not here that day. So I took it up and it was his last. So I get to revisit this really cool proclamation. And I read this proclamation because hep-C is preventable. This is something that with education, with outreach, with access to the resources, we can prevent it. This is something that is a serious viral infection. This is something that kills a lot of people every year. And I read this proclamation because it killed my grandfather. My grandfather was a World War Two vet, served in Germany. Born and raised in Colorado. And called Denver home every year after his after that, when he came back from the service, h

e was injured as the jeep that they were in when over a landmine, killed his buddies and injured him. He came to the hospital, needed a transfusion, a transfusion. And because he didn't screen then, he was infected by the virus and didn't show up until later and until they figured out that he had hepatitis C and just a few years after he was diagnosed with with liver cancer. And my grandfather would be here today and my grandfather was like my father, he was the guy and man showed me how to be a man. He was a very honorable person. He grew up in Barton, lived in Barnum. And if it were not for if it weren't for this disease, he'd be here. He'd get to see his great granddaughter and get a you know, perhaps maybe it stopped in at my campaign celebration when I was elected or when I walked across the stage at the University of Colorado to get my diploma.

Folks who were infected with Hep C and folks who are at risk need to have access to the resources, need to have access to education. We need to spread the word because like my grandfather, there are other people's grandfathers and other people's dads and mothers and daughters and brothers and sisters. This is this does not discriminate. If we do not be careful, we don't pass the word around, it's going to be somebody else's grandfather or father or mother that's not going to be in the crowd when you get your diploma. Right. So it is a. Very seriously. I'm very happy to have sponsored this proclamation every year so that we can raise awareness about it. The Hep C connection has done a great job of getting the word out and more people to the clinic and more people to get tested. It's best to know your status is absolutely preventable. And so, Madam President, with no doubt belaboring the point in the moment, I just wanted to thank folks for this proclamation and urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Councilman Leavitt. Thank you, Madam President. Councilman Lopez, I want to thank you for sponsoring this proclamation not just once, but every year, because after about the fifth or sixth year of you sponsoring this proclamation, I thought to myself, well, I was born between 1945 and 1965, and I've spent a bunch of time overseas, and I wonder if I've ever been screened for hepatitis C. So I went to my doctor and I said, if I have been screened for hepatitis C and my doctor said, no. I said, Can I see? Yeah. It's just part of ordinary blood work. Got screened for hepatitis C and I don't have it. But nonetheless, I could have had it and I was in the risk group and so I don't have it. I'm happier for it. And if I did have it, I wouldn't have shown any symptoms. But it could have been a big problem down the road. So thank you for doing this. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Leavitt. And I just want to mention that the news about the cure for this is very exciting and glad to hear that and all the progress that they're making on this disease. I see no other comments. So, Madam Secretary,

roll call Lopez. Hi, Montero. I never. I Ortega. I Rob. Shepherd. Brooks. High fat. Hi, Herndon. I can eat. I lemon. Hi, Madam President. Hi. Councilwoman. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. Close a voting not so. Results 12 eyes. 12 eyes. The proclamation is adopted. Is there somebody you'd like to come up to? The bring up to the podium? Yes, Madam President, I'd like to invite Nancy Steinfert, the executive director of the AFC Connection to the podium and whoever else I should introduce the folks who are here from the AFC connection as well. Thank you very much. I am honored to once again speak to City Council about the importance of hepatitis C testing, especially among baby boomers. I'm also grateful to Councilman Lopez for being our champion and to the council members who co-sponsored today's bill, voted for it, and then were also able to include information in their e-newsletter about testing day. We tested approximately 40 people at the web building. In addition to that, I had conversations with at least five people. Two of homes. Husband had just finished treatment within the last couple of months and successfully cleared it. Someone else who had done treatment prior last year or so cleared it. And two other folks that are waiting for that opportunity and so still living with that virus. I'm hoping that our other ten testing partners have the same great results that we did. That would be 400 people. I'd be I'd be really happy. Last year was our highest number of testing years. We tested 592 people. As you might imagine, baby boomers are kind of, I don't know, stubborn and don't feel that this necessarily applies to them. So when you're trying to twist arms, it does get a little challenging. This group you most like most likely have heard that the latest treatment for HCV has a really hefty price tag. Even so, the cure rate is 90% and those results are amazing. We know that new treatments are going to be approved. Well, all right. I don't have a crystal ball with the FDA, but we think that they're going to be approved in November of this year and those results are going to be even better. We also hope that the price will come down a bit so that they can give some competition, too, to the current drug maker. As baby boomers age, it will become more difficult to treat them because of the damage to their liver over decades of undiagnosed disease. That's why there's urgency and more and more initiatives. In fact, Governor Hickenlooper signed legislation today that strongly encourages medical providers to test boomers for the virus. Thank you very much for working with us to increase awareness about hepatitis C through this resolution and for facilitating our testing in the web building. And now I'd like to ask Dr. Sarah Rowan to update us on her testing results at the Eastside Clinic. Thank you. Madam Chair. So I'm a physician at Denver Health. I work at the Eastside Clinic and Five Points Eastside is predominantly lo

wer income and higher percentage African-American than the majority of Denver. We're funded through the CDC to do hepatitis C testing and linkage to care at Eastside. And we focus on the

baby boomer cohort. We had a successful first year of our grant activities, so we expanded our grant activities to Parkhill Clinic, which has a similar demographic. In a year and a half, we tested over 2000 baby boomers. That's people born between 1945 and 1965 for hepatitis C, and 8% of the people that we tested had newly diagnosed chronic hepatitis C. It's a much higher percentage than almost anything else that we screened for in primary care except for possibly diabetes. Of those we screened, 171 people were newly diagnosed with chronic hep C. Most none of them knew that they had Hep C, 159 people had a post-test counseling session, and that's important for alcohol cessation counseling, for review of other vaccines to see if people need hepatitis A and B, vaccines and other healthy living tips for living with hepatitis C, we also refer people. To their primary care. Provider to get an evaluation for a. Cold liver disease. And after that, the primary care provider can refer them to a Hep C treatment specialist. So none of this is possible if you don't know that you have hep C treatments been limited because Hep C treatment's very expensive right now. But as Nancy said, it's really promising. So we're very excited about the future for Hep C treatment. I think that concludes my responses or my remarks. I would also mention that of the 171 people at East Side in Park Hill Clinic who are newly diagnosed, it was a majority African-American, majority low income. So this is a disease that disproportionately affects certain subgroups within Denver and I think gives us even more reason to focus on it. So thank you. Thank you very much. And thank you, Councilman Lopez, for that proclamation. We have a second proclamation this evening, and I would like to call upon Councilwoman Lehman to read proclamation number 424. Madam Secretary. Please, both of you announced results tonight. Tonight for 71 has passed and now for the. Are there any comments on the companion bill council bill 470. Approving the cooperation agreement for the 2301 property tax increment area. Mr. President, I think you want me to put it on the floor. Okay. Candidate Yeah. Sorry about that, councilman. To be pleased with 47470 on the floor. Yes, Mr. President, I move that 471 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Has been moved in second. Now do we have any comments on 470? The scene on Madam Secretary, roll call. Brooks I futz i Herndon I can eat lemon. Lopez All right, Montero. Nevitt Hi. Ortega Hi. Mr. President. Hi. Rob. Hi. Madam Secretary. Please call the voting and announce the results tonight. Tonight, 470 has been placed upon final consideration and does pass. Seen no other business before this body. This meeting is adjourned. Telephone. Next, we have a proclamation that I'll ask counci

I and can use to read proclamation number 583. Thank you, Madam President. It's my honor to read Proclamation 583 series of 14 Acknowledging the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 and the American Indian Arts and Crafts Symposium in Denver. Whereas, in 1990, the Indian Arts and Crafts Act was passed to prohibit misrepresentation and mark in the marketing of Indian art and craft work in the United States. And. Whereas, the Act makes it illegal to offer or display for sale or sell any art or craft product in a manner that falsely states it is Indian produced an Indian product or the product of a specific Indian tribe which can result in a fine of up to \$250,000 and or imprisonment up to five years for an individual. If the total sales transaction is valued at \$1,000 or more, or a fine up to \$1 million for a first time violation by a business. Whereas the Indian Arts and Crafts Act defines that an Indian and or Indian tribe is a member of a federal or official state recognized tribe, and that a certified Indian artisan is certified as a nonmember Indian artisan by the governing body of an Indian tribe from which the individual is a direct, lineal descendant. And. Whereas, on Thursday, July 17th, 2014, the Denver American Indian Commission will host the U.S. Department of the Interior for a one day American Indian Arts and Crafts symposium at the McNichols Building, starting at 9 a.m.. That will bring various key organizations together to discuss local and statewide museums and historic sites across Colorado to encourage them to buy and sell authentic American Indian and Alaska Native art within their respective shops. And. WHEREAS, in addition, the symposium will expand markets for authentic American Indian goods. And therefore increase economic prosperity for American Indian artists and give them the opportunity to showcase their work. And. WHEREAS, The Denver American Indian Commission is one of the co-sponsors of this symposium and an active partner in addressing these issues, the Commission encourages people to contact the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at w dot i acb that dui dot gov. If you become aware of any market activity in violation of the act. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the City of the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one that the Denver City Council acknowledges the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 and encourages residents of Denver to attend this symposium to learn more about Indian art and craft work in Section two that the Clerk of the city and County of Denver shall attest in a fix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this

proclamation and that copies be transmitted to the Denver American Indian Commission, the Rocky Mountain Indian Chamber of Commerce, and the Department of the Interior, Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Thank you. Councilman Kenny's your motion to adopt. Thank you. Madam President, I move that, perhaps proclamation 583 be adopted. Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Comments by Counc

il Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Madam President. I love this job. Serving as a member of City Council on a daily basis, I learn new things. And in the course of serving on the Health and Safety Committee, we receive updates from our commissions. And this is one of the updates they provided about this symposium. I have been, like many of you have been at museums or gift shops where you see beautiful jewelry, maybe earrings or trinkets, maybe some turquoise that you believe might be American Indian art. And maybe you turn it over and you look at it and it says, Made in China on the bottom. And you have this kind of feeling like something isn't right there. And in the case of this proclamation, I thought it was important for us all to understand not only is that not right, it's not legal. And I think it's really great that our commission is getting together with the federal government to really not just identify what the law is in regards to really making sure that the things that you sell are authentic, but also saying, if I am a museum, if I am a gift shop, how is it that I could find authentic art? Who do I call? Where do I find an artisan who makes great earrings, makes great jewelry, makes great paintings? And this is the opportunity, this symposium on Thursday. So I shared this proclamation because I was pleased to know that after the many wrongs that the U.S. government has perpetrated over time with regard to native peoples , that we are also working to use the law to help protect those artisans who, you know, are trying to make a living as artists, but competing against goods that might be made overseas or elsewhere and certainly made at lower cost than a handmade artisan would be doing from a native tribe. So I encourage all of us to be smarter shoppers and to help when we are in places where Native American art could be sold to help educate our shopkeepers and others about this act as we move forward and to maybe think about checking out this symposium on Thursday the 17th. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, Councilwoman Kennish, for bringing this forward, because I to learn something new every day. And this was. One of the things I learned. I'm very supportive of this. When I was a young adult, my father had retired and was a marketing consultant to the Navajo Nation, and that was a very interesting experience for our whole family. What I think is great is that this is a this is a great event for the McNichols building. This really shows what our cultural. Buildings can do, too. So it brings the strength of the city to a very interesting topic. So thank you for bringing it forward. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. And Madam Secretary, it looks like we're ready for a roll call. Can I. Lemon Lopez. Lopez. All right. Monteiro, I never i. Ortega, I run i. Brooks, i. Forts i. Herndon, i. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting. Not so. Results 11 eyes. 11 Eyes. The

proclamation is adopted. Councilwoman, is there someone you'd like to invite to the podium? Yes. Jennifer Williams, who's a member of our American Indian Commission. Good evening. I just want to really say thank you to all. Council members for voting on this. Proclamation. Tonight. I think the event on the 17th is really going. To help build. Awareness. And really the bottom line is to build. Economic. Development among native artists locally, you know, and within the whole state of Colorado. This kind of came about. Because the commission did. Some art. Shows up at Red. Rocks. And while we were sitting outside and it was really beautiful to have 25 vendors. Selling their art. I noticed inside at the gift shop, you know, native stuff, supposedly native items that were. Really made from China excuse me, really made from China and different places. And so after about a year of a couple of years, we've been planning this event. So I just think that it's really important, especially for our artists, to be able to build their build their art and not to have it taken for granted. So I hope you guys can all come out. We also are going to do a walking tour in the afternoon to the Colorado History Museum and the Buyers Evans House and the Denver Art Museum. So hopefully you can stop by. And. Then we're going to have a reception at the Native American Trading Company right on 13th. Bannock after that. So hopefully you can come by and check it out. Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms.. Williams. Okay. We are ready for the resolutions. Madam Secretary, would you please read the resolutions. Thank you, Mr. President. And good evening, City Council. I'm Sara Showalter, senior city planner with the Department of Community Planning and Development. This case is located on several parcels addressed 151

through 175 South Harrison Street, located in the southeast section of the city and Council District ten in the Cherry Creek Statistical neighborhood. This area outlines the site in the yellow dashed line. It's located at the corner of Harrison Street and Cedar Avenue, just west of Colorado Boulevard. The property is just over a half acre in size. It's currently vacant land and the applicant is requesting to rezone to a pad under former Chapter 59. The current zoning is APD PD 625. This was adopted in 2008 to allow for townhome development on the site. It currently allows for 15 units total with a three storey maximum height, and it does have very specific and detailed architectural elevations, some of which you can see a photo of here on the screen. The primary reason the applicant is requested to rezone is the desire to do different architecture than what's in the existing PWD. There are very few substantive changes from the existing period. It'll still allow for multifamily as the only use with a maximum of 15 units. The height will remain the same, which is three storey maximum at 42 feet total. The changes that are proposed through this rezoning are updating t

he building elevations and allowing for them to be more conceptual rather than a very specific design. And probably the most important change is incorporating design guidelines that are based on the current version of the Cherry Creek East Design Guidelines. There are also very small changes to the development program to reflect slight change in the design of the site. The main reason that the requested zoning is a PUD as opposed to a standard zone district from our Denver zoning code is because of the desire to incorporate design guidelines. There are design guidelines today called the Cherry Creek East Design Guidelines that went through a process over ten years ago but were never officially adopted by a planning board. And our Cherry Creek Area plan, which addresses this neighborhood, calls for updating those design guidelines and then having them officially adopted until that time. This PD allows for the majority of those guidelines to be incorporated and applicable to this site. The reason why it's a PDF under former Chapter 59 is really a matter of timing. When the applicant applied several months ago, CPD was using a very strict interpretation of the PUD criteria under the Denver zoning code, one of which is public benefit would result from the PUD. Since that time, we've had a conversation with a lot of City Council members about the importance of zoning into new code districts under the Denver zoning code and seeing that as a public benefit. So it is our hope that this is one of, if not the last one of the last former Chapter 59 parties that you would see that policy shift was made after the applicant had already applied. And we did not want to make them start over again with a new code PUD. So that's why it's under former chapter 59. This is the district plan, as it's called in the proposed PUD, showing the 15 units that are proposed. They are oriented to face the streets and really promote a pedestrian friendly, walkable neighborhood. This is the proposed conceptual building elevations and alternate view, seeing them from the back of the alley. In terms of the existing context in this area, the zoning is immediately around the site is either other PDE zoning or GM three and immediately to the south S.R. eight. The uses in this area are primarily residential. There's quite a mix of two family and multifamily being the predominant residential uses. These images quickly orient you to the existing building form and scale in this neighborhood. The image on the top shows existing duplexes that are just north of the site. The image on the bottom there shows the vacant site with some multifamily behind it. The this image on the top shows the property that's directly west of the site, a three story multifamily building. And the image on the bottom shows property across the street on the other side of Harrison. In terms of the public process. We went to planning board for a public hearing on August 20th. They did vote unanimously to recommend ap

proval. I went to the Neighborhood and Planning Committee on September 18th, and then we're here tonight, October 27th. In terms of the public outreach that's been done for this public hearing, there was written notification to R.A. emailed on October 6th. The sign was legally the property was legally notice was signs from October 6th through today. And the only public comment we've received is one letter that was included. Just today we received it. The neighbor who wrote this letter expressed kind of two concerns. One was about the notification of the property for the planning board public hearing. I did want to note that all of the noticing requirements per our code for both the planning board public hearing as well as this public hearing were met. And the second concern cited in the letter revolves around the maximum height of the building, which is three stories or 42 feet. There is a small enclosed stairway and landing that goes up to the roof of the property, which does not count as a fourth story per our code, as long as all it contains is a minimum landing area for the stairway. So as the applicant, if the zoning is approved tonight, as

they proceed with their design and construction, they will be closely monitored to make sure that it does not include anything more than that and does not qualify as a fourth storey. I'll quickly walk through the review criteria for this piece, which does fall under former Chapter 59. The first is consistency with adopted plans. It is consistent with three of the strategies identified in comp plan 2000, including goals relating to promoting infill development in existing areas that already have infrastructure promoting infill development. That's consistent with the quality and scale of surrounding neighborhoods and also identifying areas where it makes sense to add density in appropriate way. Blueprint Denver does designate this site as urban residential, which the proposed use is very much in conformance with. It also designates this area along Harrison Street as an area of change. And finally, the Cherry Creek Area plan adopted in 2012 has this entire section dedicated to the Cherry Creek East neighborhood where the site lies. It complies with many of the goals that are in the plan for Cherry Creek East, including reinforcing the residential character of this neighborhood, respecting the existing scale, revitalizing and encouraging reinvestment along Harrison Street and updating the Cherry Creek East Design Guidelines. As I mentioned earlier, we see this pegged as an interim solution until we have the staff resources to engage in the process to completely update those guidelines and have them officially adopted. This is also in compliance with the Cherry Creek Area Plan because it has a maximum of three stories, which is what the plan calls for and our other other criteria. We do find that the site through this request meets all of them, including the justifying circumstance of a change or changi

ng condition. This whole neighborhood is seeing a lot of change with residential redevelopment. We also have a newly adopted plan that encourages that type of change in this area. So with that, staff does recommend approval, finding that all of the review criteria have been met. Thank you very much. We have three speakers today and all three of you can come up to the front pew. Steven Spahn, Reed Phillips and Brooks Waldman. So, Steven, you can go ahead and get started. Good evening, council members. Name is Stephen Spahn, 1731 15th Street, Boulder, Colorado. Can I get to back to my answering your. There it is. There we go. Great. I'm here tonight to make some very brief comments. I'm available for questions and I will ask for your approval of PewDiePie 637 tonight. My client purchased this property early in 2014 with the underlying PDP 626. And which would require an architectural style that was due, which would involve this architectural style, which was very restrictive, and it was due to the way the party was approved. We believe that design could be a it could be much improved before we started designing. However, we carefully reviewed the Denver Comp Plan 2000 Blueprint Boulder Blueprint Denver excuse me, 2002 and the Cherry Creek Area plan for guidance. With this knowledge, we created our initial design concept. We then conducted a proactive neighborhood outreach program to learn our neighbors concerns and to review our design concepts with them. We met with the East Cherry Creek Neighborhood Association on two separate occasions to better understand their concerns and fine tune our design concept. We are pleased to have earned the neighborhood support for this project to garner their support. However, a key element was to develop clearly defined architectural guidelines for this project, which is part of your package to be approved tonight. The neighborhood appreciated that the primary building was only 37 feet high, where 42 feet is allowed. With the exception of the roof stair structure on the top, we also met with city council member Jean Robb, who corresponded with many of the neighbors regarding this project. I know this hearing is not about architecture, but the images shown today represent the project that we hope to build on this site. Our team is ready to move forward on the next stages of this project, and we would very much like your support today. Thank you very much. Thank you. Fred Phillips. My name is Reed Phillips. I live in Lafayette, Colorado, and I mostly want to make myself available for questions, but also wanted to talk a little bit about our working with the Czech priest, East Arnaud. One of the specific things that may not be included within those guidelines is also a commitment to incorporate the pedestrian. Lights within the area that. Are unique to that area. Not only in this project, but also to other products we have going in the area and they are not up yet. They will be as well. So I just want to put that fo

rward as well. Thank you. Brooks Waldman. My name is Brooks Waldman. I live at 66 South Garfield Street. I'm the past president of Cherry Creek East. I'm standing in tonight for Tracy Winchester, who wasn't able to be here tonight. She's our current vice president. And I really want to let the applicant know and planning staff that we so appreciate this moving forward as a . Our neighborhood has been opioids for years now. And the design guidelines were the the tool that we

had to make sure that design was consistent within the neighborhood. Having lost that tool, a project like this could be much, pretty much anything under the new form based zoning. So this has allowed us to get the results that we intended originally and set a good precedent. And I'm so glad to hear Sarah speak about the guidelines being updated. So I'm here in support of this project. Thank you very much. Thank you. That concludes our speak and that concludes our speakers is now a time for questions of members of council. Councilman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President, for Brooks Waldman, I. I was at one of the Cherry Creek East meetings where there was a discussion of this proposed PUD, but did at any time did the neighborhood organization take a formal position on it? Can you come up to the ABCs? Can you, Mr.. Waldman, go to the microphone. I'm sorry. It's my recollection that it was voted at the board level. It was presented at the time to the community. And we had support. We had a consensus. Got it. I knew there were a lot of questions at night, but generally positive, and that there were some small neighborhood meetings or smaller group meetings going on. And then just one other question, Mr. President, for Reed Philips. You mentioned the lights that will be going in at the other projects that you've done in Cherry Creek East. As you know, this is really important to the pedestrian feel of the area in sort of a neighborhood tradition. Are you also are those properties occupied? No, they are not. One is in construction and one has just completed the construction of the main structure. Okay. And those have been ordered together. Okay. Because I wanted to be sure that you have a common wall agreement that provides for the maintenance of the light. Yes. And has addressed those lights. Specifically, which I've heard is. An issue. And in this episode, they're actually shown and reflected in the text. So unlike the other zoning, they're actually part of this property. Yes, they are. Okay. Thank you. Great. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. Are there any other questions from members of council? Seen on the public hearing on 705 is now closed. It's time for comments from members of Council Councilman Rob Cook. Didn't even ring in yet, but thank you, Mr. President. I feel like there's strong neighborhood support and there's been plenty of information out on this property. I will also confess, Mayor Culpa, perhaps on the old Chapter 59 PD, the day we had a discussion in committee about

an EV, chapter 59 PD And I really I think we've only done two or three of these in total in the last four years. But I had been in committee listening to this PD and Councilman Brooks district and we weren't happy with it being an old code PD. I went back to my computer and saw a notice on this rezoning, picked up the phone and said, Is this an old code PD? And it was already in the hopper. And I think they have good explanations for why at this point it was felt that that was the way the developer should proceed. I will be supporting this and would appreciate my colleagues support. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. Councilwoman Fox. Thank you, Mr. President. There was reference, I believe I the first speaker to the fact that he hoped or thought that architecture would be what would be finally presented. I sincerely hope it is. I'm voting for it because it's a very attractive rendition. And I'd like to see on the street what I voted for. Thank you. Councilman Fox, any other comments from members of council? Scene on Madam Secretary, roll call. Rob Shepherd. Sussman. All right. BROWN All right, Fats, I can eat Lemon. Lopez. All right. Monteiro. I never i. Ortega, i. Mr. President, II. Madam Secretary, please close the voting announce results. 12 1275 has been placed upon final consideration and does pass. Right. We are moving on to prior public hearing for 764 and 765. Councilwoman Fox, will you please put council bill 764 on the floor? Certainly, Mr. President, I know the council bill 764 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved in second hand. This is a combined public hearing for Council Bill 764 and 765 and is now open. Speakers may address either or both bills at the conclusion of the public hearing. Council will vote separately on each bill. May we have the staff report? Good evening again and thank you, Mr. President. I'm Sara Showalter with Community Planning and Development, and I'm here with my colleague Kyle Dalton, co project manager on Cherry Creek Zoning. We're going to give this presentation together and just as we come as a team, we have the two amendments as a team here, the text amendment and the map amendment. I will quickly walk through the background on this project, which has lasted many months and has been a great endeavor and partnership between our office and the technical task force that Kyle will talk about in a minute. The zoning that's before you tonight implements three plans that the city has adopted our comp plan 2000. It very much furthers the goals and that plan for promoting quality mixed use infill development. Blueprint Denver recognizes all of Cherry Creek North as an area of change and encourages the mixed use redevelopment of this area. And then the Cherry Creek Area plan

adopted in 2012. One of the primary recommendations in the plan was to update the C CCN zoning that stands for Urban Center, Cherry Creek North. I think most of you are familiar with the fact that when we're zoned the

city in 2010, the zoning was not updated into the Denver zoning code. Form based and context based approach. There was a desire then to have the neighborhood plan adopted first, and that did occur in 2012 after a very long process that involved the input of hundreds of stakeholders. And as I mentioned, a major recommendation of that plan was to update the zoning. A development study was done as part of the plan that recognized the current zoning had many factors, including floor area ratio or FAA limits, height limits and off street parking requirements that were limiting redevelopment opportunities in Cherry Creek so that the development that's been happening in the area, so much of that development that people have seen in the past few years has been occurring under different zoning than the CCN. The plan has a very robust implementation section with lots of implementation steps. Just we wanted to note that adopting this zoning, while very important, is just one line on a very long implementation plan. A lot of the comments that we received and a lot of discussion we had with the public throughout this process involved items that are not really in the zoning code and yet still very important and related to land use. These include concerns about traffic and parking in the neighborhood, about the need for better transit, serving Cherry Creek. And we did want to note that in addition to the zoning that we've been working on in the past year and a half, there have been a lot of efforts underway to address a lot of the other implementation recommendations All right. The next public hearing is on Council Bill 841. Councilwoman Sheppard, would you please put a41 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 841 be placed on final consideration and do pass. We will wait for technology to catch up. It has been moving and second in the public hearing on 841 is now open. May we have the staff report? Good evening, Theresa. Looser with community planning and development. Soon as I get to the white. Okay. Here we are. So Council Bill 841 is to rezone property located at 6900 through 7100 East First Avenue. It is located in the property is located in Southeast Denver in Council District five, in the Lowry Field statistical neighborhood. Many of you know the history of Lowry. I don't know if you want me to go into the detail of this, but through the seventies and up until 2005, the Air Reserve Personnel Center and the Defense Financing and Accounting Services were located on Buckley Annex. There were 3000 employees. In 1993, after it was announced that the Air Force base would close, the Lowry reuse plan was adopted by the city. And then in 2000, we adopted our comprehensive plan and re adopted the reuse plan as a supplement to our current plan. And then in 2000 to Blueprint, Denver was adopted. And at the time we thought that the finance and accounting services would stay. So the area was designated employment. On the Blueprint Denver map

in 2005, the Department of Defense and Air Force announced closure of Buckley Annex. So in 2008, the Buckley Annex redevelopment plan was completed by the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. It was not adopted as a city plan. It is a concept redevelopment plan that was developed after a public planning process. And it does provide a framework for land use, transportation, building height, all of the things that we normally have in our small area plans. In 2011, the property was vacated by the Air Force, and in 2012 the transfer of the property was complete to the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. And in 2013, the Buckley Annex General Development Plan was approved largely based on the Buckley Annex redevelopment plan. So this is an illustration of what that redevelopment plan looks like and a purple dot showing you the property that we're discussing tonight. The property is about two and a half acres. The property owner is Larry Redevelopment Authority. The proposal is to develop, redevelop vacant property into new row homes. And so the proposal is to rezone from oh one to general urban neighborhood rowhouse with a three storey height limit and a waiver of that height down to two and a half storeys, but from 30 feet to 35 feet in height. One is a former Chapter 59 zone district that was brought over into the new code, as is. There were no height limits. I'm losing my voice. Excuse me while I take a drink. There were limited uses. You'll see on the list here. Correctional Institution, elementary schools and libraries were the only civic uses. Residential care and shelter for the homeless were the only residential uses allowed and so on with the other land uses. The General Urban Neighborhood Zone District does allow multi-unit. It's a multi-unit zoned district, so each zone, each housing unit will face the street. And this is something that was specifically outlined in the general development plan. So there are

provisions in the Denver zoning code that allows some variance of heights and setbacks in bulk. However, you have to have an existing pattern on the block to conform to. So there is a primary street block sensitive setback and an administrative adjustment to building heights and bulk. But again, you have to have an established pattern on the block to adjust to to adjust your new development to. And since the property we're discussing is vacant, these remedies aren't available to this applicant. So as to our review, the first submittal of this came in with a request for some parking raise of parking requirements to two parking spaces per dwelling unit and an increase in the multi-unit parking requirement from 1 to 1 and a half per unit. CPD did not support that parking waiver and the applicant did remove it from their application and resubmit the application. The application was sent to all of these listed city agencies who did recommend approval of this application. As to public review. The notice of the application was sent out July 25th of this year.

The planning board had a hearing on this September 17th or so and the and did recommend approval. Notice for that hearing was sent out 15 days prior to that hearing and the sign was posted on the property notifying the public of the date, time and location of the public hearing. And then the application moved on to Neighborhoods and Planning Committee and notice of that meeting was sent out ten days prior to that meeting. And then of course for this public hearing notice was sent out 21 days prior to the hearing and signs were posted on the property again, letting the public know the date, time and location of this public hearing. The list here on the slide are the Arnaud's noticed. I will note that we notified every R.A. surrounding Barclay annex. We were required to notify people within 200 feet of the property. But it's our practice on Barclay Annex to notify everyone surrounding Barclay Annex. And today you have a copy of a comment letter with your staff report. We have had one comment on this application. So the criteria for review is consistency with adopted plans are necessary for a community need that was not anticipated at the time, at the time of adoption of the city plans, uniformity of district regulations, public health, safety and welfare, justifying circumstances, consistency with neighborhood context and zone, district purpose and intent. And the City Council may approve an official Map Amendment rezoning application for property located within a general development plan area, taking into consideration the approved general development plan. So that's the criteria that you will use tonight. As to our adopted plans, the relevant plans are current plan 2000 allow re reuse Plan Blueprint, Denver and the General Development Plan for Buckley Annex. So for Comprehensive Plan 2000, we're told to promote infill development in Denver at sites where services and infrastructure are already in place to encourage development of housing that meets the increasingly diverse needs of our present and future residents to encourage quality infill development with the character of surrounding neighborhoods that offers opportunities for increased density and more amenities to preserve and enhance and extend the character of our primary street system and to modify our land use regulations to ensure flexibility that accommodates our changing demographics and lifestyle. The Lowry redevelopment plan did not anticipate that the Air Force would leave Buckley Annex. So it was adopted in 2000 and well after in 2000. And then in 2005, when the Air Force left. The plan was silent on that. So it is not applicable to this rezoning blueprint. Denver Also well, 2002. It is an area of change blueprint. Denver We didn't think the Air Force was leaving, but we did think that if it did, it would this Buckley Annex would be an area of change. We hoped it would remain employment and that was the extent of the land use concept. Just the thought of in Blueprint Denver,

although four areas of change, we did discuss them as areas where we wanted to channel growth, where areas where we wanted to focus the new growth that was coming to the city. And specifically to Lowry. We wanted to be able to create a new neighborhood, and that was discussed in Blueprint Denver. And we also wanted to address the edges between our areas of stability and our areas of change. So the land use concept does talk about special design considerations. And I'm sorry, I have to take another drink. I know how you feel. So. There is some discussion of these transitions between areas of change in areas of stability and particularly height transitions, which is one of the features of the general development plan. So the transportation aspect of Blueprint in Denver First Avenue is a residential collector, street collectors balance, mobility and land access. And Quebec is a residential arterial street which basically emphasizes mobility over access. And this is the sub area of the general development plan that was adopted in 2013. It's called the Community Park Mixed Use Center. Some area for this property. The General Development Plan calls for mixed use land uses. But in this portion of First Avenue, it calls for attached and detached structures no more

than two and a half storeys in height, with entrances that orient towards Lowry Boulevard and Pontiac Street. As to uniformity of district regulations. The proposed zoning with a waiver is unique in itself and therefore uniform to itself, but it also is uniform to the remainder of Buckley Annex, and we've already re zoned with similar waivers. And as to public health safety in general welfare, the proposed rezoning furthers the public health, safety and welfare through implementation of the city's plans, including the Berkeley Annex General Development Plan. So the next set of criteria are justifying circumstances and consistency with neighborhood context and zoned district purpose and intent. The Code states that a rezoning may be justified when the land or its surrounding environs is changing or has changed to a degree that it's in the public interest to encourage the redevelopment of the area or to recognize the changed character of the area. So the changed or changing character of the area is, of course, the announcement of the Air Force leaving Berkeley Annex in 2005 and the subsequent sale of the property to Lowry Redevelopment Authority for Redevelopment. The current plan blueprint Denver. The Buckley Annex General Development Plan provide policy support for a substantial public interest in encouraging the redevelopment of the area to meet our citywide area of change planning goals. As well as meeting the planning goals for Buckley Annex. So the neighborhood context is characterized by multi-unit. Residential land uses irregular pattern of grid blocks, sidewalks, presence of alleys, consistent orientation to the street. The zoned district purpose and intent promotes higher density reside

ntial neighborhoods, reinforcing development patterns that in existing neighborhoods will creating the same sort of pattern in our new neighborhoods. And the H3 specific intent is allows for urban house and rural house building forums no taller than three stories. Staff believes this rezoning does is consistent with the context in that it is multi-unit residential located along a collector street with orientation to that street. It is furthering the grid pattern of the existing surrounding neighborhoods will take access from alleys and will have that multi-unit rowhouse use that our general development plan calls for. So with that, staff believes that all of the review criteria have been met and staff does recommend approval of this application. Thank you, Mr. Lucero. We have four speakers lined up and I will call off for Bob Golic, Monty for Brian Word and Kevin Yoshida. So, Mr. Golic, you can go ahead and begin your remarks. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of council. My name is Bob Golic and my address is 609 South Gaylord Street in Denver. Here this evening on behalf of the Lourey Economic Redevelopment Authority for Council Bill 841 series of 2014. The Boulevard one property that you're looking at this evening, it seems like a very small portion of Lowry, but it is a very significant portion. It's one of the last undeveloped tracts that we have. As Teresa mentioned, it is an area of change in Blueprint Denver. And that's very important because there have been significant changes to in particular that have occurred on the Boulevard One property over the past few years. The first is that the United States Air Force turned control of this property over to the LRA in May of 2012. And the second is that the LRA immediately started planning efforts on this and sought approval of a general development plan, which was obtained in 2013 with a vote of the Denver Planning Board. And that general development plan established subseries throughout all of the Boulevard One property. The sub area that we're discussing this evening is called the Community Park. Mixed use debris and that's sub is about 25 acres. The subject property you're looking at this evening is just one parcel in that sub area and it's about two and a half acres that subtree that two and a half acres per the GDP is limited to two and a half storeys. And since we're applying for the grade three zoning, that's the that's the catalyst for the waiver and here of limiting that height down to two and a half storeys. It's a good zoned district for this because it only allows single family, residential allows both detached and attached, which is exactly what the general development plan has recommended and is approved. This grade three will provide a transition from the existing residential neighborhood outside of Boulevard one that's to the north, the first Avenue coming in to the more development area of the Boulevard One along Quebec Street and throughout the center of the Boulevard One

property. The proposed R three, as I mentioned, is the appropriate district because of the allowed uses and is compliant with the GDP. This MAP amendment will bring the zoning in the conformance with that approved general development plan. We're providing or proposing nothing outside the parameters of that approved GDP. We have support of the Denver Planning Board and we have the support of community planning and development. And I urge you to do the same and will answer any questions you might have. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Garlic Monte Force. Sorry. Good

evening. I'm Marty Force. I'm the executive director for the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. Address is 7290 East First Avenue, Denver 802300. The application, my supplemental letter that's attached to the staff report and Teresa staff report I think together are quite throw in describing the conditions and the rationale for our rezoning tonight. So I'm going to focus my comments on the context in which you're reviewing this application tonight. Most of the 866 acres of Lowry Air Force Base closed in 1994. And today, Lowry is a thriving mixed use area now with more than 25 to 25000 people that live, work and recreate and go to school at Lowry. Tonight's Grade three application applies to only two acres of the 70 acre boulevard, one site, which in turn is the last phase of the 866 acres of Lowry Word on planning. Like the rest of Lowry, the 70 acre boulevard, one neighborhood has been thoughtfully designed with significant public input, starting in 2006 and over 60 meetings. That's documented in our application. The resultant final plan balances many diverse interests. It is consistent with the Denver Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint Denver. It meets market demand for urban living and it accommodates growth and provides new amenities for the surrounding area. The community input. Over the last seven years and those many meetings that we've had had some critical modifications for the Boulevard one boulevard, one plan. Specifically, we have fewer units than was originally called for. We reduced the units from 1200 overall on the site to 800, a medium density area similar to the Lowry Town Center area. We lowered the height of the buildings. We have a maximum height of five stories we're calling for, but we have no higher than three stories most of the time. More parking, parking ratios, as you heard, we waive originally had in the application. We took that out. We're going to deal with that through design guidelines on the site and traffic the projected traffic on the site is the same as when the site was occupied by the Department of Defense. That was 9500 vehicle trips per day. We did a transportation study as part of the GDP that demonstrates that the adjacent street system can accommodate the proposed development and was approved by the City Transportation Department during that process regarding waivers, in some cases, in order to replicate the building forms and the patterns elsewhere in Lo

wry and Boulevard one, we requested waivers with the zoning to provide that consistency, as is the case with tonight's application. Today, we have demolished a 600,000 square foot building. We've recycled 40 to 42000 tons of old roads, parking lots and runways. The Phase one infrastructure and street work is currently underway for the previously zoned areas. So this, of course. I apologize. Your 3 minutes is up. Sorry. Thank you. Brian. Brian were. I'd finished for Imani, but I don't know what you're going to say. Good evening. My name is Brian Wert. I reside at 250 Eudora St Denver and I'm a member of the LRA community or as I were called, Community Advisory Committee CAC and have been for 20 years. I stated this at the last lower Larry's zoning hearing, but want to reiterate that the public process related to Boulevard one, also known as Buckley Annex, has been the most intense of the public processes all through the redevelopment of the Lowry Air Force Base. The Boulevard one plan is, as Marty mentioned, and the GDP that resulted were modified significantly by the input that we received through the public process in her absence this evening. I want to mention that Councilwoman Sussman has followed this process every step of the way, attending many of the meetings hosted by LRA, as well as our CAC meetings. And Councilwoman Johnson did the same before her so that the Council representative from District Five has been involved with or followed the process all along and on the basis of the very public process and the GDP, which is the basis for this application, I recommend your approval. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Ward. Kevin Yoshida. My name is Kevin Yoshida. My address is 8025. West Colfax. Avenue in Lakewood. I'm an architect and. Consultant to the Lowry Redevelopment Authority and available to answer any questions. Thank you. That concludes our speakers is now time for questions. Do we have any questions from members of Council? Councilman Brooks. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to give Mr. Force a chance to finish his comments. Thank you. Actually, I was almost finished. I was just going to urge your approval of the application tonight so that we can continue what we started here with the development of this important infill site and add to the great legacy of city neighborhoods. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. Any other questions from members of council? Scene nine public hearing aid for one is now closed. Time for comments, Councilwoman Canete. Thank you, Mr. President. As one of the At-Large council members who helps to represent this district, I I've done absolutely no work on this rezoning. But what I can say is that I have continued to receive and respond to communications that come from residents of Lowrey and the surrounding neighborhoods. And it's very evident that over time, the process that you've created has worked

through stage by stage and the flow of communication lessened. And now you're here with, you know, supportive com

ments. And I believe that that's a testament to the work. And I, I know that Councilwoman Sussman would wish that she could be here. And I just as a council person who has watched how hard she's worked and also how seriously she's taken the feedback from the residents of Lowry that their concerns that they raised with you throughout the process about density and height had to do with the concerns about the transportation system being able to keep up with the population. And she has you know, I think we all know how closely she has taken that to heart and has really been a leader in thinking about how we can transform transportation systems in existing neighborhoods, bring increased transit to neighborhoods that are not core city neighborhoods. And so it just wouldn't feel right to vote on this and this rezoning tonight without acknowledging her leadership and her work. So wanted to do that very briefly before I urge all of our colleagues to support this rezoning. Thank you. Councilwoman Canady, are there any other comments from members of council? All right. So, you know, Mr. Secretary, roll call. I. Brooks. Hi. Brown I thought I can h i layman. Lopez. Hi. Montero. I never i. Mr. President. All right, Mr. Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Ten 90909 821 have been placed on final consideration and does pass. One pre adjournment announcement on Monday, December 15, 2014. Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 972 changing the zoning classification for 6200 leet stale dry. Any protest against Council Bill 972 must be filed to the Council offices no later than noon on Monday, December 8th, 2014. Seeing no other business before this body, this meeting is adjourned. Denver eight TV. are available for questions of counsel. Each speaker will have 3 minutes unless another speaker has yielded his or her time, which would result in a total of 6 minutes on the presentation monitor on the wall. When the yellow light comes on, you will have 30 seconds to conclude your remarks. And when the red light appears, your time is up. Speakers must stay on topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Speakers are prohibited from using profanity or making personal attacks during their comments. Audience members Please understand that council members do use electronics devices of various kinds to access the materials relevant to the public hearings before us. Be assured, however, that by mutual agreement and common practice of the City Council, these devices are not being used for texting, emailing or other communications during the public hearings. We're going to start with Council Bill 1015. Councilwoman Monteiro. Will you please put ten or 15 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 1015 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right. We're going to wait for technology to catch up. It has been moved. We need a second. It has been moved and seconded.

The public hearing on 1015 is now open. May we have the staff report? Good evening, Mr. President. Members of City Council. My name is Tracy Huggins. I am the executive director of the Denver Urban Renewal Authority, and I am here this evening requesting City Council's consideration of an amendment to the existing ninth in Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan to add the Ninth Avenue Project and to create the Ninth Avenue Sales and Property Tax Increment Area. Council approved the Ninth in Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan in July of 2013, which established the ninth in Colorado Urban Redevelopment Area. And if you can see on the slide, it is the area that is outlined in green. This area is approximately 41 acres immediately east of Colorado Boulevard and is bounded by East 11th Avenue on the North and East Eighth Avenue on the south. The site straddles Council District five and Council District ten and is located in the Bellevue Hill neighborhood. When the plan was approved by council, they also established the ninth and Colorado property tax increment area to support the redevelopment of a portion of the site. This first phase of redevelopment, which is currently under construction, consists of approximately seven acres bounded by East Ninth Avenue, Claremont Street, East Eighth Avenue and a newly constructed Bel Air Street . The Ninth Avenue Project will complete the redevelopment of the remainder of the area and provide not less than 100 units of affordable housing in a location that is outside of the urban redevelopment area. The proposed Ninth Avenue sales and property tax increment area is fully contained within the remainder of the area. So again, you can see that the boundaries of the urban renewal area are outlined in green. The gray shaded area represents an existing property tax increment area that is supporting the first phase of development. The blue area indicates the project, the Ninth Avenue project area, and then the purple lines outline what

would be the proposed sales and property tax increment area. The Ninth Avenue project will be undertaken by Ninth Avenue Denver Venture LLC, an affiliate of Continuum Partners. The project will provide a wide range of uses emphasizing placemaking amenities, creating a highly walkable and bikeable project, integrating and creating open greenspace, building pedestrian and bike access, accessible amenities as well as public plazas, all consistent with the strategic vision and the goals of the General Development Plan or GDP. The development plan represents a community sensitive vision for a high quality urban infill project that addresses market demands for the site can commence redevelopment activities immediately upon closing is consistent with the vision and goals of the neighbors and is beneficial to the city. Phasing of the project generally moves from north to south and from west to east, following the sequencing of abatement and demolition of existing buildings. The first phase of developme

nt is currently contemplated to be the blocks located between 11th Avenue and Eighth Avenue, Colorado Boulevard and Astor Street. This phase is intended to include multifamily, residential, open space areas, ground floor retail and repurposing of the existing parking garage located at the intersection of Colorado Boulevard and East 11th Avenue. It is also anticipated to include the construction of office and retail uses below grade and above grade parking, the repurposing and adaptive reuse of the iconic research bridge as a hotel or other commercial use, which will serve to connect the northern and southern portions of the project while preserving the history of the site. Concurrently with the construction of this phase of the project, the developer intends to construct open space in the form of a hardscape plaza space between SW Street and Albion Street , between ninth East Ninth Avenue and East Eighth Avenue. Later phases of the development plan include additional residential development between Ash Street and Bellaire Street and the repurposing of the existing nurses dormitory, together with construction of additional open space adjacent to the nurses dormitory blocks located between Ninth Avenue and 11th Avenue Street and Bellaire Street are currently contemplated as either for rent or for sale. Multifamily residential blocks located between Eighth Avenue and Ninth Avenue at Street and Bel Street, are currently contemplated as for sale, townhome or stacked flat residential. The nurse's dormitory is currently contemplated as a mix of commercial or community uses. The phasing plan reflects the current state of the project. Phasing and such phasing plan may be modified over time as market conditions dictate. The project anticipates a mix of uses including residential, retail, office and hotel configured in a manner that integrates a variety of public spaces. The residential elements of the project include apartments, potential condominiums and townhomes totaling between 911 hundred residential units. In addition, the project anticipates approximately 1 to 200000 square feet of office, uses 2 to 300000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, and a potential hotel with 110 to 160 rooms. As part of the project, the developer has committed to build affordable housing on the Ash Street parcel immediately adjacent to the project, recognizing the importance of this undersupplied use in the area. The final mix of horizontal and vertical uses as well as project phasing, will be determined by economic feasibility and market forces. Maximum density will be as provided for in the underlining zoning and GDP. As part of approving the Urban Redevelopment Plan Amendment, Council will also be approving the Ninth Avenue sales and property tax increment area to support the project. Tax increment financing is utilized when the project costs are greater than the amount of traditional fence financing, that being debt and developer equity that a project can

support. By approving the Ninth Avenue sales and property tax increment area, Durrow will capture the incremental sales and property taxes generated as a result of the project and use these monies to reimburse the developer for eligible project costs. The public investment is reflective of the cost necessary to eliminate the blighting conditions and support the development vision. In approving the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan in 2013. Council found the area to be blighted as a result of the following conditions being present on the site and thereby limiting the developer ability of the area. Slum deteriorated or deteriorating structures. The predominance of defective or inadequate street layout. Deterioration of the site or other improvements. Inadequate public improvements. Environmental contamination of buildings. Or property. And substantial physical. Underutilization. Or vacancy of the site. Buildings. Or other improvements. The sales and property tax increment generated by the project will be used to reimburse those eligible costs related to demolition, environmental remediation, construction of public infrastructure and other site work. In addition, the incremental property taxes will be used to reimburse costs related to other public

improvements, including public parking and public open space and amenities. The total budget for the project is estimated at approximately \$419 million. The majority of the cost will be paid by the developer through a combination of private debt and equity investment. The net Tiff investment of approximately 48 million represents just over 11% of the total project budget. During my report, you've heard me state that eligible project costs will be reimbursed through the sales and property tax increment generated by the project. I'd like to take a moment to fully explain what I mean when I say reimbursed. As you can see from this graphic, the developer will pay for all costs associated with the project, including those Tiff eligible costs, most notably environmental remediation, demolition and infrastructure improvements. As vertical development is completed and or under construction, Dura will undertake to issue tax increment revenue supported bonds to reimburse the developer for those eligible costs, delaying the issuance of the tax increment supported debt until there is actual development and therefore measurable tax increment will increase the efficiency of the issuance. When Durant uses tax increment, we have a statutory requirement to consult with Denver Public Schools. Through this consultation and communication regarding the project. Denver Public Schools evaluated the potential impact on the elementary, middle and high schools that would see enrollment impacts as a result of the project. The results of this evaluation suggested a need for approximately one. A \$1 million, one time payment of tax increment to address potential expansion needs primarily to Palmer Elementary. Similarly, Dur

a has consulted with the city's Department of Finance to understand the city service needs related to the project. The cost of providing services to the newly redeveloped project area are estimated at approximately \$1 million per year. In order to address this anticipated need, as well as to manage the ability to issue debt sufficient to yield the net tive proceeds required by the RE developer Dura and the city have agreed to a waterfall funding which would result in a \$300,000 annual payment to the city following payment of annual debt service and a fees. Any remaining tax increment would be split between the city and Dura. Dura would use the retained amount to accelerate debt service payments, while the city would use their portion to additionally offset the cost of city services. The funding of these obligations has been included in the cooperation agreement related to this project. For many years, the University of Colorado, the city and county of Denver, the Colorado Boulevard Health Care District, local neighborhood organizations and the general community have all worked together to create a new vision for the area. City Council has found the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan objectives to be consistent with the objectives from various city plans . We believe the Ninth Avenue Project is also consistent with these plan and objectives. Objectives from the Denver Comprehensive Plan 2000 include, but are not limited to promoting quality infill redevelopment, encouraging mixed use, transit oriented or adjacent development supporting mixed use housing, mixed income, housing development, and the use of public private partnerships to facilitate development. Blueprint. Denver looks to projects that support the creation of high density transit supportive, pedestrian oriented, mixed use town centers or urban centers. And interestingly, when Blueprint Denver was approved, this project area was not indicated as an area of change. However, Blueprint Denver does note and anticipated that there would be reinvestment areas within areas of stability that would benefit from substantial reinvestment through infill and redevelopment. The Colorado Boulevard Health Care District Plan was adopted by the City Council in March of 1998 and includes the entire area covered by the Urban Redevelopment Plan. The Colorado Boulevard Health Care District Plan provides several design and development goals and objectives, including maintaining and improving the livability of the surrounding area as an urban mixed use neighborhood with a vital residential base and strong neighborhood serving businesses, improving the physical appearance of the district, and a desire that the scale and buffering of new developments should respect the character of buildings across the street. A general development plan establishes a framework for future land use and development and resulting public infrastructure within a specific area. And approved GDP provides a master plan for coord

inating development, infrastructure improvements and regulatory decisions as development proceeds within the subject area. In 2009, GDP was approved for the ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Area. A major amendment to the GDP was approved in January of 2012, which was followed by the approval of the ninth and Colorado Urban Design Standards and Guidelines in late summer 2012. Collectively, these documents speak to additional development expectations, including creation of a neighborhood that integrates multiple uses, including commercial office,

retail, hotel, live work possibilities, residential public services and appropriate public spaces. It establishes a hierarchy and network of corridors that provide safe and comfortable routes for pedestrians. Bicycle and automobile traffic looks to coordinate the overall plan building, massing and connectivity together with design elements to create a desirable, unique environment which encourages a variety of activities, including strolling, sitting, conversing, relaxing and interacting, and the creation of a unique, distinctive and identifiable, identifiable development that establishes and promotes connectivity and access across neighborhoods. Approval of the urban redevelopment area, authorized jury to seek property owner and developer interest in redevelopment projects within the area and provide tax increment in support of those efforts. The main goals of the Urban Urban Redevelopment Plan are to eliminate blight, renew and improve the character of the area, encourage residential, retail and commercial development. Build upon the present economic strengths in the area by encouraging the growth of existing uses that are suitable in the area. Encourage land use patterns that result in a more environmentally sustainable city. Encourage land use patterns where pedestrians are safe and welcome. Encourage high and moderate density development where appropriate. Encourage reuse of existing buildings, including historic preservation and adaptive reuse. And to promote a diverse, sustainable neighborhood economy, including mixed use and commercial development opportunities. Dora is asking City Council to find that the inclusion of the Ninth Avenue project as an amendment to the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan is in conformance with the city plans. Just as when an urban redevelopment plan is initially approved, there are a number of legislative findings City Council must make to approve a material modification to the plan. These include one that the Ninth Avenue Project is located within the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Area and will promote the objectives set forth in the ninth in Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan two that a feasible method exists for relocation of displaced individuals and families and business concerns. The project area contains no residences, therefore no individuals or families will be displaced. Additionally, due to the vacancy of the site, no business concerns

will be displaced by the project. Three. That written notice of this public hearing has been provided to all property owners, residents and owners of business concerns in the resolution setting this public hearing. City Council requested Dura to undertake this task. Written notice was mailed first class mail to all known property owners, residents and owners of business concerns in the in the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Area on November six of 2014, which is at least 30 days prior to this public hearing for the statute, requires that no more than 120 days have passed since the first public hearing before City Council on the Plan Amendment. Tonight is the first public hearing before Council on this Urban Redevelopment Plan, Amendment five. The statute also requires that two years must elapse before council consider can consider an urban redevelopment plan amendment if they previously failed to approve an urban redevelopment plan amendment for this project. This is the first consideration by City Council of an Urban Redevelopment Plan amendment for this project. Also, the Plan Amendment contains no property that was included in a previously submitted urban redevelopment plan amendment that was not approved by the City Council. As such, the requirement to wait at least 24 months since any prior public hearing is inapplicable. Six Conformance with the Denver Comprehensive Plan. On November 5th of 2014, the Denver Planning Board unanimously found that the proposed amendment to the ninth in Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan conforms to the Denver Comprehensive Plan and applicable supplements. A letter to this effect has been submitted to City Council by the city's Planning Department during request that City Council concur with this finding. Seven The Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan, as amended by the proposed amendment, will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of Denver as a whole for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Area by Private Enterprise. Ninth Avenue, Denver Venture LLC, an affiliate of Continuum Partners and a private development entity, intends to undertake the redevelopment project. Eight. This amendment to the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan contains provisions for tax increment financing. Accordingly, Denver Public School District One has been permitted to participate in an advisory capacity with respect to the inclusion in the plan of the tax allocation provisions authorized by Section 31.20 5-1079 of the Colorado Urban Renewal Law, Denver Public Schools has provided a letter of support for the Plan, Amendment and the use of tax increment financing . A copy of this letter has been submitted as part of the record of this public hearing. Finally, nine The city and county of Denver can adequately

finance and agreements are in place to finance any additional city and county of Denver infrastructure and services required to serve development

ent within the Ninth Avenue Project area for the period during which the incremental taxes are paid to the authority. The plan allows for cooperative agreements between the city and borough to address additional infrastructure requirements in city services as they arise. The city and Tura have agreed to the use of tax increment generated by the project to be paid to the city to address the expected services required for the project area in the cooperation agreement presented for Council consideration. Well. Well, I'll just leave it right there. In conclusion, this project has been a very long time coming. Darragh is pleased to have been able to work with the city and the university and the various neighborhood organizations, the redevelopment and the community as a whole. To bring forward the Ninth Avenue project as an amendment to the Ninth and Colorado Urban Redevelopment Plan. This project is highly reflective of the citywide goals, objectives and strategies that are found in the various city planning documents. It will eliminate the blighted conditions within the area. It will create a new neighborhood that integrates multiple uses. It will integrate the surrounding street grid through the site, providing connectivity with the surrounding neighborhoods. It will provide a broad mix of housing types, densities and price ranges. All these things, in combination with the creation of open spaces, will create a pedestrian oriented neighborhood with blocks and buildings appropriately scaled in relation to the surrounding area with a mix of neighborhood enhancing uses. For these reasons, I respectfully request your favorable consideration of this plan amendment and will be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you, Ms.. Huggins. We have ten speakers signed up for this public hearing, and I'm going call the first five and ask that you make your way to the bench right in front of me. David Bromberg. Marianne McCready. Chairman Sekou. Frank Cannon. And Steve Sweat. Brunner. So if you five could please come to the front pew and David Bromberg. Whenever you are ready, you can go ahead and begin. Good evening, councilwoman and councilman. I'm David Bromberg. I live in the 1300 block of Fairfax Street and I believe Council District ten. I'm on the Mayfair Neighbors Board and have been the representative to the Coral Boulevard Health Care District for the past four or five years. I just, first of all, want to say I am very excited to have a local developer involved with the project that is looks like they're going to get to the finish line and we have progress and a aggressive schedule. There has been great outreach to the neighborhoods, both coming to our monthly board meetings as well as our annual meeting from the development team. We look forward to an hermitt development. You know, a high mixed use of the space I think is most appropriate. I live nearby, work nearby. I know there's concerns about traffic and such on Car Boulevard, but tha

t's part of the beauty of living in the city. And I just want to encourage your support with this project. Thank you. Thank you. Marianne McCready. Hi, Marion. Mickey. Mickey Cisneros for 57th Avenue. I'm just here on behalf of the applicant to answer questions if you have any point. Thank you, Chairman. Thank you. Oh. Good evening. My name is Chairman Sekou, the organizer for the Black Star Action Movement advocacy group for poor, working, poor and homeless people. We enthusiastically support this metropolitan district formation and also it being proved and we joyfully expect a unanimous vote on this thing. I happen to be personally in favor of metropolitan districts that allows ordinary people to do extraordinary things for their neighborhood. And now is the time for folks to begin to participate more in the development of their neighborhoods and strictly in those neighborhoods, so that we have more community control over the affairs in our particular communities. And so for us poor, working, poor and homeless people, we see this as a great opportunity for us to also come up with the rest of the city as it provides jobs, training and also economic development opportunity for small businesses. So we hope that the composition of the governing board will consider. US as potential customers, clients and partners in the developing of the city so that this city is truly reflective of its diversity. And in regards to the African community, we're coming officially an endangered species in the city. Our unemployment rates are at top. Our educational processes and schools are failing, and we seriously could use some help, even though we're not helpless. We know that there is no such thing as a self made individual community, that we're all connected and the destiny of one is the destiny of all. And so we hope that as you go about this process and we have faith in the folks that are doing this, ordinary folks helping ordinary folks out so that we can all be proud of the city and have a vested interest and stake in making this the

most outstanding city in this nation. Thank you. Thank you, Frank Cannon. Good evening, Mr. President. Members of Council. My name is Frank Cannon. I reside at 2560 Birch Street in Denver. I am the development director with Continuum Partners. We are the developer who is undertaking the redevelopment of the 19 Colorado Project. As has been stated, it has been a long road for this property. We are very excited to be here this evening, looking forward to moving forward on this project. It's been a little over a year since we first engaged in conversations with the university to become the developer of the site. We began our exclusive negotiations with the university in January of this year. We started our community outreach efforts in February of this year, and I believe we've had, in the order of 15 community meetings reaching out to the broader community to ask the community their input on the project. One of those meetings inclu

ded actually a kids workshop to ask the children in the community what they would like to see. And we had two of your council colleagues there playing with Rice Krispie treats and building the project with us alongside, which was very exciting. The project is a challenging project and we only have two requirements really to close in on the property moving forward. One is the completion of this action this evening to solidify a tax increment agreement in order to close the gap and help us complete the significant amount of abatement, demolition and new infrastructure that needs to be constructed to develop these 12 city blocks. And the other is to complete our redevelopment agreement with the Urban Renewal Authority, which is very close. We've been working very diligently with Tracy and her staff in getting through that. And I think we will I think we will reach that conclusion here in the very near future. So happy to be here to answer any questions. And we look forward to your support on the project. Thank you. Thank you. Steve's wet browner. And as he comes up, I'm gonna call the next five Bruce O'Donnell, Richard Marshall, Lorne Breslow, Maria Valdez and Lori Bogue. Grant Good evening. My name is Steve Zach Brunner. I'm managing counsel for the University of Colorado. Excuse me. It has been a long and tortured process for the sale of this property. I've actually lived through all of it. It's been about ten years now as a much, much younger man. I want to thank everybody for all their assistance in this university, a university, everyone on the city council, Dura and folks in the city's office. It's been a long process and everyone's been great to work with. The university is obviously very supportive of this and hopefully this is the last step towards the redevelopment of this exciting project. As I said, I live right around the corner at 7,027th Avenue and hopefully this is the last step. So thank you. Any questions for me at the university? We'll have questions later on. Thank you. Thank you, Bruce O'Donnell. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President, and members of council. My name is Bruce O'Donnell. I reside at 128 Eudora Street in Denver. And I've lived my entire life within just a few blocks of this site. And I am here tonight to urge you to vote in favor of this request by Dora, in addition to living nearby. I've had about a 20 year career working in the city and county of Denver with land planning entitlements, zoning GPDs and also creating ways to finance infrastructure by utilizing public funding as a tool such as metro districts in urban renewal and TEF. In addition to that, I served ten years on the Denver Planning Board and have seen many of these processes come through in good results in our city have come from that. I have a lot of experience with complex infill sites like this to include the Gates Rubber Site, Colorado Center, the St Anthony's Southlands Lakeside and an Argo market to name a few. And I think the opportunity for our city,

these other sites I've had more involvement with Pale compared to what our opportunity is at night than Colorado Boulevard. This site is very well planned today. The city policy documents and plans that are in place from plan 2000 all the way down to the general development plan, are all consistent with the city's plans, and this is therefore an implementation step that's before you tonight to be able to see the city and the public's vision implemented. The scale and the mixing of uses are proper for this site. The parking solution is right. There is great open space in public realm improvements that have been described by Tracy this evening. Connectivity is well done. There's a pedestrian plaza that's on a scale of the Pearl Street Mall in Boulder that is being put in between Albion and our streets, as you saw this earlier this evening. And there's also some important nods to the history of the site with some buildings and structures being maintained. The site, also, like all infill sites, is smart growth. It's utilizing existing infrastructure to help the city's visions get implemented. And so then the TIFF package that's before you tonight is an important ingredient to enable all of this. And in fact, this site should be the poster child for what TIFF can do in our city. In it, the demolition and environmental remediation and the ability to invest in public infrastructure is

what enables all the great attributes of this site that Tracy and Laura have outlined in their presentation. I would also add that the developer continuum has an excellent track record in our community and has proven in locations like Denver Union Station and Bellmore and Lakewood that they deliver the goods in get it, so to speak. So as a citizen of Denver and a neighbor, I urge your support in voting in favor of this this evening. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Richard Marshall. Thank you. Mr. President, members of council. My name is Richard Marshall, and my residence is at 2805 East Ninth Avenue in the Congress Park Neighborhood and Council District ten. And like Bruce and many others you've heard from tonight, we've watched this property evolve for a number of years, and we're really excited about the evolution that Continuum has brought to the table with their support tonight. Continuum is a great developer whose track record, as Bruce alluded to, is beyond reproach in their execution of the Belmont redevelopment, a difficult shopping center site in Lakewood, but probably more importantly for the city, their co-developer role in Union Station. And that is probably one of the most spectacular redevelopments we could have imagined down there. And I think they'll bring the same level of expertise and excellence to the Ninth and Colorado site. Their goals for a mixed use walkable neighborhood is exactly what I think the neighborhood was looking for earlier and is excited about seeing in the plans today. And we're looking forward to their commitment to that vision a

s they move forward. Since they were selected about a year ago as the current developer by the university, they've had a number of opportunities for the neighborhood to be involved and have listened effectively and incorporated many of those comments into their plans. So and Bruce alluded to why this project makes sense for itself. I think it would have been difficult under conventional financing to endure or provide a mechanism to deal with those challenges in this urban setting. And I think it's exactly the kind of tools that would be needed to make this project happen. So I urge your support and thank you for your time. Thank you. Lorne Bressler. Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the council. My name is LAMB Breslow, 1352 Cherry Street. I am one of several founders of the neighborhood organization Do It Right at ninth, as well as a trustee of the Bellevue Hill Neighborhood Association. I stand here today in support of the proposed tiff for ninth in Colorado with some brief comments. First of all, I want to thank Councilwoman Sussman and Councilwoman Robb for their tireless support of the neighborhood surrounding ninth and Colorado Boulevard. Their leadership on this issue was pivotal, both pivotal to getting the redevelopment back on a productive track. I also want to share my appreciation for Steve Zack Bonner for managing the process that resulted in the selection of Continuum Partners after a somewhat contentious period. Q Did my opinion ultimately do right by the neighborhood as we move forward? I would like to ask that the City Council work with the developer and with the surrounding neighborhoods to minimize the impact of cut through traffic. Many of the mitigations that are required are beyond the bounds of the actual development. And so I ask that we continue to partner that with an eye towards the safety of the children who live and play in the surrounding neighborhoods, as well as the additional foot traffic that I expect as people walk to the new development as we move forward. It's my hope and expectation that Continuum Partners will continue to pursue the Do It Right and ninth neighborhood vision focused on placemaking with local businesses, especially small businesses with green spaces and a charming new urban neighborhood that includes affordable housing. The bones of this are already reflected in the evolving site plan, but we'll obviously want to watch carefully as the details emerge. I think Frank Cannon and continuing partners for their excellent community outreach and effective partnering and look forward to more of the same as we move forward. I believe that there's no question that the Ninth and Colorado development needs to proceed and continue in partners is when my confidence is the right development for this project. So I urge the City Council to approve the proposed tiff for this project because it cannot proceed without it. Thank you. Thank you. Maria Valdez. Good evening, dear city leaders. I'm a little shorter.

I want to thank you for considering this tonight. And I want to express my support over the years that I've lived in the neighborhood. We moved there because of the hospital and because of the health needs of our daughter. And over the years that I've lived there, we've gone through waves. We went through waves of hospital encroachment into the neighborhoods, the waves of. White flight to the suburbs. We went through waves of many, many types. But this one seems to be right. Seems like the right time. The economy's good. Our neighborhood is. Strong and vibrant. And

Bellevue Hill seems to be a very desirable place to live right now. And I'm sure glad since that's where I live. We've gone through years of hope, followed by dashed hope, and finally, I think followed by faith that this will be a good result. There have been thoughtful interactions with us as neighbors and with other neighborhood groups, and the outreach has been heartfelt and sincere. We believe and we feel that this will only help make our strong, vibrant neighborhood stronger.

Thank you. Thank you. Lori Bogue. And I've got to move this back up just a little bit. Good evening, Mr. President, and members of City Council. My name is Lori Bogue. I live at 1200 Ash Street. I've served this past year as the interim vice chair of the Colorado Boulevard Health Care District, and also for the past three years have been the president of the Bellevue Hill Neighborhood Association. As you know, the Ninth and Colorado Redevelopment Project sits wholly within the boundaries of Bellevue Hill. We're a strong and engaged neighborhood, a vibrant community. And during the past ten years, we have collectively held our breath as we dealt with the uncertainty of what was to become of this site, often wondering if we would actually see any development come to fruition. This past year, we were pleased when the project began to move forward. When Frank Cannon and the Continuum team came on board, Frank and his team have engaged in a constructive, positive program of community outreach. And throughout the past year, they have listened to our concerns on issues from street grid configuration to pedestrian accessibility to vehicular traffic patterns. And they have made modifications to their plans to accommodate our concerns. These conversations continue today and we look forward to their continuing during the coming months and years. We want to express our appreciation for the manner in which Continuum has conducted the community outreach. We would also like to thank Steve Zack BRAWNER from the university and Councilwoman Sussman and Rob for their tireless efforts in keeping this project moving forward. And at this point, I would like to urge you to stand to support Council Bill 1015 and allow this project to continue to move forward. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers for 1015. Time for questions from members of council. All right. We have no questions from council. So the public hearing

on 1015 is closed now. Time for comments from members of Council Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you, Mr. President. Am happy to. Happy to go first. Although my partner, Councilwoman Robb, has been with this project almost as long, I think I heard from Tracy that the original GDP was 1999 before the turn of the century. If you think about that. And so I know that my partner Will Castle and Rob will be have lots to talk about in all those years. Certainly it's something that I worked worked on since becoming council member, but so grateful to have council having Rob's experience on this. It's also wonderful to see the leadership of our neighborhoods and this neighborhoods surrounding the ninth in Colorado and these many of these people are in this audience are people I see every week, because that's the kind of work that they have put in on this project and how much they care and and how closely we have work together as a neighborhood, as a community to really make a good project here. Very, very happy to have them here tonight. And I want to thank the CEO leadership as well. We've gotten to know each other pretty well, too, over the last four years. And it is it's a project that has taken a lot of leadership and a lot of followership as well. I particularly want to end on the notion that if you are going to develop or imagine buildings, I would very much suggest Rice Krispies as your building blocks, because when you get frustrated, you can eat the buildings and if you if you want to. And I enjoyed the children's workshop that you provided. I've enjoyed the outreach that the Continuum Partners have done, as you heard from the leadership about this project. So look forward to going forward. It particularly like the notion that tax increment financing here, you can't create the percentage of tax increment that there is because it starts with zero. There were no tax returns on this particular piece of property. So all of the increment is from a base of zero. And I urge my fellow colleagues to support this request. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Councilman Roman Sussman, for reminding me how long I've worked on this, or at least been around in Steve, just like you. I don't look a day older, even if it's ten years. Actually, I think the first thing I want to say is we had some rough times throughout those ten years, some very disappointing times, some shock. And without mentioning any names, I will say that the former proposals had this weird silver lining of crystallizing what the neighborhood really wanted on the site. It was very clear from the neighborhood that was just the time that Councilwoman Sussman was coming on council. We heard that message, and I think we really were able to enunciate the vision very clearly. And then the stars aligned. You know, when we first were very worried about it,

we thought, who's out there in this economy? Well, gradually the economy came around, our vision crystallized, and folks like Continuum were listening. I also wanted to talk about Continuum a little bit. I, I really think it's rare, I have to say this, that you have a public hearing at council and you hear how much faith the people who talk have in the development team. So you have a lot to live up to. But I have been in meetings with Frank Cannon, most notably one on affordable housing that's just off the site but will be part of the overall project. And very important, when you're developing an area like this and Frank Cannon's ability to listen and repeat what he heard until he got it exactly right, I could take lessons. Some of the other things that I think are great in this project is you may remember that the former children's center there, this was demolished, but the panels have been saved and some may be able to be incorporated. I've already mentioned the meeting on affordable housing. I think the continuum is overachieving in the park. Which is good. We all appreciate that. And the children's workshop. And by the way, my grandson went and he was more interested in eating than in building anything. Even though I drove him around it under the bridge, I kept saying, Look at this building. That's a bridge. You should study these buildings. Who knows, maybe 20 years from now. But I think what it really said to me to have a children's workshop is that cities are places for children, too. And that is very important that our development community realize that we need to have family friendly development. That doesn't mean that it can't have some density, but that it's an important place for people of all sizes and ages. Let's see. Finally, I guess I wanted to say that I really enjoy working with the Bellevue Hill neighborhood. That's not to call out favorites. That's not what I'm saying at all. But every neighborhood in this process has worked with a positive attitude, despite the disappointments you might remember. I think it was a national Jewish rezoning. When Bellevue Hill was here, they weren't absolutely 100% happy, but they realized it was the future. They realized the importance of the hospital and they wanted to work on it. And that's the attitude that I have seen there. And I think it's it's amazing, a little rare sometimes, but appreciate it. And also then I just want to say it's been really good to work with Councilwoman Sussman on it. She constantly said, we need more beds, more heads on this site, we need more people. And, you know, it's any time in my experience, I'd council, I guess I'm getting old enough even though I'm not that much older. But I've been getting old enough to reflect on my experience. It really is wonderful, whether it's Albert Brooks, Albert Wedgeworth, Carla Madison that I've worked with on Colfax or in this case, Councilwoman Sussman, to have a good partner in crime to bounce your ideas off of as you strive to do the best you can for the people you're representing, I think is is really part of the s

tars aligning in this project. So thanks. Bring it on. I'm ready. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilwoman Fox. Thank you, Mr. President. I have spoken a number of times against ordinances. It's a pleasure to be able to speak about one that I'm going to support the bill. Before this last election, I really did a lot of thinking about what I considered that the city needed to do, and there were about four projects that to me were so imperative that it just absolutely had to be done. And this is one that was at the top of the list, not in my district. None of them were in my district. But in trying to make a city better, this seemed to be absolutely crucial. If there's a big hole right now and you just cannot leave it that way, it is certainly something that meets the definition of blight. There's no question about whether it should be a redevelopment in my mind. And in fact, my involvement goes back even more than ten years because I served in the legislature at the time that it was decided to move the medical facilities to the What's now Anschutz Campus. So it was clear that something was coming and something needed to be done. And I thought, Gee, developers will rush in and do it well. All these years later, it is clear that the but for requirement, which is a way that you measure whether urban renewal ought to be in an area if the developers are going to come in and do it themselves, that's that's the best plan of all. But it's been sitting there years and years and years and years, and there was a gap for funding, which also was affecting another institution I care about greatly, the University of Colorado having dealt with that for a long time. So it just all came together, I believe, finally with this proposal. And one other thing I think that needs to be mentioned. You're talking about the council. Sussman was dealing with the zero tax that we get right now under this proposal, at least, I think we're getting 300,000 a year into the city to help cover city services , and that is going to be a real plus even during the increment period. So this is one that I believe we need to get on with. I'm delighted that we have people here who are interested and supportive, and although I have probably opposed about half of the tips that have come before me

not feeling they were well structured. This one, I think is and deserves support. Thank you, Councilwoman. Thoughts? Any other comments on 1015? Seeing none, Mr. Secretary. Roll call. BROWN Hi. But I can each layman. Lopez. Montero. Nevitt Hi. Ortega. Rob Shepherd. Sussman. Hi, Mr. President. Hi, Mr. Secretary. Please close the vote in the results. Lebanese, Iranians, Lebanese, Iranians. 1015 has been placed upon final consideration and does pass. All right. We're moving on to the second public hearing on 1034. Councilwoman Monteiro, would you please put 1034 on the floor? , emailing or other communications during the public hearings. Councilman Brown, will you please put Council Bill nine for one on th

e floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that Councilor Bill 941 be ordered, publish a do pass. And wait for technology to come on, because we're going to need a second. Okay. But. But I will correct that in the system. The public hearing for accountable 941 is open. May we have the staff report? Hello. I'm Diane Dilulio with Department of Environmental Health. And we thank you for this opportunity to present the staff report. D.H. commends the zoo's multiple efforts to minimize waste that would otherwise go to a landfill, including their recycling and composting programs and now their proposed waste to energy facility. Yes, sir. Then I felt that you can be heard. Go. Go ahead. Could I start over? Yes, please. If you could start over, you just. Okay. Commence the zoo's multiple efforts to minimize waste that would otherwise go to a landfill, including their recycling and composting programs, and now their proposed waste to energy facility, all of which are focused on the zoo's objective to be a zero waste facility by 2025 and recommends approval of this waste to energy facility. Since the waste to energy facility is viewed by the city and the state as a form of waste disposal, special reviews and approvals are needed, including issuing a certificate of designation which for the city means passing an ordinance. According to the city's Revised Municipal Code, Section 40 3-103. When considering whether to approve a certificate of designation, the Council shall take into account one the effects of the facility on nearby surroundings to the convenience of the facility to potential users. Three The the ability of the facility to comply with city and state environmental health regulations and rules, and for how the facility fits in with the city's comprehensive plan. Additionally, five Council also needs to consider and state approvals. The planned waste to energy facility meets these code requirements for the following reasons. One There are no expected never negative impacts on nearby surroundings because of proactive monitoring by the zoo and the design features of the waste to energy facility to the waste to energy facility is very convenient to the zoo and city. Who will be the users? Three. Regarding compliance, the zoo has obtained the state required permits and with DEA will conduct compliance monitoring to meet environmental health regulations and rules. Is satisfied that the zoo will meet its compliance obligations. And four regarding the comprehensive plan. Denver Parks and Recreation determined that the waste to energy facility at the zoo serves a substantial purpose in supporting the operation of the zoo. Also, the facility is in line with the city, with the city's sustainability goals with respect to energy and waste reduction. Additionally, five reviews the waste to energy documents submitted by the zoo and concurs with the state regulators in recommending approval of the certificate of designation for the zoo's waste to energy facil

ity. D.H. notes that throughout this evaluation, the zoo involved other city departments and the state regulators, and it engaged in a robust effort to involve external stakeholders and the zoo incorporated environmental permits and mechanisms for tracking environmental compliance in their planned waste to energy facility operations. D.H. has a strong working relationship with the zoo, including record review, environmental auditing and regular inspections to assist the zoo and compliance with existing permits. Inspections associated with the Waste to energy facility will be incorporated into his ongoing partnership with the Zoo to ensure compliance. For these reasons, DHS requests Council's approval of this ordinance. Thank you. And I'd like to introduce Shannon BLOCK from the Denver Zoo. Thank you. Thank you. So hi. My name is Shannon Bloch and I'm president and CEO of Denver Zoo. And I loved what you guys said earlier about Natty, about caring and collaboration and advocacy. And I'm here to reassure you, we've heard recent concerns from our neighbors regarding the south side of the zoo. And we all definitely take a role in making our neighborhoods better. And we're taking the comments we receive to heart. I also wanted to make you aware that we've invested over \$700,000 on exterior facing improvements in that area thus far, including Duck Lake improvements, sidewalk landscape amenities and the installation of the first phase of our architectural fence . We may remain committed to our efforts within Parks and

Recreation Department to continue these improvements, and we have plans in 2015 working with Parks and Recreation to create a seamless process for future communication and collaboration on our planned exterior facing improvements. I have earmarked significant funds in our budget to implement the next phase, which will include additional amenities to beautify the Southside, and I look forward to implementing them with community input in the next year. However, tonight is about a totally separate topic and nothing should take away from the excitement of tonight, which is a final step in the process, allowing us to operate our waste to energy system inside the building that has already been built to house this exciting technology. The waste to energy system is a game changer for sustainability and environmental stewardship. This will allow us to reduce our solid waste to landfills by 90%. It will power all of our elephant passage and power nearly 20% of Denver Zoo. We're the greenest zoo in North America, and we are committed to continuing to keep this bar high for future generations. So please know how much I appreciate your past and continued support as we finalize this amazing project that is going to put us one giant step closer to becoming a zero waste facility. Thank you. Thank you both for that presentation. We have six speaker sign up today and I'm going to go ahead and call all six and ask that you make your way to the first pew for

comments. Hank Boots, Nancy Francis, Thad, Texa, Lewis Koski, Bridget Walsh and Mr. Sekou. So Hank Boots, you can go ahead and begin your comments. Sure. Madam Secretary, can you grab. Hi. I want to start by thanking the Council in reference. To Netty for supporting and encouraging neighborhood activists. I don't oppose the concept of W.T.. I oppose the sense of entitlement that. The zoo. And museum have regarding City Park. The fact that DPR operates without oversight of elected officials has resulted in encroachment on the park by the zoo and museum to the tipping point. The issue before the council is a certificate of designation, but it's really an exemption. The real exemption is the esthetics who was brought up. The zoo plans to beautify the South End, but that should have been presented when park land was given to the zoo. The system won't change the look of the fence line. Or zoo footprint. Footprint. But it was already changed for elephant passage. And as an environmental steward and good neighbor, Denver's, who commits to ensuring the system meets standards, they should run their system properly. But otherwise, how has the zoo been a good neighbor to City Park? How has the zoo been a good neighbor to the neighbors of City Park? I've lived there for 40 years. I can't list a lot of things as it stands. We've been told that Denver Parks and Rec runs autonomously and council does not control them. I think that should change given the circumstances. Our group, City Park Friends and Neighbors, had a recent meeting with Mr. Brooks in which he endorsed the idea of gathering all interested parties to confer periodically about city park issues. We'd like to go further and propose a neighborhood advisory committee for City Park. Such groups already exist, such as for Botanic Gardens and would include representation from the institutions as well as Orientals. I urge Council to delay approval of this proposal and endorse support of the formation of a neighborhood advisory committee. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Boots. Nancy Francis. I'm Nancy Francis. I live on Vine Street, two blocks west of City Park. I speak today to urge City Council to delay a second reading of the proposed bill to authorize the zoo to operate an industrial process in City Park. To be very clear, the issue is not a referendum on sustainability or the very laudable goal of waste to energy processing. Rather, the issue in front of council is one of oversight. You have visual evidence illustrating what failure of oversight has produced so far, and industrial facilities sits as a wart on the landscape, a permanent defacement of City Park planted in the very midst of its most historic and heavily used areas. Another recent illustration of the zoo's lack of regard for city park occurred during boo at the zoo. The zoo and Denver Parks and Recreation work together with our citizens to treat City Park as the zoo's overflow parking lot. Signs posted at 23rd Avenue Red Lots Full Trice City P

ark Motor Coaches patrolled city parks throughout the two day event, shuttling passengers from stops labeled with large animal banners. Parks and Recreation helpfully cleared Park City Park's event calendar for the weekend. Citizens have asked for family weekends free of events in City Park. We don't even merit a hearing on that suggestion. It's viewed as controversial. And just last week, more turf was turned out along Fair Lake to be paved in concrete up to the bandstand to make it easier for equipment vans to drop off sound equipment. The manager of Parks and Recreation has unilaterally declared that the zoo's waste process is a valid use of park land and did not even deign to notify the public of her decision. Do you believe that one political appointee who has no credentials in industrial, mechanical or manufacturing, manufacturing, engineering or in

power generation should make this land use decision without public scrutiny. It may be legally authorized by current Denver ordinance, but is this appropriate? Is it good stewardship to place so much control in the hands of a single appointed official who is not even required to reside in the city and county of Denver? You cannot rely solely on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to regulate the zoo's industrial process. The state's permit considers only emissions. In fact, they have told us that the division does not have the authority to deny a permit based on community awareness, land use and noise. These issues are addressed at the local and county level. Consider this very carefully, please. You are talking about an industrial process in a public park, city park, in the midst of residential neighborhoods with no oversight by the city and county of Denver. Before you consider the proposed bill, I ask you to take two steps. First, establish an oversight body to provide a means to engage citizens in the process of decisions that impact City Park, modeled after the Neighborhood Advisory Committee in the Denver Botanic Gardens. Intellectual property issues can easily be addressed for inside. Descriptions as your 3 minutes is up. I'm sorry. You have to. And I want to make sure I get the rules right. If you want to defer your time to you, do it during the recess. Or can you do it during the. No, it's usually. It's during the recess. Okay. You say. Yes. I era as well. This is the landmark. And so, my friends, I do I do apologize. Your time is up, so. I can't you my time. That's alright. You can read the rest of it. There's no need to absent. Absolutely. Mr. Text, you are making bad text. We'll get it. And don't worry. This is just a fun time to use fad tax of 4535 Julian Street Denver, Colorado. As long as we're talking about waste, it seems to be a wasted opportunity not to take the red light, find money out of the general fund and earmarked for homeless services. After all, they're among the most vulnerable populations in our crosswalks. It seems only fitting that they ought

to benefit from the hazardous behavior that endangers them. Also, given your general unwillingness to spend money on the homeless, nobody would ever think you're using the fines as a revenue raising device. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Tex. Luis Pawlikowski. And I apologize if I mispronounced the. Good evening and thank you. My name is Louis Chelsea. I'm the president of City Park. Friends and Neighbors. We're an R.A. that includes the neighborhood surrounding City Park. We have over 300 members. I am also on the board of Greater Park Hill Community Association, and I'm a stakeholder with income agency, the Inter Neighborhood Cooperative. I have attended discussions and read various documents about the zoo's waste treatment plan. There have been a number of issues that have been cast in a somewhat skewed and cloudy light by the percentage of the zoo plan. It has been stated that INC, Greater Park Hill and City Park Alliance have given their blessings to the zoo plan . I'll read you a part of Hank's letter that was dated December 8th. Any perceived approval of this project was gleaned from the minutes of the INC park meetings, and the preliminary approval was only in respect to the concept of waste gasification and in no way should have been used by City Council to imply the main body of ink either knew about the set design, scale orientation or approval of the gasification plan. I'm sure you'll agree that this is a far cry from approval of the zoo's plan. I've also had discussions with both grade Park Hill board members and president of City Park Alliance, where they mirrored the sentiments of the ink letter. We at City Park, friends and neighbors agree wholeheartedly. The response from these organizations is uniform. After the zoo's presentation, a request for more information was put to the presenters. Once the information is made available, then perhaps the plant could have agreement by all. Unfortunately, that was not the case. The main points that need to be addressed are air quality, smell, noise, visual impact, risk management and location. Why wasn't the facility built with consideration to its appearance from the park? Why couldn't the facility been located offsite or at least further from the park boundary? Why is the zoo, the park and a neighborhood being used as a laboratory for this new technology? We therefore request that approval be delayed and now see a neighborhood advisory committee be formed from the neighborhood R.A. And that the zoo includes said next in its deliberations so that the plan can be perhaps approved by all parties. We look to you as our representatives to make certain that the crown jewel of our city city park remains as was always intended. Thank you. Thank you. Bridgette. Walt. I'm Bridget Walsh, and I live in Park Hill, and I'm also a board member of City Park Friends and Neighbors. I would like to read some observations about the risks of the gasification process. From Wikipedia on the subject of biomass gasifi

cation. Environmental advocates have called gasification incineration in disguise and argued that the technology is still dangerous to air quality and public health. Since 2003, numerous proposals for waste treatment facilities hoping to use gasification technologies, fail to receive final approval to operate when the claims of project proponents did not withstand public and government scrutiny of key claims . According to the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, one facility, which operated from 2009 to 2011 and Ottawa, had 29 emission incidences, 13 spills, and over those three years, it was only able to operate roughly 25, 25% of the time. The second observation is from the European Commission report guidelines for safe and eco friendly biomass gasification. The technology of biomass gasification differs from other energy conservation technologies based on renewable energy sources, because it inherently involves the production, treatment and utilization of flammable and toxic gas mixtures. Plant, media and utilities. Therefore, an adequate risk assessment is strongly recommended, is often a legal requirement for placing the plant into the market and running it. A risk assessment is aimed at protecting the workers in the plant itself.

Manufacturers. Operators have to keep in mind that accidents and ill health can ruin lives and can affect the business too. If the output is lost, machinery is damaged, insurance cost increase. So there is a possibility of prosecution. A risk assessment consists of a careful examination of what could harm, what causes harm to the people and environment in the plant. Some considerations are human and animal health hazards, such as dangers from toxic gases, safety issues such as explosion hazards and fire hazards and environment hazards from plant emissions, and loss of containment relating to toxic substances. While Denver voters may never have the opportunity to judge the risk assessment plant at the zoo's industrial waste plant, because much like oil and gas companies refuse to give first responders information about the trade secrets, content of the fracking solutions they are injecting into the earth. The zoo has wrapped up much of the they are needed to for a robust citizen and government agency review of their proposals. As trade secrets are confidential business information, I suggest that citizen health and safety is much more important than the future profits of the Denver Zoological Foundation, who, along with DPR, run the zoo with an iron hand that is symbolized by the Gulag style gate 15, the back door to the zoo, but an ugly, deep wound on historic city park. I implore you to put this project on hold until there is a legitimate neighborhood advisory committee set up to evaluate for the first time the zoo's gasification proposal and the light of day, the risks seem very serious and potentially deadly for park users and neighborhood residents. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Walsh. Mr.. Tha

nk you. My name is Chairman Sekou. Founder of the Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense. Advocacy group for poor, working, poor and homeless people. First of all, I would like to thank Miss Nancy Francis for giving me the honor of reading what she didn't have time to read. That is thoroughly reasonable. In the States. Before you consider the proposed bill, we ask that you take two, two steps. One, establish an oversight body. To provide a means to engage citizens in the process of decisions that impact City Park. Modeled that after a neighborhood advisory committee in Denver's Botanic Gardens, reason to take it tour. I mean, I went down there to see this before you vote on this. Right. And take a tour by a guided neighborhood resident who lives there so they can give you its perspective about what they're talking about. See a picture and say, beats a whole bunch of words, man. You can see what they're talking about. All right. Nodding. So don't rubberstamp this, please, she said. Operation of an industrial process in City Park, which we call the crown jewel queen city of Denver. Wait. Until oversight and control mechanisms are in place that will ensure the success of the zoo while protecting our city park, its users and neighborhoods. Everybody coming up here opposed to it. What does that tell you? Do you hear him now? Oh, City City Council. I mean, the city attorney, we was an operations meeting and there was this rule called 106 called Pay Attention, you act judicious like look like you're paying attention even when you ain't. Yeah, I remember that one. Yeah. And while they were speaking out, watch people do everything but listen to them. Except for a few people. He wasn't focused on what they were talking about. You couldn't repeat one word. They say it. Yeah. Yeah, yeah. See, they don't come every day. I do. I saw you paying attention. Don't lose your father too much. But you know who else was up here? Charlie picking his nose. Mr. Sinclair. Looking at. Mr.. Mr.. Mr.. Mr.. Sekou. Mr.. Speaker, I appreciate. I appreciate. Your. Honor. This is a coup. Thank you for your comments. Sit down if you can. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, please. Thank you, Mr. Sekou. All right, that concludes. That concludes the speakers. Council members. Are there any are there any questions? Any questions from members of council? Yep. All right. Count Catwoman Ortega. So I first want to ask, what is the

existing process that is utilized to dispose of the waste at the zoo today? Shannon, would you mind coming forward and explaining the process and you know, how long does the waste sit there? Some of those kinds of things? Absolutely. Those are good questions. And Jorge is our expert, so I'm going to have him answer them. But any questions for me also? I'll be right here. Thank you. Thank you. My name is George Parnham, the vice president for design and campus management at Denver Zoo. And I appreciate the question. We currently manage our solid waste in the s

outh side of the zoo, and we have since the early 1970s, we have two disposal processes. One is a compactor that takes our waste compacts. It holds it for about a week and hauls it off to landfill. And we have a dumpster that takes manure and takes that on a weekly basis to a composting facility. Okay. My next question is to ask the person from Environmental Health spoke to elaborate a little bit about the certificate of designation. I remember we used this process when we had a medical waste incinerator that tried to open in the Swansea, a neighborhood many years ago. And I don't recall that it is solely limited to industrial zoning. So can you speak to where the certificate of designation is allowed to be applied under the zoning code? I don't know about under the zoning code. I do know that it's on a case by case basis and it's based on well, it's a document that allows land use for waste treatment disposal. Okay. I have some other questions, but I know we have other members, so I'm happy to defer and come back. Okay. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Brooks? Yeah, thank you. Mr. President, I have a couple of questions and I think one of them on our Shannon's up here. But Andrew. Andrew, why don't you come up here? I want to talk about kind of the outreach process that you all did. Did you do an outreach process? Please kind of elaborate on what you all do with the community. Absolutely. Andrew Rowan, government affairs manager for Denver Zoo. We started telling the story of waste to energy in 2009 and are due at the zoo event. At that point we started sharing some of our ideas and processes with our main supporters just to get some of their feedback. Beyond that, we took on a much more formal approach when it came to the neighborhood groups and also city council. Starting at the beginning of 2013, we met with every city council member and briefed them on the process and briefed them on the technology and the ideas we had. Along with that, we also met with all registered neighborhood organizations, all registered neighborhood organizations. At the time, City Park Friends and Neighbors was not registered until early 2014, so they were not in the process that was outlined throughout the year of 2013. But we did meet with every registered neighborhood organization and we received feedback. We shared the plans. The PowerPoint that we shared was very similar to the one that is on the city council website right now that was shared with the Infrastructure and Culture Committee. Beyond that, we also made presentations to specific stakeholders. So we reached out to the specific RINO's and had them send representatives. We also made a presentation to the INC Park Committee as well, so we feel like we did a very thorough public outreach process. We received overwhelming support at that time. Now there was a little gap in between when we did our outreach and becoming and coming in front of council. The last nine months are eat up or our engineeri

ng and design plans have been under review by city and state officials. That is what that is what accounts for the gap between our outreach and coming in front of council about nine months later. And you all had a change in leadership during that time as well. Did that affect any of the outreach or the communication? Yeah, we've had several changes at our CEO position and also our government affairs and external relations. Vice President, they are both no longer with Denver Zoo, so we are picking up where they left off and entering this process. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Just just another question. And I believe maybe environmental health can answer this question. That was one of the folks who was from the Sea Girt Curtis Park City Park Friends and Neighbors group talked about the kind of air pollution that gasification may cause. Do you all know anything about that? Or there is a specific permit that the zoo was required to have? Yeah. Come to the mike. Which requires them to monitor for exhaust, and perhaps the zoo can tell a little bit more about their permit. Yeah, that'd be great. Thank you. There's the permit that we're talking about tonight is the solid waste permit. There's a permit that also is specific to the air emissions. That permit is handled by the State Department of Public Health and Environment. On behalf of the EPA, we have been issued a construction air permit for the facility and it meets the most rigorous standards for air emissions that exists at the state and at the federal level. So that was a concurrent process of permitting and a very rigorous technical review. And it also is

woven into the eat up or the engineer and design operations plan. That's part of this certificate of designation, which really mandates how we fulfill and maintain our our permit requirements for the air emission as well. So how often when you all be testing the air emissions continuously? Okay. And and once it gets past a certain low level or dangerous level in which we heard a little bit, you what are you required to shut down? What's the. Well, I'll provide this caveat. We don't expect that it will ever get to dangerous levels, but the permit levels are are far below dangerous levels. If we do ever get to those permit levels through our continuous monitoring, we would have to have a shutdown, take corrective actions and resume operations. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Councilwoman Rob. Thank you, Mr. President. Some of my questions have been answered. First, I just want to establish a timeline here. So according to the question Councilwoman Ortega asked, the zoo's been handling waste at approximately this location since the seventies. That is correct. Yeah. These are probably for you, George. And when was the building approved or permitted? This the the main building, which is part of Toyota Elephant Passage, was approved by the Denver Building Department in fall of 2009. And it was completed. Am I r

ight in remembering 2011. Or late summer 2011? Okay. And then some questions about the facility itself. Will you be handling commercial waste said is any waste generated by sources other than the Denver Zoo? No. Okay. And then in the packet of materials with all the appendices, you have an appendix, Jake. It's called Safety Material Assessment Assessment Reports on waste handling and safe operation. But when you go to that appendix, it's said it's to be completed later. Can you just elaborate what's going to be in there? When is it going to be completed? Yes. A backup. Thank you. My name is Jennifer Hale. I'm the director of safety and sustainability for Denver Zoo. In regards to the question of when Appendix J will be completed, it was on hold. We were waiting for our air permit to be issued, which we received this afternoon, the final air permit. And there's very specific conditions that we have to meet with that plan. So once we got that permit signed by the state, we will be working on this final plan and me submitting it to DHS and CDP. So that's not required before you get the certificate? It is not. No, it is part of an addition as part of a requirement, as George had mentioned, the merging of both the air permit and the eat up conditions. Okay. And then my final question. What is the general timeline moving forward? When do you expect to be in operation? Thank you. So we'll after approval of a certificate of designation, then we would start to move equipment into the Waste Management Building over the course of early 2015, starting to put those pieces in place and starting operations sometime in the end of the first quarter of that year. As we move forward in installing the many pieces of equipment that that fill out the system and hopefully would come into operation towards the end of 2015. Thank you. Thank you.

Councilwoman Rob. Councilwoman, can each. Thank you. Question for the Department of Environmental Health. So I was cross-referencing things folks were talking about with the materials in the packet just in case folks wondered what we do on these computers. There's only one thing we do, which is look at materials. I found the section referenced by someone who said, you know, trade secrets in terms of the gasification process. So I just want to be clear, aware of the exact chemicals and processes involved. And you review those exact processes and chemicals in making your recommendation regardless of what is or is not in the public documents. We have a list of chemicals that would be on site that's within the up. And so we have looked at that. We have looked at how their operations could be managed to be protective of human health and the environment. We do not know the exact process steps, but we don't believe we need to know the process steps in order to be protective of the material that they're going to be handling on the site. Okay. So I just want to say that back to you to make sure I understand it. So we are thinking more abo

ut the site itself in terms of the safety of, you know, the chemical interactions if spills, things like that. When you listed the conditions that local government is responsible for reviewing, you did not specifically I don't think mentioned air quality analysis. Is that the state's responsibility legally to be focused on the exact emissions? I just want to clarify roles and responsibilities between the city and the state in that they will monitor the air to specific. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Pardon for interrupting. I don't mean what the zoo's responsible for. I meant in reviewing and issuing permits. What is our responsibility as a city versus the state's responsibility in regard to saying, yes, this is a process or this is an air emission that would be acceptable? This is not this is dangerous. This is not so what are our responsibilities? Okay. The city does not issue a permit. We will audit their their work to make sure that they're in compliance with the permit. Got it. Thank you. That is the state's

responsibility. Yes. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman County Councilwoman Shepherd. Thank you, Mr. President. My first question is for George George Pond. You mentioned that a. Part of the waste that is currently generated at the zoo is is being hauled to the landfill. How many tonnes is that annually? It's £1.5 million annually goes to landfill. £1.5 million is going to our landfill. Okay. That's my question for you, Kate. A question for Shannon. I think I heard you say that 700,000 had already been spent on beautification. Was that specific to the what we're calling, I guess, the back end of the. Zoo, south side of the zoo, right? Yeah. And I also heard you make say that you've already made a commitment to earmark funds for beautification in your next budget cycle. That's correct. And approximately how much? Well, I have a board meeting tomorrow, so the Finance Committee approved it, but the board has to approve it, and I'm sure they will, but I don't want to get out of order. But it'll be a signal of significant funds. And I'm imagining a significant piece of that is for the South. Side. Correct. That's what I mean. That was my question for you. My third question, I think might be for Councilman Brooks. Perhaps there's been a lot of talk about the neighborhood advisory committee. And am I understanding correctly that you have committed to this group? Yeah, you know, and I share about that in my comments. But City park friends and neighbors and Councilwoman Mira Sussman came on over. We had a conversation about this a couple of weeks ago, but it was more about the larger master plan of City Park and how we move forward and how we work together with all the facilities and how those facilities, the Museum of Nature and Science, the zoo, the park talked to neighbors about their plans. And, and and so anyway, I share about that. But in 1997, there was a task force that mayor, Mayor Webb, put together around kind of master planning the

park. And it had folks from the neighborhood have folks from the zoo, had folks from museum interested in science. And I think something like that needs to be created. And then Councilwoman Robb talked about Botanic Gardens and the oversight committee that works with them and how, you know, it's not always a seamless process, but it's effective, right? Everyone feels informed. And so we need something like that to be established again here in City Park. Okay. So I'm hearing a pretty firm commitment there. And then I guess my final question is how long has the zoo itself been in this location and operating? 118 years. You know, I think it's really interesting to point. I mean, we've talked a lot about the historic nature of the park itself, but the zoo itself is also historic in this location. Thank you. Those are all my questions. Thank you, Councilwoman Shepard. Councilwoman Monteiro. Thank you, Mr. President. I had a question. There's a lot of conversation about what the state regulates and what the city doesn't regulate. I wanted to ask a question. Is there anywhere through the process where the Denver Fire Department was involved? And did they what you know, what did they say? Because if there was ever any unfortunate incident, who would be the first responders? I think it would be the Denver Fire Department. Well, certainly the Denver Fire Department would respond to any any issues. But there's two ways they've interfaced with the designs. One is during 2009, when the plans were being reviewed, the Denver Fire Department, among the other buildings in the Toyota Urban Passage area, reviewed that and made comments. And and we complied with all of those comments moving forward. The building department will be involved as specific pieces of equipment get moved in. Some of which need permitting, building, permit type things. And they they would get involved as well. But part of our eat up or our engineer design operating plan absolutely addresses risk management at multiple levels from an operations stand to health and human safety, but also for fire. I just want to be clear. The last time the Denver Fire Department weighed in was in 2009. We've been in communication to them since then. So I wouldn't say it's the last time that they weighed in necessarily, but their formal action of reviewing the building, its type and occupancy and fire rating was in 2009. Okay. Thank you. I'm still uncomfortable with your answer. What does that mean, that they weighed in? Well, they actually they were part of the permit approval process at that time. So they so they approved the the occupancy rating use, as well as the fire suppression system in 2009? That's correct. Okay. So and then I just have one more question. So is there a response plan for the concerns that the neighborhood people have talked about? Well, if I could, I'll broaden that. Yes, there is a response plan for safety. There's a response plan for noise, noise and order odor. If

if that's what you're asking. So the EDA specifically calls out criteria for how to handle noise, odor and safety issues, as well as how complaints will be taken addressed. What's the timeframe in which those can be addressed and how we produce a corrective action plan? And who are the the

reviewing agencies who will confirm that things have been handled? I have one more question. So how will and maybe Councilman Brooks is going to answer this, but how will the neighborhood people know what the response plan is under any situation? Have they been briefed on what that would be? Well, it is part of our plan. So there is a very specific flowchart of communication and in it. So it is part of the documents that are being considered here. And so it will be published. But certainly we will continue our communication, among other things, to make sure that we're communicating how those concerns and responses can be handled. So we will take responsibility for that. Thank you, Councilman Montero, Councilwoman Fox. Thank you, Mr. President. I have a question for the gentleman who talked about talking with council and other community groups from the zoo. I do remember you're coming to talk to me. And I felt as if this really seemed to be an environmentally sustainable move. I was very impressed by your presentation. You say you went to other groups too, and they were overwhelmingly enthusiastic. I guess I don't mean this as a rhetorical question. We have had a whole string of people who are not in support. Where is the evidence of this overwhelming support so that we can know that some communities really are embracing this? Sure. During that public outreach period, we did host a number of open houses and we did have a guest list sign in there. And we did receive comments via email and also written comments at that time. That was some of the overwhelming support that we had heard. Also, in sharing this with some of the people that we consulted with, that would be the National Board in the Renewable Energy Laboratory. And some of our other scientists peers are very supportive of this technology and using this kind of process. We did send out public notice to all the registered neighborhood organizations and as I said, held several information meetings, received comment, and some of the comments were related to where is this going to be? Is it going to smell? How are your operations going to minimize noise and odor? And as my colleague George Pon stated, embedded within the EDA are the criteria that we must abide by. And those have been rigorously vetted by people who are professionals in this field. We also have an action flow chart for if there are concerns. The reason why I stated overwhelming support is because we heard virtually and I will stand by this virtually zero negative comments during our exhaustive outreach that started in 2009 and was very, very exhaustive in 2013. We heard literally zero negative comments about it. A

Iso, as part of the review period for the heat up, there are public notices that are put out there as they pertain to the different permits that we received from the city and state. Those public comment periods received virtually zero comments. I believe there was one comment made during the state air permit period and that was again from this new group, City Park Friends and neighbors who we've just been recently hearing from. If I may, Mr. President, I just want I know that you all are new, but sometimes it really helps when you know that there's some concern to have some balance in the presentation and then the people speaking. Thank absolutely. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Fot Council Members Robin Monteiro Okay. If I go to Councilman Sussman, who had had the opportunity. Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want Andrew I just want to ask you, you also went to ANC Park Committee, which is a subcommittee of ANC. I just wanted to elaborate on Councilwoman Foster's question and how did they respond to the presentation? Yes, we were asked to present. Actually, we approached them during this period and we presented to the committee during that presentation, they were supportive. And they did move a month after that presentation to vote in support of the process. I know you guys have received some emails saying that they were not duly informed up to that point. As I said, the presentation that was made during the Infrastructure and Culture Committee was very similar to what was made to Ing Park as well. So we did feel pretty good about their support. Another part of the public process was presenting to the Parks and Rec Advisory Board. We did present the plans in a public forum there. There was a public comment period during one of those meetings. Nobody spoke in opposition and they voted in unanimous support of moving forward with the waste energy process. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. All right, Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President. In still continuing during this meeting to go through the materials in front of me. I had to ask previously, without seeing this attachment about whether you are expected to accept waste from any other source. And all of a sudden I found a draft waste acceptance plan in the packet. I don't think it's actually labeled as a separate appendix or I got the appendix numbers mixed up, but it does very clearly say in the first sentence at this time the zoo is not approved to accept any waste streams, but it goes on other than from other sources. But it goes

on to say at some time, or at least to imply at some time in the future, you might do that. My concern is I want to be very clear what I'm approving tonight. What would be the Procedure if you decided in the future you wanted to do that, because until tonight, I didn't understand that that could possibly be part of the plan. And I think that's a very different thing than talking about the operation a

nd maintenance of a zoo, which is definitely a park use. Absolutely. And I and I'll make one clarification. Your earlier question was somewhat specific about commercial waste, but I'll answer so absolutely no. On commercial waste, we are we will take parkways. So tree branches and things like that. As a as a part of it, we do not have the discretion to add any outside waste into this. So this is really the discretion of the Parks Department and I believe the Department of Environmental Health also, in order to to change that, we don't anticipate at this point it's not but it's not our discretion to do that. Okay. So I want to know from someone in the city, what is the process if indeed it's some of these things previously acceptable? You've got cardboard cloth landscape away. What's the process to to accept other materials? If the zoo wanted to accept other materials, they would have to go to D.H. and also go to the CDP, Colorado Department of Environmental Health, and tell us what they're going to do, what they plan on accepting how that would fit into their program, the type of waste, subsequent waste that could be generated, whether it would just be a solid waste, what would it be a hazardous waste? We would we would ask a lot of questions to understand exactly what they would be bringing in, how it would be managed, and what the byproducts would be. Would they have to come back to council? I'll leave that to legal. Good evening, Jessica Brody, Denver City Attorney's Office. The municipal code doesn't specifically speak to that question, but I will say that council does have discretion at any time to withdraw the approval of their certificate of designation. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Robert. Councilman Monteiro. Thank you, Mr. President. Is there a representative from the Francis City Park that I could ask a question to? Can you please come up to the podium? So I have two questions. Number one is the Friends of City Park, a registered neighborhood group. I'm sorry. I can hardly hear you. Is Friends of City Park a registered neighborhood group? Are you registered neighborhood organization? Yes. So in 2009, did you or did you not receive this information? We were not in existence in 2009. Okay. Okay. Thank you. And then the other thing that I wanted to ask is the request for. You were talking about a group similar to Botanic Gardens. I'm not sure what that is, but what is it that what is it that you want accomplished or discussed if such a group would be organized? I'll answer that if you haven't guessed. I'm from New York originally, and I'm here in Denver now in about four years. I've heard ever since I've come to Denver that we're trying to be a world class city. I would ask you, do you think in Central Park where they have a zoo, that if they put up a facility, as you had pictures of, that people would stand around and applaud it? Sure. It sounds great when you're going to turn waste into energy. I mean, who would be against that? T

he question is, what's involved? Where is it? And it just doesn't seem right for Denver and for it's beautiful city park. Everybody that I know that comes to see me from wherever they are, I take them to the park with pride. I show them all the beautiful views and everything, and then they say, What's this thing over here? If indeed the zoo was going to present this thing in a very favorable light, they probably should have built a structure that everybody could say, This is lovely. Yeah. I mean, it's great. And the technology sounds good, but what is the technology? Somehow it's shrouded in certain secrets that we don't really know. We have a lot of people that that understand these things a lot better than I do. And they would certainly look into it and put their input towards it as well so that everybody could feel good about this and everybody could be proud of it. But I can't tell you that I'm proud of it. And I don't know anybody that is, except maybe the people that are trying to make it happen. So I'll just be blunt. So the idea of establishing a committee to work with the zoo is to. To kill the project. We would love to have communications with them on a regular basis. We are, you know, we're neighbors. We love the park. We love the zoo. We love everything about it. But we sometimes feel very excluded from the process. And whenever there seems to be something that the zoo wants, they come here or wherever they go, and they seem to get it accomplished. And we never have a say about it. So as a registered neighborhood group, you're not receiving information? Well, we we are now, but we haven't received any of this. As I said, we're relatively new. And when this all got started, we were not in existence. We came about, if you recall, from City Loop, which was a project that was also tried to put upon us and we know what happened. Well, thank you.

Okay. Anybody else? No, thank you, sir. Thank you. And thank all of you for listening. I appreciate. It. Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President. I think David Broadwell could expand further on my earlier question. And I would like to hear from David on on what it would, you know, whether we're approving future acceptance of waste from other customers. Thank you. Councilwoman David Broadwell, Assistant City Attorney. I thought I'd shed a little additional light on your very, very important questions. The and particularly calling up the language you were quoting a moment ago, a linchpin to the legality of this waste to energy facility in this location in a city park. Is that it only be processing parkways. It's legal because it is an integral part of the zoo itself. And I think one of the speakers alluded to it a minute ago. To the extent there's been talk of anything else going through this waste to energy facility, it may be other parkways. So it still passes muster as a legitimate park use in a park, but it can't be processing third party waste from other locations unrelated to the parks. And

I think the conversation around this is is there's some interesting there's different layers of this here, certainly, and certainly the environmental health part of it. And the process of the certificate, you're you're you're considering here tonight, we always know with all things in parks, there's an underlying principle about how parks can only contain park uses under the charter. And this certainly passes muster legally because it is integral to the operation of the zoo. And the zoo is certainly a legitimate park use. But we attorneys will advise down the road if we have to, that it can't become a third party receptacle receptacle for third party waste from from other completely other locations and other purposes as a matter of our charter. Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. All right. Any other questions? Are they? The public hearing is now closed. Time for comments, Councilman Brooks. Thank you, Mr. President. This is this has been a rather robust conversation. And for me, this conversation has been going on for about a year and a half off and on. I first want to address city park friends and neighbors. We we had a really good meeting a couple of weeks ago. And Mary Beth Sussman does not serve as the councilperson person over the park, but she was there. She came to be a part of this meeting. And so I really appreciate you being there as well. And you don't hear council people saying this a lot, but I learned a lot. I learned a lot from my neighbors. And I heard a lot of their concerns. And it was a first meeting. And I think you heard a little bit. We the first time this group came together was to fight the city park loop kind of conversation, which is now in Councilman Lopez's district. Congratulations. And and so it started with it started with a bit of friction. But I have to say, you know, these neighbors are incredibly passionate and incredibly intelligent about the things going on in the park. And so I learned a ton. I think, you know, unfortunately, this conversation is getting turned just a little bit because the vision and the skill of our conversation was about the entire park. And how do we stop thinking in silos in City Park, at the Museum of Nature and Science has their projects and the zoo has their projects and parks and Rex thinks about their projects and City Park. But how do we think about it? Holistically is what we were coming to. And and they have this group and many neighbors have felt kind of pushed to the side out of conversations. And I certainly can appreciate that. And so that's when we talked about this advisory group and this task force that would have representatives from every party, not just one group in a silo, but every group, the zoo, the museum and nature and science, parks and rec, and members of the community to talk about and vet issues like we're talking about today. I don't think or at least that night, the issue was not about gasification. The issue was about all of the decis

ions that led up to neighbors being pushed to the side and not being considered. In this conversation, I got to say, I agree on every development that that I'm a part of downtown. And we talk about a building or a facility having a back. Right. Like the facility has to worry about not having a back side either. We're just talking about this with the St Joseph's Hospital, that they don't put their backside in the neighborhood and the zoo. The neighbors feel like the zoo kind of has their backside in the park. And if you go into the park, you you kind of see that. And and that's that's a design element that we should have talked about we should have considered when designing that. So I am proposing that we put together this neighborhood advisory group or this task force mirrored similarly to Botanic Gardens and what they have. And Councilman Robb brought that up and also Lord Dennis Miller, executive director of Parks and Rec. And and it will be you know, we will work with the neighbors, will work with all the the major stakeholders to kind of put this together. But but I have to say that I feel like this gasification process is sort of a separate issue. And, you know, I

have received calls to delay this issue and so that this organization and this group can convene first and then make a decision on the gasification process. But my questions were answered in this and I think David Braswell and we talked today, talked about these are just park issues, right? This is not going to be a commercial facility. I think a lot of phone calls and emails that I received today is was worried about this being this kind of solid waste facility in the middle of the park. And that's not what we're looking at all. I want to put people's attention to £1.5 million of waste that gets trucked out of City Park into a wasteland that, you know, we don't really see a lot in Denver, but a lot of folks who live close to it, this feels like an opportunity for the city. It feels like an opportunity for many of the organizations in our city to start thinking about zero waste. And so I will be supporting this. I will be supporting this with an astronaut. And the asterisk is that we as a community kind of come together and begin figuring out what this what do developments, what do initiatives in the future look like? Do we have a process for it? Because we don't have a process currently and we need to develop one. And my encouragement to the zoo is you do have neighbors. We do have neighbors, and we have to engage them. And there needs to be regular check ins with the neighborhood on how this process is going, even if it's quarterly of Hey Here, the here are the readings that we have from our facility. This is how much we have been using that. What do you guys think about this and getting folks, engaging folks into that? So I'll be supporting this, but I will also be supporting much more community engagement in a task force going forward. Thank you.

Thank you. Councilman Brooks. Councilwoman Shepherd. Thank you. Council President Herndon, I will not be here next week for second reading. So I really wanted to make my comments tonight and I really want to thank my colleague, Councilman Brooks, really touched on a lot of the key issues and did a great job. But I think we've all learned a lot through this process especially on what Councilman Brooks talked about is like the back of things and how often that topic comes up in conversation. I mean, sort of rhetorically, there's a rhetorical question. I mean, everything has a back, doesn't it? Or does it or should it or what should it look like or, you know, where should it face? I think that's a really big question that we should talk about a whole lot more comprehensively as we launch into the redo of our blueprint, Denver, which is our land use and transportation plan, which process will start in 2015. So there's an opportunity to address this question in a more holistic and comprehensive way. Secondly, I know that the zoo has learned a lot from this process. You know, and I know these are good people I'm looking at. You know, I'm looking at them. I've known George Pond for quite a while now. I know that they have heard you. And that they are committed to working with you, to really finding ways to help beautify that back side of the park, to make it a better transition or boundary between the two. I, you know, I believe them. I can see them nodding vigorously. And I know that they're going to work together with you in this coming year. And I think there'll be a lot of opportunity for public input about what that looks like. And I believe you have the support of everyone on council as well around that. Thirdly, I mean, you know, I've heard great commitment on the part of Councilman Brooks to forming that neighborhood advisory committee. He just outlined, you know, all of the issues that they want to tackle, not just in relation to the zoo, but at the Museum of Nature and Science. And I trust that that process is going to move forward and move forward in a good way. Fourth, I just also want to touch on the issue of waste. There's a lot of goals that we are trying to accomplish here. I sit on the Sustainability Advisory Council, as does my colleague, Councilwoman Peggy Lehman, and we just completed our 2020. And by the way, so does George Pond. And there's I commend him for serving on that committee, because it's mostly partners that are directly here in the city from the city departments that are on that. So he sits on that as a partner who isn't actually from the city. The 2020 goals in the waste category are this specifically to reduce waste disposed of by the city through its operations, through delivery to a landfill by 30% in 2020 over the 2012 baseline. Secondly, the community goal, the broader community goal is to reduce waste disposed of by delivery to a landfill by 20% over our 2012 baseline. So t

he reduction of £1.5 million not going to that landfill is very significant. Not only that, this is a cutting edge, proprietary process that not only the zoo is going to use and in, you know, continue its goal of being net zero eventually and the greenest zoo of America. But that can be replicated in many institutions across this whole country and hopefully our own city here shortly as well. So I think, you know, it's going to be an exemplary, amazing experience that we're about to experiment, that we're

about to go on, that we can all think, you know, deeply about about how we're going to reduce our waste and filling up our landfills very quickly. I just want to say, lest anyone is misled, Miss Lori Dana miller, our director of Parks and Recreation, is a city and county of Denver. RESIDENT. She is my constituent. She lives across the street from an equally historic park in the city and county of Denver. So she is deeply committed to how the public interfaces with our parks and what that experience is like. And she's been active on those issues, not just as the director, but also as a citizen. So I just want to put that out there, lest anyone might think otherwise. But finally, I asked this question because I wanted to make sure the zoo has been there for 118 years. It's not just a historic park. It's a historic zoo that receives millions of visitors every year who treasure it. And it teaches us and educates us all, you know, from cradle to grave, about our world, about all the species who inhabit this world and how we have to care not only for them, but for their habitat, not just for our own survival, but for theirs as well. So in my mind, they're kind of married at this point, right? So, you know, just like any long term marriage, it's not always perfect. There are a lot of strengths. And then there's always opportunities for growth, always opportunities to grow and improve. I you know, I just want to make sure that this discourse doesn't devalue the important, significant contribution that the zoo has made in conservation and education to the city and county of Denver and into the region. So I really hope, you know that we're not having a conversation about two different entities because they share and cohabit the same space and they have for over 100 years. We can do things better. I hear commitment from Councilman Brooks, and I know you're going to hear commitment from many other members of this council that we can always do it better and we are all going to hold each other accountable in that process. So I am voting yes to move this forward tonight, and I do thank you because I have learned a lot from this conversation. So I thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Shepherd. Councilwoman Lemon. Thank you. I hardly can add anything to what my fellow council people say. So I just. Want to say. That this has been a long term thing that we have all been aware. Of and. Worked with. And it has come to this point, which is a pretty exciting point, and

we will continue to work with and come to it. There have been many, many. We know that the zoo is committed to public outreach. They from 29 to 2013, they went they have done a lot of public outreach on this so that we all share the same values. Where I am glad that there is a new group that really wants to be involved and I welcome their involvement and I think I'm going to vote yes for this and just look forward to the next steps. So thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Lemon. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I am going to I am going to vote for this. I did. I do see the benefit to this new technology. I do see the benefit for the conversion and the fact that it doesn't smell. I mean, I know a lot of places whose. Well, never mind. But let's just say I know that smell and I wish we had an ordinance on that. But but I think this is going this is a very good idea. I think it's brilliant. And it makes me want elephants in my neighborhood so that we can go on, get off the grid. You know what I'm saying? No, it's not flying oak. Oh, you know, in all seriousness, I do understand the residents concerns. I do see that when you look at the building, you look at the backside is not pretty and it doesn't match with the neighborhood. But, you know, when you when you see that, when you see that side, it begs to see art, our mural ism, something that ties the zoo to the park. I could I can I can imagine so many. I actually have a guy who did our Barnum mural. His his name is feud it was Chris go by Knox in Alameda and look at the mural he did it is amazing and it ties in the circus because of Barnum and P.T. Barnum and all that history we have in the neighborhood. But could you imagine something like that on that facade? It ties right into city park. Could you imagine a mixed media? I mean, I'm not talking about my favorite horse at dinner. I love that guy, but I kind of am. There's something that we can do to make that better. And I think there's something I mean, it's more than just that, how it looks and the facade. Right. It's it's looking at the zoo as a park as well. It is. It's timeless. It's 118 years old. It's that 57 Chevy that just a little bit of a little bit of turtle wax. I'm sorry, folks. Amphibian folks. Are they here? No. Reptile, reptile with a little bit of it. You make it shine. And it's a classic and it's an instant classic. And that's what the zoo is. That's what city park is. And one wouldn't be without the other. City park wouldn't be what it is without the zoo, to be quite honest. It wouldn't the zoo wouldn't be what it is without City Park. And I think it's I think it's imperative that there is communication, there is some ongoing communication, that there is some coordination. Denver is a growing metropolitan city. We should act like it. And these two uses meet perfectly. It's just a matter if. It's. If it's a. It's a visual thing. Let's get it done. There's a lot of walls in our district. I did not add to the property va

lue in our neighborhoods. We put art on them. Next thing you know, everybody wants to live next to the mural. There it is. So with that, I mean, I'm I'm supportive I'm supportive of these permit. I do hear you out City Park and I think the further communication and coordination is going to be super beneficial. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank the people who came to testify. And I want to thank the zoo. The zoo. You did do a lot of outreach. I know you care about the community, people who are opposing this. You did a very good job of making yourself heard in being sure that we did our homework, really knew what we were approving, because I believe this is a very serious consideration. And I looked at the criteria that we have to approve by, and I think they have been satisfied. The effect on the surrounding area was probably the greatest one to think about. But I have to say, going through this process, it's listening process. I'm puzzled on two counts. The first thing that puzzles me is that last September 2013, the zoo mailed to 65,000 people on their mailing list. So granted, probably zoo members, some in the neighborhood, some outside notified the R.A. had 65 people, which is pretty good attendance for a public meeting at a public meeting. And then in October, Prep had an informational item. Their agendas are public. Especially the park advocates in this city. Watch that. On November 14th, there was a public hearing. No one spoke. The building then was completed in 2011. And although I don't represent the area, I did chair what was known as Ludy and Parks came under that I never since 2011 heard anything that drew my attention to the south side of the zoo where my attention should have been drawn. I will say, and I understand that friends and neighbors of city parks, the new group, and I think they have legitimate concerns about the south side of the zoo. And that brings me to the second puzzling item of this. We have a 4700 square foot building there that was built in there, was planned in 2009, built in 2011. And yet the back of the south side of the zoo really looks incomplete in its cheek two and a half years later. So the frustration mounts. Now, let me just say this. One thing I've learned in public office is you never get an A in process. I'm not sure neighborhoods get a day at council, certainly doesn't get an A. It's a very hard thing to do well. So that brings me to I really applaud Councilman Burke's approach. I was fascinated to compare the cooperative agreement between the zoo and the city with the cooperative agreement of the Botanic Gardens in the city. Since I represent the area where the Botanic Gardens is and that agreement with the Botanic Gardens was done before I was in office . But we've had our share of controversy at the Botanic Gardens, too, about buildings, but it requires it has teeth, it requires a neighborhood advisory group, requires neighborhood trustees, i

t requires notification of that group. The groups are official. So if you don't get the message, you follow down. If you don't speak when it's time to speak, you've fallen down. So I really do hope there may be a better approach in City Park. It's not one size fits all, but I really do hope that the process goes quickly. I considered the delay and was still considering it during this meeting, but I will say I think it took four years to do this amendment. To the. Botanic Gardens Agreement and you guys really just need to get to work on this stakeholders group or whatever is set up. It's going to be a long discussion, but it'll be a discussion for the good. So thank you, everyone. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. Councilwoman Monteiro. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank everybody who came out tonight, and I want you to know that through the conversation, I was very uncomfortable with some of the things that were being presented on part of the Denver Zoo, because I kept thinking if if this was in my council district, what would I do? And in retrospect, I would have I would have really and not that nobody I don't want to cast aspersions on anybody, but I just feel that somewhere along the line, the communication sort of did fall by the wayside. And for that I feel uncomfortable and that I was a little bit confused too, about the neighborhood concerns. People have been talking about the backside and, you know, and and to me, that's a I mean, that's an easy remedy if people come together and they want to make for a better design. I didn't hear too much in terms of fears around if the unforeseen should happen. That's why I was asking the questions about the Denver Fire Department and what a response plan was for neighbors and even people utilizing the zoo. So that I didn't feel 100% confident about that. But I do feel 100% confident about confident about is that Councilman Brooks has. Has made the commitment and so has the zoo. And so has. Right now the Friends of City Park to come back to the table and start addressing some of the concerns and fears that people and and maybe even participants will have. Those didn't come through very, very clearly. It was mostly about what we don't want. And being able to have a group come together and talk with one another, hopefully will move the needle on what we

do want and how we want to communicate with the zoo. I have a tendency I love the zoo, but I also have a tendency to understand that the zoo is. A neighbor. And there's always that constant. Tension. About how can we become better neighbors? And so my hope is, is this moves forward that it is an opportunity to bring people together and to have had substantial conversations about opening up the lines of communication. So I will be supporting it. I trust Councilman Brooks 100% in this particular situation and the zoo and well in any. He laughed. I was talking about this. This, this. Only on this one. Only. No, no, I wasn't. I was we're talking about

this. But and also the neighborhood that everyone will come back to the people and and work this out. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Monteiro. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I'll try to be brief, because I think many of my comments have been made already. First of all, I want to thank all of the people who have written to my office and express their views on all sides on this issue. Appreciate the time. I had to sit down with the folks from the zoo to learn about this process. I think some of the concerns about air quality are real that people will need to be engaged in to monitor that because of some of the various types of chemicals that are used in the process. But I think by creating this community advisory committee to not only be engaged in the park as a whole, but with the work that will go on with this waste to energy process, I think is important. As a city, we have a new climate adaptation plan that the mayor rolled out this year that calls for trying to reduce our overall emissions. And this is one step in that direction. There are many things the city is working on and talking about to try to move us in that direction. You've got states like California that are zero emission, states that are doing incredible things with, you know, hydrogen fueling stations all up and down the coast and lots of other things. And we're all being asked to do our part so that we can realize that climate change is real and the impact it's having on our environment is real. The fact that we've got less water, it's going to impact our food supply. So we're all going to have to be doing our part to address this issue. And so for that, I commend the work that you all are doing to move in that direction. I think this is going to be good for the city in terms of being, you know, one of those projects out of the chute , as you indicated. You know, Denver Zoo is the only zero waste facility and others will be coming in looking at Denver Zoo to see how we did it. You know, are there other areas in the Denver metro community that can learn from this? I know from work that I did with Enroll participating in their energy executive program, this is something that they have been working on with private sector folks for quite some time. They actually, you know, do this process on their site out in Golden to fuel part of their operations. And so I think this is going to be good for the city. I think the issues with the neighborhood can be addressed through this process. And I just have to say that. The community process you went through. Have you not done that? This room would be full tonight and people would be screaming and hollering at us to not let this go forward, to demand that we we, you know, take additional steps. And I think the fact that and it's not to discount the input that we've had from those of you who are here that did testify. But I think that says a lot to the process that you were engaged in because this is an activ

e community and had homework not been done. We would be here for another few more hours. So, again, I'll be supporting this tonight. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Brown. Thank you, Mr. President. I see this as a win win tonight. It's a win for the neighbors because they will get a in the hand. They have tonight got a commitment from their councilman that they're going to establish a neighborhood advisory committee and the zoo is going to work with that. And I know councilman will ride herd on this project. And secondly, the zoo gets an innovative project. One in which we should all be proud, and we'll put Denver on the map. And that's why I'm supporting it this evening. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Brown. Councilman Brooks. Yeah, thank you. You know, I want to thank Scott. I want to just mention this record. Thank Scott Gilmore for for getting me these final recommendations for the City Park Partnership Task Force that was created in 1997, which the City Park friends and neighbors came up with. And, you know, all things always come around because the person who's on here who really helped drive this was Hiawatha Davis, who we talked about earlier tonight. And so we will attempt to work hard to recreate what he did in the city. And we know that he was a driver. So I'm excited to put on it. And by the way, in 1987, I was graduating from high school. But just to start out, throw that out there. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. All right. Any other comments on 941 C? None, Madam Secretary. Roll call. Brooks I brown fats. I can eat lemon. LOPEZ All right.

MONTEIRO Hi. Nevitt Hi. Ortega I Rob Shepherd, I. Susman Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close the voting and announce the results. 3939 941 is in place upon final consideration and does pass. All right, we need to do the movements for 972. First, we need to put it on the floor. So, Councilman Brown, would you please put Council Bill 972 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. A move the council bill 970 to be placed upon final consideration and do pass it. Has been moved in second it. Now we need a motion to postpone. Councilman Brown. Thank you, Mr. President. I move the final consideration of Council Bill nine seven to with this public hearing be postponed to Monday, February 23rd, 2015. Second, it. Has been moved in. Second. Do you have any additional comments? Councilman Brown. Thank you, Mr. President. Once again, I'm requesting that this postponement be voted on available in a favorable manner tonight in order to allow the applicant in the neighborhood to resolve still outstanding issues. Thank you, Councilman Brown. Any other comments from members of Council CNN for voting on the postponement? Madam Secretary, roll call. Brown I thought. I can. Eat. Lemon. Lopez All right. Monteiro I never. I. Ortega, I. Rob Shepherd, I. Susman. Brooks, I. Mr. President. Madam Secretary, please close the voting. Announce the results. 39

39 Final consideration 972 has been with this public hearing has been postponed to Monday, February 23, 2015. One Pre Adjournment Announcement on Monday, January 12, 2015. Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 1071, changing the zoning classification for 13.15 acres northwest of the intersection of Paignton Boulevard, East 40th Avenue, required public hearing on Council Bill 1072, changing the zoning classification for 17 six one East 60th Avenue. A required public hearing on Council Bill 1073, changing the zoning classification for 60.10 acres northwest of the intersection of Rainier Boulevard and Green Valley Ranch Boulevard. A required public hearing on counts about 1074, changing the zoning classification for ten for 16/156 Avenue 16 one on one Green Valley Ranch Boulevard and required public hearing on Council Bill 1080, changing the zoning classification of 3325 to Ninth Street. Any protests on these bills must be filed. The council offices no later than noon on Monday, January 5th. No business. Just one point of order. When we completed our action on the gasification thing that was just on first reading, correct. It was. Yes. It was just on first reading nine or 941 the word public apology from the misspeaking. So, you know, the business for this body, this meeting is adjourned. Denver eight. It has been moved in. Second eight comments. Councilwoman Fox. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a bill authorizing the purchase of a building to move the city fleet. And I want to make it clear, I have no problem with the fact that. We are purchasing a new. Building. Nor do I have a problem with the fact that it's this building. What I do have a problem. With is the same problem I had with the 911. Building purchase. The intention. Is. Some time after. This to roll. Both of those amounts into acop certificate of participation so that we are. Now incurring more. Debt that the voters have not gotten a chance to weigh in on. And so when we buy things that we cannot pay for and we have to finance through co-pays which bypass the voter, they know that I am help me out. Which I will mention one other thing. I think I brought this up before when the accompanying material comes through and it says, is there any. Controversy surrounding this ordinance? Perfunctory. Somebody just puts no in there. Any time a copy is connected to these purchases, please put. Yes. Thank you, Councilman. Thoughts in the comments on or questions for 1115 Councilwoman Monteiro. Thank you, Mr. President. I see there's someone here from the city who could just give us a little. Well, give us some information, background information on this. Good evening, council members. I'm Jeff Steinberg. I'm the director of the Division of Real Estate. This building is a building that would replace the existing fleet Maintenance and Electronic Engineering Bureau building that's located at 35th and Arkin's Court. This building will be a 50,000 foot building. Currently, it's a

70,000 foot building that's being impacted by an RTD take. The building size will be reduced by 20,000 feet, so the net square footage will be 50,000 feet. Councilwoman Fox is correct in that the form of the acquisition will be financed via a copy. Nick Grimm. And what agency of the city of Denver is it for? It's actually for two agencies. It's for safety and technology services. Okay. So Denver police and sheriff. It is predominantly Denver police. That's fleet maintenance. So that's where all the police vehicles go to have all of the services done to their vehicles. And then separately, the Electronic Engineering Bureau does all the radios for police vehicles. So it's a one stop shop. And is it accessible then for those particular city agencies to be able to get there? Because currently where they are, it's pretty easy. Down Brighton Boulevard. Yeah. I mean, this is

down Brighton Boulevard as well. This is a 20/131 Street. So from Brighton Boulevard at 31st, if you go west, it's probably less than a half a mile. So it's in the same general facility as the existing facility. And did you do a pretty widespread search for replacement of that property? I spent almost a year and a half to two years looking for a replacement. And ultimately what we were looking for is a site that we could lease. The problem was, is that when we found facilities that had a potential to be leased, the amount of capital improvements that we would have to put in, it was several million dollars. And it didn't make sense for the city to spend that much money in capital improvements on somebody else's building. And whether and what other options for financing did you look at? I mean, we looked at what options there were, which is ultimately the general fund and what moneys are available to be utilized for the acquisition of the building. And there aren't any funds that are available. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman Monteiro.

Councilwoman Robb. Thank you, Mr. President. I understand this couldn't go to committee because it came in that week when we weren't having committee meetings. So I think there are a lot of questions and that's why we're doing committee work on the floor where we reimburse by RTD for the building that is part is being taken. Now we're paying less the amount that is being taken. So in other words, the building is currently owned by Belle Haven Realty and in its configuration it currently has 70,000 feet. We went out and had the building appraised based on the architectural plans that show what the building will be after the take occurs. And that's the price that we're paying for the building in the after statement. Okay, I thought so. We're relocating from the. I thought you were saying that the Arkansas court building we were leaving because of an to take. No. This building is being impacted by an RTG. Take the one we're buying. Correct. Okay. So why are we leaving the Arkansas court building again? The the Arkan

sas court building is a building that will be demoed and be used as a park as the improvements to Brighton Boulevard and the area. Very good. Thank you, Councilwoman Robb. Councilman Brown. Councilwoman Robb asked my question. All right. Thank you. Any other questions or comments on 1115? Thank you, Mr. Steinberg. Seeing none. Madam Secretary, welcome. But no can eat. Lehman. Monteiro. Nevitt. I. Ortega. I. Rob. Shepherd. I. Sussman. I. Brooks. Brown. I. Ortega. Sorry. I did vote already. Mr. President. Hi. Madam Secretary. Please close the voting. Announce the results. 11 eyes, one nay. 11 eyes, one 811 eyes. One day. 1115 has been ordered to publish. Madam Secretary, can you do you have the next one, I believe is 1062 called out by Councilman Fox? Councilman Fox, would you like for us to do with this? I have several. Questions I'd like to ask. I don't want to pull it out for a vote. Go right ahead. There are seven bills tonight that are related to health. Insurance, dental insurance, etc.. I just pulled this one out. This one actually relates to the amount that we are authorizing for Kaiser. But I had several questions and I see Heather Britton here, and I know that Heather would know the answers. Robin Ortega Make sure I did not miss any. I look up and down. Got them right. Madam Secretary, can we get the first one? 1097 Councilwoman Shepherd, what would you like for us to do with this? Yes, I have some questions regarding this. Go right ahead. Okay. So just as a short way of a preamble, when we were contemplating the I'm talking about this body was contemplating the urban renewal area for this site. You know, there was some questions asked about the future of a sort of affordable housing on the site, knowing that tax increment financing would probably be used to help redevelop the site. And I remember that several of us up here asked about, you know, what type of mixed income affordable housing we might have. Recognizing that, of course, affordable housing is one is a significant crisis in the city and county of Denver. Also realizing that public transit, both West Colfax Bus, which runs very frequently as well as the fairly recently created West Colfax quarter light rail runs there being an excellent opportunity to to create some affordable housing. And then we understood from that time that the developer, the master developer Ffg was looking toward and working towards acquiring a parcel and selling it to DHS. Following some conversation that we had in committee last week, I do understand that that conversation continues to move forward. Please bear with me. We have a lot happening on this parcel, which is why I'm bringing it up. There's a lot of conversations happening specific to different pieces of this that have passed through council will be passing through council. So there's another bill that's coming through very soon that we did discuss last week regarding a zoning that would likely trigger our recently amended affordable housing or

dinance, which is known as the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. As the developer, as we understand it, will be building 224 for sale condo units. In committee I asked about what type, you know, how the IHS would be required or satisfied. And we understood that the master developer had made an initial proposal to add requesting credit under the age for the DOJ product, Denver Housing Authority product , which is planned, as we understand it, to be rental housing for low income seniors, 30% of area meeting of area median income. So we definitely had a lot of questions about where is the city's stance currently on this issue? What are those negotiations looking like and what is the timeline? So my question for the Office of Economic Development and I see Seneca homes back there is will this council have a clearer understanding of the affordable housing planned for this site before any future upcoming public hearings and final readings happen, both with regards to the urban renewal area and also the TIFF, and then of course, the potential rezoning of BLOCK One. Great. Thank you, Mr. President. Seneca Homes with the Office of Economic Development. We have been in communication with AFGE. I think they have submitted essentially a framework proposal for. What they would expect to do to. Fulfill their affordable housing requirements. Over the last. Week, we have been constructing our response and we will be meeting with them within the next couple of days, and I'll be able to give you more information after that meeting. Certainly we will keep council up to date and letting them know essentially what our stances and how our assistance is consistent. With. First the newly passed affordable housing plan and also the spirit of the IHS revision. Okay. Thank you. That's my question for now. I do have some comments, but I see that councilman probably has questions as well. Katherine, can each go ahead? Yeah. Thank you very much, Councilwoman Sheppard, for pulling this out. And I guess minus more of a comment than a question, which is that I do believe that the developer in this case was very responsive to the comments. I think it was over a year ago, maybe, maybe even eight months ago that we created the initial urban redevelopment area. And many folks asked about this topic. And so I'm glad that the discussion is progressing. But I will acknowledge that hearing the proposal that was described in committee last week was concerning to me, because even though I really do believe in low income senior housing, and I believe that that proposal was very responsive to the questions we asked about the urban redevelopment area. This site has always really prioritized also families, you know, all the way back to Anthony's visioning plan, it was really commented that this was an area with a lot of families and a desire to keep families. And so I think that the inclusionary housing ordinance requirements are above and beyond this initial commitment that was made to look

at the redevelopment area and and think about that project. And it's important to you can't necessarily trade off many of the condos in the plan that I have been briefed on our two bedroom units. And so if they all get converted to senior apartments that are one bedroom, we really won't be doing anything to address families and we'll be missing an opportunity. So I do think it's important for us to be weighing the whole site and the different types of public participation that are happening here. We are creating an urban renewal area with a tiff tonight, so we are foregoing property and sales tax to fund some very important projects that we'll hear more about during the public hearing, which will be, I'm assuming, a few weeks from now. But I think that the housing plan is very clear that we do need a mix of housing. And I think the inclusionary housing ordinance is very clear about the ways that we compare what we're getting and what we're losing. And so I really do trust the department to have that discussion, and I'm glad to hear that it is happening. But it will be very important for me when I'm having final reading on this bill, as well as any others related to this site, to have a little bit more of a sense of where that's at. So I was a little concerned with what I heard in committee, and I hope that the conversation evolves in ways that really are thoughtful about that mix and what our plans say about them and what the opportunity on this site is. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman, can you just Councilwoman Shephard, did you want to give another comment? Sure. I'll say a couple more things. So the committee discussion last week was very vibrant around not only recognizing the need and creating affordable housing for those, you know, who really are very low income folks who are going to need who may never be able to buy a home and need, obviously good quality, decent housing to live in the 30% of AMI addresses that. But I would very much like to echo with councilman can each said I mean I talk to families in this neighborhood all the time and there is a growing concern that there isn't going to be affordable housing for low to moderate income families. And that neighborhood, which has traditionally been available to people in that income bracket there. And it is quickly, quickly becoming no longer a possibility. So I want to

underscore that, you know, I believe that the conversation needs to include, you know, the discussion around affordable for sale housing. And one thing that I mentioned very specifically last week was that, I mean, lots of people would love to come to Northwest Denver and buy a single family home. You it's but it is exceedingly expensive to buy a single family home in northwest Denver. The opportunity for perhaps an entry level condo or other attached housing with price points much lower than what it cost to buy a single family home would give families an opportunity to buy. In my district and as we all know, home owner

ship is one of the best ways that families create wealth for themselves by continually paying down their mortgage payments and hopefully appreciating or realizing the appreciation of some capital of their investment. And that it's one of the chief ways that they hand that wealth down to future generations. So it's an important tool in helping to break the, you know, continuous cycle of poverty. And it's one way that we need to look at how we address our affordable housing crisis in northwest Denver and in Denver particularly. So I'm supporting these bills moving forward tonight, but I just felt like we needed a little bit more discussion on the issue tonight. Proclamations. We have one proclamation this evening. Councilman Brooks, were you pleased with the proclamation? Yes, certainly, Madam President. And I'm reading this for Councilman Council President Chris Herndon, who represents the airport, and he couldn't be here. He's in Dallas at ap3. Convention. So I'll be reading this in his state proclamation 80 celebrating Denver International Airport 20th anniversary. Can you believe it's 20? I can't believe it. Where is Mayor Federico Pena vision to imagine a great city, including a grand vision for an expanded airport that would support Denver's economic growth for decades to come. And. WHEREAS, Mayor Wellington E. Webb continued the vision and built the thing. It doesn't say that, but we all know what happened and oversaw the opening of the Denver International Airport on February 28th, 1995. And. WHEREAS, Denver International Airport instantly became an iconic American airport for its rooftop tents. State of the art technology and its critical link within the nation's airspace air airspace system. And. Whereas, with the support and guidance of Mayor John Hickenlooper, Mayor Bill Vidal and Mayor Michael B Hancock, Denver International Airport has grown over two decades to become the primary economic engine of the city of Denver in the state of Colorado and the Rocky Mountain region, generating more than 26.3 billion annual economic benefit. Whereas Denver International Airport supports the equivalent of 190,000 full time jobs and a payroll totaling 8.6 billion. And. Whereas, Denver International Airport has the third largest domestic network with nonstop service to more than 170 destinations worldwide. Whereas Denver International Airport destinations have increased by 30% since 2011, including services has opened new gateways to economic connections to Europe, Asia, Central America. And. WHEREAS, Denver International Airport, it's today is the fifth busiest airport in the United States and 15th busiest in the world, serving more than 53 million passengers per year. And. Whereas, a new 519 room Western and at Denver International Airport Hotel will complete its original vision of the airport. I believe that's going to be done the third quarter of this year, whereas the commuter rail service between Denver International Airports T

ransit Center and Denver's Union Station will begin the service in 2016 and connect millions of passengers with the City of Denver's vibrant, vibrant downtown. And. WHEREAS, Mayor Michael Hancock has recognized the area as connecting Denver International Airport and downtown Denver as the corridor of opportunity and will provide economic benefits for decades to come. Last. Whereas, WHEREAS, the Denver International Airport is positioned for another 20 years of successes as America's favorite connecting hub where the Rocky Mountains meet the world now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one that Denver City Council recognizes. Denver International Airport, known as Den on its 20th anniversary and congratulates Denver International Airports Management and employees for developing and maintaining and operating a world class serving. A world class airport serving Denver. The state and the country in the world and section to the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest in a fix the seal of the city in county Denver to this proclamation that copies be transmitted to Council President Chris Herndon, who is not here. Denver International Airport CEO Kim Day Mayors Michael B Hancock. Federico Pena. Wellington Webb. John Hickenlooper and Bill Vidal. And a copy for all DIA employees to be hung in a prominent location. Thank you. Councilman Brooks, your motion to adopt. Yes, Madam President. I move that proclamation 80 be adopted. Thank you.

It has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of council. Councilman Brooks. Thank you. Madam President. In 1995, I was 15 years old, was a junior at Clare, my high school, and me and my mom were flying through Denver. And, you know, as a kid, I could care less about the airports that I fly through and connect with. But I specifically remember my mom saying this is one of the most incredible airports and it's going to connect us to you know, it's going to be a lot easier for us to fly from L.A. to Denver to get to the East Coast. And I remember seeing the tits and it stuck as a memory for me. And little did I know that I'd be on city council one day in the city of Denver making upgrades and improvements to this airport. So this is such a privilege and an honor to be able to talk about this airport. We spent \$4.8 billion in purchasing Denver International Airport today. The return on investment is \$26.3 billion. So I think that was a great investment that the city did. And for every \$1 of public money that we put in, we returned six. We got six back to the city, to the state and to the Rocky Mountain region. And, you know, you know, DIA makes Denver relevant to the rest of the world. And you don't realize that until you are on some of these trips that we go on to connect with other other city leaders worldwide. And people begin to talk about Denver because of Denver International Airport and and what it does to the region and what it does specifically

for the city of Denver. I just want to say I'm grateful for I and I'm excited on where it's going. Kim Day is doing an incredible job and her leadership team who's all sitting very nicely in the front row. But I got to I can't help but reflect on Federico Pena right now. And the visionary leadership that he had to say, you know what? We're gone from Stapleton. So this to Kansas, really to a lot of people in Denver. And we have a vision to put this airport out here. And it's going to it's going to elevate Denver. It's really going to make us relevant on the world stage. And the leadership, the boldness that it took him and his team to collaborate to make that happen is just encouraging and inspiring. And now here we are today with a young adult DIA, who is paying incredible dividends for this city and really is as a catalyst for this state. So I'm excited to bring this proclamation forward. And I just want to thank all the employees at Denver. And I think this. No one is more excited than me in this council to see this train connect downtown to DIA. This is going to be really. I keep saying, DIA, you guys want me to say din to din? This is going to be really exciting. So thank you so much. Thank you, Councilman Brown. Councilman Sussman. By. The way, that's Brooks. Brown. Oh, that's my little brother over there. I killed a man. Brown, did you want to get in the queue? Sure. When I see you hitting the monitor, that's what you want. Thank you. Madam President. Yes, if I may. A lot of us are not seeing that speaker lineup that we normally. Yes. We're not. Okay. Thank you. All right. So we can't. Function. Michael. Okay. While Michael is fixing everything, I can tell you who the next person is. And that's Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you very much. It's always hard to follow the eloquence of this very young fellow councilperson next to me, who's barely older than Delia. But thank you for those great words. I feel so very much said the way that you do, too. I just I have always often told him that when I grow up, I want to work for DIA, because it's just such a wonderful organization. And what it has done for our city and for the surrounding area and for our state is phenomenal. And the growth that Kim De and has done, it has been wonderful to see the team she's put together has just dynamite. I see all of you there in the front row and of course, the employees that they were employees. I think we will have a long time before we can get past saying DIA. I still say Valley Highway and you know, Boulder Turnpike and the rest. Many of us can remember those. So congratulations on 20 years. It's wonderful. It's hard to believe, but keep up the good work. And I'm just so proud of our airport. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. And I just want to apologize for being late. I just drove in from the Western Slope. So in 1995, I was the president and city council when we had the first flight

that came into DIA. And it was snowing like crazy. And we had. Multiple flights coming in. Where? In the previous airport at Stapleton. In that kind of weather, we would not have been able to have two planes land side by side. And I don't know how many of you remember flying in. And there would be a plane next to you and you could literally wave to people in the you know, as their plane was going by, you were that close to each other. So that safety issue is one that was corrected by building the air and ensuring that not only we have a safe airport, but we have the ability and the capacity to have 12 runways if we ever need them in the future. Which is incredible because it could be the world's largest airport. And with the 53 square miles that DIA has, the opportunities not just for Denver and not just for the communities that surround it, for the whole front range, has benefited

tremendously. And I don't know how many of you drive through Aurora, but it's amazing how many industrial businesses there are along the I-70 corridor that benefit from their close proximity to DIA. So I just want to say happy birthday, DIA, happy 20th birthday. And to the team of managers who helped ensure that this runs efficiently and continues to be the economic engine that it was envisioned to be. I want to say congratulations and thank you for the work that you do every day. I just want to say a special thanks to my colleagues who served at that time, who helped go out and knock on doors to ensure that this issue was put on the ballot in Denver and in Adams County to ensure that we were successful in Annex and into Denver and being able to move forward with it as it had been envisioned. So thank you for bringing this forward and please add my name. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Next up is Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Madam President, I wanted to also chime in and say happy birthday to DIA. I remember the first time seeing DIA with my own eyes and I was as a young guy when those of us that remember Stabler, Stapleton, remember that all you had to do was get on to Quebec. Stapleton was kind of it was your average airport. It really wasn't intriguing to the I knew where it was. I think the only time I had been there was a kid when we walked in the Broncos home from there in their first championship and or their first AFC championship in 1986, when we seen the open the scene that first plane come in and being able to see it with your own eyes is the most magnificent airport I think anybody had ever built. And it still is. To this day, I have had the privilege to see other airports around the world, around the country. And I tell you, there is nothing like Denver International Airport. It is completely unique. It does even it feels like you're walking into a I don't know what, but it's it's beautiful, spacious, it's clean, you know, it's user friendly and it's just amazing. You know, you're always in are and speaking of are. There's just somethi

ng about the architecture with that airport and something about looking at that canopy and seeing the snow, the snow peek mountains at it that it represents. And then there's the most incredible picture. I thought if they could not get even more magnificent. Somebody stole my idea. And I one of these days, I was just like, I got to get out there during a thunderstorm. They had the blue Mustang in the middle of a thunderstorm. And the air captured this fear. I know who the photographer is, the captain that captured the picture of the blue Mustang with the in the background and with this lightning bolt and thunder cloud. Right. And I thought to myself, if there was a new definition of the word mystique, that is it. And if I and I attribute both of the Broncos two Super Bowl wins to that, I love Bucky the Bronco. But man, that Mustang is awesome. And any team that comes in and sees that, that's got to shake you up a little bit when it's at the airport. It's a beautiful airport, but the thing that makes it the best night, I'm glad some folks chained up the chain chimed in on this is their employees. It's the concessionaires, it's the parking attendants. It's the folks that greet you in the beginning to ask if you need help with your luggage. It's guest relations. It's everybody who makes that airport. It's the janitors who keep that airport clean. Those of you have seen other airports around around the country. They are not as clean as DIA. And it's just I know there's a good crew there. There's great folks that are that are from management all the way down to the folks that that are the tarmac rats that are out there, you know, working on a daily basis. It is an amazing, amazing facility. Every time you come with a new idea, it's hard. It's hard to top the next one. So happy birthday, DIA. And to here's to many more. And one day, hopefully it'll be the spaceport and add more to the rumors. Right. So anyway, thank you. Happy birthday. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, I thought you were going to say you felt like you're in an episode of The Jetsons or something. You. No, but if there was an X-Wing, Star Wars X-Wing that landed, that that would be awesome. Yeah. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Shepard. Yes, thank you, Madam President. I actually just want to ask Madam Secretary to add my name to the record as a sponsor. Thank you. You next is Councilwoman Robb, followed by Councilman Brown. Thank you, Madam President. I just am going to be very brief and say that DIA is the most spectacular airport I've ever, ever seen. And I'm always so proud. When I come back to Denver, it feels like home when I walk in there and see the great art and experience such pride in my city. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilman Brown. Well, thank you, Madam President. We have had six speakers and I want to talk. Thank Councilwoman Ortega for talking about the past, because so far no one has used the B-word baggage. But I think I mean, this whole thing, my goodness. With m

e opinion, does he deserve a lot of credit or what? Because did he come under a lot of pressure, personal attacks? Is the name Gene a human being anything to you guys in his column in the

Rocky Mountain News that he was frankly relentlessly attacking the CIA and the idea that we should move this airport hundreds of miles out of Denver. You know, we all drink from wells dug by others, and we need to credit my opinion and his vision. If you read Mayor Webb's book, he talks about. That the fact. As we've heard tonight, the dish opening on February the 28, 1995. But it was supposed to open back in 1994. In fact, he mentions the DIA really opened three times, finally the only airport in the country to do that, the first two. It was not ready. And he says in his book, the mistake he made was to set once the first date didn't come through. Then he set another date. That was a mistake, he said. He should have just opened it when it was ready to open. But it really wasn't very happy back in 1994 as we celebrate this happy birthday. It was tough. It was a PR, a national PR disaster. Remember the photos of the luggage? You guys remember that? Yeah. But we did it. Someone might ask. Will we ever have another day like project? And I think we will. And I think for us, it was handed out tonight and it's called the National Western Center. This is our next big DIA light project, in my judgment. And it's coming. And fortunately, we have good leaders. One is sitting at a little elevator tonight above us that is heading up this huge project. But they're out there. Trailblazers. And we need them. And we should not forget them. So, happy birthday, DIA. Finally. Finally. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brown, are there other members that would like to speak? I just want to take a moment of personal privilege and just go back in the day with Councilman Ortega. Actually, I was Councilman Ortega as a council aide at the time, and I remember that the D.A., a baggage system that being severely criticized, there was even a conversation and a controversy about the terrazzo tile, which, you know, went on for days and days. And at that time, it was very difficult for some people to see the vision of what the future of DIA would look like. And I think that it really helped set the tone for and position city of Denver in the United States. And I was so proud the first time that I was able to see it. It was just majestic and so beautiful with the roof along the roofline, along the mountains. So I'll never forget that. And I just want to say that. To Mayor Pena at the time, we were going through serious economic problems, and it was this big public works project that really helped to restore the public trust and the faith that our economy was going to turn around. And it did. And then the next project that came along that was a colossal lift was Denver Union Station. And that, as you can see, is also a national project. And now we're looking at linking through

the East Line, Denver Union Station and DIA. So I'm so, so proud to be able to look back and see that we've done large projects like this before. We have more coming before us. And all I can say is I was younger then. Not that that's going to stop right there. And but thank you so much. And happy birthday and many more. Madam Secretary, roll call Brooks Brown. I can eat lemon high. Lopez I Nevitt I Ortega, I. Rob Shepherd. Sussman Hi, Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 11 eyes. We have 11 eyes. Proclamation 80 has been adopted. Councilman Brooks, do you have someone here that would like to this proclamation? Yes, I do. Our CEO Kim Day is advancing day in New Zealand, trying to work on nonstop flight. So we have Stacey Stegman, who is the vice president of communications and marketing head. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. Madam President, esteemed members of council. Great words he said tonight, and I think we are all honored to be here. And with our whole that a large number of our leadership. Team and we take what you said seriously. I think we know that that we are charged with preserving and protecting this amazing asset. And we are all committed to doing so well into the future. So there will be many. More successes for four years to come. As you noted, as day is and isn't able to join us today, she was very disappointed to not be able to be here. One of the things that she has that regularly coming from L.A.X. was the difference. On how she worked and. Just felt this conflict all. The time with the political leaders in the city. And she always. Says the great support that she has from city council is so amazing and. So unique in Colorado and how much that just makes her happy and how much easier. It is. And so on behalf of Kim Day, I want to thank you all for that. I also wanted to say. That we are having our 20 year celebration. On this Saturday. I think you all have hopefully received an invite to that. So it. Will be a great opportunity to honor those like Federico Pena. And Mayor Webb, those who were visionaries in the past, so that we can thank them for what they have given us now and into the future. So we all hope to see you there. Thank you very much. Thank you. Resolutions. Madam Secretary, will you please read the resolutions? Madam President, point of order. Can we just have each of the managers be address identified for us from DIA? I know a couple of them are new and it would be helpful just for all of us to know them. My name is Bhavesh Patel. I'm the new chief revenue officer for the airport.

I'm Ken Green. I'm the chief operating officer of the airport. Still Williams. Senior vice president of HTC and Special Projects. Good evening. I'm Craig Haggerty. I'm acting senior vice president of Properties. And good evening, Neil Maxfield, senior vice president of Concessions. Thank you. Thank you. Thank. Good idea. Councilwoman Ortega. Resolutions. Madam Secretary,

will you please read the resolutions from. Seem as far Chadwick in the audience. I believe she's the point person on this one. It's my recollection that when the Denver portion of the construction of the 16th Street Mall went before the RTD board, they required full payment up front. Is that what this is? Right. What they. Bartsch had worked with the Department of Finance manager of special projects. But the RTD board did two weeks ago. Tuesday was passed a resolution feeling that they should not RTD should not front any money to municipalities for work they are doing for the municipalities, and that the money should be sent to them upfront for the work that they would then perform, which is obviously very different than what we've been doing for ever, because this is a time sensitive project in terms of moving it forward with the federal grant money we have or that RTD has received. We negotiated with RTD staff, and this is a 15 day turnaround payment. They will supply us invoices and within 15 days we will have a concurrent review of those invoices with RTD staff and pay RTD the funds based on those undisputed invoices. So they have the money in hand to pay the contractor within their 30 days. So was this funding? We anticipated the full amount in this year's budget. This is actually downtown funds. So again, it's a reimbursement. So this proposal for these intersections has been approved through the borough board. This is the figure that ties it in to RTD to get the money to RTD. What you saw in council was the usual 30 day. They would send us invoices every 30 days and we would pay them. And due to the our TDs change in position, we've had to realign it to be able to pay in 15 . So what is this push to the back burner that we were going to use the funds? It doesn't. It doesn't. Everything is continuing on track. If this is approved second reading next week, RTD staff will take this out, said for bids on the street and hopefully we can get this project started prior to the November date when we have to start stop construction. So on the RTD project, it doesn't hold anything up on the dura side. No. What gets pushed on the back burner? Nothing. So the dirt project that art, the RTD project does the actual transit ways. And this money is for the intersection between the transit ways we're going to build. Rebuild. Great. Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you. Councilwoman. Take it. Catwoman. Rap. Not so fast. I just am trying to. Because we did have a presentation at one time from Tracy Huggins. I believe in infrastructure or something. Is this the full cost of all five intersections? Correct. And we will not be building all five intersections. Based on the current construction costs that we're seeing across the city. We won't know how many intersections we will be building until the bids come back. Oh, okay. So we don't have to spend all of this. This allows us if another grant is received by our TD for the transit ways, it allows us

money for future intersections. And again, it's a reimbursement. So it's not like money's spent and we'll never have it. It's put there. And then we go back to RTD and collect it. Okay. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman. Any other questions or comments on Council Bill two zero? All right, CNN. Madam Secretary, you want to tee up the last one? Accountability 091. Councilman Monteiro, you called this out pertaining to the National Western Center Master Plan. What would you like for us to do with this? Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to request a one hour courtesy public hearing for the National Western Center Master Plan on Monday, March 9th, 2015. It has been moved and we do second. Thank you. Council Bill three zero approves the Zoning Map Amendment. The Council is required by law to conduct hearings on zoning map amendments, and the Council's actions are subject to a court review in order to provide a record for court view. Testimony is recorded and any items presented to the Council are marked as exhibits and become part of the record. Public hearing for council bill 30 is now open. We have the staff report. Good evening. My name is Tim Watkins with Community Planning and Development here to present rezoning application number 2014 IE 82 for property located at 1410 and 1420 South Santa Fe Drive property is located in South Denver Council District seven, known as Lucky District seven in the Overland neighborhood in the northern northeast portion of the North Overland neighborhood and located at the intersection of Santa Fe Drive and Arkansas Avenue, the property collectively is just over 30,000 square feet and the owner is requesting a rezoning from E three, which is urban edge commercial corridor three story maximum two I.A. or light industrial. And this would allow for marijuana cultivation facility and an existing building and property and for the city's strategy of

retaining First Amendment freedom of speech rights. The use overlay one or adult use would be retained and also use overlay to a billboard is proposed to be retained. The existing zone district urban edge commercial corridor three storey allows for development along auto dominated corridors and provides for a deep build to requirement, which allows for some parking between the building and the street. And this zone district allows for provides a transition between commercial and residential areas. The requested zone district, air or light industrial use is intended for employment areas, allows for offices, businesses and lighter manufacturing and warehouse uses, and does not allow any new residential uses. The existing context of the site in a surrounding area, beginning. With the zoning. Is surrounded by. Some heavy industrial or before. Just to the south or excuse me, not heavy industrial. That is a general bit general business. And then I.B. is the heavy industrial to the northeast and to the west and northwest is more urban edge. Commercial Corridor three story. The

existing land use is predominantly industrial and the purple color as well as some surrounding commercial retail and office uses. You'll also note the rail corridor, major rail corridor running north and south, just a block or two to the east of the site. Here's an aerial image showing the property in the surrounding area and you can see that it is predominantly industrial and lies within quarter. About a quarter mile separates it from the established residential area, which begins just east of the Broadway corridor to the right of the screen. The building form and scale. The center image to the left is the property. This is a light industrial flex building that allows for general manufacturing office and retail or wholesale uses. For a number of years. This was actually the Monarch Shower Doors facility where they would manufacture these products and had a showroom for wholesale sales and service to the north west of the property is existing residential and light industrial flex uses and abutting the property to the south is a fairly new commercial retail complex fronting Santa Fe Drive. Public process to president includes applicant outreach to the Overland Park Neighborhood Association and other applicable neighborhood groups were notified through written notice for all public meetings , and also written notice was provided to all applicable groups for the Planning Board, Public Hearing and Neighborhood and Planning Committee, as well as the public hearing this evening at the Planning Board hearing on January seven. Planning board members unanimously voted to recommend approval for this application onto the five review criteria, beginning with consistency with adopted plans. Comprehensive Plan 2000 recognizes opportunities for smaller custom fabrication and entrepreneurial start up businesses in historic industrial areas, including the South Platte River Corridor and rail tracks, which has been an important part of Denver's economic base for over a century. It also addresses the age or suggests that the age of the buildings and infrastructure and the change changing needs of industrial users should be addressed. Blueprint. Denver The concept land use is industrial. Recognize that this area is an area of stability and there are two types of areas of stability recognized in Blueprint Denver including committed and reinvestment and reinvestment maintains is intended to maintain the character of an area but also accommodate new development and select redevelopment. And this is fitting for an aging industrial district where reinvestment could benefit the existing buildings and surrounding infrastructure. The Future Street Classification and blueprint. Denver recognizes Santa Fe Drive as a commercial arterial. These typically serve commercial areas and contain small retail strip centers with front parking lots. They are often highly auto dominated or oriented and less amenable to walking and bicycling. They're primarily intended to accommodate regio

nal traffic from one part of the city to another, while providing access to nearby businesses . Arkansas Avenue is a local street. The Overland Neighborhood Plan, adopted in 1993, acknowledges the presence of industrial users in northeast, in the northeast, half of the neighborhood, and it encourages landscape buffers between industrial and residential areas, which is not applicable to this property, given the blue white distance between industrial uses and the residential areas that are about a quarter mile away. The next review criteria uniformity of district regulations. The Denver Zoning Code would be applied uniformly to this site, so that criteria would be met. The rezoning would further public health, safety and welfare by implementing recommendations of adopted plans. The justifying circumstance is that the land and surrounding environs has changed or is changing. This is characterized or could be characterized by the recent retail development adjacent to the property to the south. Also there is new residential and mixed use development occurring and in the more central and south part of the overland neighborhood

closer to the Evans rail station. And this is creating more demand for retail in that part of the neighborhood, more so than this industrial sector. Also, the aging industrial properties are in need of a reinvestment and there are some new regulations that apply, including November 2000 medical marijuana, which was legalized in the Colorado Constitution at that time. And in November 2012, recreational marijuana was legalized in the Colorado Constitution. The Denver Zoning Code, adopted in 2010 specifies where growing of marijuana is allowed and there are excise and licensing spacing requirements and business application requirements provided through the Business Excise and Licensing Office. The fifth criteria is consistency with neighborhood context, and the purpose and intent of the zone district should be in alignment. So the industrial context is characterized by an irregular pattern of large blocks with parking that often surrounds and buildings. And businesses that are located near highways or arterial streets. The Light Industrial Zone District is intended for employment areas. It allows for offices, businesses, light industrial uses and warehouse uses, and no new residential uses are allowed. So these are a good fit with each other and for the area and CPD, upon finding that all review criteria has been met, recommends approval of this application. Thank you. Thank you. We have three speakers. Sign up today. Call up all three. You can come to the first few. Tom Downey, Gary Cohen and Kara Swisher. And you all three can make your way up. And Mr. Downey, you can begin your remarks. Good evening, Mr. President. Council members. Tom Downey, 9856 East 27th Drive. Where the attorneys representing the applicant. And we're just available for questions. Thank you, Gary Cohen and. Gary Cohen. 1318 South. Marion. I'm available for qu

estions. I'm the owner of the building. Thank you. Thank you. I'm curious. We see little 150 West Ninth Avenue, apartment 4512 in Denver, and I'm representing the applicant. All right. Available for questions. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Do we have any questions from members of the council? Councilwoman Fox. Thank you, Mr. President. One thing in the presentation just raised my curiosity. I'm familiar with this area because I drive by it often. And there was a statement not about the grow house. I understand that use, but when I said in the interest of free speech, they wanted to retain the adult use. What are you planning? I won't go back to the slide, but it is the general policy and recommendation city of Denver to retain First Amendment freedom of speech right in the city that whenever existing property owner has a existing district that includes you overlay one, we encourage that to be retained to provide for that that right throughout the city. But it's not necessarily an intended use by the applicant. Go ahead. I really was asking the applicant if there is any use that you are intending for this, because I'm curious. No, councilman, there's no plans for an adult use. I was just at the request of the planning department. We did not request a change in that availability. I appreciate the explanation. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Fox, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilwoman. Fantastic. My question. Thank you. All right. Any other questions on public airing for accountability? Seen on public hearing is now closed. Time for comments. Councilman Nevett. Thank you. I'm going to see if that works. Oh, it did work. Okay. But you called on me anyway. I don't have a whole lot to add. This is pretty straightforward, pretty cut and dried. I can tell you that I did a little extra outreach to the surrounding neighborhoods and got no particular interest or concern from them . So I hope will move forward with this and improve it tonight. Thank you. Count Commonwealth. And the other comments on Council Bill three zero. Scene on Madam Secretary. Roll call. Now. Nevett I Ortega. Rob Shepherd Sussman. Brooks Brown. Hi, Fats. I can each layman. Hi. Lopez. Hi, Monteiro. Hi, Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close the building and announce the results. 3939 as council bill three zero has been placed upon final consideration and does pass. All right. We're moving on to this excellent second one, which is Council Bill 83, a bill for an audience approving a proposed cable franchise agreement between the city and county of Denver and Quest Broadband Services Inc, also known as CenturyLink, granting a non-inclusive cable television franchise. Councilman Brown, will you please put Council Bill eight three on the floor to be ordered published? Have two proclamations this evening, and we'll start with Proclamation 189, sponsored by Councilman Lopez. Councilman Lopez, will you please read Proclamation 189? Thank you, Mr. President. Council Proclamatio

n 189 Series 2015 In support of supporting Colorado Senate Bill 15 dashed to 12 212 to protect public regional stormwater management activities, whereas management of stormwater from urban areas is essential to preserve lives, protect public health and safety, avoid damage to downstream property and stream systems, as well as to comply with state and federal law. And.

Whereas, regional stormwater detention facilities are vital to the city and county of Denver, stormwater management and water quality improvement strategy. And. Whereas, the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, in partnership with the city and county of Denver and other local governments, has proposed legislation to clarify that regional stormwater management facilities do not cause injury to water rights and should therefore not be subject to water rights administration. And. Whereas, this legislation, if adopted, would allow the city and county of Denver and other local governments to continue to utilize, utilize regional, regional, storm water management approaches to protect the public and improve water quality without the time and expense to local communities of obtaining a water court decree. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Council of the City and County of Denver firmly support. Senate Bill 15, Dash 212 concerning a determination that water detention facilities designed to mitigate the adverse effects of stormwater runoff do not materially injure water rights. Section two at the Cooking of the Week. I always mess up on this part. Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest and affixed the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that copies be transmitted to the urban drainage and flood control district. Governor John Hickenlooper. Speaker of the House of Speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives. Tequila Hollingsworth. President of the Colorado State Senate. Bill Cadman. And the Denver delegation to the Colorado General Assembly. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, your motion to adopt. I move that council proclamation 15 dash zero 189 be adopted. It has been moved in second comments. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. This proclamation is very straightforward. And what we want to be able to do as a city is join in with the other municipalities and regional governments around our governments, around the region, and really clarifying that just because we are detaining water either in a floodplain or a detention facility and holding it for no more than 72 hours does not. And it does not mean that we need to be able to take out water rights on those detention facilities. It's important that we mitigate water runoff and stormwater management. As we learned in September of 2000. How long was that, Paul? That's right. 13. It seems like it was yesterday, but it. We want to make sure that we have the facilities and the infrastructure, but

also the legal backing to be able to take this water so we don't violate any anything else, but also so we protect lives and public property and private property to make sure that these flood waters don't cause the damage that they did in 2013. Imagine us being able to have that or having to take out water rights on these facilities. These are facilities that we don't intend to do anything without water except keep it away from private property and potentially harming folks lives. And so, you know, it's kind of a bureaucratic mess. When we look at water rights, it's always a huge issue. Water politics are a huge issue. But at the end of the day, we don't want to trample over anybody's water rights or anybody's water. We just want to be able to preserve our property protected and protect lives and the metro area. So that's what this is all about. It is making sure that that statement's clear. You know, I have the honor to represent Denver, along with my colleagues, Mary Beth Susman and Peggy Layman on the urban drainage and flood control district and to also chair the district. And there is a lot of support for this for this Senate bill. And we want to make sure that the water rights administrators and the folks that are down south understand our position and that we don't get any legal trouble. So. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you, Mr. President. As as Councilman Lopez mentioned, I also sit on the urban drainage board, and this bill just seems like the only sensible thing to do. I've been so impressed what urban drainage has done with the cities, the participating cities, to protect the participating municipality municipalities from the floods, which was remarkably seen in my district in that 2013 flood that we had received probably the most rainfall in the whole Denver area. And we had Wonderful Lakes at Lowry and Crest, Moorpark, our retention areas, and I can't imagine if we had not had those retention areas, what might have happened in our district. I thank you so much. And I completely support this proclamation and the bill that's in the legislature. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Any other comments? Proclamation 189. CNN. Madam Secretary, welcome. Lopez. Hi. Montero. NEVITT Hi. Ortega I'm Rob Shepherd. SUSSMAN But I can eat. LEHMAN Hi, Mr. President. Hi. Madam Secretary, please close the voting, announce the results tonight. Tonight's proclamation 189 has been adopted. Councilman Lopez. Is there someone you would like to invite to the podium to review the proclamation? I would like to introduce and bring up Mr. Paul Heineman from the WHO'S, the executive director of the Urban Drainage and Flood

Control District to the podium. You have to sing like Eric Garcia. Okay. You don't want to hear me singing. Thank you very much. This is this is a very vital piece of legislation for all local governments, both municipalities and counties, because dry detention basins are the most cr

itical tool in protecting the communities and the property downstream from both a quantity standpoint. In other words, the flood and then also from a standpoint of water quality, because these dry detention basins is they hold rainwater back and let some of the pollutants filter out. It brings cleaner water downstream. So I really appreciate city and county of Denver passing this. And our first committee meeting committee hearing up on the hill, across the street over there is on Thursday with the AG Committee. So we'll add this to the other municipalities and and counties which have also supported this legislation. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. We are off to our second proclamation and proclamation, two of one sponsored by Councilwoman Shepard. Will you please read Proclamation 201? We do have one proclamation this evening. 589. Councilman Lopez, will you please read proclamation 589. If Lopez. Espinosa. Councilman Espinosa. He can read it now. I'll take it. So bear with me. This is a long one. So proclamation number 15 0589 Recognizing September 2015 is Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. Whereas a diagnosis of cancer at any age is disruptive to the lives of patients in their families worldwide, it is estimated that between 160,000 and 250,000 children are diagnosed with cancer each year, and approximately 90,000 will succumb to their illness. In the United States alone, cancer takes more children under the age of 14 than any other disease. And. Whereas, statistically, each school day, 86 children are diagnosed with cancer, and one and one in every 285 American children develop cancer before the age of 20. And. Whereas, there have been key breakthroughs in cases of childhood, acute leukemias and pediatric cancer care. Children continue to receive chemotherapy, drugs and treatment developed in prior decades. Specifically, only three new drugs have been approved by the FDA to treat childhood cancer in the last two decades. Treatment is intense and generally includes surgery, radiation and chemotherapy. Whereas. And. WHEREAS, although there have been tens of millions in funding allocated towards clinical trial research, there have been there has been very little improvement in the overall survival rate of childhood cancer in the last decade. There are currently more than 380,000 childhood cancer survivors in the United States. And. Whereas is an imperative that the funding and research be continued so that the children with cancer could benefit from additional cancer therapies and drugs that lead to a greater number of cures. And. WHEREAS, this month, we pay tribute to the families, friends, health care professionals and communities who lend their strength to children fighting childhood cancer, and may their courage and experience move others to pave the way for new cures and a brighter future for our children. Now, therefore, it be the claim proclaimed by the Council, the city and County of Denver, Section one, that the Denver

City Council recognizes the month of September as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month and encourages city and county of Denver residents to affirm their commitment to fighting childhood cancer by donating time or funding into appropriate programs and activities to support this cause. Section two that the Clerk and of the city and county of Denver attest and to fix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and that copies be transmitted to Cassandra Green. Cassandra Green, American Childhood Cancer Organization, Hope for Heroes and the Contreras Family. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa, your motion to adopt. I am president. I moved that proclamation number 15 0589 to be adopted. It has been moved and seconded comments from members of Council Councilman Espinosa. So I'm glad I didn't choke up reading this this time. It was tough to read the first time. And now that you're calling, it's choking up again. This this has hit home to the district office personally, as many of you know. Rita Contreras, longtime city employee district. One longtime desert district. One resident gave birth to a wonderful her son, Nathaniel, and he's been struggling with childhood cancer for years. And we knew at some point during her tenure with my office there would be some challenges. And those challenges came sooner than expected that Nathaniel is persevering and he's a strong fighter. And I would just like to offer the podium to Nathaniel if he'd like to speak. So. To do that, right? That's right. Um, I would like to say thank you for raising awareness for childhood cancer, because the more people who learn about childhood cancer and the challenges, the more we can fight for money to find a cure. There are many heroes, just like me, fighting for their lives every day, even though red is my favorite color. I hope you will wear gold in September in honor of Childhood Cancer Awareness

Month. Thank you. Thank you, President. All right, Councilwoman, I take it you're up. Oh, my goodness. That's a tough act to follow. First of all, I'd like to ask that my name be added to the proclamation. And I've known Rita for a long, long time. Rita actually worked with me in my council office before before Nathaniel was born, actually. And I'm very much aware of the challenges that your family has dealt with. And I know it's symbolic of what all families go through that have children who are fighting cancer. And I just cannot imagine what those struggles are like day in and day out. And Nathaniel, you're my hero. To see you on Facebook and see that big smile, you just light up my heart and we're all fighting for you and praying for you and all of the other children who are struggling with cancer. And I appreciate you coming and reading your comments and encouraging all of us, all of the adults in our community to do our part in making sure that we fight for the the funding that's needed so that young people in our community don't have to sit around waiting and

waiting and waiting for the the research and the and the medications that are needed that can make a difference in your life. So thank you for being here tonight. And I love you and your mom and just keep praying for you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Nathaniel, I just want to tell you that there will be cures found. There is always hope. 50 years ago, when I was 11, I lost a brother to cancer. And there isn't a day that goes by that we don't remember him because his cancer has a very high survival rate these days. But 50 years ago it didn't. So cures will be found. And God bless you. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank Councilman Espinoza for sponsoring this proclamation and also welcome, Nathaniel. I know you've been here to the city council before, and I know that your mom has worked in the city council before. And I am so, so happy to see you. I'm so happy to see you walk up to the podium and speak. You know how many people get so shy and they're so scared to come speak? Even grown ups, when they come up here, they freak out. You didn't freak out one bit. You used to really strong. And that's one thing I know about you is that you're very strong. And I'll tell you something. I had cancer, too. It was a different kind of cancer, but I did two. And I know how sometimes you got to take that chemotherapy taste like you swallowed a battery. It's gross, huh? It's really gross. And sometimes you can even feel like you're sick all the time. You feel tired. But it'll get better. You just got to believe it. And you got to believe it in here. Okay. Ethan. Right in here. All right. You spend that time with your family and your brothers, and you'll get better. You'll get better. All right. And I also know something, not talking with other council members up here and your mom. And we all know that you love Legos. You do, huh? You know you love them. Okay, I do, too. And they're mine. Are a lot different from yours. Mine didn't make sounds or they weren't cool. My Star Wars Legos. They are nothing like the Star Wars Legos now. And I'm kind of jealous, but so I'm going to bring you something special. We have a little box here of Legos from the city councils, from all of us. And it's Iron Man, because that's who you are and that's who you're going to be. Right. And it's all in his heart, right? You know that. So I'm going to give these to you. And here's something else we got from the city council to. When I had that battery taste in my mouth and I felt sick and everybody's going to laugh because I'm not skinny. The only thing that really sat well was chicken wings. That was chicken wings. John Murray chicken wings. And it was your favorite and it was my favorite and as the only thing I can eat. So I tell you what, when you get hungry again, go take your brothers and take your family and go get some chicken wings because they taste super good. I'm go

ing to give these to you when we're done with the proclamation. But you hang in there. Okay, Hito. You get through it. Believe me, you'll get through it. All right? Love you. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Espinoza, you back up. The Council President. I am the recipient of the proclamation. Cassandra is actually attending with her son Logan, who is a childhood cancer survivor. And so I just want to acknowledge that Logan is here in our audience as well. Thank you. And we will hear from them very shortly. Any other comments? From members of council. CNN Madam Secretary, Raquel. Espinoza i flynn. I. Gillmor i cashman I can eat Lopez I knew Ortega. I Susman Hi. Black Hi. Brooks Hi, Mr. President. Hi. I'm secretary if this goes very nasty results. 1212. Eyes five nine has been adopted. Katherine Espinoza There's something you'd like to invite up to the podium to receive the proclamation. I would like to invite Cassandra and Logan to receive the proclamation. Cassandra Green. Thank you. It's going to be really hard to follow up. Nathaniel tried to talk him into coming and doing. Do it. So. Good evening. Just over one year ago, I entered into this scary world of childhood cancer. When our five year old son was diagnosed with brain

cancer. After the initial shock of diagnosis, I began researching everything relating to childhood cancer and the different treatments available. After many hours spent, I found it all to be very disheartening because of the huge lack of funding and studies being done to find a cure for our children. 4%. That is a very well known number in the childhood cancer world. Out of all of the funding for cancer in the nation, only 4% is given to help find a cure for our children. I don't know about you, but to me that's unacceptable. Our children are worth more than four. They are our future. After discovering all of these facts about childhood cancer, my family and I made a pledge that we would stand up and fight for these children because kids can't fight cancer alone. A couple of days ago, my son was asked if he could have any one wish in the world. What would it be? His reply at only six years old. He would make all of the kids sick with cancer in the world healthy. Good. Sorry. That's my wish, too. And we will fight until we find a cure. I want to thank you all so much in the city of Denver for pledging to help us fight for you. For a cure. That means the world to us. My name is Chris Andrew Green, and I'm the founder of Hope for Heroes, who Founding Hope program operating under the American Childhood Cancer Organization. Our mission is to help families through their journey with childhood cancer. All. It's possible. We would like to invite you if you are interested in helping to spread. Aware. To support families struggling with childhood cancer. To go to our Facebook page. Hope for heroes. Dot asco. To find out many ways that you can help. Denver We would so appreciate it if you would help us to turn this beautiful ci

ty gold for the month of September and help honor the brave children who are battling the biggest fights of their lives. Thank you very much. Thank you so much. And thank you, Councilman Espinosa, for bringing that forward. All right, Madam Secretary, we are on to the resolutions. Will you please read the resolutions. of the following local maintenance districts. 15th Street. 20th Street. Consolidated Larimer Street. Santa Fe Drive, C St Luke's Del Gainey Street East 13th Avenue South Downing Street Tennyson Street Number 2/44 Avenue and Elliott Street Golden Triangle West 32nd Avenue Broadway a South Broadway Streetscape, Arizona. The Iowa Wesley to Yale and Iowa to Wesley. And lastly, 10th and streetscape portions of 38th to 44th since there are no public hearings. And if there are no objections from members of council, we will not take a recess and seen no other business before this body. This meeting is adjourned. Denver eight TV's Your City, Your Source. Denver eight. On TV and online. To stay connected to your community, your city, your source. The first is the 41st and Fox station area that will open in the spring of 2016, introducing new multimodal access to the area and transitioning the area to a more TOD and mixed use context, supporting higher intensity redevelopment as well. And also within the area, we've seen a number of proposed rezonings and larger redevelopment sites signaling a change in the surrounding environments to that TOD and mixed use context as it evolves over time. And finally, we find that the existing UO two zoning does not reflect the city's adopted vision as reinforced in the Globeville Neighborhood Plan adopted in 2014. Another change condition. Now on to consistency with neighborhood context. As described earlier and as well in your staff report, we find that it is appropriate to apply zoning within the Urban Center neighborhood context at the subject site, both through the adopted plan vision as well as the multimodal context that will be enhanced when the 41st and Fox station area opens in spring 2016. And then moving on to consistency with zone, district purpose and intent, the c r zone districts are intended to promote safe, active and pedestrian scale diverse areas through building forms that activate the street edge. And they also introduce small scale commercial uses along with primarily residential uses. So we do find that the rezoning of C, r X8 is at the subject site is consistent with this purpose statement. And finally, the cr8 zone district specifically applies to residentially dominated areas served by collector or arterial streets where scale of 2 to 8 storeys is desired. And as we've seen to the adopted plan vision, our subject site is located on a mixed use arterial. And plans recommend building heights of eight storeys. So we do find that the rezoning is consistent with this intent statement. So based upon CPD's review of the five criteria, we find that all the criteria have been met and accordi

ngly recommend approval of application 2015, i.e. 00052 from IAU or two to see our x eight. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you have. And the applicant is here as well tonight. Thank you. Thank you. We have two speakers for this hearing. We have our Ahmad Payan and Mr. Sekou. Thank you. Congratulations, city council on your new appointments. And I just want to touch on a couple of quick items. I believe that the direction that the city is going in this part of the city that has been neglected for. I've been there since 1962. And it's it's been longer than that. I believe this is an

area of smart growth. And I believe this is this is an area that's going to be as well as other cities in the world. I call it Smart Town. And this is the first of the beginning of very many light rail projects that will be moving forward. So again, I'd like to thank you and applaud you for allowing taking these only requests and consideration as and especially your planner, Ryan Wittenberg led outstanding staff that you have on board of the city and County of Denver Planning Office. Again, this is an area of change against smart growth and a transportation development center. Again, the reason I say smart growth is because we have a light rail station that encourages high density housing there, but to be used effectively and efficiently to use the services throughout the city, but more importantly, to make them more citizens and the residents of the city and county of Denver, more mobile and using and does not use in their cars and creating pollution in our neighborhood. Again, I just want to say thank you. And I did reach out to several neighbors upon Councilman Brooks's request. One resident neighborhood that suggested if we could get some street sweeping done over there. And finally two of the tenants are being evicted, unfortunately. And the other four didn't have very much comment. And you did receive three other comments that several other residents to respond. So, again, thank you and have a great evening. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name is Chairman Sekou on the. Proud founder and organizer for the Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense, representing poor, working, poor and homeless people. On the surface, this looks like to be something that needs to be happening again. This area has been disregarded as far as a place for development. And now that the city is in a boom period, all neighborhoods who traditionally were poor, working, poor, homeless, black and brown people. Are now up for grabs. If this is going to follow the other processes of how other neighborhoods have been developed over the last ten years of gentrification and relocation, and especially for poor and working poor and homeless people. This change to build housing is for who? Who? Poor people. Brown people. Black people. Homeless people? No. No, it wasn't done in five points. It's not going to be done there. So you have displacement going on. And this for the new folks is part of

your tool belt. So you can help keep poor, working poor and homeless people within the city county of Denver by not being a rubber stamp for developers and the mayor's office who are under Dodge for taking money from these developers. All right. And then when these developers come in here, they don't employ no poor working, poor homeless people on this project so that we can come up in one day afford the rent. So you have designed poverty. Systematic poverty, that the biggest problem and now you have a great. Opportunity tonight because they messed up. Say it's more y'all than them on the boat. All right. Y'all can seize the upper ground now. Send a message to the people that you can't come in here. We are concerned about you. So people don't have to come in here and do what they just did, man. See? Because that can be a standard operating procedure, man, that we got to go through that. Why? Why? See? What? Doesn't make no sense, man. So to abort folks from having one of them housing rights that you had out in San Francisco. You know what I'm saying? Total disruption and madness. And then in the process of rebuilding, you could have spent the money on homeless and working people without all of that drama. Come on. Come on, man. Come on. Because the people are. Sick and tired of being sick and tired. And as their voices are muted and the dis and the demonstrations don't. You don't get it. They would have said, we have no other choice. Mr. Sanchez is. Mr. Secular. Tear down. Mr. Sekou, 3 minutes is up. Thank you very much. Thank you, sir. All right, so that. Concludes our speakers ready for questions from members of council. Councilman Brown. Yeah. Question for Armando Payan. Mr. Perry, how long have you lived in neighborhood? I've been in this neighborhood since 1963, and I like to think that gentleman that spoke. But I'm brown and I've been here and I've been here since 1963. Okay. Mr. Brown, just ask. I'ma set you up. Well, to answer all of the misconceptions that gentleman just put on there. So you've been in there since since 1906? Yes, sir. How can you answer the question? How many years you've been since 1963. Over 50 years. And what are you doing in the community right now? Right now, we have a multiple of projects going on. And just just to share with some of the council people who have been part of this process, we gave out 500 backpacks to every kid in garden place. Those kids didn't have a didn't have a backpack to go to school. We took it upon ourselves to go get those backpacks. The United Way, the Salvation Army. Not one of those organizations gave us those backpacks. Did you know what? We went and got those backpacks for those kids because you know why? I know what it's like to be poor. And this project is for poor people. It's not about. I ain't got no money. Sir, I appreciate. Appreciate your responding, but could you please just answer. This question, sir? Thank you. Thank you for what you're doing in the

community. So you said t

hat you reached out to some of the neighbors who were in here. You know, we've had we've probably had three rezonings in this neighborhood within the last couple of months. And so just concern that some of the folks who are in the neighborhood don't really understand the transition that's going on. And so just tell me about some of the conversations you've had with some of them. Well, again, I've been down there and just reached out to some of the residents that are down there. And I know because I've been down there myself and they welcome the change in terms of the positive things that it brings to our neighborhood, things that we don't have no grocery stores down there. We got marijuana dispensary stores down there. We ain't got a grocery store, but thank God that's when there's one coming down the line. So before now, that's going to happen. And one of the a couple of the residents have already alluded to that these are some basic services that are going to happen that haven't been there before . We're going to get a clinic. They have some medical services there. We're going to get a grocery store. We're going to get some banking because right now, you know what, it cost \$3 to go to 7-Eleven and do a transaction. You know why? Because we we don't have a bank down there to do branch banking. They take advantage of us and exploit us. But that's all going to change for the better. And we'll have jobs. I can guarantee you that. So, again, I want to thank city council because I believe this is smart growth and this is going to help everybody. You're right. There are neighborhoods been neglected for over a hundred years, but that's going to change right now for the positive thing. And my belief is I'm still there to help that change move forward and we don't get left behind in the process. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. Councilwoman Ortega, you're up. Mr. Ryan, if you can just stay there for a second. Sure. Can you tell us generally about how many residential units you expect to put into the development? Maybe just a handful. Depends on the cost. And, you know, my goal is to, again, help provide some of the services that this neighborhood has been neglecting for for the past several years. What would make those affordable housing? And I really mean I know what it is to be poor. You know, I'm not I'm not I mean, for me, this is something that to help the community. To answer your question directly. I'm hoping to get 6 to 8 units in there. What the composition of those I don't really don't know because I don't have the cost. I've been looking at some costs and obviously they're skyrocketed. But I'm hoping and work with Denver Housing, Section eight housing to be able to afford some some nice units to some individuals such as our in this room today. Well that's that's a lot foresight. And Debbie Ortega, for the record, was at the school that was that guard in place handing out backpacks and helping us. Our councilwoman

at Lawrence right here. So these are the kind of council people you got up here making decisions, helping us and think about the poor, who our school has been neglected. Ceremony. I'm not sure I heard you correctly. Did you say 60 to 80? No, no. 6 to 8 units. 6 to 8 units. Are you going to build the four, eight stories? Well, I don't know yet. I mean, I have to look at construction costs right now. It's I mean, it's so cost prohibitive. But again, I want to be able to provide some meaningful housing for the neighborhood. And as part of the development there, as you indicated or somebody indicated in the pictures, there are no curbs, gutters, sidewalks. There's not. Redevelopment. Will require you to do that, correct? Correct. Currently, right now, there's no multi-modal transportation or no infrastructure currently to help facilitate any of that process. So right now, if you ride a bike, get lucky because you're going to be riding around on the street. So hopefully with this development, we can get a nice bike path. In fact, we can hopefully we can get a a flyover so the kids can walk to garden place and don't have to try. I had a kid, a friend. They got ran over on that highway when I was in second grade. So I know what it's like to feel death and next to a companion at that early age. Thank you for your call. Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega, Councilman Cashman, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. And for planning, please. So we're we're zoning from a maximum of eight storeys so we can go to story stage stories. Correct. From the Air Zone district currently doesn't have a maximum height recommendation in stories it's regulated by IFR, and the request is to rezone to an eight story district. That is correct. Exactly. So it we'll be anywhere from, I guess, one story to at eight stories. What I'm where I'm going is so we've we've looked at a number of rezonings in this general area over a period of weeks. And so here we are going again with a size we really don't know what it's going to look like. And I wonder if you can just speak to how we project traffic demands and how we assess our ability to handle that. Sure. That's a great question and exactly to your point. At the

time of rezoning, we're not able to predict specifically what the product will be built on a particular site. So the traffic impact analysis that you're referring to does take place during the development review process. Exactly. For that point, to understand the mix of uses and the implications from a specific proposed development. So our colleagues at Public Works are transportation engineers would review a proposed development for traffic impacts along with the range of other development standards to understand if any improvements need to be made at the time of rezoning. But the see our X eight zone district does introduce a greater sense of predictability. I would like to think than the current zoning currently applies affords

today because of the AIA zone district that doesn't regulate building heights in terms of stories and instead by far so which is more unpredictable. Buildings can be very tall and skinny, can be very low and flat. The current zoning would also allow for parking in between. The building in the street doesn't have standards like transparency and entrance requirements, so those standards are all built into the C r zone district. So there definitely does increase the sense of security and predictability, both for a property owner and the surrounding neighbors as well. Right. So the traffic study is is obviously done after any zoning. That is correct. Okay. And since we have no idea what's going to be built on this land, and I'd be welcome to hear from you, sir, as well. But the question is, is there any thought about affordable housing as a component of this? Sure, I'd be happy to answer. And then Mr. Pine can speak to his specific project. So if the rezoning were to be approved tonight, any development proposal for the subject site would of course, comply with the standards of the S.R. X eight zone district. So in terms of our staff review, we do look to the entitlement that would be allowed by that zone district. So the permitted uses the building forms to see if it implements our adopted plan. So that is primarily the purpose of some of the criteria you saw before you tonight. And in terms of affordable housing, the Denver zoning code generally attempted to reduce barriers in 2010 during the drafting of the code to affordable housing to facilitate it. Of course, zoning is just a very small portion of the conversation about affordable housing, but reduced parking requirements, smaller unit sizes before, and based approach that doesn't regulate development by maximum unit counts, that sort of thing all incentivize affordable housing in a variety of different ways. All right. I just take the opportunity to say that this form of approval, before we have any idea of what's going on, on the land, it makes, it's informed me difficult to assess any vision that's going to unfold. A little too vague. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Sir, did you have something you wanted to add? Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I work at the. Go ahead, Mr. O'Brien. I work at the Colorado Department of Transportation, so I have a good, comprehensive understanding in terms of traffic counts, multimodal transportation, not only through the state of Colorado or throughout the entire country and around the world. So in terms of multimodal transportation, believe me, I've been looking at a circulator bus, how to get our residents to the grocery stores, to the brand, to the branch banking and how to make it more efficient and effective. Get the people out of their out of their cars and encourage them to use multimodal transportation and make this building more efficient and effective. I have done some research with Denver Urban Housing and Renewal to make these units afforda

ble. I'm not a big time developer. These aren't million dollar units. This is just something affordable that can maintain the character and the nature of our our community and to be able to enhance the quality of education that our kids receive in our neighborhood. So, again, yes. Am I cognizant of those traffic studies? Have I've done any? No, but I am aware of the traffic council, what I can do as a resident. But more importantly, as I mentioned earlier about smart growth, a smart town. I take all those principles into consideration to make sure and have a good quality product, one that's going to exemplify the city and county Denver, and one that's one that will set the tone for the rest of the world to follow, such as the one called Psaki call smart town. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Casper. Any other questions? 642 Seen on public hearings now closed comments. Councilman Brooks, rep. Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I think my colleagues bring up some valid points in this area. You know, in the last three months, we've received multiple rezonings in this area. And the access points around the 44, 41st and Fox Tod Station is few. We're grateful for the transportation and the light rail, but we're concerned about the number of the amount of development that that may be happen in the future. And so we just here at the city of Denver and to your manager, many of you know, up here, Chris Nevitt, who has been looking at this area with us and this is going to take a multifaceted approach

from CPD Public Works, North Denver Cornerstone Collaborative with Kelly lead at the at the lead of this bringing all of these things together to figure out what these actual traffic counts look like, what are some alternate modes of transportation and also trying to figure out, you know, and I think Councilwoman Ortega, I know she will comment on this, but the rail that is so close to the development here. And so, you know, I invite any of my colleagues to be a part of those conversations. We were just starting those. The good news about this development is these are these are rezonings. And so the development has not yet come. I don't think the market is quite there yet for the financing of some of these developments. And so it's going to give us some time to make sure that that we get it right as a city in planning in this community. I just want to give a real shout out, though, to Armando Payan, who, you know, most developers that you work with, you know, maybe they give a little something back to the community or whatever. But few are a part of the fabric of the community. And wherever you go in Globeville, everybody knows Armando's name. And, you know, if someone's respect when you go down the street and everyone says hello. And so I thank you for doing a lot for the community and thank you for always bugging us about Garden Place Elementary . And that'

s the kind of that's the kind of leaders we need in the city, folks who understand it from micro and macro. So thank you for your leadership. I'll be supporting this and I hope the rest of my colleagues will. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brooks. Councilman Espinosa. Sorry about the multiple clicks there wasn't getting her response. So there are plans in place. Globeville, residents and constituents opined about it and they generated something and it's got a real grand vision. And so but the problem is, is that there are some missing pieces. And I want to sort of talk about that, even though this is not necessarily the right place. The zoning. Yeah. To quote you said, zoning is just a small piece and maybe it needs to be a bigger piece in the in the affordable question, because we still have in a time of incredible prosperity in this city, we are lagging behind in delivering those affordable units. And maybe our piece isn't big enough for affordability. So to that end, what I would like to encourage my colleagues, because, again, not the process is what it is. And there's sort of the you know, all the checkboxes are checked to approve the rezoning without a project, but maybe we need to work on this displacement and accommodation ordinance of some sort. Because while we're not losing a lot of residents in this area, I can tell you, as somebody who came from Jefferson Park, where new development did displace a lot of residents, and we had a neighborhood plan in place that we worked on together as a community, and we wanted to capture that and we couldn't. And so the ordinances are aren't there? They weren't there in 2005. They're not there in 2010. I really hope that in 2025 we're not talking about how this whole area doesn't have an affordable component, a robust, affordable component in a tod. And so, you know, it's again, it's a bigger issue and it's a problem that we as a body, I feel we need to address. But it's not particular to this zone, this rezoning. It's a it's a larger context. Thanks. And Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Flynn, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to echo everything that Councilman Brooks said. It is very inspiring to see Mr. Pion here as a member of the community. When we think of developers in Denver, we don't usually picture Mr. Pion. I worked for the previous five years before coming on this council on the project that is building the commuter rail that built a 41st and FOX station. And I've been in that neighborhood a lot, have been by that property a lot. And I've seen in my mind's eye what someone like you community based can do. I just want to commend you for doing it. And I want to commend you for your interaction with Chairman Sekou. And I want to invite you as you move along, to feel free to call us and keep us abreast of your progress and let us know what we can do to help this happen. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Councilman Cashman, you're up. Thank you,

Mr. President. Mr. Biden, I would echo that when Councilman Flynn said it is great to see a local man as a developer. The problem is we sitting up here. Zone vague concepts. And we don't know when they're going to unfold. I don't know if you're going to own the property when this gets when a development actually takes place. Yes, sir. You'll be free to respond when I'm done here. But yeah, I'm just letting you know that my questions are not about you as an individual. And no doubt, in no way doubt your commitment to your community or your intention. But it's a little bit like when a liquor license is granted to a restaurant, you don't know who's going to be operating that down the road. So you try to figure out the pros and cons of what's best, regardless of what human being is involved. So thank you for your time tonight. I appreciate it very much. Just just one quick

comment, Mr. Cashman. I'm in the process of setting up a will to keep this property in my family. As I mentioned before, we've been there since 1963 and have no intentions of leaving. You know this neighborhood has been dear to my heart. And right now, we're totally invested into the school right now in the process of changing the school playground into learning landscapes, one where it's more productive. Because you know why when you walk up to that school. Mr. Pines, I appreciate your chance. Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate your passion. Councilwoman Ortega, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. I wasn't sure if you officially closed. Yeah, we did go to comment. This is the comment period. Yes, ma'am. So I wanted to express my support for this. This site is three blocks east of Foch Street and the light rail site where we have other commuter rail or heavy rail, I should say, where we've got cargo that travels on that corridor is even further away. So this particular site would not be directly affected by the issue that I've raised in the past with development that's happening right next to rail. I have worked with Mr. Payan in the Globeville neighborhood for many, many years, and I know of his commitment to the Globeville community and appreciate the fact that he has stepped forward to build some affordable housing in the community. We're going to see a lot of development in this area. You know, we've got one site that's 45 acres, so you'll Denver Post site and we've seen piecemeal rezonings come forward on that particular property. We did one two weeks ago for a different site. That's an existing operating business. But I think the opportunity to ensure that affordability is a big part of what is being developed in that area is very important. As you all know, our work in trying to extract, if you will, affordable units is when we have public financing in the development. And so far, we haven't seen a public financing plan for any of the proposed development. So at which time that comes forward, and that gives us the opportunity to ensure that's part of the big

picture conversation. So I will be supporting this rezoning application tonight. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Any other comments? 642 Seen on Madam Secretary, roll call. Brooks Clark. Hi. Espinosa. Flynn. Hi. Gilmore. Cashman. I knew. Ortega. Sussman. Black. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please close voting. And as a result, Lebanese security is in place on final consideration and does pass. All right. That is the first one. Next, we are on the council, Bill 649. Councilwoman Blakley, please put 6.9 on the floor. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 649 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. Public hearing for 649 is now open. And when you are ready, we'll have the staff report for you. Mr. President. Good evening, counsel. My name is Steven Chester, senior city planner with CPD here to present the staff report for 2610 through 2638 West 13th Avenue. A rezoning from au0 to two C Amex eight. This case is very similar to the one you just heard, so forgive me if I go through this a little quickly, but Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Flynn, for bringing that forward. All right. We've got one more proclamation, proclamation seven one sponsored by Councilman Lopez. We should actually have called this proclamation 50, but we couldn't do that anyway. Councilman Lopez, will you please read Proclamation seven one? Thank you, Mr. President. Proclamation number 71 of 2016 celebrating the Denver Broncos as the 2016 AFC champions and uniting in Orange for Super Bowl 50. Whereas the Denver Broncos Football Club was founded in 1960 in the Mile High City of Denver, Colorado, as an original franchise of the American Football League, the NFL, and joined the National Football League NFL in the 1970 NFL NFL merger and remains the only current American Football League conference American Football Conference AFC West team to never relocate or change its name. And. Whereas, the Denver Broncos are owned by Pat Bowlen and have Pro Bowl Hall of Famers John Elway of 24, Gary Zimmerman in 2028, Floyd Little in 2010, and Shannon Sharpe in 2011. Known for their Orange Crush defense and having the greatest, most devoted fan base and the NFL's. And. WHEREAS, the Denver community has proudly invested in their team converting their stadium into Mile High Stadium, approving the construction of the current stadium Sports Authority field at Mile High, and holding records for attendance and consecutive sellout seasons. And. Whereas, The Denver Broncos hold 15 divisional titles, eight AFC Championship titles, and possess two Vince Lombardi trophies from their back to back victories in Super Bowl 32 and Super Bowl 33. And. WHEREAS, Future Hall of Fame quarterback Peyton Manning, coach Gary Kubiak and the NFL's top ranked, top ranked Denver defense led by Captain DeMarcus Wear and Von Miller, had a stellar 2015 season with a record of 14 and four, earning a trip to the Super Bowl 50 in Santa Cla

ra, California. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the council celebrates the Broncos winning season and supports them on their quest to win their third Vince Lombardi trophy. Section two. The Council is hereby united in Orange and proclaimed Super Bowl. Sunday, February seven, 2016. To be Orange Crush Sunday in the city and county of Denver in section three that copies of this proclamation be transmitted to the Denver Broncos football club. Mr. Joe Ellis, President and Mr. Pat Boyce. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, your motion to adopt. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council proclamation 71 series of 2016 be adopted. It had been moved. And secondly, comments. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I am elated, like everybody else here on this dais and in this city, to read this proclamation and to have worked with folks in hour, an hour, an our council, my aides, this this body and folks in the front office to make sure the proclamation got through and also to make sure that we did this before Super Bowl 50. This is I'd like to say good luck. To our team that is now in Santa Clara and will be playing. But we know that luck doesn't win games. We know that hard work wins games. We know that dedication and devotion. Devotion wins games. So it's kind of a misnomer to say good luck because everything they've done hasn't been luck. It's all been by design. It's planned, it's dreamt, it's worked hard for. And I can tell you that the other day I went and I bought the Super Bowl 50 program, and I own all of them. I think the first one I bought was Super Bowl 21. So I don't own the 12th. I'm trying to get my hands on it. But and it was just a matter of pride. And I have put them in a in a keepsake box that I have in it. And it's heavy already with things like this. And I can just tell you that it's such a privilege to be able to be from a city in which its team is is just as strong as its residents, as it as the city itself. We have one thing in common. No matter what our differences in this city are, we're strong Bronco fans. And there's a reason why you wait in line 30 years to get Broncos tickets, a season tickets. Right. There's a reason why it is packed at Mile High Stadium or Sports Authority field every single home game. And there's a reason why our team wins when they feel that energy. Right. And there's a reason why the Patriots fell at Mile High Stadium. Right. And there's a reason why we are able to to celebrate this. So without further ado, I'm just very proud of this proclamation. I'm very proud of our team and go Broncos. Let's bring home that Vince Lombardi trophy. Let's put the third one in our case. Bring it home where it belongs in the mile high city of Denver. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. On behalf of the honorary councilman of Lucky District. 58, the Honorable Von Miller, I would like to voice my strong support for this

proclamation. Go, Broncos. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Briefly, I just I want to recognize the contribution of this community that Broncos owner Pat Bowlen has made over the long years of his ownership. He's widely regarded as one of the top owners in the league, one of the leaders in the league. And the the t shirt that I am wearing was a gift from Patrick Ball and Pat Bowlen to my mother in law on her 100th birthday in 2014. And he sent along tickets to my mother in law so that she could go to the game. And we brought her to that game, and she was able to enjoy the very first professional sports game in her one century of living at at Mile High Stadium and watched the the Broncos squash the Kansas City Chiefs. And so I just wanted to not let this vote go by without recognizing the contribution that Pat Bowlen has made to this community. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Councilman Espinosa. My dad will be going to the game and my I got that email because my cousin but I mean not didn't buy had tickets and gave them both to his father and my father so the brothers can go to the game. And as soon as I got that, I was like, Oh, what am I going to do to top that ever? So the best thing I can do and my my both my aides and my mom would, would, would be I might not be here for the next council meeting if I didn't say this one thing. Go Broncos. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. Please add my name to the proclamation. And I also want to acknowledge the incredible work that the NFL is now doing in drawing attention to the issue of Alzheimer's. We all know that people and has Alzheimer's, as does my mother. And the awareness and the information about resources that are available to families, especially individuals who are the caregivers of their loved ones that have this, there are incredible resources available. So I just want to thank them for helping to. Not only draw awareness, but to help find a cure to this incredible disease that has struck so many people. And if you look at the statistics of how many baby boomers who are anticipated to get it, it is important to find that that cure. So I'm all in go Broncos. Let's win that Super Bowl and bring home that Lombardi Trophy. That is a unique and individual one with that big 50 right in the center of it. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Okay, Councilman. Brooks.

Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to point out, I'm glad that my colleagues are talking about things out outside the football field that the Broncos are doing. And one of the things that I respect, the Broncos organization and Peyton Manning for so much as as well, is they specifically go and invest in all of our neighborhoods and our underprivileged neighborhoods, single family homes, individuals who are really struggling. Peyton Manning I go to a school, underperforming school, and spend time with the kids, the Boys and Girls Club. The B

roncos are a big supporter of them and that is huge to have these these incredible athletes come and speak words of encouragement to these kids . And so I want to I want to any great organization have to they have to have a social capital give back in this organization with the Broncos. They do such a great job. That's why they're going to win the Super Bowl. I mean, come on. So I want to say go Broncos. Thank you, Councilman Lopez, for for keeping this thing up and for having our guests, which I'm so excited for. Oh, I know, I know. You're right, Councilman. You don't understand. You got to play the game. Understand how we got here. Thank you, Councilmember. Captain Lopez, you back up? Yeah. I just want to continue the love affair with our team. You know, I'm glad, Councilman Brooks, that you brought that up. And I want to just put another underline under that. The word community and Broncos. The main the point the main point I talked about about the Broncos being in Denver and staying in Denver and had never changed their name. And it's the original team. That's that's the foundation of a great football team. That's what you call leadership on and off the field. Right. And we love this team for that reason. And, you know, growing up not too far away, just right there in the West Side, I used to my first job was actually being a janitor at Mile High Stadium and don't ask about the bathrooms of those. That's the old stadium in the old nitty gritty stuff we used to have to clean up. But it was awesome, that magic. Everybody feels it. You know, the Broncos very recently had supported one of our efforts at Pako Sanchez Park to really re-envision the park and really activate it. And what they did is they said to get people out to the community, we're going to offer a raffle and two tickets to the Broncos game. And lo and behold, there was a gentleman who came out from right there in the Westridge Homes right there in West Colfax Real Park neighborhood, Avondale area. He had lived in the shadows of the stadium his entire life and never been to a game. And the Broncos sent him and a guest to his game. And that's the kind, you know, it's that presence in the community. That's one of the reasons why this team is an original team. But it is also and I'll end with this, it is also America's team. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. So. I don't. Know. I think with. A little excited myself and I don't know what happened there. So football is one of those things. You either get it or you don't get it. If you don't get it, you think it's kind of one. You're wondering, what is this silliness, what city council wastes from their time with this proclamation? If you do get it, then you understand the very many moments in your own life that the excitement of a Sunday or a Thursday night or a monday night has provided. And for me, when I heard who our guest was going to be to accept the proclamation, for me it was jus

t like, Oh my. Because I remember the Gentleman's Gait and Roman the defensive backfield for many years. I remember many of the men that he played alongside, and for me it mattered a great deal. And so I hope you will just carry back my thoughts and my thanks for a whole lot of good times. I get it. And I appreciate it very much. Thank you. And yes, go Broncos. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Any other comments? Proclamation seven one. I would just add echo everyone's comments, but I think it's also important to note, I mean, as we heard, the Broncos is such an institution here in Denver. And as Councilman Brooks talked about, the Boys and Girls Club, it's in my district and my fellow and they're huge supporters of our youth, huge supporters of this community. And taking it to the football side, you know, our Broncos are a great idea of perseverance because we know the Super Bowl struggled initially, but then we also know the success of that. And then you talk about Super Bowl memories. If you were to rank order your top ones, you would have in that list John Elway making that dove to get that first down against the Green Bay Packers. And so very excited about our team being extremely successful. Super Bowl. And with no further ado, Madam Secretary, call. LOPEZ Hi. ORTEGA Black Eye. Brooks Go, Broncos. Clark Go. Broncos. Espinosa. Go. Broncos. Flynn. I. Gilmore. Cashman. Can each. Yeah. Oh, you got me, sir. Mr. President. I am Catholic. Thank you. We got them all. Madam Secretary, please cast your vote in the results. 11 Eyes Lebanon is proclamation. 71 has been adopted. Councilman Lopez, is there an All-Pro three time Pro Bowler? Some some ring of Famer you like to

invite to the podium? I'm glad you brought that up. He's a three time Pro Bowl selection. He's a ring of Famer in the Denver Broncos. He's a two time first team, All-Pro, second team, All-Pro, four time AFC Honors, NFL record, four fumble recoveries, four touchdowns, 40 interceptions, 784 interception yards, three touchdowns. And he is our strong safety of the Orange Crush. Number 36, Billy Thompson is going to receive the proclamation. Oh, that's. That's a nice reception. Thank you so much. First of all, let me thank Councilman Lopez for for this proclamation on behalf of Pat Bowlen, Joe Ellis, and John Elway and our entire organization. We want to thank you for this. You know, when I first got to Denver, 1969, we didn't win very much. And 77 was the first time the Broncos went to the Super Bowl. And I was a part of that. It was probably the most exciting time in my career as an athlete because no one expected the Broncos to be there. And we got there. And now it's kind of like we expect to be there and win. Pebble is a unique individual, and I'm glad you brought his name up today, especially because he does have Alzheimer's. And when I first met him, he told me, This is Billy. I know. You didn't play under my leadership, he said. But I want to tell you what I'm all about, he said. I'

m about winning on the field and off the field. I want to be. I want to be. I want to win in the community. And he won me over right there because his whole thing was he wanted to be in the Bronco community and help as much as he possibly could. And he still feels the same way today. And that's why, you know, we've been in this war eight years and. I just you know, I want to think that we're going to win this one for him. It would be tremendous because here's a guy that never wanted his name involved. He would be the first one to say, it's not about me. It's about it's about the team and the coaches and the community. And so he's allowed me to do some things in the community with the alumni that that are incredible. He said, Whatever you need, we will we will get you because we want to be big in the community. We want we want to do everything we can. And I'm not a Boys and Girls Club. I'm kind of like one of the honorary members out there and a little person and one of the kids out there I kind of adopted. And he's a senior. So, you know, he's he's amazing a man. That's why I met him at the Boys and Girls Club and and gave him a hand. And now he's he's going to graduate. See you. So I'm just. But Pablo made it. He is the Denver Broncos Boys and Girls Club. And that's the way he wanted it. And it's great. And like I said, we've been there eight times, which is remarkable. I see I see us winning. I see. I feel a vibe with this team. We're underdogs going in and I kind of like that. So we won't go in cocky. And this team that we're going to play is going to be a tough team to beat, but I think United and orange. I think that we can do it and I'm excited and I thank you for this proclamation, and I know everybody in the office will accept it. We're getting out of Dodge on Thursday and it's going to be exciting. So I'm saying Go Broncos, United and Orange and I know everybody will be here. Thank you so much. Thank you all so much for that. All right. We are moving on to the resolutions, Madam Secretary, we please read the resolutions from business development. 954 A resolution approving the purchase of insurance, implement a rolling owner controlled insurance program RC IP for construction projects at Cambridge National Park during the period of one 116 to 12 3118, an amount not to exceed \$3,104,385 for insurance premiums. Existing zoning is an old chapter excuse me, 59, and the requested zoning is urban context rowhouse. Three stories from the eight associated with this zone district allows apartment buildings on certain streets, collectors and arterials, which doesn't apply to this site because the both streets on the site are local streets. So urban neighborhood context the. Sorry. Multi-unit in. Allowing apartments on collectors on. Mr. Here's my page. Low scale single unit multi-unit, residential and commercial uses embedded in the neighborhood residential structures are urban house rowhouse townhouse structures. Commercial may contain a mixture

of uses, single unit and are located on local streets and commercial uses located on mixed use and main streets. And again, this Rowhouse three zone district is a three story height limit intended for use in this context and promotes low scale residential uses. So pretty. 144 is the zoning currently single family residence and a vacant portion of the property. The current structure is two stories. The party was adopted in 1984 and it was not it was related to uses not building new structures. It was adding use of office and design studio to the residential use. And all of the surrounding zoning of the property is you are age three with the euro three overlay. The Euro three overlay is four historic properties that are designated properties and that allows some commercial limited commercial uses in those properties. This property is not designated and would not apply here, but in surrounding properties it would allow office, bed and breakfast and one other use that I have I'd

have to look up in the code. So again, it's an existing residential use, a single family surrounded by duplex and single family for a fairly residential area. This gives you an idea of the property we're talking about has been altered to a degree. My understanding that the property was originally built as a church and then became a single family house and then the artist's studio and all were added. And so there has been some, some mixing abuses in this property and then lower that's on the upper right. Lower right is a commercial structure that's become a residential structure across the alley to the east. And then below is the duplex next door. Lower left is a single family house across the street, and then upper left is a townhome apartment across seventh Avenue from the property. So criteria is consistency with adopted plans, uniformity of district regulations, furthering public health, safety and welfare, justifying circumstances and consistency with neighborhood context and zone district purpose and intent. Registered neighborhood organizations in the area were notified October 22nd of our receipt of a complete application, as well as council offices, as well as all of the renos, were notified of our planning board hearing on January 6th. At that hearing, the Planning Board unanimously voted to recommend the City Council approve this zoning. We did clear planning plan committee on January 20th and the renos notified are the law on the Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association. La Alma Neighborhood Association. Denver Arts District on Santa Fe. Santa Fe Redevelopment Corporation. Denver Urban Resident Association. Denver Neighborhood Association and Inner Neighborhood Cooperation. And today we have one letter that's in your packet in opposition to this rezoning. So the plans that are pertinent are comprehensive plan 2000 Blueprint Denver and the Allman Lincoln. Lincoln Park Neighborhood Plan adopted in 2010. So current plan to conserve land by promoting infill development. E

ncourage quality infill development. Identify areas where increased density and new uses are desirable and can be accommodated. Blueprint Denver The land use concept is mixed use, which is higher intensity than other residential areas and an employment base with some with housing as well. And it is an area of change. Blueprint Denver Future Street classification. As I said earlier, for both Seventh Avenue and Inca Street, are on designated local streets. So long. The Lincoln Park Neighborhood Plan has a vision set this segment and a framework plan and then subrosa sections. So the overall vision was to read to focus redevelopment in three general areas in the neighborhood 10th and Osage Station, the Santa Fe Corridor, and then 13th Avenue, west of Osage. But also the vision statement that applies to this property was stability of existing residential areas, maintaining that stability and within established residential character areas and applying the appropriate small light residential zoning to these areas. And it did provide we'll see in a few moments a land use plan and a height of the structures plan for the proposed property. It is 1 to 3 stories in what they call this southern residential neighborhood. So this is the land use plan. You can see kind of where there is a red box. At the bottom is the property we're talking about. It is in a area that the plan calls for townhouse development. And then in the building height map, the. The orange where our square is, is up to three stories in height. These are the recommendations out of the law in the Lincoln Park neighborhood plan. So this is just to show you those character areas, the two yellow areas are the two residential areas, the southern yellow areas, that southern residential area where the townhome is recommended up to three stories. So staff believes that this proposal is consistent with these neighborhood plan recommendations and that by getting out of the poverty and into a standard zone district, we are furthering the uniformity of district regulations. And by implementing the law on the Lincoln Park Neighborhood Plan, we are furthering the public health, safety and welfare justifying circumstances . Again, the plan or its surrounding environs has changed or is changing to a degree that it's in the public interest to encourage redevelopment or to recognize the changed character of the area. I think that with the on the Lincoln Park plan recommending that we go with townhome in this area, it is favoring the redevelopment of the area and acknowledging that the area is going to change. So this is the appropriate justifying circumstance. And we did also talk a little bit about neighborhood context and the zone district purpose and intent. I wanted to say that the plan actually does call for this specific zoned district in this portion of the neighborhood, which is a little unusual for an area plan. But that's what we have with this one. And so with that, staff is believing that all of

the criteria are met and is recommending approval. Thank you. All right. We have four speakers and Alaska. Go ahead and say hi for Tim Pawlenty, Nancy Bachmann, Robert Pacheco and Mr. Saca. So, Mr. Tim, you can make your start and the other three, you'll be right afterwards. Thank

you. Thank you very much. I'm the owner of an architectural firm and it's very small. There's two of us. And what we really focus on is. You say your name and introduce yourself. You didn't do that, Tim. Just introduce yourself. I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. My name is Tim Politics. I am an architect with one line studio architects representing revision real estate, a sole proprietor who is developing properties and particularly low rent facilities. And so what I will like to talk about is the idea of low rent. When I met this individual last summer, I was intrigued by the idea that he wanted to do small apartments, and the idea was that if you could put small apartments in a row home, you make it more attractive. And so it's not something that's in an apartment. It's actually a rental unit that has a front porch that addresses the street and is small enough that it becomes affordable and is well below what the average rent is for the area right now. So this owners particularly looking to build studios and one bedroom places units. And when we looked at this particular property, what was attractive is that it's got a bus stop right in front of it. It's within a block away from the Santa Fe Arts District. It's in a neighborhood that wants to be an area of change and is just a beautiful neighborhood. And when we looked at the existing property, he said to me, How can you make this work with the way it's zoned? So we looked at the PD 144 that was approved years ago and discovered that there's a 57 foot foot setback on the North End. There's a 64 foot setback on the East End, just to say a few restrictions that are there. Basically, they can't move beyond the existing framework of the existing structure and the property that's at the corner of seventh and anchor is left open. Now, the sad thing is certainly there's many ways to use that, but when you see the townhomes across the street on seventh, when you see the way the corners are treated and this allows them a park neighborhood, they're actually really substantial. Every corner, whether it's sixth in Santa Fe, eighth, and anchor of every single street around there, just to name a few. They do something interesting at the corner. And instead this is one block where there's nothing interesting. And we said, how can we best go about this? And we started looking at the zoning plans and realizing that it's right there in front of us. This should have been zoned along with the current new zoning to be use today because it's most fitting it allow the consistency of the existing neighborhood to preserve it, to preserve all the requirements of that, but yet allow it to be developed so that it is for excuse me, fulfill in that corner

the way it should be. We did reach out to the Councilman Lopez before we even submitted and just kind of got the idea about what the process would be. We also reached out to the planning agencies and all the neighborhoods did receive a letter, have not received any comment back from them, to be honest with you. And we know that this is in support of them. You're 3 minutes is up. Oh, I apologize. Thank you very much. Nancy Berman. So I am against this zoning change. I live right behind the property. Do you say your name. In Nancy Berman? And I'm against the zoning change. I live right behind the property they're trying to rezone. Nobody in the neighborhood was notified about this at all. We found out by accident about the first meeting and went to it. At that time I said something about doing a petition and I was told I was too late for that. They posted a change and I went to get a form and I was told, Oh no, this form is just for petition. And I said, Why didn't it see anything on the board? And I was told there was no room for it. I feel like if I had been notified, I could have gone around the know the neighborhood and gotten enough signatures. The people in the neighborhood are really upset with the development that's going on all up and down our streets. The houses are being changed to apartments and condos. We feel that the neighborhood has become very dense. There's so much development going on. And there's there's just so much happening. There's so much congestion in. And like he said before, there are two bus stops on seventh. There's traffic on sixth. There is so much happening in in. When I went to the meeting before, we were told this is going to be 14 units and it's right there and they want to put it right on the street and three storeys high in. And, you know, I'm listening to this lady before talk about higher intensity, increased density, stability of residential areas. I sent a letter to the city council. I don't know if you got a chance to talk about it. I went to the meeting with my boyfriend. He's lived there since 1980. I've lived there for ten years. And it is just it's making our heads spin to see the development that's going on. It's incredible. It's happening so fast. And I don't know why this property that has a little bit of grass on it. It's just overwhelming to me. I'm just here to say that I. I feel like everything that is coming up is being rezoned and being developed for I mean, less than half a mile away, there's this huge apartment complex at 11th and Galloping Eagle with hundreds of units. And everywhere I look, there are apartments and condos and everything. And I feel like now it's happening right behind me. And to get into this parking lot for this condo or whatever it is, is

going to be right between our garage and the one right next door to us. The alley can handle all the parking. Right now, we can't get out of the alley on six. We can't get down on seventh. There is so much going on in our neighborhood.

It is jam packed. It is really jam packed. And I just wish that somebody from the city council would just come and walk the neighborhood. It is just so dense right now. I just I don't know. I just feel like this is not a good idea for this is part of our neighborhood. You 3 minutes are up now. Thank you. Robert Pacheco. My name is Robert George Pacheco, and I've been a resident in that neighborhood and I live right across the alley from this proposal. And I've been there since 1969. And then I was down three more blizzards since 1956. So the neighborhood is changing way too fast. That alley that we're dealing with my back alley. My garage is the garage recessed out to the alley in that whole block. And his property, the property they're talking about. I'm constantly painting their fences because people graffiti the hell out of it, you know? And the kids, they get out of school across the street from Del Pueblo Elementary. Now it's a girls school and there's a nice grass field there now because I took out BLOCK Grant and had been put in since I've been out and about in the neighborhood. I'm a neighborhood watch captain also, and I make it a point to meet everybody that moves into the block. And I know everybody firsthand who lives on that whole block. And I've never met this young man, the architect, and never even met the new owner that bought the property that we're talking about, as a matter of fact, that you keep on saying that it's a residential property. That house that's sitting there now, houses over eight people is more than 12. People living in it are not residential. There's only one kitchen in that house and they all share a kitchen about that's what sits there now. And I think it's supposed to be designated a historic little house or church, whatever it used to be, but technically it never has been. And the person who sold it actually hasn't even got paid for his property yet. So we're talking about building something that's three stories tall that you're going to sit there. Are you going to block our view to the mountains? We're really getting sandwiched in between Denver Health and Sixth Avenue. This way, this way and this way. And we're going to have more houses coming up on the block that he's talked about on that corner. The block around the next corner, they're going to knock down a auto place that was there and a house and a lot they want to put other units in there. The kids are ready. Cross the street. They're almost there. So much for they don't even want to go to drop their kids off on galloping hill street. And they it's a tragedy. Every morning I will walk my dogs out there and, you know, they just there ain't no where to put a car. And there are two bus stops, one on this side and one on this side and everything. They seem to come at the same time. And I got hit once by a bus out my door, ripped my door on the car in front of Gilbert. So there really is no parking. And what is he going to put parking on this

property? Is he going underground? I have AC mentioned somebody had sent a letter I've never received nor that I live right across the alley from. Ain't nobody in that block ever received a letter. What they was going to build on the problem. What they proposed to build on that property. And I can't see it does not conform with the units that are on that block right now. There is not one single three story unit on that block. And he's talking to row houses. And I can't envision it. I don't see no pictures of it, but I can see it in the mind what it is, because I work on buildings. I worked on the Mile High State, I worked on a few buildings around here, the Buell on right up on Broadway. So I know that there are plenty of housing in the state. Mr.. Pacheco It would be nice if it was just single housing. You're 3 minutes away. Thank you, sir. Mr. SEC, you. Yeah. We at the Black Star Action Movement support Nancy. Mr. Speaker, could you say your name, please, sir? My name is Chairman Sekou. Black Star Action Movement representing poor. Working for homeless people. The struggle in the city. Is for everyday folks. One thing needing to take back their neighborhood. And the pace of development that's happening. And most of these paradigms and construction schemes and dreams are coming either out the East Coast, the West Coast, or Chicago. We are none of that. This is Denver, Colorado. This is the wild, wild west. We like room, not density. Room to stretch out. What happened with our political leaders who gave up the vision of the wild, wild west? Having room people, having healthy environments and able to breathe, man. You're stacking people up in this thing like slave boats now. And there's nothing healthy about that. Nothing. And there have been studies and all the rest of that that talks about New York City and how uncivilized people are in attitude and all the rest of that. And people are snapping at a drop of a dime. And now you want to recreate that here. I was born and raised in Colorado, and I've visited and been to over

40 states in this country. Never had the opportunity of leaving the country because I was too broke. To go. And yet what I have seen in this town is abysmal, man. Did you hear what they just said? There was no community engagement in that. When they come to discover the process is already fixed and corrupt and they didn't miss deadlines. You're talking about the neighborhood, man. A house is not a home. Our neighborhood homes man bested in that tradition in that. Believe in that. And then you come here outside like a refugee from somewhere else. That none of this is working. Where you came from. And you bring that here. And then what will politicians do or trust to say? Who gets? Pockets of these developers who are nothing more than lapdog lackeys of these developers and pushing these things through without neighborhood involvement. Put a stop to this. You didn't put this one on hold. This one speaks to the heart of it, like Co

Ionele Dunn. And if you don't smell this and stop this and work on your instincts as human beings, why are we here? Why don't we just shut this down? Everybody stop lying about who we are and what we represent. All that campaign material and we the people to do to do all of that and just say who you really represent, because your actions speak louder than your words. And it's a bunch of hypocrisy that's going on in this room, except for a couple of people. Mr.. Thank you. Mr.. Mr.. Sekou. Yeah. Yeah. Three more like your ground. Yeah. 3 minutes is up, Mr. Speaker. That concludes our speakers. Time for questions of members of the Council. Councilman new? Yeah. THERESA Yes, of course. Would you like to talk about just the outreach to the community there a little bit? Was there an R.A. that that represented that area? And were they contacted and did you hear from them or. No, I didn't hear from them. They were contacted. What R.A. is. Well, those are that I listed. Let's get back to that slide. Oops. There it is. Well, that's not it. Actually all of these on the Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association, but all my neighborhood association, Denver Arts District on Santa Fe, Santa Fe Redevelopment Corporation, Denver Urban Resident Association, Denver Neighborhood Association and Inter Neighborhood Cooperation. So no. Residents. Ma'am. Ma'am. Ma'am, please. This is a question for councilman. No letters of support or opposition for me in either room. No letters. No letters at all from any R.A.. Just the letter from Ms.. Berman. Thank you. Yes. Which is architecturally. To talk about your outrage. What did you do with that neighborhood and how did you reach out to the residents in that neighborhood? We actually we were trying to learn about the process of how to submit for Arizona application. And we were advised by the planning department originally that it's encouraged to go to reach out to the neighborhood associations. They didn't actually mention to go door to door because and particularly they weren't too concerned at the time the representatives, because this was changing a zone to match what was the neighboring properties and all sides. So we were actually not encouraged to do that when I presented it to the owner and said, you know, we were encouraged to do this. And he said, Well, if we're not required to do that, then let's just get the letters to the associations. And it wasn't our understanding that this being a rezoning application, that it was about getting the neighbors to sign on to it exactly who lived across the street. So in that respect, certainly if I were a neighbor, I would want to know what was going on. But that was our understanding that the notification process and the signages and stuff like that were there to do that. So that's the level of contact that went out. We did not go door to door or send out any fliers for the reason. Furthermore, we actually don't have any plans in place about what to build on that site, other than t

he fact that the idea of real homes is desired. We've explored possibly how many years could go on there, but a lot of it still has to go through the planning department to figure out what the setbacks, what can happen there. So not knowing what to present exactly, other than the fact we want to rezone to match the neighbors, we didn't go beyond that. What size and price range are you talking about from the units that you're thinking about? Just I actually the size of the units would be in the realm of about 4 to 700 square feet is what they were looking at. They would even go less but does get into micro apartments and they're becoming difficult issues and we're not looking at that. So that sort of thing, the price point is below. I don't recall what the actual average price for a one bedroom is here in Denver, but the numbers that were told to me were several hundred dollars below. Historic market rate. They are market rate. It's a private it's a private development. They're not using any subsidized housing at this time. Any parking plans for the site. Do not have any parking plans yet other than the fact that we were going to follow the Denver zoning code, which at this current time is one parking space per stall and it doesn't take any considerations for transit and all the other potential, I guess, deductions for those things. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman there,

councilman espinosa. Teresa the so currently and in the future neither street that this borders is in collector or arterial streets. The apartment form is not available to this parcel. Correct? Correct. Good. The. Uh. Once again confirm what we already know. There is no required notification of immediate neighbors and no. Okay. Um. Although the signs on the property usually notify immediate neighbors just saying. Yeah, that's it. Thank you. That's it. Yeah. Thank you, Councilman Noser. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Theresa, maybe you can. I'm a little bit confused, and maybe I missed something on the Cook Street rezoning that we did to Tyrone Urban Dash Rowhouse. They were required to do an entire block face, and here they're not. Is that because they're. Because they're directly adjacent to the same zone district that they're applying for? They are not required to do that. They're directly adjacent to. The you are three. Okay. And so in calculating the area to be reasoned, we count the RH three adjacent as part of that. And so we don't require that two acres or one block face. Okay. Thank you. That's all. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Kathryn Lopez. Yes, sir. Historic preservation of historic buildings or anything historic on that side or adjacent. So I had a conversation with our landmark staff. There has not been an application to designate this property, even though it was built in the 1880s, and there's not been an application to demolish the property either. So when I tried to push a little further and say, well, with the property be eligible for designation, t

hey thought that it had been altered so much that maybe not, but they needed to do the research and they haven't done that. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman Ortega. I'd like to ask the architect that. But. Tim, can you tell us? Based on the 12,500 square feet and considering what the set back requirements would be, how many units could realistically be put on this site, given your estimation of 4 to 700 square foot units? That's actually something that's challenging because we initially there's there's all sorts of rules about blocks, sense of setback. And so we were trying to figure out if we applied for those, because some of the neighboring properties actually have buildings closer to the street. And that actually makes a difference because when you have to consider parking, parking stalls and buildings. But we were the latest we looked at it was somewhere between seven over seven is where it was. It could totally fit on there. I don't I think you would struggle as you get to the teens to really make it work. I'm not saying it's impossible. We are very creative in the way we try to do things, but the idea is that it has to work as a solution, integrated both to the street, to the neighborhood, parking, the whole thing. It's not about how many units you can get, it's about how many living residences can you get. And is this proposed to be an apartment? Building. I mean, help me understand. It's the zoning district. Sale or rental development. There for a rental. Could they be converted in the future to sale? It's quite possible. I don't know that the regulation in Denver currently is favorable for that, but if rental is what I've been told and that these are townhomes, so they're side by side units. But this Denver zoning code does not allow them to be stacked in any way. They have to be separated and there is a requirement that they can only be two stories at the front street and they step back where they are beyond the view of the street, where they can go up to what they call the 2.5 story, which is a limited third story unit. The urh3a specifically wants ro homes. And that's why the matching of the existing ro home district next to it. Okay. So just factoring in seven units. What is the requirement for parking in this area? Theresa, if you can answer this, please. One unit per one parking space per unit. So they'd have to be able to fit 77 parking spaces on the site. Yes. While trying to squeeze in seven units on a 12,500 square foot lot. Yes. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Ortega. Councilman, this motion a piggy leapfrog you get the councilman clark had that chance to ask a question yet. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. To serve another question, I'm looking at Slide eight in my deck. It's the existing contact zoning. And then I also pulled up the Denver zoning map. So this this is really an island surrounded by this zoning on all sides, correct? Yes. So where minus the overlay, the y

ou are three. But in terms of the the kind of food that could be built here. Yes. Okay. And so the the block that the neighbors who have come tonight to to talk are is on is already zoned exactly the same as what is being proposed. This site would be, in. Fact, that entire. Block, it looks like in and most of the adjacent are either zoned that or even higher. It looks like if you get a half block to the west, then the density gets even higher. Yes. That's correct. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Councilman Espinosa, you back up? Yeah. So this is sort of related to that. Councilman Flynn asked the question about minimum area. And the

the reason why we have the minimum area so we don't get in the business of doing spot zoning, even though that's sort of effectively what we had just approved was a spot zoning, but by creating a giant area. That's also sort of a problem in that. And I'm actually working and I'm in discussions with others and hopefully you guys are too about whether that minimum area is really doing what it needs to do or is it capturing areas that don't need to be captured in order to bring forth projects that are meaningful. QUESTION For the one of the to the Miss Cook is it I'm sorry. Herman Berman. Yeah. So are you aware that the question that I asked Theresa before about the the street classification restricts you? What, like what's going on at 11th and gallop go can't happen at this location because it's constrained by the street classification. I'm sorry, could you repeat that? Because I was talking to her. So it's kind of a nuanced question, but what's going on in 11th in Gallup, go Galapagos goes considered a collector street. That's a different category of street than the two that bordered this property. And therefore, you can't put that same apartment form here. You were restricted to this row house, the which is what he was describing. Right. I understand that. I brought that up because I was saying there are so many apartments we're surrounded by apartments and condos in in the people who live right there don't understand why the zoning is being changed to bring in any more. I know on that side of Inka there are condos, but across the street there are houses, homes in. Across the street there are apartments. But right across the street on Galapagos, there are homes. And then do you also realize what Councilman Clarke is saying, that actually all of the adjacent property in north, south, east and west of this parcel is the exact same zoned district that is being proposed. Yes. And I think if I'm I don't know because I don't know a lot about zoning. Santa Fe is very dense because of all the art galleries. So I am I assuming correctly that that's zoned that way and it carries it on to our streets because of that? Yes. It goes all the way to goes to Mid-Block between India and Santa Fe. Right. So I'm assuming because we live so close to Santa Fe that that zoning carries ov

er on to our residential streets. Yeah. So what you're going to if fortunately you don't follow this this forum and all of the different meetings, what you're going to find is no fan of the disconnect between existing fabric and context based zoning. But you're going to hear in my comments an explanation on why I'm going to go where I'm going to go with this zoning. And I feel for you. But but there there are within the constraints of our zoning code, the way it's written today, there are significant protections, particularly for this block relative to the context. And I can't believe. Right. But my concern is as a homeowner, it is so dense there right now, there's so much congestion and traffic and and the streets are loaded up all day long. We can't get up and down sixth or seventh or eighth or people from the hospital are parking already and galloping go. Inka is packed in for the city council. I understand because of zoning changes, the zoning is there already. But as you change this zoning and make these properties able to change it from a from a home to a condo or an apartment or a row house, it just keeps building up and building up. And you don't live there. But we do. And it's the biggest it it's just jam packed and it's so hard to live there. And I'm just asking for your consideration to maybe not do it to one little corner of this part of the community. It's just crazy to live there now. It really is. And I feel like if I had had the opportunity to do a petition and you could have seen how many signatures I would have gotten. There are a lot of Spanish speaking people there. There are a lot of working people or they would have been here. I'm. Oh. I'm just very frustrated. I understand what you're saying, and I know that it's open to the zoning change. I understand that. But as a homeowner and my boyfriend is out of the state now, but he's been there since 1980 and my neighbor has grown up there. But it's. What these. And I was going to reserve all this for comments and oh, they don't mind. But unfortunately, in our role in this, in reviewing these things, every single element that has to stack up in support of a rezoning does and and where this even breaking you know I still feel that this we break down in our notification process and I've already got conversations with Kyle in and will with Theresa on how we can fix that. Even notifying you and giving you the heads up that this is going to happen doesn't change the fact that there is plan support at every single level and that you're surrounded. This is an island in a zone district. So what can you do as a homeowner? I mean, when you know, I mean, we own six, six, seven and six, seven, one, two, we just watch it grow up around us and walk everywhere. I mean, what do you do as a resident of Denver. Ma'am? I paused. Someone there? Oh, I'm sorry. I think other councilmembers might address some of your concerns there in the comments. I. I believe so. I just is just thinking. And the quest

ions come from Espinosa. Oh, no, sorry. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Tries to get you to give me a little bit, maybe one minute, if it's possible. Understanding as to why this neighborhood was in the 2010 was reason to row house when most of it, as I've driven through it over the years, is single family bungalow. So how did this come to be Row Rowhouse three story in the first place? I didn't work on this neighborhood. I believe it was. It was our two zoning, which was the multi-unit zoning that was prevalent in a lot of Denver and. That's as much as I can tell you. I honestly did not work on the zoning in this section of the city. And I don't know. Kyle, did you work on this portion of the city? Can you address like. So this neighborhood has been set up for for many, many years for densification. To which close it is. And it just hadn't happened until recently. I'm Kyle Dalton with the Department Community Planning and Development. So this area of Zone R three previously, which is multi-unit residential, that's why it has the all three overlay because that's mapped wherever our three used to be. It was zone two yards three eight, because the neighborhood plan immediately proceeded our zoning code effort and it specifically calls for UAH three A in the southern residential area as the products of, you know, a couple of years worth of neighborhood outreach and public meetings in the neighborhood specifically to articulate the vision for their neighborhood. So your age three was a little bit of a reduction in entitlement from the former our three zone district under the old code, but it directly implemented the recommendation of the adopted plan. Thank you very much. That's that clears up very, very nicely. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, Councilwoman Canete. Thank you, Mr. President. May I ask a question of the architect, please? You're definitely not the owner, and I understand that. But are you authorized tonight to make a commitment to this council and to these neighbors that you would be doing an inclusive process in your rest of your design? So, for example, can you commit to holding a meeting with the immediate neighborhood and firing them so they know about the meeting to share any ideas as they are developed and to get feedback? Is that something that you can commit to for this owner? Truly, I've never had that conversation with the owner so that I don't feel that I could speak for them on that regard. But what I will tell you is after the Planning Commission, we got to meet several of the neighbors last time and they brought up concerns, the first concerns we had ever heard about. And so we actually took time after that meeting and listened to the concerns and kind of addressed how we would potentially deal with trash, how we deal with alley improvements so that it would take the traffic, how we would address certain things. It would absolutely just kind of comply with those sort of things.

So, um, personally, I have a lot of interest in what people have to think and what they say. But I, beyond that, I don't know that I can speak for anybody else at this time. May I ask where this owner is located? Are they in Denver? Yes, they actually currently reside off of. Actually, they live in Bonnie Brae and have offices off of 22nd and Lafayette. And I was a Denver resident until I couldn't afford to have a family in Denver anyway. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennedy. Councilman Lopez. Can we have Mr.. Mr. Politi say we want to come up with the and. On the property in the max build out. You said it's probably looking like seven units, definitely not in the teens. Do you know in your conversations with the owner and I'm glad that my colleague asked the question whether you can commit or not . And I really appreciate your answer. But does it necessarily need to be built out to seven units? Is the owner looking to max out on what can be built there? I think that's something that they have to analyze about how they can. There's a number in order to do small units. There's sort of an inefficiency with them because especially when you're dealing with vertical nature and stairs. So there's a certain amount of development that has to happen just to actually afford construction prices today, even if you consider the most creative and least costly ways to do that. So what I'd say is, like I said, seven is probably the minimum and it could go into the teens, but there's a limit on that just because there's only so much space on to that. Does that answer your question? It does. I appreciate that. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Councilman, New. Castle, let me ask you one question with car. Yeah. Just real quick when they went through the zoning process, did this property have the option to come out as opposed to adopt the new zoning? I think generally when we we did the Denver zoning code process, which was adopted by council in 2010, of owners of pods like this one approached the city. And, you know, we're actively involved. Some of them chose to voluntarily rezoning to the new code because of the vast numbers of properties in the city. The city did not proactively outreach to owners of parties. And so, you know, it's doubtful that they were directly reached out as part of that process. Okay. But they could have chosen to opt into the new zone if they had pursued it. That's

correct. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman, new councilman, I'll tell you. I just wanted to clarify one last question on the parking. So if the developer decides that he wants to squeeze in more units. Teresa, you mentioned that they would be under the code required to have one parking space per unit per 12,500 square feet is not a large block size. That's going to limit the number of units. It'll limit the number of units. But does the applicant have the. Oh, it's the right word. I want to use the opportunity to request a waiver as part of the appl

ication process as they move forward to do the actual build out. Well, I suppose they could go to the Board of Adjustment, but typically. Not to be done here. If they go there. If it's new construction, it's sort of looked at as well. You're creating your own hardship and just design it differently and meet the standard so it's not received with very much sympathy. But I suppose that is an option. Okay. I just I think the parking on this site is absolutely going to restrict how many units can be on there, regardless of the size of the units, whether they're 400 square feet or 700 square feet. But I think the number of units is what will drive, how many parking spaces are required to provide. Right. Well, thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega, you in other questions? 140. Seen in public hearings now closed time for comments. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I represent this area. First of all, let me just thank you both for coming down here and at least for sending that email in to us and the letter in to us, and let's get some kind of response. You know, I did meet with the applicant early on. They were very forthright in coming and just kind of let us know what was coming down the pike and just in terms of just changing the pool to be absorbed into the irh that was around the area, you know, to. To. The question that Councilman Flynn raised this was the you know, the old R three and it was an area that was designed to go a little higher. But here's the thing. And this is probably my thinking is at the planning board out there in this neighborhood, you have a lot of 100 year old homes. You have a lot. This is one of Denver's original neighborhoods, and you do have a lot of that original build. I don't see a lot of people. They realize the value of those homes and some of the, you know, potential historic designation. A lot of those folks aren't going to want to scrape it. Right. So I know that there's a lot of worries in our neighborhoods about it changing drastically and dramatically and seeing a lot of those homes disappear. And there's not very many of them that do if they haven't been changed or altered, a lot of them are existing historic structures. As a matter of fact, in the Lamar Lincoln Park neighborhood, there's a bunch of them. Right. And almost every other door, you knock on it, you know. Mr. Boucek, I really appreciated what you said. You had to rock around the neighborhood to really understand it. I do. That's the neighborhood I used to go to school here. I went to West High School and I walked anybody every single day. And even as it's representative, I walk that neighborhood. And it is definitely changing, but it's definitely something worth keeping. And, you know, if I. If I may really, really push for this. I think it's and this is for the architect as a bullet is if when you have that discussion with the owner great architecture. As you know, I'm not an architect, but I lea

rned this just on this diet and also just learning about it as we go. It great architecture always seems to mimic its surroundings. It always seems to blend in. And I know a lot of the heartburn that folks have when they have these great shoeboxes with no patios in the middle of an area that has brick and patios and is charming like these neighborhoods. Right. We don't want to see that kind of and I think a lot of folks in this neighborhood, they react more to the architecture than the density. Right. Because it sticks out like a sore thumb and it just doesn't carry the character to as much as possible. You can achieve that with your age here. You can actually achieve that, that that style of architecture as you're building out. I don't think it's going to be seven units. I really don't. I think there are parking space requirements are going to definitely force the card in terms of what you can do and what you can't do. And that property, hopefully we don't max out and hopefully we do include and mimic that architecture in that style, those front yards, you know, those homes that are so close together so that they didn't prevent the horses from running through. Right. Like in the old days. And that's what they were for. And, you know, this is definitely I definitely understand your angst. I definitely understand that you see the neighborhood changing all around. However, with this particular area, it's been changed for a long time. Even before our zoning code update in 2010, this was a high density unit area. People could go in and put four and five places in here, even six places. So think of how much worse that could have been. And the you are h description, that zone district that do that you are all in is much more strict in terms of what you can

build than that are three that are three wreaked havoc in some of our neighborhoods and just west of there in Villa Park in Westwood Barnum so you have those four plex is multi units, people are parking in the front, right? I mean they put a concrete pad, it's oil drip slumlords, nobody takes care of it. That's not what's going to happen over here now with this zoning district. It actually restricts that. So that's the one thing if that does ease it off is to your mind a little bit. But, you know, back to back to the architect, Mr. Bullet, I think, you know, you really convene some people if you really get to the owner and say, hey, look, we got to really blend in here because it is ownership. It is people like Mr. Pacheco that are walking around their neighborhoods, that are the captains that are going to keep eyes on that property. Right. And that's exactly what we try to go for. And that's the kind of untold story in the zoning rezonings that says untold benefits when you when you actually work with some of these folks that get it done. Let me see. That last thing I was going to say was that it's a vacant lot now. I am not surprised that people tag on that fence

e and that people don't hit that building up it. When you have vacant lots, when you have vacant property, it attracts so many different things. Right. You don't that's those are multiple lines that are not looking after that property. Right. And you want that there. The other opportunity that's there with that beauty is you have a business there. You have a business and you have multiple cars going in and out of there. Right. And there's very I mean, it's it's less restrictive. So as the neighborhood changes, I just hope that when we have these applications, that, one, we understand exactly what it does and what it doesn't do. Right. But second, that the architecture and the style and the future, the rezoning hearings, these zoning hearings can't dictate. We can't say that you have to have a porch, has to be this color with these kind of trees. We can't do that out here. It's not legal for us to be able to consider that. But hopefully what we can do is just encourage folks mimic that neighborhood. Right. There's a reason why these like these neighbors in are here tonight. There's a reason why the houses look the way they do on the West Side. It's that kind of character. It's a reason why it's preserved. Let's mimic it. Right. If we can do it in Chicago and I've seen it done in Chicago, we can definitely do it here. So with that, I, I do support this rezoning moving forward. And, and hopefully we can get you information today. I'd like to get a hold of those block captains in our neighborhood. So we thank you. Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Councilman Espinosa. So this is actually this is very similar to my comments on the earlier one, but it has. But it has kids, but it's completely different in that my concerns on that prior on the two age rezoning was the ability to create garden court forms in a neighborhood that was clearly destined for CO2 development by plan and by everything else. Here is a situation where, again, there's a lot of talk about Row House, but I didn't talk about the fact that, yes, the garden court form this is now one one step above where we were before with the three a in this garden court form is allowed here and it wouldn't take much more property acquisition to get and I'm going to get a visual here of a garden court for. So a row house for my colleagues, a row house form implies that these units are facing the street in front setback. That's a garden court form. That's a perpendicular non addressing the street sort of thing with a 15 foot slot. So you have what's unique about this on a corner lot is you have a row house that's facing one street and then a garden court next and now you've got three sets of townhouses. So here if you want some ideas and that is intrinsically. Not part of the fabric. It's not part of the intent. I read 5.2.2.2 last time. I'm not going to read it to you again, but this is the next line. I mean, this is the next section right after that, where once again, on the specific intent of this rowhou

se zone district, there is no mention that the desire is a garden court for yet it is in the tate the used to mean the allowable form table, and then it allows this 30 foot high block sense of setback . But you can then redefine your sensitivity. And that, I believe. What? What we're doing here is a serious issue, which is we're going to reason this to be consistent with the surrounding things. And then all you have to do is acquire the proper amount of square footage, get the right zone lot, and now you can do a garden court form that is sort of antithetical to the neighborhood plan. And so it doesn't matter this in this case, everything supports. This zone district. The problem is, is the zone district doesn't support its own intent. But that's a different argument, one that I'm gearing up to have. But they just so I will be supporting this rezoning, not because I love it and think it's the greatest thing since sliced bread, but this is one of those cases where all the checks to check box are checked the way they are supposed to mean they're required to be. And all the legalese and whatnot point this direction. Usually I'll find a piece of daylight. I don't see a piece of daylight here. And so to the residents that are here, I feel for you. Really do. Thanks. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa.

Councilwoman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to be very brief. Thank you both for being here tonight. I totally understand your frustrations, and I appreciate your passion and your dedication to be here so late. I did read your letter numerous times and I listened very carefully to you. The problem is. As I you've been made well. Aware, is this little party is an island of the same zoning, and that is actually how your own houses are zoned. So as Rafael Espinosa just pointed out, it does meet all of the required boxes that we need to check off. We can't be subjective in these decisions we make and we cannot approve development plans. And a lot of the conversation tonight on all three of the rezonings we talked about, we talked about actual development plans, but that's not what we do. We only look at the requirements for the zoning. So I feel for you. I appreciate your passion and thank you for being here. Thank you, Councilwoman Black.

Councilman Nu. I just wish the owner was here to understand his thought process when they. When they were in the rezoning of the whole area of why he decided to stay with the board instead of convert it to the zoning. He probably would have saved a lot of hassle tonight. And but in anyway, I sure hope I'd like to echo Councilwoman Canisius. Yeah. Appeal to you to go through a design process, include your neighborhood and discussion about that. You know, if if the owner decides and maybe you decide, it is better to have less units and maybe even a home ownership situation to create a better citizens for that community to create a greater neighborhood. That's great. I know I'm talking about development plans from

plans from my colleague, but I sure hope that they'll be that you learn the lesson, that you'll be inclusive of what's going on. This zoning goal will occur tonight. But the main thing is you still have an opportunity to bring the neighborhoods together and design and and feel a part of that neighborhood. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. New Councilwoman Ortega. The only thing I want to add to this conversation is that when the applicant comes back to CPD to move forward with the application, that you carry the message forward, Teresa that we are asking the applicant to work very closely with the immediate neighbors on the design. You know, I think you're hearing loud and clear that the zoning changes that were made in 2010 take us out of the process of, you know, defining the number of units, the number of parking spaces, some of the details that this body used to deal with. But if we were dealing with the old zoning, as Councilman Lopez said, the R three zoning actually allows higher density in in this neighborhood. And some neighborhoods across the city where they were over zoned have gone through and done overlay zoning to try to, you know, restrict how much development can come in the neighborhood. And I understand the concern that when you have a single family block and you now start with allowing, you know, a multifamily development in one lot, you know, then you start seeing some of that effect, as we've seen all over the city. But it's all also based on people in the neighborhoods, whether they're willing to sell their properties or not. And, you know, it's it's a slippery slope in terms of, you know, whether people are going to choose to stay in their neighborhood or whether they're going to be enticed by the increasing price of land in this city. But as the zoning for this particular site is being requested, it is consistent with the zoning completely surrounding the property. So I will be supporting this tonight as well. We've had many different conversations about the form based zoning and whether the way it is, whether it's working correctly or not. And some of these conversations, I believe, will come up as the updated blueprint Denver begins to move forward. I don't know where that process is. It would be helpful to get an update from the Planning Department on how much they're planning to engage city council in that discussion in that process, because I think it's very important for us to be involved before we have a final product that gets brought to us to adopt. So thank you much, Mr. President. Thank you. Councilman Ortega, any other comments? Council Bill four zero. Scene nine. Madam Secretary. Roll call. Lopez. I knew Ortega, I. Black Eye Brooks Clark. Eye. Espinosa Flynn I Gillmor I Cashman Canete. Mr. President. Madam Secretary, please cast a vote and as a result. 12 eyes, 12. Eyes, four zeroes in place on final consideration and does pass on Monday, March seven, 2016. There's a required public hearing on Council Bill 79

approving service plan for the creation of the West Global Metropolitan District number one in West Global Metropolitan District. Number two relating to the development project known as a 2570 development. On Tuesday, March 29, 2016, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 69, changing the zoning classification for 5050 South Syracuse Street in a required public hearing on Council Bill 87, changing the zoning classification for portions of 601 South Bannock Street, 81 South Broadway and 99 West Kentucky Avenue. Any protest against Council Bill 69 or

Council Bill eight seven must be filed with the Council offices no later than noon on Monday, March 21st, seeing no other business before the body. This meeting is adjourned. Madam Secretary, please quote a very nasty result tonight. Tonight, 69 has been placed on final consideration and does pass. All right. We've got one more. That is Councilor Bill 87. And Councilman Brooks, would you please put 87 on the floor for final passage? Yeah. Thank you. Mr. President, I move that council bill 87 be placed on the floor for final consideration and do pass. Thank you. The public hearing for accountability seven is now open. May we have the staff report? Good evening. Council President members of city council ryan winterberg with Community Planning and development here for rezoning 2015 i00136 It's portions of 601 South Panic 801 South Broadway and 99 West Kentucky. And the request is from TMU. Three waivers and conditions. You are one, and if you go to two CM 16, you are one, and CMCs 16 you are two. So to orient you to the site, it is in Council District seven in South Central Denver. Zooming in a bit, it's within the Baker Statistical neighborhood. And I'm zooming in a little bit farther to the location so we can see that our subject site is located essentially at the intersection of Interstate 25 that we see at the south and the consolidated main line that we see there to the west. It's located between the Denver Design District, which is the area just to the north and the CMS. So sort of sandwiched in between those two things. And it's less than 1000 feet from two light rail stations to Alameda Station in the I-25 and Broadway station, which of course, are served by five light rail lines and some of the best bus transit accessibility in the city. So we really do see a great opportunity for transit oriented development in this area. Okay. So the request on the property is 4.52 acres total. It's currently owned by RTD, but D for Urban. So that's the developer of the Denver Design Center to the north currently has an option with RTD to purchase the property beginning in the spring. RTD has authorized this rezoning application. It's currently used as an unimproved surface parking lot and it does feature some detention area in the lower left hand corner. So while the approval of a rezoning is not the approval of a specific development project, the property owner and applicant's representat

ive are requesting a resounding in order to change the mix of uses and generally facilitate a transit oriented development consistent with the Denver Design Center to the North. And interestingly, the application does propose to maintain the UO one where it currently exists today and maintain the use of two in areas where it currently exists. And we'll see that in just a moment. So the request before you is to see an X 16, which is within the urban center neighborhood context, allowing mixed uses and buildings generally up to 16 stories in height. So now we'll walk through the existing context. So now into the existing zoning and this is where I can kind of point out the split between the two zone districts that exist on the site today. We can see to the north there's kind of a split in between the property. That's where the IFB used to exist today. And then the area to the south is where the TMU 30 waivers and Condition zero one exists. So TMU 30 is a former Chapter 59 zone district, and it's intended to be applied in transit, mixed use areas, near light rail stations, and the district controls building massing to a maximum of 5 to 1 and a maximum building height of 220 feet. So again, kind of regulated both by FLIR and maximum height. And we'll see there is a view plane that does apply to the site in just a moment. So however, the two new 30 zone district standards don't include, for example, what we know today to implement body, including build to requirements, active ground floor uses, transparency and entrance requirements. And so the rule one that also applies to this particular area allows for adult uses along with distance and spacing requirements. And now to the I.B. that we see at the northern portion of the property. It is a general industrial zone district allowing both the industrial and general building forms. The IB zone district permits maximum density through an R ratio of 2 to 0 and maximum building heights only one adjacent to protected districts. And this particular site is not adjacent to a protected district. The zone district as well does not implement the build to requirements, the transparency and active ground floor standards that we would expect in many tod areas throughout the city. And the 202 that's the billboard use overlay does apply within that particular area and it would allow for the installation of a billboard with distance and spacing requirements as well as the availability of a permit. Okay. So now into the existing context, we can see that the requested TMX 16 zone district is applied pretty consistently across the Denver Design Center to the north and to the east with both the UO one and the YOU oh two zone district overlays. We can see a general tapering and heights as we move closer to Broadway, going down to eight stories and five stories respectively, and then the implementation of some of the Main Street Zone district standards along Broadway. So in

recognition of that Main Street corridor. Okay. So

there are two general development plans that apply to the particular property. So the first one is outlined in red. This is the Denver Design District GDP. It was approved in 2009. And then we can see outlined in blue just to the site is the Cherokee redevelopment of the former Gates rubber factory GDP. So it's important to note that the Cherokee Games redevelopment GDP was approved for a very specific development concept, largely to the south of the interstate. We just have a very small portion of the site that applies to it today. And the majority of the site was not developed within the context of the GDP and urban design standards and guidelines that also apply. We have a new property owner that has purchased the majority of the site and they're seeking a new redevelopment concept within the framework of the Denver zoning code. So we do anticipate that the Cherokee Gate's GDP will be repealed at some point, and the urban design standards and guidelines will be substantially modified. So we're not going to be talking about them today in terms of consistency with adaptive plans for this particular piece of property, since they will no longer apply. Okay. So for the GDP, that does regulate the majority of our site. The Denver Design District GDP was approved in 2009. It's approximately 80 acres and it's bound to the north on Alameda, to the east on Broadway and to the west by the consolidated mainline in the south on the interstate. And it's intended to transform this auto oriented commercial context into a pedestrian friendly, mixed use TOD and includes a number of goals and strategies to implement that vision, including high quality streetscapes and open space, higher densities near transit stations with appropriate controls tapering down to residential neighborhoods, balancing modes of transportation and high intensity mix of uses. And additionally, there is a connection contemplated through the site to link up the I-25 and Broadway station area just to the south. So urban design standards and guidelines also apply to the Denver Design District. You GDP area. They are concurrent areas. They are again intended to create high quality TOD that integrates with the surrounding community and restores the urban fabric. They are administratively reviewed by CPD staff and our particular portion of the site that's within this UDC boundary is in sub area five, which is the office district. It's the commercial core of the area with the highest intensity office uses and a mix of other uses. And again, that gateway connection that's contemplated to the I-25 station just to the south, along with a multimodal trail, is reinforced to this document. Okay. So in terms of the existing view plane, the Washington Park View plane applies to the subject property and it originates in Washington Park and is intended to protect views of the mountains generally. The farther you move away from that origin point, the higher permitted building heights grow, and it would sp

ecify maximum building heights for all structures , so including rooftop equipment, that sort of thing as well. And for our particular site, maximum building heights are estimated at 122 to 146 feet across the subject site. So while the requested CMF 16 zone district does permit buildings up to 200 feet in height, the view plane will ultimately regulate the maximum building height for a building, so likely below the maximum height of the zone district. So in terms of existing land use, we can see that our subject site is unimproved surface surface parking in detention. We can see commercial and retail at the Denver Design District to the north and the east. That's the pink. You see. That's a pretty auto oriented context. We see some scattered warehouse commercial and office buildings to the east that generally orient to Broadway. Can we see substantial surface parking and vacant property to the south of I-25 and retail and warehousing to the west of the consolidated mainline that some some larger sort of big box retail there. So this is not a site that a lot of people would experience as a bicyclist or a pedestrian. So to orient you to what it looks like a little bit so you can see the photo in the upper right hand corner is looking north along the site. So the consolidated main line is just on our right hand side. And then the photo in the lower right hand corner is looking south underneath the Interstate 25 flyover. So now within the surrounding context, we can see some of the development that's pretty typical of the Denver Design Center that you may be more familiar with. So lower scale office, commercial and retail. And then the photo in the lower right hand corner of some of the smaller scale warehousing and commercial operations that front on to South Broadway. Okay. So in terms of process, the following six registered neighborhood organizations have been notified throughout the process, and we have received two letters of support from the Baker Historic Neighborhood Association and the Platt Park Peoples Association supporting redevelopment of the site, as well as the multimodal connections that may be implemented through adaptive plans. And no other public comment has been received as of today's

date. So we did send a notice of receipt of application to Arnaud's and City Council on December 2nd. On February 3rd, the Planning Board unanimously recommended approval. On February 17th, the Neighborhoods and Planning Committee moved the bill forward. The City Council first reading was February 29th and signage of today's City Council public hearing and notice to Arnaud's was properly posted on March 8th. Okay. So now in terms of the five rezoning criteria, we'll walk through all five, the first of which is consistency with adopted plans. And there are five adopted plans that apply to our subject property. The first of which is comprehensive plan 2000. And we did find that the rezoning is consistent with comprehensive plan 2000, looking

to a number of strategies, including the promotion of mixed use infill development, the identification of areas where increased density and new houses are desirable, and transit oriented development that makes effective use of existing transportation infrastructure. Now once a blueprint. Denver So you'll see that our subject site is actually omitted from the concept land use map. But we don't think that this was particularly intentional. We think it's likely due to its former function as a rail spur, where redevelopment was not contemplated at the time of the plan. But we can look to the surrounding land use recommendations in the Denver Design Center to inform the appropriate mix and intensity of uses for our subject site so we can see the purple area to the north and the east of our site is called out as town center and town centers are intended to meet a variety of shopping, entertainment, service and employment needs, and they're large enough to serve several neighborhoods. They are a destination and it uses include shopping and commercial uses at a high intensity. But unlike many shopping centers, town centers are intended to be pedestrian focused focal points for nearby neighborhoods. We can also see that our site is split between an area of change and an area of stability. Areas of change, of course, where Blueprint Denver recommends channeling growth to increase access to jobs, housing and services and benefit the city as a whole. And we do see that the area of stability roughly follows the I-25 corridor, which likely indicates that this stable transportation corridor wasn't contemplated for redevelopment. But that line where the area change and area stability meet, that's generally the boundary of the Denver Design Center GDP. So it's likely intended this entire area was contemplated for redevelopment. So we do find that the rezoning request to connect 16 U1 and TMX 16 year or two is consistent with recommendations in Blueprint Denver and in terms of future street classifications. Since this particular site doesn't have any frontage on the right of way, it has very little street context. We do look to this surrounding area to inform the appropriate mix of uses and intensity, and South Broadway is called out as a mixed use arterial street. So this is a higher capacity street featuring a high intensity and mix of uses. And Interstate 25 is called out as an undesignated arterial other. Because I 25 has very little presence at this particular site. It is elevated. We don't feel has a great contextual purpose to guide us in this particular location. So we do find that it is appropriate to apply the high intensity mix of uses through the proposed TMX 16, UO one and two zoning at this particular site. Okay, so two neighborhood plans also applied to the subject site. The bigger neighborhood plan was approved in 2003 and it includes framework goals that apply to the entire neighborhood as well as sub area strategies. There's more detail in your s

taff report, but you can see that framework goals generally recommend creating and maintaining an appropriate balance of land uses to preserve stable areas, but developing vacant land in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding lands and encouraging a mix of uses that assure availability of neighborhood services and amenities to reinforce the role, identity and needs of the neighborhood. So in terms of the sub area, our particular site is within the retail centers. Sub area retail centers are destination business areas, often including retail and offices, and they may include some moderate density housing, but they are predominantly intensely commercial. The area is intended generally over the course of the plan horizon to develop to more intense uses in the future. So the plan does recommend this long term redevelopment should be facilitated by a flexible framework in zoning standards that we see proposed before you today. And the retail center sub area also makes several urban form and urban design recommendations to address the urban context and to establish a pattern and character for the long term evolution that is both intense and dense but also pedestrian friendly. So we find that the rezoning requests to connect 16 year one in year two is consistent with both this land use guidance and these Urban Forum recommendations, where we find that the current mix of zoning, the 2030 waivers and conditions and IP doesn't really compel this pedestrian oriented character. The Alameda Stationery Plan adopted in 2009 also

applies to our subject site, and it did not supersede the adoption of the Baker Neighborhood Plan. So we do look to the totality of recommendations. So the format of this plan includes recommendations that apply to the entire area based upon the principles of transit oriented design as well as some sub area strategies. So the principles of TOD that are shown here include redefining the station's nature as a destination, place and oriented density closest to the Alameda station and Broadway station areas for that appropriate mix of uses. So in terms of land use and building heights recommendations from the Alameda Station area plan, you can see that our site is called Out in Office Employment Land Use Concept. So this is really an area that recommends channeling office and commercial uses to create an employment center and a diversity of employment options for the neighborhood. So we do find that CMF 16 is consistent based upon these land use recommendations. Our subject site is also recommended for a maximum height of 14 storeys. So without a 14 storey zone district option, we do find that the requested CMCs 16 zone district does fulfill that building height recommendation, of course, coupled with the Washington Park View plane that will ultimately cap building heights likely below 14 stories. And the Alameda Station Area plan also makes a number of urban design recommendations related to a future Bannock street connect

ion that we can see running north and south through the site and linking up to the I-25 and Broadway station that are not implemented, not captured by the current mix of entitlement. But we do find that the CMCs 16 zone district would implement. So our site is also within the Denver Design District, as I mentioned earlier. And you've seen the goals presented already today and our subject site is within Sub Area five. Again, that's the Office District, which is the commercial core of the project high intensity office uses. And of course general development plans are able to provide guidance to subsequent rezonings of properties within that GDP area. So we do find that the requested TMX 16 zone district is consistent with this mix of land uses. And in terms of building heights, we see that the Denver Design District GDP also recommends building heights of up to 14 stories for our subject site, again regulated by the Washington Purview Plan. So based upon the analysis, we do find that the rezoning is consistent with adopted plans. In terms of uniformity of district regulations, we find that the application of the CMC's 16 you a one and your two zone districts will result in the uniform application of some district standards across the city as well as the Denver Design Center. Well, they will be applied uniformly. We also find that the rezoning will further the public health, safety and welfare through the implementation of adopted plans. In terms of justifying circumstances as stated in your application, change or changing conditions is called out and we do find a number of change conditions both at a regional scale as well as at a site specific scale. So as presented today, there are numerous adopted plans that make recommendations for the evolution of this particular area into a transit oriented development concept and context. We see a number of redevelopment projects both within the Denver Design District and to the south, anticipated at the I-25 and Broadway station. That's actually signaling the physical evolution in these environs. Of course, for our particular site at a site scale, we've seen a great change condition in that the site has transitioned from formally being a railroad spur now to a potentially developable site, especially with the proposed sale from RTD to a private developer later in 2016. That's really going to unlock the potential for the transit oriented development that's contemplated by our adopted plans. So in terms of consistency with neighborhood context, we do find that it is consistent to apply zoning here within the urban center neighborhood context based upon adaptive plan, vision and multimodal context. Again, the rezoning is consistent with the zone district purpose statement for the seam zone districts, and specifically with the intent statement that the CMF 16 zone district applies to areas served by arterial streets where a scale of 3 to 16 storeys is desired. Of course, South Broadway is a mixed use arterial a

nd numerous plans recommend a maximum building height of 14 storeys. So based upon our analysis of the five criteria, CPD recommends approval and the current property owner and both potential purchaser are both here to answer any questions you have today, and I'd be happy to answer any as well . Thank you. Thank you. Two speakers tonight, Bill Serrano. I'm sure I said that wrong. I apologize. And Dan Cohen. So, Bill, you can begin your remarks. Hi. My name is Bill Savoy. I am representative of RTD and here to answer any questions tonight. Dan Cohen. My name is Dan Cohen with the For Urban. We're the auction holder on the land, and I'm here to answer any questions. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Time for questions

and members of council and Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Bill, could you address the question that immediately popped into my mind, which is, why do you want to retain the adult use overlay? You know, I that's a good question, because I. Maybe I should ask Dan. I'm sorry. Yeah, you probably should ask me. I, I wouldn't say that I would want to personally, but. Okay, so why are we, why are you proposing to retain the adult use? We we have no specific intention to integrate adult uses on the site. I believe that there's also some legal considerations on the city side for maintaining that aspect of the zoning. Then third, try. Let me ask Ryan why why are we retaining the adult use over shore? So when we receive a rezoning request where the you one adult user currently exists, we do examine each request based upon a case by case basis, whether to maintain or to remove the other one. From the city's perspective, to not run afoul of the First Amendment, the city must still maintain adequate opportunities for adult uses throughout the city and county of Denver. So when we do receive a request that proposes to remove that, you are one we must analyze to see if that is putting us in any potential risk of First Amendment rights. But again, the applicant did make the request to maintain the overlay. So that is how we reviewed the application. Okay. I didn't realize that was a First Amendment right. Is that that seems odd. In fact, this is the old railroad. This is the old Colorado in Southern. There's never even been a structure on here, to my knowledge. Is that correct? I don't believe so. I've looked at aerial imagery as far back as 1933 and I can't find a structure. Okay. My only other question is for Bill. Sorry. This is land that RTD acquired as part of the original Mac line, the original light rail line, and I believe that was all locally funded. There's no federal funds that acquired this property. So my question is, are there any encumbrances due to any of these federal funding that implies or imputes any restrictions to how this could be used in the future? No, no. And you're correct, this was bought with local funds when it was built up in early nineties. That's good enough. Thank you. That's all. Thank y

ou, Councilman Flynn. Councilwoman, I tell you. Thank you. I have a few questions as well. The first one is for rain. What is the open space requirement on a parcel of this size? This is 4.52 acres. Right. So our particular site is located within the Denver Design District, GDP, a portion of that particular site. So the GDP does have an open space requirement of 10%. So roughly that GDP area is about 80 acres. So 10% of that extrapolate out is about eight acres. And are we counting the. Streets as part of the open space. So streets are subtracted from the gross area to develop a net area calculation and those are publicly dedicated rights of way to create that the baseline. Okay. And then on the detention, is that currently detention that's on the site for RTD or is it part of the detention that was required for court? But actually the detention and correct me if I'm wrong, Bill, it currently does serve the RTD Park and right area to the south as well as portions of Interstate 25. So when the property does come forward for redevelopment, that's that's something that'll have to be accounted for and accommodated in other ways. Okay. Let's see. My next one is on this one would be for Dan, if you would mind, coming forward. So. I get this is sort of being morphed into the bigger D4 project and can you speak to what the affordable housing commitment is overall for development that's going to be going onto the site? There's not a a specific consideration within the GDP for affordable housing, but it's certainly something that we're looking at. Actually, our first phase of development on the site is what I would call a market rate affordable project. I believe that when we first opened for occupancy, probably 40% of our units were at or below 80% AMI. So while it's not a tax credit, affordable housing development, it's something that we're definitely committed to. But we don't have a specific doctrine or written commitment of any kind that that we have at this point. So thank you for answering that. So for people who currently utilize the park and ride that's there, will there be some other form of parking for folks who will continue to use that site? And if so, how will that be addressed? Bill, would you like to? He's probably better placed to answer that question. Thank you. Sure. And I think there's a lot. Of things going on at. This site in and around, obviously, you know, that there's there's the to the south. We had Broadway station partners. We have the interchange project. So we're currently working with the city on what we're calling a comprehensive parking strategy to look at how we evolve parking. Which will look. At things like where do we put structures and other things like that. I think there's. A the notion that parking is going to. Be impacted. There's going to be periods of time where we'll probably have less parking. I think our overall goal is that we retain essentially the parking that we currently control, which is around a thousan

d spaces. So it may not be in that same physical location, but somewhere in the nearby proximity. Sure. Yeah. Okay. And then let me see if I had one more question. Mira talked about the maximum heights being controlled by the new plane. And that's 14 stories, right? This is the maximum height. Of well, in terms of adaptive plans, we do see recommendations for 14 storeys, but for the view plane, maximum heights will be regulated to about 120 to 246 feet. So they may actually fall below the 14 storeys because that does include permitted height encroachments like elevator shaft, safety equipment, that sort of thing. So we may see buildings falling below 14 storeys. Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you, counsel. And I'll take Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. Did you what was the what was the open space requirement in the GDP? I believe it should be 10%. And what is it in a cmcs 20 or whatever we've got going on here? I see about 16. So the CMC 16 zone district itself does not have a built in open space requirement. But through the general development plan informed by the Alameda stationary plan is how that open space requirement will be implemented. Are we going to we had this funky definition come up in District one. Are streets going to be considered open space? Are we actually defining open spaces, being on individual parcels and not in the right of way? So the general development plans does set forth different types and kind of characteristic qualities for open spaces. Some are aggregated open spaces that are truly plazas and and larger urban spaces, some with landscaping, some with grass. But then enhanced streetscapes are called out as a type of open space that I believe actually in the Denver Design District . GDP don't count towards the 10% requirement. Awesome. So when future rezonings in this area come up, who's responsible for being mindful that the open space requirement is being met so that we're not rezoning things to to. So that allowed development potentially required development potentially in some cases to to co-opt that open space requirement. So the c m x 16 as well as TMX eight and EMS districts that we see applied throughout the design center don't preclude open space as a use within the permitted use list. So it's kind of a layered way of reviewing developments within this area. So the zoned district is a framework that would allow for private development, but also for open space. So at the time, a site development plan review, there are certain triggers in the general development plan that trigger our Development Services Department to look for the implementation of those open spaces consistent with the GDP. So the rezoning to see 16 or any other urban center zone district doesn't preclude open spaces, since we do have another tool that captures that ultimate implementation. So if the open space is the open space defined in such a way in the GDP, that there is a certain characteristic, it sounds like there's different t

ypes and there's certain characteristics that actually require more set back that is not consistent with a cmcs zone district or. Not anything that I believe would be precluded by a C 16 zone district. These aggregated open spaces are often framed by an intervening street network. So again, the step back really wouldn't be pegged to the open space itself. And there are smaller, more kind of intimate spaces that are proposed through the general development plan. And I don't believe that the zoning standards would preclude those or hinder them in any way or the development that orients to them. Additionally, we also have urban design standards and guidelines that apply to this particular site that do offer an enhanced level of development, review and quality. So if there was any conflict between, say, a zoning standard and the ultimate intent of those open spaces as captured in the urban design standards and guidelines, that could certainly be something. How would we resolve that? Would we resolve that with a relaxation of the zoning requirement and some sort of modified zoning or or what. You know, without a specific project or site in mind, it's it's difficult to kind of contemplate. Well, the reason why I ask is it's easy to capture open space on a development parcel, but if the intent is to bring it to have a more civic quality, but the zoning sort of mandates that it's more internalized. We capture the open space, but we're not actually functionally generating what is desired. And so this is just another chess piece. And and so I'm just sorry. When we talked about that, I didn't when you when you mentioned this open space, it suddenly made me sort of think back to how we've redefined in the St Anthony's development open space, being in the street. I'm glad to know that's not the case here. But this is a large there's a ton of potential in this site. And I want to make sure that we're not overlooking something or creating a situation where we have internal, privatized open space when that was not the intent, and that our zoning somehow addresses that need comfortably so that we're not actually forcing more interior courtyards. Right. In that. Yeah. To achieve that. The aggregated open space recommendations that the GDPR I think do a very good job of capturing that as well as the GDP does contemplate multi-modal street

connections that integrate surrounding communities into the site. So the development that occurs in the Denver design district is certainly not inward facing. Exactly to that. Point. I'm glad I asked all this because now it tells me that I got to go look at this to help us sort of guide other things in our station areas as well. So thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Any other questions? 89. A7 skimming seen on public hearing is now a close time for comments on 87. Councilwoman Ortega I'd like to make a few comments. When I started to serve on City Council and represented District nine, the Broadway marketplace wa

s actually part of my district, and we worked very closely with the bigger neighborhood in doing and the Denver Urban Renewal Authority in in doing the development on this site. I can also remember going over and being on site when the Montgomery Ward building was imploded, left many of us scrambling, trying to get out of the cloud of dust that was blowing our way. But a lot has changed since that time, and I don't think any of us envisioned the kind of density development that we're seeing happen in the city that is being encouraged. Obviously, it was long before the vote for RTD and creating the rail stops that are encouraging the TOD development though. The one thing that I did not raise in my questions was proximity to rail because I see on on here that at the southern end of the property, the central mainline is further away from the site. So it's got that natural buffering that's already sort of built in into place to ensure that we're not building housing or other high density uses with lots of bodies, lots of people right next to the rail where we see cargo and specifically flammable liquids and hazardous materials that might pose a risk to human life. And so, again, as you heard me say earlier, we will have some recommendations in July. Councilman Clarke and I are serving on the committee that Chief Tate is spearheading, looking at all of these issues and development, being part of the conversation and ensuring that we are, in fact addressing public safety, health and and welfare of the people that will be essentially encouraging to live or work within a close proximity of these rail corridors. I think. You know, clearly this has been an area of change. It's the the buffer of both the WASP Wash Park and the Baker neighborhood. And clearly, we have three. What will be three rail stops by there or is it just to just the two? Okay. That will serve the, you know, the large density that will be both at the Gates site as well as the D4 properties. So I think this is quite appropriate. I'm anxious to take a look at your master plan and see what you know that big picture looks like. I know this body looked at some of that when the drainage project was proposed to come through the site. I think the zoning had been done prior to this council being seated. But. You know, this is right along the lines of what has been proposed at all of these TOD sites. So I'll be supporting this tonight. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Espinosa. My little bit of Kevin Flynn tonight. Uh, my senior prom in 1990 was in the printing building. 1990? Yes. I'm an old man to you, Elvis. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Any other comments? 87. Excuse me. Seen on maps. Secretary Roll Call. Ortega Sussman. Black Brooks Espinosa. Don Flynn. I. Every time I. Vote or. I. Question. I. Knew. Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please, first of all, announce the results tonight. Tonight, the 87 has been placed on final consideration. Does pass one pe

riod. German announcement Monday, April 4th. Council will hold a courtesy one one hour courtesy of Public Hearing Council Bill 173 approving the I-25 and Broadway station area plan as part of the city and county of Denver's Comprehensive Plan. And on Monday, April 25th, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 183 relating to the Denver zoning code, amending the provisions of airport influence overlay zone district. No other business before this body. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you, Chief. I thank you. Thank you all. And thank you, Councilman Nu, for bringing that forward. All right, we we do have one more proclamation. Proclamation 352. Councilwoman Ortega, will you please read Proclamation 352? I would be happy to. Proclamation number 352, honoring Myrna Hipp for her public service and declaring May nine as Myrna Hipp Day. Whereas Myrna Hipp moved to Denver in 1976. Graduated cumulative. Cumulative from Metro State College and lived and worked in Denver until she passed away on March 27, 2016. Whereas Denver City Council wishes to recognize Myrna Hipp for her almost 25 years of service to the city of Denver and her dedication to providing affordable housing and community service to those in need. And. Whereas, Morris served as Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Development during Mayor John Hickenlooper's administration and as Director of Housing and Neighborhood Development Services under Mayors Wellington Webb and Federico Pena. Whereas, Myrna was responsible for the implementation of Denver's affordable housing programs

from the 1980s through the 2000. She oversaw the city's investment of more than \$175 million in affordable housing development and preservation, and more than \$50 million in other neighborhood improvement projects that Denver residents continue to benefit from . Whereas, Myrna served on the Denver Housing Authority Board of Commissioners for 12 years, providing vision and leadership to transformative redevelopment, including the villages at Curtis Park, Benedict Park Place, Mariposa District, Sun Valley Transit Oriented Development Planning. And. Whereas, accomplish these feats while providing love and support to her loving husband Ernest, her son Rick KIPP, her daughter Lisa tunstall, Lenski and her brother and her brother grandchildren, other family members and friends throughout the community. And. Whereas, the city would like to honor Myrna here posthumously for her dedication to the city and her lifelong commitment to affordable housing and neighborhood services. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver that the Council of the City and County of Denver. Acknowledgment of him for her public service and declares Monday, May 9th, as merely hip day section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall affix and attest the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy be transmitted to the family of Myrna Hip. Tha

nk you, Councilwoman Ortega. Your motion to adopt. I move for the adoption of proclamation number 352. It has been second hand comments. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. So Mirnas life is weaved through these three proclamations that we've heard tonight. Mirna was an alum of Metro State College, which we just celebrated earlier this evening. And in her role, when the District one police station was closed down after they moved from their site in the Jefferson Park neighborhood over to Sunnyside. She was involved in putting that site out to bid and making sure that affordable housing was part of that project. And the work that Mirna did with the nonprofit and I see a number of them here in the audience tonight of ensuring that the role they played in this community in building and providing affordable housing units across the city was so vital to the survival of many of our families. And that's even more so important today as we have seen the price of housing escalate. Some of those very projects exist in my own neighborhood of Highland, where they are the only affordable housing left in that neighborhood. And so the work that she did was just so important to all of the families who benefited from this. I have enjoyed serving on the board of a nonprofit housing development group that worked very closely with Maria, and through that relationship, was involved in securing some city funding along with others, as is the process that all of these nonprofits go through to be able to provide this housing. In her work at the Office of Economic Development, which has gone through different iterations with different names over the years, the Community Development Agency model cities. But in in her work, she funded many other community programs. I can remember representing Globeville, Swansea, Elyria and working to try to get, you know, some of the alleys paved in the neighborhood and, you know, some of the other neighborhood services, like a recreation center in the community. And it was the community development block grant funds that she was involved with helping to administer for low income neighborhoods across the city that truly benefited as a result of her work. I want to thank her family, her husband Ernest, her daughter Lisa, her son. Rick and her grandson, Miles, who she was just so proud of for you lending money to all of us and sharing her with the city, people that she worked with every day and with the communities that she served and was so proud to do. And I just can't imagine how much her passing has left a hole in your heart. But I know that many of us share that pain with you as well, because she was such a dear friend to so many people. And I just thought it was so important to be able to take a moment. In honor of her many years of contribution to this city and to all of the people who truly benefited from her work. Thank you, Mr. President. I just ask that this be supported, adopted by my colleagues. T

hank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I would like to ask the secretary to add my name as a sponsor. I did respond last week, but it's not on the not on the list. I want to make sure that it doesn't go unnoticed, that our careers mirnas and mine had crossed paths several times, many times over the years. And I was just truly shocked, too, when whenever someone leaves us so suddenly just shocked at the news. And I'm very sorry to hear it, but I do want to make sure that my name is on there as a co-sponsor. And thank Councilwoman Ortega for bringing this forward. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Ortega, for bringing this proclamation forward. And thank you to the family for being here, for sharing Moreno with us. I

met Myrna when I was barely out of high school into college, and I was working in the community in the West Side in West Denver. And the first time I met her, she was just this really strong woman that wore the city seal on her lapel and knew a heck of a lot more about my neighborhood than I did. And she spoke of this vision. She looked at she worked with different community leaders. And for me, you know, seeing her there are people you grow up associating. With with different things. Different organizations have an aspect. When I looked at her, I saw the city. And I knew that that mariner meant well and her work will never be forgotten. One of the most impressive and most memorable recollections I have was being in the gymnasium over at St Joseph Church on Sixth Avenue. And it being packed. We had I don't know how many residents in there talking about my Lincoln Park plan, talking about, you know, the future of our neighborhood. And there was Myrna front and center facilitating the discussion, know how many different organizations and people were there. But you know, that was her that was in that was her element. And I will always remember her that way. Now, I could just say that. I was able to actually have a conversation not too long ago with her and to see her and to shake her hand and give her a hug. And she patted me on the back. And we just kind of shared that moment. And I'm glad that that's the moment that I get that I get a. Save up here and in my chest forever. So thank you for sharing her with us. You know, we'll always remember her service to the city. We're always be grateful her fingerprint will last a very long time here. Thank you, Councilman, for bringing this forward. Thank you, Councilman Lopez, Councilwoman Canete. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, would like to be added as a co-sponsor. I think I missed this one when I was out of the office last week and I only met Mirna a few times. I was working for a nonprofit organization and she was on the board of Making Connections. Denver at that time was certainly involved somehow in that work wi

th the Annie Casey Foundation, and I remember her having very high standards and her saying to us that we better not just say we're going to do some work in a community or say we're going to be advocates for affordable housing. Better really deliver if we're going to get funding and if we're going to, you know, hold ourselves out as doing this work. And so I appreciated those high standards. It was certainly she was a presence in our work in that we were always thinking how would Mirna evaluate what we were doing, would we meet her standards? And so even though I didn't know her well, she influenced my work through those high expectations. And so obviously her legacy on housing is one that we will always be appreciating. So thank you to her family for allowing us to recognize her in this way. And thank you to Councilwoman Ortega for your acknowledgment. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Canete. Any other comments? Proclamation three five, two, three. None. Madam Secretary, welcome. Ortega I. Susman. Brooks. Clark. Espinosa. Flynn. Hi. Gilmore, I. Can each. Lopez. I knew. Mr. President. Hi. Madam Secretary, please quote Vali Nasr adopts. A Lebanese. Lebanese 352 has been adopted. Councilman Ortega, someone you'd like to invite to the podium to receive the proclamation? Yes, absolutely. So I just want to first state that Mirna did not want to have any kind of fanfare. Honoring and recognizing her. And it took a little bit of convincing that really was to allow all of us to be able to come together and share with the family how much Mirna was loved by so many people. So I want to invite her husband Ernest to come to the podium on behalf of the family and if you could maybe introduce the family to us. And while he's doing that, I'd like to ask those who are here in honor of Mirna and all her many, many wonderful contributions to the city would please stand. Thank you. Thank you. Ernest. Thank you. First of all, I'm sorry the cops left because when Myrna died Easter morning, the first people that showed up were the cops. And. They were amazingly good. I wasn't very you know, I was really kind of out of it. But that guy, I and I still have his card and I'm going to send a note to the chief about how professional that guy was. So it's not just the people who die. Who are we should honor but but but them all. I'd like to introduce Bernice family, Rick Hipp, her son, Lisa Costa Lansky, her daughter and her wife, her husband Chris Costa Lansky. And their sons, Brett Costa Lansky. And Miles Hirsch. Miles Mirna told me one time that her job was to spoil Miles and and with everything Myrna did, she did well. And she did that very well. Very well. So thank you very much for for for recognizing her and and and she didn't like she didn't want accolades. But we think it's pretty cool. So thank you very much. Mr. President, I just want to. I want to also thank Ernest for his years of service to the city as a former city employee as well. Thank you. Thank you. Co

uncilman Ortega, three great proclamations this evening. Council job. We're on to the resolution. So, Madam Secretary, will you please read the resolutions. From business development 308 resolution to set a public hearing for the formation and adoption of the Five Points Business Improvement District 309a resolution authorizing expenditures and the Economic Opportunity Special Revenue Fund, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Case Management, Employment and Training. Moved and seconded public hearing 322 is now open. And may we have the staff report. Good evening, Mr. President. Members of City Council. My name is Tracy Huggins. I'm the executive director of the Denver Urban Renewal Authority. Get comfortable. I only have about 45 pages of text that I need to. Just kidding to go through. But there are a number. Of things that we do need to cover to make sure that this amendment is undertaken consistent with the urban renewal statute. So we are here this evening to ask your consideration of an amendment to the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan to add the 2560 Welton Street Project and to create the 2560. Welton. Street property tax and sales tax increment areas. The Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan was approved by City Council in September of 2012. In doing so, council. Found the Walton Corridor. Urban Redevelopment Plan to be in conformance with the Denver Comprehensive Plan 2000 and its applicable supplements. While the Urban Redevelopment Plan authorizes the use of tax increment financing, Tiff cannot be used until it is specifically approved for a project. Therefore, again, we are here this evening requesting your consideration of an amendment to the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan to add the 2560 Walton Walton Street Project. Create the 2560 Walton Street Property Tax Increment Increment Area and Sales Tax Increment Area, as well as to amend certain definitions in particular the definition of property tax increment to conform with statutory changes due to the passage of House Bill 15 1348. In addition to the Urban Redevelopment Plan Amendment, there are those three companion ordinances that will be considered following council action on the plan amendment. These include Council Bill 323 to approve the 2560 Walton Street Sales Tax Increment and Property Tax Increment Cooperation Agreement Council Bill 324 to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement among the City, Denver Public Schools and Borough and Council Bill 325 to approve the letter agreement among the city, urban drainage and flood control and dra. And each of these bills will be discussed later in my presentation. The Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Area, again, was established in 2012 for the purpose of encouraging redevelopment. Along the Welton Corridor. The urban redevelopment area is comprised of approximately 29 blocks, generally in approximately Brown bounded by Broadway Street on the West Glenarm Place and 24th Avenue on the South. Downing Street

on the East and on the north. By either California street or the alley between Welton and California streets. At the time the plan was originally approved, no projects were identified. However, the plan allowed for future projects to request tax increment assistance and contemplated tax increment areas that would be approved as projects were brought forward within the urban redevelopment area. To date, three projects have been approved. An affordable. Housing. Development project at 2300 Welton. A mixed use project I'm sorry, a mixed income residential project at 2460. Welton and a mixed use project at 28 a well 2801 Welton. The project being considered through the amendment this evening is the redevelopment of the site located at 2560 Welton Street. The project site is located at the southern corner of Welton Street and 25th Street. And the site is currently vacant and owned by the developer, a joint venture between Palisade Partners and Confluence companies. And as you can see on this slide, the site is located at the light rail stop at 25th and Welton. The project is comprised of an eight story steel and concrete building to include 129 apartment units. With 22. Units restricted to 80% of the area. Median income or AMI will also include approximately 10,000 square feet of ground floor retail and approximately 15,000 square feet of second floor office space. The project will also include 185 parking stalls within a structured parking garage. 27 of these parking spaces will be accessed from the alley, while the remaining 158 spaces will be accessed from 26th Street. The site is zoned CMC's eight Urban Center Mixed Use Up to eight. Stories is. Located in the Five Points Historic Cultural District and is immediately adjacent to the 2015 Wilton Light Rail stop after planning and neighborhood outreach efforts, including consultation with the Landmark Preservation Commission. There was general support for the proposed height of the building and the total cost of this project is expected to be just over \$40 million. The apartments. Premier units range in size from 606 square feet, four studios to 1563 square feet for three bedrooms. The unit mix includes 12 studios, 94 one bedroom units, 19 two

bedroom units and four three bedroom units. Market rate rents are expected to range from \$1,250 per month to 2006 \$2,630, depending on this on the unit size . 22 units, four studios, 16 one bedroom and two two. Bedrooms. Will be affordable at 80% AMI. And this. Affordability requirement. Will be in effect for not less than 25 years. The Urban Redevelopment Plan authorizes Darra to finance projects within the urban redevelopment area by the use of tax increment financing. The Urban Redevelopment Plan Amendment will add the 2561 street property tax increment and sales tax increment areas. Each of these will derive their incremental taxes just from the project site. Dora staff has reviewed the budgets and pro forma submitted by the RE developer and believes there

is a financing gap in the project of \$4.2 million. This financing gap will be addressed through property tax increment and sales tax increment again generated by the redevelopment of the property. The site is currently owned by the developer who is paying approximately \$31,000 per year today in property taxes. This amount will constitute the base taxes from which property tax increment will be calculated. The estimated taxable value following redevelopment and the sales taxes generated by the retail component are anticipated to generate approximately \$481,000 per year in net property and sales tax increment. These incremental tax revenues will be used to reimburse the developer for eligible expenses of \$4.2 million over 25 years. Let's skip that. One. As noted previously, City Council found the urban redevelopment plan to be in conformance with the planned and is applicable supplements. Accordingly, any amendment to the Urban Redevelopment Plan must also be in conformance with the Urban Redevelopment Plan objectives. To maintain the continuing conformance with comp plan 2000. The general objectives of the Walton Corridor Urban Renewal Plan. Or to reduce or eliminate blighted conditions and to stimulate the continued growth and development of the urban redevelopment area. The proposed projects meets the following objectives of the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan, and I'm certainly not going to walk through all of these, but just highlight several of those, including the objective, to eliminate the present and growing factors which contribute to the blight in the urban redevelopment area to encourage residential, retail and commercial development and redevelopment that is socially and economically inclusive and from which the urban redevelopment area and its environs can draw economic strength to more effectively use underdeveloped land within the urban redevelopment area to encourage land use patterns within the urban redevelopment area, which will reduce dependence upon private automobiles for transportation, to encourage high and moderate density development where appropriate, including structured parking, and to promote a diverse mix of dense housing options. In bringing forward this plan amendment. There are a number of legislative findings that council must make. These include that a finding that the 2560 Welton Street Project is located within the 29 BLOCK Welton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Area, and that it will promote the objectives set forth in the Welton Corridor. Urban Redevelopment Plan must find that a feasible method exists for the relocation of displaced individuals and families and business concerns. The project area contains no residences. Therefore no individuals or families will be displaced. Additionally, due to the vacancy of the site, no. Business concerns will be displaced. By the project. Finding that written notice of this public hearing has been provided to all property owners, residents and owners. Of busines

s concerns. In the resolution setting this public hearing City Council requested Dura to undertake this task. Written notice was mailed first class mail to all known property owners, residents and owners. Of business concerns. In the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Area on April 29th. 2016. Which is at least 30 days prior to this public hearing. The statute requires that no more than 120 days have passed since the first public hearing before City Council on any plan amendment. Tonight is the first public hearing before Council on this Urban Redevelopment Plan Amendment. The statute also requires that two years must elapse before council consider can consider an urban redevelopment plan amendment if they previously failed to approve that plan amendment. For this project, this is the first consideration by Council of the Urban Redevelopment Plan Amendment for this project. Also, the Plan Amendment contains no property that was included in a previously submitted urban redevelopment plan amendment that was not approved by the City Council. As such, the requirement to wait at least 24 months since any prior prior public hearing is inapplicable. Must find that the plan amendment is in conformance with the Denver Comprehensive Plan. On May 4th, 2016, the Denver Planning Board unanimously found that the proposed amendment to the

Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan conforms to the Denver Comprehensive Plan in applicable supplements. And a letter to the effect has been submitted as part of the record of this hearing and a request. The City Council concur with that finding. The Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan, as amended by the proposed amendment, will afford maximum opportunity consistent with the sound needs of Denver as a whole for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the Walton Corridor. Urban Redevelopment Area by Private Enterprise 2560 Walton Street. LLC. An affiliate of Palisade Partners, is the property owner and a private development entity who intends to undertake the redevelopment project. Council must also find that the city and county of Denver can adequately finance and agreements are in place to finance any additional city and county of Denver infrastructure and. Services required to. Serve development within the 2560 Welton Street Urban Redevelopment Area or project area for the period during which the incremental property taxes are paid to the authority. And the plan allows for cooperative agreements between the city and Doura to be brought forward to address additional infrastructure. Requirements in city services. Services should they arise. And finally, this amendment to the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan contains provisions for property tax increment financing. The passage of House Bill 15 1348 amended the statute governing urban renewal activities and now requires that before City Council can approve a new urban renewal plan or an amendment to an existing plan, you must find that an agreement has been ent

ered into among the city Dora and the affected taxing district in regards to the allocation of property tax increment to the project. There are two other property taxing districts Denver Public Schools and urban drainage and flood control. As noted earlier, there is a companion ordinance to approve the 2560 Welton Street Cooperation Agreement. This agreement generally directs the responsibilities related to the tax increment. In addition, the cooperation agreement requires DAERA to require the developer to comply with DORA redevelopment programs, including the provision of project art, the first source hiring policy, the utilization of small business enterprises, and the Enhanced Training Opportunities Program. To satisfy the new statutory requirements with respect to the inclusion in the plan of the tax allocation provisions authorized by Section 3125 107 Perin nine of the Colorado Urban Renewal Law, Dura has negotiated agreements with the two taxing entities. This process included. Noticing the entities. Of our intention to utilize property tax increment to support the redevelopment project. Following that notification. The taxing entities each evaluated the impact the project would have on their services. Both Denver Public Schools and Urban Drainage and flood control determined that the 2560. Welton Street. Project would have minimal service impacts and have each agreed to allow the full available amount of property tax increment generated by their respective maladies to be allocated to the project. Yeah. In closing. The Denver Urban Renewal Authority is pleased to work with the. City and county of Denver to bring forward this project. The redevelopment of this site and the delivery of 129 housing units with a combination of market rate and affordable units near downtown and along an existing transit corridor captures many citywide goals, objectives and strategies that are found in the Denver Comprehensive Plan. The Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan and the Walton Corridor Urban Redevelopment Plan. The 2560 Welton Street Project advances many of the Urban Redevelopment Plan objectives which are intended to revitalize this important corridor. And therefore, we ask for your favorable consideration of this amendment, and I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you, Tracy. We have two speakers for 322 Paul books and Tracy Winchester. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, council members, for having me back up here. Tracy Winchester. I live at 217 South Jackson Street and Way News District. I am pleased to support 2560 Welton Street because it is everything and embodies everything that we've been trying to do in our revitalization plan. Again, the plan, as outlined by Will Austin, was started in 2009, 2010, 2011, which talked about bringing in new business, bringing in density, bringing in residential. And this incorporates what we want for the area. We had plenty of community meetings again to make sure that everybody wa

s in favor of what this was going to be about, because it is talking about eight stories and this is new for this area. And so we did have some people who commented on that, but we've been zoned since 2010 for eight stories. And this is something that we see is going to be critical for the redevelopment of the area. Thank you. Thank you, Tracy. Thank you, President and council. My name's Paul Brooks with Palisade Partners. And I'm just here to answer any questions you may

have. Thank you very much. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Time for questions from members of council. Councilman Flynn. Thanks, Mr. President. Tracy. Just a couple of questions to clarify. In my mind here. If I can pull up your presentation again. Mm hmm. The tax increment amount is the amount of the principal, if you will. 4.2 million is included in the slide. I'm scrolling down here for the sources and uses, and the \$4.2 million tiff reimbursement is listed as a source. Is that needed up front because this is a reimbursable I don't understand. So the developers are going to have to get a bridge or some sort. Okay. That is correct. Yes. The developer will. Borrow money. To pay for those. Costs that then will be reimbursed through. The tax. Increment. And I notice that most of the reimbursements are in the construction phase. That's correct. Okay. Thank you. Those are my two questions. Thank you. Councilman Flynn and Councilwoman PANITCH. Thanks so much. Real quick question for Paul, please. Hi. Thank you again for including some affordable units in here. I think we talked about this in committee, but I'm going to acknowledge my memory is not what it was 6 hours ago. Did you all figure out whether you're going to be able to accept vouchers on at least the 80% of I army units, if not the market rate ones, in terms of just being able to provide just a little bit expanded flexibility for the potential of renters who may bring a voucher with them. Yes, we started to explore that possibility. And this through our due diligence up to this point, it looks like we should be able to do that. We are actually the next step is to reach out to HUD directly and make make sure that we're not missing anything, but we are exploring that possibility. Great. Thank you so much. And I think this was mentioned, but just clarify for me, I believe that, again, might have been mentioned. Was there an ID loan in terms of the 80% of my units in this building? Yes, there is. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilwoman and each Councilman Espinosa. Just a first blush at the rendering and stuff. It genuinely looks like a really thoughtful project and so I'm glad to see us investing in something that seems to consider context and the way forward. But I did want to ask the question, since we just got done with the five points of the discussion, how, what, what elements of the culture district, even though no guidelines or standards exist, what, what makes this sort of of five points, you kn

ow, what is what what features. So yeah, we. Really started with a strong base and made sure it was masonry, which is very common throughout the district. We also kept with the Chamfered corner a lot of the brick detailing. Another common thing these days are vinyl windows. These are all, Anderson, 100 windows. So they're of a much higher quality. They went down and looked at breaking it up into 100 foot increments at the maximum. So it looked like it was actually if you look at the rendering, it actually has kind of three distinct bases along the bottom. And then we are really excited from a cultural perspective. We are right at the light rail stop and so we actually incorporated a little bit of a more modern element. But the idea is, is, is to have this area that people are very comfortable coming in and trying to have the retail actually flow in somewhat in a mini Union Station concept and then also have the office users that kind of be able to peer down into this space to really create a congregational area to kind of create that vibrancy. So that's just one of or a few of many of our architects down here tonight. So that's good. Any new space for Councilman Brooks? In my comment, you know, I was noting some of the things that you were talking about. I sort of internalized that that break up of the massing along with that adjoined the light rail station and stuff like that. That's again, the stepping back to the levels and all that other stuff. So yeah, just be so that so far so good. But yeah, if there's some last bit of element placards or sort of terracotta naming or so, I don't know what some sort of detail that sort of again still reinforces where you're at. Please don't, you know, please consider that as well. If you get. Something, we actually will. The building's been in the Lydian, it's the Lydian mode. After jazz scale, we're really going to honor the jazz heritage at this building and then hopefully the Ionian comes as well next. So but the and then at the Wheatley, which is our project down the way, we were really honoring Phillis Wheatley, the first female African American poet, the why Phillis Wheatley YWCA used to actually sit on that that area. We're actually in the process of creating a digital book and collage. And then and then we've also worked with, you know, part of the DURA requirements is to have public art component and so on that project. And we're probably going to carry it into this project as well. We actually have some exterior cylindrical posts that during the day you can actually read up on the history of the Wheatley on the levee, and it would be about the Lydian. And then at nighttime, intellectually cache some down light in a way that I think we'll will hopefully create in the evening. Kind of a nice energy. So perfect. That's exactly what I was asking for. So things. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilwoman Ortega. Crazy. Can you tell me what the how the 80% EMI is spread among the unit

mix? Sure. Um, a

nd if I can. Pull. This back. Uh. There we go. So make sure that I'm. That I'm answering your questions correctly. So the the. Lower portion of that slide shows the mix of the 22 affordable units. So four of them will be studios. 16 are one bedroom in two or two bedroom. Okay, great. Thank you. I know you covered that, but somehow. Sure. All right. Thanks for the question. Thank you. Councilman Ortega. Councilman Brooks. Yeah. You know, this is I want to I want to bring Paul up to kind of talk about this. And Paul, I know you reached out to Tracy, reached out to myself. One of the requirements so we don't talk a lot about but I will be talking a lot more about we, we, we those projects that are funded by TIFF, we actually have requirements around minority contracting as well. And so just tell us a little bit about what you've done with that and what you're trying some of the numbers you're trying to get to there. So are in two as part of our you know, part of receiving the financing, we're required to submit an SBA, SBA plan and I believe it is a 23% of our hard costs of the project need to be funded by it. It's it's they've actually changed the requirement recently but women and minority owned businesses. SBA small business may I should have Matt McBride of confluence companies come up because he's the one who manages that entire process and make sure that we're in compliance with all of that. But we've done the same thing on the Wheatley and we're carrying forward obviously on this project. Yeah. And and just a further comment because I think this is really cool and that a lot of developers have done this. Paul reached out to Tracy, reach out to myself and ask about some of these opportunities, working opportunities for folks of color, you know, on his project. So I thought that was really cool and I think we need to do more of that. We need to. Tracy I'm telling you that we want to see more of that and we want to see that accountability. If we're doing these private kind of projects, he's doing a project in a neighborhood that's tripled the unemployment rate in the city. And so it's important that we're connecting people with jobs. Thanks. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. Any other questions? 322 CNN. Public hearing is now closed. Time for comment. Councilman Brooks. Yep. Thanks, Mr. President. Thanks. Members of council. Thank you to remember the council, who is who who voted in 2012 for the Urban Renewal District. Wow. To see the projects come up is is really exciting that that night many people stood up thinking that eminent domain was the main reason we were, you know, having a conversation. But really, it was about projects like this that fit the scale of the neighborhood, both the built environment scale and the spirit, the scale of the neighborhood. And so I'm so excited to support this. The thing I want to call out and highlight is I think we celebrate here this passage, but we don't know the frustration and the hard work t

hat goes into this, the meetings of of toiling over the performa to make sure that it's right with Tracy and whoever the developer is. The issues with RTD, because this is on the light rail and and some of the access issues that we have here, the neighbors realizing, oh my goodness, the entitlement is a zoning of, as you might say. And so all of those issues go in OED trying to figure out how what's the next level of affordability in housing in this. And so you know, Paul, thank you for, you know, fighting the good fight. I hadn't mentioned landmark, my goodness, which is a whole nother deal, but it all came out to be an excellent project. And one of the real mixed use projects, I mean, retail office and housing and different levels of affordability. So we're really excited. And Tracy, thank you so much. Many don't know that Tracy Huggins early on when we first did the urban renewal area said, hey, let's meet every other Friday with some developers, with stakeholders in the community to try to gin up some support. And, you know, I'll never forget those early mornings, like, what are we doing? But they're proven to be fruitful. So thank you. Thank you all for working really hard on this. Thanks. Thank you. Councilman Brooks, you know the comments, 322. CNN. Madam Secretary, welcome. Black eye. Brooks Clark. Espinosa. Hi. Flynn I. Gillmor, I. Cashman I. Can hear. You. Ortega Hi. Sussman, I. Mr. President. I. Councilman Clark, did you want to give a voice vote? I. All right. Karmel Madam Secretary, please. Because the voting announced the results. 1204. By 322 is in place on final consideration and do pass. Lastly, Councilman Clark, we need Council Bill three, 23, four and five on the floor for final passage in a block. Thank you, Mr. President. I move the council bills 323, 324 and 325 be placed upon final consideration and do pass in a block. It has been moved and seconded. Any comments? Catherine Brooks I'm assuming you don't have comments. I say that? All right. Madam Secretary, roll call. zone lot area of 4500 square feet. Also allowing for adu use. To understand the existing zoning context, you can see that the site is PD 406 and is entirely surrounded by the zoning of USC. Up 1b1. Excuse me. The existing

zoning was constructed in 1996 and its intent was to permit child care and community uses. That child care uses were restricted to 3000 square feet, which is approximately that of the single family residential and the community use restriction was limited to about 12,000 square feet, which is that of the Robert Steele gymnasium. Additionally, this PDR was based on the former R two zone district, and what it specifically allows for is the maintained use of those are two regulations in addition to the child care and the community use. In terms of the historic structures on the site. The Robertsville Gymnasium is located on the State Register and currently the Denver Square does hold a certificate of non historic status. From a land use perspe

ctive and looking at the existing context, we can see that the surrounding neighborhood is predominantly single family residential, with also duplexes categorized as multi-family low rise. The site itself is categorized as recreation, where the gymnasium is for the previous Boys and Girls Club and the Preschool Center is categorized as public, quasi public. To give you a few photos to acquaint yourself with the site. The Robert Steele Gymnasium is at Mission Revival and fronting King Street, and the residential structure is fronting 39th Avenue and some surrounding photos of the residences in the area. To provide a summary of the public notice, we received a receipt of complete application in December of 2015 with the Planning Board Public Hearing on March 30th of this year. The Planning Committee moved it forward on April 13th of 2016, and we are here tonight on June 20th, 2016. All Arnaud's within a 200 foot boundary of the site have been notified at the point of this presentation that was produced on Thursday. There were 17 letters that have been received in total, six letters in opposition and 11 letters in support. It's my understanding that some additional letters have been forwarded on to you guys in the meantime. I will highlight that a protest petition has been placed on this site and that in view of that 24%, 20 or more percent of the property owners or excuse me, of the land area within the 200 foot boundary. It will require a cast of ten affirmative votes for the passage. And so we had 22.6% residents sign on. A total area of 59,841 square feet. Next, they'll go through the review criteria outlined by the Denver zoning code, the first of which is consistency with adopted plans for this area. We have two citywide plans of comp plan 2000 as well as blueprint done for the land use and transportation plan and review of comp plan 2000. There's a variety of strategies, a few of which I will highlight in the land use strategy strategies. We are looking to broaden the variety of compatible uses within the neighborhood, working with economic activities, strategy to support and collaborate, effort for business, educational institutions to enhance the supply and quality of childcare. Also wanting to continue to foster the integrity of livable neighborhoods and support high quality, comprehensive preschool education. Moving forward, the blueprint Denver. The land use recommendation for the subject site and surrounding area is single family residential, with the recommendation that single family homes are the predominant residential type. Also, please note that this site is within the area of stability. The future street classification of both 39th as well as King Streets are designated locals and intended to serve more localized neighborhood serving trips. As a result, CPD finds that the rezoning is consistent with Trump Plan 2000 as well as blueprint done for the land use and transportation plan. We also find that it applies a uniformity of dist

rict regulations and furthers the public health, safety and welfare. Additionally, the justifying circumstances within this area is that we note that there is an evolving community demand for communities serving needs within the neighborhoods as we see an increase of families moving back into the city and that that growth. Additionally, we have the adoption of the 2010 Denver Zoning Code, which provides greater flexibility and opportunities for these uses. And as a result, CPD finds that these criteria are met. And finally, we do find that it meets the neighborhood context or excuse me, the zone district context, purpose and intent and applies in that. As a result, CPD recommends approval based on the findings. All these review criteria have been met. Thank you. Thank you. So excellent staff report. I am going to start calling folks up to speak this evening. I'm going to call the first five speakers. If you can make your way up to the bench right here at the front, this will help with all the other proceedings. So when I when I call the next five, just make sure that that bench right there is reserved for them. The first speaker that we have is David McMurtry. Yep. Come to the podium. You have 3 minutes. And correct me if I'm mispronouncing your name. McMurtry is correct. Okay. Thank you. And I believe I was given three additional minutes. Who gave you three additional Ryan. Howard right there. Okay, good. You got six. Go for it. Okay. My name is David McMurtry. And along with my wife, we are the ones applying for this zoning

application being discussed. A special thank you goes to Councilman Espinosa. I know we did not see things eye at first, but your willingness, along with Amanda Sandoval, John Olson and Levinsky and historic Denver to work to create a compromise is something that I am truly grateful for. I would also like to thank Brian Stammer for being so supportive during this entire process. Lastly, I would like to thank my district representative, Councilman Cashman. Now I'm going to go off what I had prepared just for a second to give a little background. Last Friday, a group of neighbors filed the protest petition requiring the majority or the super majority of votes of ten as of 330 today. An email was sent to a lot of the parties that were involved in this, saying that they were withdrawing their opposition to the project and as has been relieved, confirmed. Nobody from the opposition has shown up. I'm going to read some parts of mine, but just because of brevity and to help honor everybody's time in this room, I've pushed it so that myself shall speak. My wife shall speak, and any from historic Denver shall speak. There's probably eight or nine other people all wearing the fancy little buttons that came here to speak in support. And I asked them not to speak at this point unless for some reason the council finds reason to bring them back up to speak on our behalf. So that being said, there was a very, very vocal but small group of

neighbors that had not at the time gotten behind the compromise. Their number one concern from the beginning was the preservation of the building and honoring its past to quote one of the concerned neighbors in an article she wrote in North Denver Tribune about a year ago. She states the Robert Steele gymnasium is a community treasure and has benefited North Denver families for more than 100 years. Denver wants to build for the future and preserve what is valuable from the past. Sensitivity and responsibility will be required in order to balance the gymnasium history and importance in this community. I could not agree more. Plus, the picture shows I call it the Little Alamo. But why I'm so frustrated by all the attention that had been created up until today is that everything the neighbors wanted was right in front of them. If the council wants to honor the past and find an owner to turn the building into a child care facility and continue the tradition of serving northwest Denver youth started over 100 years ago by Reverend Rudolph. If the council wants to make sure that the building remains for future generations and is preserved, then find an owner who is willing to put over \$1.5 million into renovations, bringing the building up to code with modern air heating and plumbing. While not in any significant way altering the building we have pushed, the boundary of the building will allow to make the history respected. We are going to have the highest ceiling of any. Got it in the country. We are going to be the only Goddard School in the country with a basketball gymnasium floor for classroom. For the classroom. We intend to create a museum along two walls of the school to celebrate all the images and stories of the property that I have collected up to this point. This is being done not because it is the best practice of being a child care facility, but because those that walk into the building will immediately feel the historic nature of not just the building, but the Northwest Denver community since time is short. I will bring up two additional issues that the neighbors brought up. They wanted the additional protection of the Rudolph Four Square. We met that with a two year covenant and we have acquired a zone zoning permanent permit dating May 18th of this year that specifically allows for continued use of the space as a child care facility. Let me be very clear. Not only is it our desire to turn the House into an annex for STEM learning, art and extracurricular activities, but keeping the house is in our best interest. If we demolish the building, we will lose square footage that we will never be able to gain back. It is a tough balance when neighbors put financial burden of updating a building that has had a ton of work done over the past 50 years on owners who have already leveraged most of their personal assets into the upkeep and updating of the gym. All we asked for at the time was flexibility as we figured out the best way to deal with t

he building. A third concern presented by the neighbors parking and traffic. For this, we are looking to the leadership of those that have done it before and are intimate with the inner workings of the neighborhood. Councilman Espinosa's office has told the neighbors that they are committed to working through their concerns along with the city, myself and this along with my city in the self ones, zoning has passed and in addition, we are in negotiations with the nearby U.S. Bank and Skinner Middle School to allow our staff to park on their property as requested by the neighbors. I will skip some and kind of come to the conclusion, which is I would like all of us to take a deep breath. And while it may seem very simple now, for the past few months, it has been very tense and strenuous and emotional at times. But the bigger picture is that there is a massive shortage of early

childhood education in the city, not just in northwest Denver. Our school, while not going to solve that problem, will play a role in this issue. We are not big developers. We are a husband and wife, both raised in Colorado that have a dream to own a small business and at the science and at the same time make a lasting educational impact. If we don't get our zoning passed tonight, then who is next? The line will be out the doors with developers drooling at the opportunity to build something on a city property. Zoned us sub one. This is not what anybody wants. So I can look at all of you in the eyes tonight and I mean this genuinely, that this is not going to be just a school, that this is going to be something that the members and residents of Northwest Denver are proud of, but the city at large as well. So, again, I really appreciate your time and that's all I have to say. Thank you, Mr. McMurtry. Before I call it the next speaker, I want to look over at our assistant city attorney. Dave brought in your testimony just now. You mentioned about pulling a petition or sending an email that you pulled your petition. Is that true? Can we. There. From that? Go ahead. I don't see any email popping. And you may not have gotten it, so I got it. Rafael Councilman Espinosa. So that makes a difference in terms of the words, I don't know. I don't want to interrupt the process here, but I just wanted to. Good evening. Members of council, namely Sarah. Assistant City Attorney, Section 12 410 five Zoning Code, specifically Subsection B provides that any protest, petition or withdrawal of the protest petition shall be received seven days prior to the public hearing. So in this event, since if any email was received withdrawing that petition, it's too late and you need ten votes. Thank you. And I was aware of that, that legality. Thank you. Next speaker is Annie Lewinsky. Allison. I'm sorry. Allison McMurtry, I just. Okay, another word first. Since I can cut part of my speech, I would just like to say thank you for that beautiful dance. It has been a really stressful week and that was a beau

tiful blessing. So I just want to say thank you for that. So we have a baby boy here who's due in October. And if he is due on born on his due date, he, I, I will need to go back to my full time job in January. If you pass our zoning tonight and construction goes as planned, this baby will have childcare when my maternity leave ends. Ironically, if our zoning does not pass tonight, we will find ourselves in the same shoes as so many other Northwest Denver families with no childcare. When I return to work every day, this school isn't open. Parents in Denver have one more day of uncertainty while hoping their turn is next on the wait list. One more day they are driving miles out of their way for childcare rather than a school in their own neighborhood. One more day with one less option where to put their kids in preschool. Especially in northwest Denver, there simply is not enough childcare to meet the needs of all the families that live there. This is personally frustrating not just to me and my husband, but to many other families here. And our support tonight that a few neighbors could prevent over 100 children from schooling every day counts. This is a pivotal night for me and David. The future of our family dream is decided tonight. Colorado Uplift has been helpful and supportive of us while we wait for us to purchase this property. Our original contract with uplift expires in three days from today. Because of the challenges we faced and their support of us in particular, they have generously extended our contract to get us through this meeting tonight. Every month of this extension, we have paid \$10,000 to hold this contract. We are just a family trying to open a small business. We are not land developers with deep pockets. We are out of time and money to continue to invest in this property before we even own it. Any other zoning option would take months and we don't have the assets to hold the property beyond the commitment that uplift to uplift has generously provided us. We need a resolution tonight to proceed. We're looking forward to running this school for decades to come into our seventies. We feel we've proven our respect for this wonderful, the wonderful, historic nature of these buildings, and we ask for the flexibility to maintain it in the future as necessary. We were absolutely ecstatic when we discovered this property with its long history of serving the community and children. It seemed like a perfect fit for the God or our Goddard dream. We applied to the city for the appropriate zoning for our school, and they recommended you as you be one. They said that was the correct zoning to run our school. We trust them and we ask that you pass our bill tonight and approve our zoning. We can't wait to get started on our school. Thank you. Next up is Annie Lewinsky. Hello. I'm Annie Levinsky, executive director of Historic Denver, and I'm happy to be here tonight to offer our support for this rezoning. As has been mentioned, t

he steel gymnasium is a wonderful historic property and constructed in 1914 as both a church and a youth center by the Reverend Rudolph. And it was designed by the architect Robert Wilson. And

you'll know his work. He's also the architect of the auditorium, theater and the 20th Street gym. And they all share that same blond colored brick that is one of our iconic features in the city. It did, of course, later serve as a Boys and Girls Club and has really continued its legacy of being a center for the community and for youth throughout its 100 year history. When the property went on the market last year, we were mildly concerned about its fate, given its unique nature. And so when we heard from the owners here tonight, the prospective owners, we were both relieved and pleased with their potential use as a Goddard school. And this is, I think, a particularly appropriate use given the history of the building and one that will serve the community and the building well. We are also grateful to the owners for engaging with us and seeking our counsel about renovations over the last few months and as well as for formally providing the certainty that David mentioned in the form of two covenants. The first is a ten year non demolition covenant on the gym, which as mentioned is on the State Register of Historic Places and a two year non demolition covenant on the Associated Manse even though it already has a certificate of non historic. We recognize that these may not have satisfied all the neighbors concerns, but we believe that execution of those last week is a large part of the reason that many of them chose not to be here this evening. We are very much looking forward to the continuing relationship with the owners as they begin their stewardship of this building . And we hope that we can offer continued support and assistance in its preservation over the long term. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Linsky. Mr. Chris Penney. This. I'm sorry. We can't. Okay. Amy. Next up is Amy. Sure. Okay. They're not. So nobody else is going to speak. Well, let me just call through Jill Donoghue, Emily Jacobson. All right. That concludes our. Speakers questions from members of council. Councilman Black. Thank you. Just a quick question. Did you consider applying for a landmark designation for this building? Why or why not? We did consider applying for the landmark designation, but one of the biggest reasons with is that specifically with child care being some of the strongest and most stringent zoning in the city that we wanted, very flexible and quickly adaptable, moving ability to make repairs. One example that we had talked about is that our target audience doesn't know the difference between a piece of a broken window and why you shouldn't eat a nail. So we were really making a strong push to protect the building that still give us the ability to make immediate changes to the building that addressed the safety of the children specifically. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman

. Councilman Brooks. I mean, Councilman Cashman. Thank. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. Mr. McMURTRIE, please. So you're the property owner you want, or will you be involved in the actual administration of the school? Your background, etc.? Good question. I and my wife will be on site owners. I will be the one that will be opening it and I will be there on a day to day basis as if I was a neighbor in the property. We're not just dropping in, making a big to do and then leaving. We will be a part of the community. And as far as the background, my wife is incredibly beautiful and smart and she has a business background. And on the other side, I have been in education my entire life. Foster care, middle school teacher. Last six years I worked for a nonprofit. So the combined combo of the two of us makes for what I think is a very strong team. And I really, being an educator myself and a part of my life is I'm a professional speaker and trainer for educators, and it would be hypocritical to not walk the talk. And I really do intend to have this to be some of the most empowered teachers and educators in the city and be a real leader in that way by living by example. So we spoke earlier and you told me that you felt early on in this process you had made some missteps that might have contributed to the early contentiousness of the debate. Talk about that. And if you do become a part of this community, the ability to interact with the neighbors is going to be critical. Talk to me about plans for the future. Well, as far as the neighbor, I truly believe I've flooded a bunch of people's, not me specifically. But I think there's been a lot of additional letters of recommendation that have come in email form to a lot of the council people via neighbors in your districts. But I believe very deeply that as neighbors we are leaders in the community that we will treat everybody with not only respect, but that we will take care of them as if we were living in that neighborhood. To the to the question about what happened at first. I had never even bought a house, let alone a split level gymnasium and a house connected to it. So I come into this process having never done anything like this, and as I kind of stumbled through it, one of the things that I would have liked to have done is been more clear early on. But what is a challenge is I now have the clarity, like I now have seen not just how this plays out, but we know exactly what we're doing with we have architect plans that are 99% done. So I can say I know this is what's going to happen as opposed to when I first started, I was a little unclear. And that uncertainty sometimes created

challenges. And some of the neighbors felt that I didn't communicate as clearly as they would like. And for that I will own as part of the learning process that has been this is this entire experience. Okay. Thank you. That's all, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Brooks. Thank you, Mr. President. And Elise, qui

ck question for you on the technical aspects of the zone, and thanks for going through your presentation. I didn't find a lot that was in conflict. And so maybe give me a little specificity around what the neighbors were complaining about over the criteria on which we judge rezoning. But I don't think that there are specific concerns with the criteria itself, maybe a little bit of questioning of some of the analysis on the adopted plans. But the concerns that we heard from the neighbors, as David made mention of, was parking and traffic flow. That was a big concern that we hear really with any rezoning, understanding that that will further be handled at time of zoning permits and then the preservation of these buildings due to their historic nature and ensuring that the zoning doesn't further incentivize the demolition. Okay, great. Thank you. And the applicant. Quick question and this is more on a near use. Will you all be receiving any funds from different preschool program? Not at first. That's something that will be addressed as we move down the road. But this project is currently funded without needing to have the preschool. And that's not so much on capital, but on the actual program to subsidize the costs for those who are struggling financially. I mean, actually, the preschool program is for every kid in every economic level. But we see more than anything folks who are very poor using those preschool program dollars. So just want to, number one, let you know that that's a resource. Number two, hope there's probably some folks in your neighborhood who would appreciate that. Got her school be in a resource of them and subsidize in some of the costs. You asking the question? I'm just letting you know. Go ahead. Okay. Yeah. We were familiar with that specific program, but David and I have talked a lot about loving to be able to do something kind of once we're up in open and running. I'm assuming it's some sort of scholarship type program and stuff like that. So we've talked a lot about how excited we are to be able to do stuff like that once it's opened. And so we'd love to hear more about that. Great. Thank you, Councilman Katzman Espinoza. You know, can you bring up the slide for the with the prep the protest boundary? And Mike, if you're here, you can hear me. Thank you for these new monitors. I can see the whole thing and it's great. Really, this is more of a comment to my fellow council members, but I wanted to use this as an exhibit. If you look at this. The Antilles. What percentage was achieved with these with what's shown here. 22.6%. So this is the second time District one has experienced a protest petition and I just spoke last time. This is not easy to accomplish. And I just I spoke last time about it, how difficult it was. And so I just wanted to point point out that if you look at the sheer number of properties, the better part of half of those properties have been have signed that petition, but yet it only equals 22%, which is

barely hits the threshold. And so when if this happens again, that's what I'm talking about is even if you get over a huge majority, simple or a huge majority, it's very difficult because of the nature of how this is calculated with the right of way counting as part of that area when it's actually a significant number of property owners. So I just wanted to point that out and then talk to the. You know, there was some the I think the you answered correctly in mentioning that the concern from the neighborhood was was largely around the preservation aspect. I mean, the landmark status of the building. But there actually was significant debate at that planning board. Wasn't there more towards is this actual particular correct zoning for this sort of anomalous building in a Opseu zoning district? But ultimately, planning board recognized that every bit of planning supports this actual zoned district in this use and structure can be used for this use. In our current rules, with the appropriate zone district in the new zoning code, is that correct? That is correct. Yeah. So thank you. All right. Are there any other questions for members of council? Public hearing for council bill 252 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah, I actually for for two just so that people know I did receive at 311 the letter from the primary negotiator on behalf of the community and just to quote it, so that people don't wonder what it really said. It said the neighbors. The neighbors copied on these emails, have examined the covenants, conferred with their neighbors, and have reached out to the property owners who signed the protest petition. All parties concerned have agreed to suspend their efforts to defeat the zoning map amendment application. However, at this late hour, there will be no effort made to actively participate in this hearing. I mean, I paraphrasing now the rest of it. So, you know, I'm I think that speaks to. Well, it

does speak directly to the covenants that were negotiated and agreed to. And so I do want to thank the applicant for doing that, because as referenced in my comments with the planning board there for, you know, I'm a stickler for criteria. And for all intents and purposes, every bit of criteria that we weigh on these rezonings is met by this application. And so it would have been a tough thing to sort of find the daylight in that protest petition. For me personally, as much as a stickler, I am looking for that daylight. The nun was here. And so I am glad, though, that you both of you have agreed, even though you didn't have to, to reach that covenant, because that buys that building, which is significant and recognizably landmarkish, ten years of guaranteed, tender loving care and protection from demolition. And to add the additional two years on the house voluntarily as well is noteworthy. And so thank you very much. You're right. We did have a tough go of it to begin with and it was a learning process.

ss. But I really appreciate that you what you said here tonight and what you agreed to with historic Denver. So thank you. And I'll be supporting this. You can't swim, Kenneth. Thank you. Mr. President, I just wanted to thank the folks that did come out tonight. Appreciate it. Even more, especially even when you give up your turn to speak. And I just want to give my kudos to the councilman for your role in helping to encourage this in historic Denver. You're here so often as part of these really positive outcomes. And so I just want to thank all those of you who are involved in the effort. I'm a resident of Berkeley, and, you know, I'm only recently in the Denver public school system after having to find, you know, all that child care that didn't exist in the neighborhood. So I can attest to the fact that it is needed and it will be a net benefit. I hope that you make an effort. We're losing a lot of diversity in northwest Denver. So to ensure that you're doing outreach and recruitment for the kind of integrated environment that I think our neighborhood is still struggling to maintain, even in the face of some of that loss of diversity, I think would make this a wonderful outcome as well. But it is a landmark in all of our eyes, regardless of its legal status. And so thank you for your willingness to take care of it. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. I'll be supporting this this evening. The I appreciate your education background. I appreciate the glowing recommendations from your friends and people who know you and that you're a fine American. And but what I really appreciate what mattered to me in this decision was in our discussion about you're realizing that you blew it early on to whatever degree, you know, and those things happened. You know, sometimes we run with scissors and nobody gets hurt. Other times we stumble and someone gets stuck. This appears to be a no blood, no foul situation. But even better than that, your stated willingness to work with the community as time evolves and to work with historic Denver to for the long term preservation of what I think is a spectacular building. And so, as I said, I look forward to supporting this tonight. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. I really want to echo what Councilwoman Kennish to my right just said and to Councilman Espinosa. It seems to me that this is a really good example of active preservation rather than passive preservation. Sometimes the best. I think the lesson to take from this is sometimes the best way to preserve a historic building isn't necessarily to put a plaque on it, but to find a way to reuse it in the form that that really in a way that's really consistent with the form of the building. And so I'm very happy to support this. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilman, are there any other council members? I want to chime in. All right. If not, I just

wanted to say. Thanks a lot. I drink coffee, waiting to be up all night. And now I'm going to be up all night and there's not going to be a public hearing. Having said that, since community planning and development has determined that the requirement for a legal protest signals of the owners of at least 20% of this property within 1200 feet of the site has been met. Petition signatures represent 22.6% ten affirmative votes instead of the standard seven affirmative votes of counsel are required to pass this bill. Having said that, Madame Secretary, roll call black. Hi, Brooks. Clark. Hi. Espinosa. Hi. Flynn. I. Gilmore. I. Cashman. Can each new Ortega. I. Assessment. I. Mr. President. I. In. Let me just make that correction. I meant ten instead of seven. And so happens we're not bringing my glasses to. Waiting for Ortega. You can. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 12 hours. 12 eyes council bill 252 has passed. I apologize for that rookie mistake. Councilman Espinosa, will you please put Council Bill 314 on the floor for a final passage? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 314 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right. This has been the motion. In the second Ortega. All right. Council. A public hearing for

Council Bill 314 is open. Speakers may address either the Moth Council Bill 314 and Resolution 370. We mean we have the staff report. Good evening. Council President Pro Tem Members of City Council. My name is Ryan Winterberg with community planning and development here to present presenting to you at the I 25 and Broadway station area. So it does include 27 individual parcel addresses. I won't read them all out you tonight, but the request is to rezone from TMU 30 waivers and conditions UO one to CMC 12, DMX 12, C, Max 16 and C are x eight. So the subject site is located in Council District seven. At the confluence of the Baker and Ashmore Park neighborhoods. But we can see that it's it's really bringing together a lot of different neighborhoods in the hub of this transit oriented area of our city. Zooming in a bit to the location, we can see that the site is located at the I 25 and Broadway station area. Will this. So Bill 249, I will put it on the floor. I moved the council bill to 49 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 249 is reopened to allow for limited additional testimony. As a reminder, we closed this public hearing the first time it came through and are reopening it with a specific intent to hear from three people. So to start, may we have the updated staff report as of May 23rd. Good evening, Teresa Lucero with community planning and development. All I have to report are more letters. You have the original staff report and the staff position has not changed. So there since the May 23rd hearing, there are eight new letters in opposition to the proposed rezoning. An

d you had those accompanying the memo that I sent. That's the only thing I have to report. Thank you very much. So we do have two individuals tonight, one representing the applicant and one representing the neighborhood. And so I'll call on in order. First up, we have Douglas macKinnon. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. My name is Doug macKinnon. I reside in Denver 730 17th Street, suite 220 members of Council. Thank you for the opportunity to come back before you. Councilman Kasich, I think you brought the motion. For us to stumble through the steps. But since that time, we have reached out, as you requested, to the neighborhood organization. We've had several meetings. The meetings began with a concept. We shared a concept of what we were proposing for the property as we requested that concept. You may remember a little bit of about the site. It's about a 400 foot long rectangular site facing Colorado Boulevard. The first concept we shared with the neighborhood was a four building concept that had in each of these individual buildings, approximately 12 to 15 units. The entire project was part of underground primary ingress, and egress was off Colorado Boulevard with secondary egress and access off the private alley to the eastern edge of it. That meeting was attended by the leadership of the R.A., as well as a group of concerned neighbors. We had a very spirited dialog. We did not come to a resolution. But at that initial meeting, we proposed that we would cap the units at 54 units on that property. We also offered that we would provide a covenant running with the land to secure that in favor of the neighborhood organization. We subsequently received commentary from the neighborhood organization that indicated they were uncomfortable with that number, that they wanted only between 20 to 24 units on the property. And in addition, they tried to share with us their concern that the most appropriate comparison for that property was a property, the former Mount Gilbert property, across Moorpark. We did not feel comfortable with that comparison, but we did go back to work. We presented a revised concept which reduced the four buildings down to three buildings on the site. Again, three individual buildings, complete underground parking, primary access of Colorado Boulevard, secondary access off the private alley. In that proposal, we had limited the units down to 48 units. We went back and forth and again a circular, somewhat circular dialog occurred. This time it should be noted that the you know, I very much appreciate the leadership of the R.A. They reached out to us on a smaller group basis to have a principled a principled dialog. So myself and my two co-owners of the property met with the R.A. President, Mr. McCormick, the head of zoning committee, Mr. Sweeney, and Mr. Michael Hughes, who I don't think is here tonight. So we very much appreciated and embraced that dialog to try to see if we can come to a resolution. That also was a long meeting

was attended by Teresa as well hosted by the city. And at the end of that meeting, we had come to an attempt to resolve the issue. We'd asked the neighborhood group to give us. Mr. Rick I'm sorry, that is the 3 minutes. So in the interest of fairness, I'm going to give the neighborhood their 3 minutes. Don't go far. Council members may have questions and bring you back up once we get to the questions. But I want to stick to our commitment to 3 minutes for each side. Jay McCormick.

Hello. Good evening, President Pro Tem Karch and members of the council. My name is jay mccormack. I am president of the Kramer Park Hilltop Civic Association. I reside in Denver at 141 South Claremont Street. Thank you for the time. We, as Mr. macKinnon described, we had a series of meetings with the development group in different formats, and Teresa Lucero attended the final one, which went on for a long time. At the end of that meeting, I think where Doug McKinnon was going was the seeming to be, as far as they could go, was to bring their number of units down to roughly 40 units still in the garden court format. We took that back both to our R.A. board and how to vote. We also put it out to survey as many people as we got from the neighborhood using SurveyMonkey and then also accepted comments via email. The board voted to oppose the rezoning for the reasons stated in the documents I've given you, and generally it had to do with confusion and worries about the garden court format, which seems to be a key topic here tonight. The density being so much greater than had been proposed in Blueprint Denver. Many neighbors are indeed looking over at the Cress more project on the Hilliard site and regarding that as an appropriate density for this one acre site. And finally, there's not been substantial traffic studies. We have no idea. It's quite a dangerous intersection where elites still miss Colorado and people are worried what ingress and egress in Colorado, how the alley would work. And there's very little understanding of that in the survey. Using SurveyMonkey, we had about 172 responses, which is a pretty good return from our neighborhood and 74% of the people. You can only vote once using a survey. 74% opposed, 26% voted not to oppose. In addition, we received around the hour and received 35 emails from Concerned Neighbors. We have no idea how many of those may have already voted in the survey though, so statistically I can't give you a number. All 35 of those emails that you got in the last few days were were opposed. And so as a result of those things, we opposed to this particular rezoning amendment. And I can see the rest of my time to Doug if he needs it. All right. Though, you know, he considered the rest of his time to be a 42 seconds. We finished the meeting last time with an attempt to solve it. The neighborhood came to us and said we could imagine a unit count that would have a three in front of it, which we assumed was 39. We asked them for one more un

it 40. That's what we agreed to try to get done. Unfortunately, as I indicated, when he took it back to the ward, it was not approved. So we do not have an agreement tonight. We tried. We still are very much desirous of this rezoning. We think it's an appropriate rezoning. RH three Is is the most appropriate zoning for the site. Single family housing is not it's not a it's on a state highway, 50,000 cars a day. Single families, houses do not make sense on this site. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much. That concludes our speakers questions from members of council. Any questions?

Councilwoman Ortega. I just want to clarify that the garden court format is what was finally proposed that the developer is planning to move forward with. Is that accurate? If you could come forward and just clarify that. The conceptual plans that we showed to the neighborhood do tract the garden court form. We understand, based on the past hour, that there's certainly some division internally as to what that guard and court form should look like. We're cognizant of that. But indeed that was the proposal conceptually garden court form on the on the property. And it's 40 units. Is that correct? Correct. We were willing to limit to 40 units. Okay. And. There was somebody that talked about a covenant on the property that limited to the. Correct. That somebody was me. And we are still willing to covenant from ourselves running with the property in favor of the Arno to never exceed 40 units on that side. Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega, Councilwoman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. So just to clarify. Mr. McKinnon, you said you offered 40 and the but the neighborhood was willing to take 39. No. Oh. Okay. Clarified at the end of the meeting. We had asked for a proposal because it became very, very circular. We asked fundamentally from the from the neighborhood side, from their leadership, what would the unit count be that you could support? And then the number that was proposed was a description of something with a three in front of it. Uh huh. Which we took to be 39. And Jay well he'll speak to we said, would you consider one more unit 40? We shook hands at that with the understanding that the board leadership, the president and the head of the zoning committee were going to go back to see if they could get that approved. So we left the meeting optimistic that we were going to have a. The transaction that we could work with. Unfortunately, a couple of days later, the results of the vote came to us. No, no agreement. Okay. I have a few more questions in the garden court format, and I'm sure you were listening to our discussion. Can you just describe to us what the size is that the courtyard you were proposing if you had 40 units? Yeah. Yeah. Our architects, certainly our

architect, had proposed it consistent with with the code. So that is a minimum 15 foot entryway into it. The courtyard would expand once you're a little bit deeper to t

o allow for plantings and that kind of thing. But it did not have a correlation that I believe is coming from the amendment, which is a correlation between the width of the courtyard to the height of the property. These were three storey buildings, so logically would be 35 to 36 feet. But the concepts that we presented had a 15 foot respecting the code as it exists today. Yeah. Okay. And it's my understanding on developments that are an acre or more that that drainage retention has to be built. Correct. Have you factored that into your site plan and that that is going to take. We have it's complicated. As Councilman Sussman knows, this is a drainage nightmare in the in the city. And President Clarke also spoke to some of the concerns about what travels to the plot and what doesn't. So, yes, our site plan would need to provide for on site. Retention that take away some of the available area for what you could build. No, not on the concept we presented. Mm hmm. Okay. And then. Believe it or not, Colorado Boulevard is a parkway and there is a 20 foot parkway setback back and the right away limit is eight feet. So it actually. You can't have the building. Until the 29th foot from the curb of Colorado Boulevard. So that's set back pretty far. Not only do we believe it, we've planned it that way. And that still doesn't limit the number of units. No. That's the concept we present. Right. Thank you. I have some questions for CPD. I. Teresa. Hi. So. In the staff report it one of the aspects of the gr3. It says it provides a transition to urban and urban edge. Mm hmm. And this neighborhood is. Urban edge. It is an urban. Hilltop is an urban edge. Well, that's how I was taking it with the issue zone district. That's okay in the neighborhood. Okay. And then the height is 30 to 35 feet, which is the same height. Yes. Okay. And I blueprint Denver identifies it as an area of change and it says single family duplex. That includes a mixture of housing types, blah, blah, blah. That includes duplexes, townhouses and small apartment buildings. But it says typical densities are between ten and 20 housing units per acre area wide. What's that mean? It doesn't define the area. I don't think it means a specific property. If a blueprint was a citywide plan. Very rarely. Other than on the map. Did we? Discuss single properties, but. Okay. All right. Well, this property is about an acre, so that's why I brought that up. And then also consistent with Blueprint Denver area of Change Strategies, the grh3 zoning standards will require an orientation to the street. Yes. And so this proposal. The Garden Court is not oriented to the street. At least two of the in the garden court form. At least two of the doors have to be oriented to the primary street. The remainder of the doors can be oriented to the courtyard. Okay. And then another. Aspect of Blueprint Denver, it says building scale. That is the same as the adjacent area of stability. Yes. So can you address that? We

II. We you just asked me that the 30 to 35 feet. That's the same height that the ESU de Zone District has. So it's the same height as being proposed for this property. So when that says building scale, it's referring to height and not the density in blueprint. Mm hmm. Can you read the sentence to me again, please? A building scale that is the same as the adjacent area of stability. I guess I'd have to read more of that, that paragraph. But typically in blue print, we are talking about both the scale and sort of intensity of development. So I would think it would mean either or both of those things. Okay. And then comp plan 2000. Says low scale multi-unit residential where services and infrastructure are already in place. It's an opportunity to add moderate density in a location that serves as a transition to both Carter Boulevard and the Cherry Creek neighborhood. So I guess I'm just wondering with that what that term moderate density refers to. Again, blueprint doesn't define, although it does define for single family duplex, that 10 to 20 dwelling units area wide. So in my mind, when I think of moderate density, I think about our old neighborhoods that are a mixture of single family, duplex and small apartment buildings as moderate density. Okay. That's all I have for you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Black. Councilwoman Gilmore. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro Tem Teresa. I have a follow up question to Councilwoman Black's question on page ten of the staff report and blueprint. Denver is one of the criteria that we're evaluating this rezoning on and where it reads typical densities are between ten and 20 housing units per acre, area wide. And so area wide, you just said, is not defined. No. But even if it's not defined, it is the terminology area wide isn't defined. But when it says ten and 20 housing units per acre per acre is a definition. Yes. Okay. So Kylan actually is a good one to ask this follow up question because he sat down and did some math and we he came up with between three and four. Where do you go? Three and five dwelling units per acre, sort of area wide in the hilltop neighborhood. And then he took a look at this

property and the property to the north, both of which are the single family duplex along the edge of hilltop. And as I recall his numbers, he if 50 units were built on this property, then the density would be 19 dwelling units per acre. And that's his math. So I see you shaking your head, as Kyle said. So I guess my follow up question then is either Kyle or David Broadwell. Is Kyle Dalton's math going to be submitted into the public record? Because really, all that I have in front of me to make a decision on is, of course, what you just told me. But then what has been has been documented. My understanding is no, the only thing submitted in the record is the answer to the question. The staff report as written, is CPD's. Position. Okay. All right. Thank you, Teresa. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Councilman Cashm

an. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. Let's see. Let's start at an easy way. Doug, please. The parking you have planned for. Let's say you get 40 units. What kind of parking would we be with? As I mentioned, we proposed to put all of the parking for the project underground. Right. And leave that probably between 1.4 to 1.6 stalls per unit is going to make sense. There was a request from, I believe, our first meeting with the neighborhood to do to commit and obligate ourselves to do two stalls per unit. And we found that doubling the code requirement was, was not something that was appropriate for us. Yeah, it's interesting. So we're trying to judge this on a plan from 2000 Blueprint Denver from 2002 and a Colorado Boulevard plan from 1991. And the Colorado Boulevard plan talks about that projects should park all the project needs on site. So how you come up with a number for that is a little bit of a mystery. Thank you. Jane, please. So the the number with a three in front of it. Okay. The developer obviously would like to call that a 39. I'm guessing you folks would like to call that a 31. If it were put in front of me. I'd assume something like 35. So it appears to me that we're talking about five units and I'm wondering if I'm close. So, Councilman Cashman, we were in negotiations and not getting anywhere effectively. We were trying to take something that could at least be voted on that was different. And so we said, Well, let's try something with a three in front of it. The lower the number, the more likely that the are and maybe the neighbors would have been more aligned or, you know, voted. More heavily for. Rezoning. You know, I was hoping for 32, something like that. You know, they couldn't budge off of 40. We agreed to take that back, telling them that we don't know how the board is going to vote on this, but at least we have something to talk about. And when we didn't and we moved, we moved it out to the community as well. Sure. So you weren't coming forth with a preconceived number that your group had discussed and said, throw 35 at them. You were hoping to have something to keep the discussion moving along. No. And I can tell you now that I've got, you know, more than 200 bits of feedback, that the community seems very centered around the rowhouse part of this, part of the code or possibly townhouses or something along those lines. Sure. With, you know, density in the mid-twenties. And that's where the community seems to be standing. Thank you. Teresa, please. So as Councilwoman Black and Councilwoman Gilmore mentioned, Blueprint talks about typical densities between ten and 20 housing units per acre. And so the word moderate rears its ugly head again, because in your staff report, you say the G-rated three zone district allows a moderate step up in density on the subject property. Again, if I'm thinking moderate, I'm thinking 25, 30%. I'm thinking you get up around 60, 70%. We're getting extreme, which would make something

in the 40 range more than moderate. So how is CPM? I was interpreting that as height and intensity of use because in the description in Blueprint Denver of the family duplex, it talks about single family duplex townhomes and small apartment buildings. Okay. So you are not talking about density in the form of. Number of units. Number of units. I never know the number of units for sure. So do we have other H3 developments? We do. You asked this question, and. What I asked you earlier was, do we know how many units per acre? And that would take some analysis that I didn't have time to do. And before I when you asked the original question this afternoon. So I was thinking maybe Boulevard one, but I pulled up the site plan there for the grade three area and they've combined it with the garden court that you're seeing is combined. They're using the Annex five zoning and the RH three zoning. And so it was hard to figure out, well, what's the density then of the area? That's the garden court. So that was the only thing I had time to pull up and didn't really. Have any feeling at all for other multifamily developments of whatever. Zone zone district. But in, you know, row house form, you know, it's two, three stories. It all depends on what the code allows. And typically are townhomes and row houses are that three story in my mind. Heights So again to me that's a fairly moderate height when some of our single family homes are allowed

the same height. Sure. But I mean, as far as the density of units here, you're still normally. It's. Ten, 20 units an acre. That's what we have. The only guide we have. Back home I have absolutely no feel for. I'm sorry. Hmm. No, that's an important piece. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Councilwoman Kennish. Thank you, Mr. President, I. Well, I think I maybe will follow up with you, sir. I don't know if this is where Councilman Cashman was going, but I want to take us to the criteria. Yes, my question. So I don't know, Councilman Cashman, maybe not where your question is going to the uniformity of zone district question. So to the extent that he's asking questions about other RH threes, how do you analyze the uniformity of district regulation and restrictions in it? There's very little in the staff report on that criteria. So I'm going to dig into a couple of these criteria more, but I want to understand how you analyzed that without looking at other RH threes. I'm so sorry. So one of the first things we do when someone walks in the door and says, I want to rezone my property, is look at what does our plan say, and then we try and translate what our plans say into a zone district that we think is appropriate. And some of the things we look at are what's what's what are the zone districts in the area. In this case, the RH three is across Colorado Boulevard in the Cherry Creek neighborhood. So one of the other things we look at is do they have the acreage to to rezo

ne? And in this case, because of the grade three, acreage wasn't an issue. So we do get an idea when we talk about zone districts, by looking at zone districts in the area of the property that's being proposed for rezoning and saying, okay, that gives us we take a look at those properties if they're built, that gives us an idea of what could be built here. But truly, in this case, it was the description in Blueprint Denver of what could be built matching up with the building forms allowed in this district. Thank you. And if I can just follow up on that point really quickly. It's a it's a high level look at uniformity are similar located parcels. It's not about what's actually built in RH. Oftentimes we don't know what's going to be built. We didn't know if a duplex was series of duplexes or townhomes were proposed. And. So we don't know that. Okay. I just want to clarify. So there was an analysis of whether this parcel was being treated to similar parcels in terms of the zone district, but that's not looking at the level. Councilman Cashman wants to address what's actually built in. How does it compare? Because. All right, I think that's good. The other question I wanted to ask you is, is there anything else you want to say about the public health, safety and welfare criteria and how you approach that one? Because this one was a little confusing to me. You basically said because it met a different criteria, it automatically met this one. And well, this is one that I know the neighbors have written in their letter that we don't address safety because we don't address traffic. But it's another thing that we have no knowledge of because we don't know what's proposed to be built. So if it was a townhome, it would be different traffic than if it was a duplex. Then it would be different traffic. If it's a garden court, then it would be different if it was a single family home. So. We take that if we are adhering to the plans that our citizens have written and council has approved, that we are adhering to the health, safety and welfare of the city. And is that the same for most rezonings then? It's not a different analysis you've used on this parcel. No. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you. And I guess my other questions are for Doug macKinnon, please. Two questions. You've indicated that your plan requires ingress and egress from Colorado Boulevard. Do you have reason to believe that in later stages of review that that would necessarily be approved? Or is it that there is a process and the city will have decision making and and it may or may not be approved at a later point. We are early on, approximately about six, six months ago, Councilman Kasich, we went to the city with initial dialogs about how could the site be connected to the arterials around it. So we did have a detailed dialog with traffic and transportation. They absolutely confirmed for us that Colorado Boulevard is absolutely the right ingress and egress. They had requested that that egress a

nd ingress be pushed as far north as possible, and that's where we've oriented it on the northern boundary of the property. Okay. Thank you. Second question and I only have three, this one. You mentioned how your concept that you shared with the neighbors compared to our earlier discussion with regard to the walkway or the the Court. Can you enlighten us on how your concept compares with the other two criteria? So are there units on all three sides in your design, correct? Yes. Correct. And are the units stacked or are they, in fact, row homes where if it's 35 feet, that that's one unit in the 35 feet? In our concept, they are stacked. The amendment that I heard tonight would change that requirement under the under the guard. Okay. So it's more like an apartment where floor floor one is unit one and floor two would be a separate unit. Think of them as flats.

Okay. Okay. Thank you. Last question. Would you care to share why you all couldn't live with a number that began with the three? We don't have to talk about what it was. But why? Why? Why did. Your economics, pure economics, putting 100% of the parking underground a very expensive proposition. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Councilman Espinosa. So I'm going to sort of put a little on your words. This is not a different analysis. It's just the wrong analysis. And I'm going to go through it. Can you bring up the slide of the future land use map and Blueprint Denver. Can anyone? Do we still have that Kelly or. Okay. I actually brought a copy because I. Need I need to have it in order to explain why I was shaking my head so vehemently. Can you give me a minute to load it? Jasmine Espinosa, do you have other questions? Well, we're digging up that slide. So what was stated? So what it reads is that. So when you look at the map and hopefully they call it up, there are three shades of orange. I mean, two shades of orange and one shade of yellow. The shade of orange is the middle shade, a peach shade where this property is located. And that is the area of change that is identified as single family duplex. That was the area that we were talking about in Blueprint Denver. Now, I got to go find that language. Shoot. Councilman. I am actually looking at the staff report. Technically it is Page. You're looking at the staff report, not the power. Page 11. Yep. Okay. But you can call up the PowerPoint because it's the same graphic. But where's. The slide? Did you want to see? 10 to 20 units per acre. Language injustice. Six. Councilman, which side did you want to see? The the future land use map and blueprint in Denver. Okay. Why am I? So. And because I needed you, Kyle had done an analysis. And this is this is crucial. We don't have the full two blocks in this picture. But no, but that's all that matters. Right. Is Kyle did what blueprint Denver is is it specifically states that the single family duplex is the area that is supposed to be the 10 to 20 units? He included the single family, which

is a completely different area in an area of stability. To answer your. Question, so let me walk everybody through. And because the the edges, the police, the the property across the street is urban residential. So you're taking the plan recommendation. I mean, the zoning of an urban of a completely different area in Blueprint Denver and applying it to a. No no those are three what I described was if I can use mine was the block that's being proposed for rezoning and the block north of that that are both single family duplex in blueprint Denver those are the two blocks that counted the number ran the numbers on and only those two half blocks and they border Colorado . What we're saying is what's a you know let's talk about the appropriateness of the zoning, right. So what we're saying is because the applicant has stated that they could fit 60 units in this zoned district, the proposed zoned district, which would be 60 units per acre. And any place in that, if you make this change, you can make this same change anywhere in that single family duplex area, meaning that you're basically justifying 60 units per acre in the entirety of that area of change. The zoning could mean based on those current single family zoning of that area, you could fit in 8 to 10 units, which is on the bottom end of the recommendation for that area. If you did a duplex at T you now you're at 16 to 20, which is directly in line with the plan recommendations. What you're doing with this zoning district by taking a zone district across from across the street, which is an urban residential, is increasing the development potential to three times what is the recommendation of Blueprint Denver adjacent to an area of stability which is less than ten. Mr. Dalton, would you? Councilman. Councilman Espinosa, we will have a chance for comments later. Do you have a question for anyone in there? I just you know, when we when we do these analysis, those colors mean something. And you're you said area wide and you started considering this in a in a far bigger context than what Blueprint Denver is doing. So maybe I didn't understand Mr. Dalton's math, and I apologize, Kyle, for the eminently shaking. But I have to think about what what precedent we're setting. And this is a considerably higher density units per allowable units per acre. If you started as and you like the plan recommendation is, then you could hit the desired recommended recommended unit density. So if I may, I mean, I don't hear a question there, but I'm the Kyle that folks are referring to. Kyle Dalton, Principal City Planner with Community Planning Development. And all I will say is that, well, what we looked at, just to clarify for the record, what we looked at is what blueprint Denver is saying about what it means to be single, family, duplex, residential. And and in this word area Y that we're hinging on is it's in there for a reason. And it's it's important it seems simple that it's one word, but it actually goes to

the intent of Blueprint Denver and how it's used and how we use it in evaluating rezoning applications . Right. Which is not mapped parcel by parcel, but what are you achieving in an area?

What are you giving in a neighborhood, in a region of the city, etc.? So we looked at what would be different because it doesn't define area. We looked at what would be different ways to think about an area since it's within the single family duplex, residential classification we looked at, well, what if we included all of the land that is single family duplex, which is this half block and the one to the north. What would that look like? And that's where if they built 50 units and you look at the number on the ground today, it's still within that range of 10 to 20 acre wide. That's about existing units, not what's possible under the current zone district or under future districts. So I think all of this conversation is kind of points to what Teresa was saying early, over and over again, which is that it's hard to say because you don't know how many units there are, how many people may build next door under their zoning, or if they were to rezone someday. And so again, on the totality of the recommendation, that's how we found it, consistent with single family duplex. But but now I want to I finally found the language so directly verbatim from the blueprint Denver Single Family Duplex. Residential areas are moderately dense areas that are primarily residential but some complimentary small scale commercial uses. There is a mixture of housing types, as you stated before, single family housing, duplex townhouses and small apartment building. The typical densities are between ten and 20 housing units per acre area wide. Again, we're talking about the single family duplex residential area. In the single family, detached structures often predominate. So not I mean, this is in the definition of that land use, the future land use for that area. I don't know. I mean, each area has its own similar write up. And so if it means area wide, it should indicate that it's talking about that in all adjacent areas. But we're talking this is specific language to that area of single family duplex, residential, which is that band. And so it's so I just wanted to make that, that clear because I, I really. This is a incredible uptick in unit density that speaks to that other stuff, but that's a different matter. Thanks. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa, Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem. I just have one question for the developer, and that is regarding access. How would people get into the development from South bound Colorado? Because there's a raised median all the way down to lead style and there's no turn at Ellsworth to get into the alley. How do people access this coming from the north? If they're councilman, I believe if they're only on Colorado Boulevard itself, headed south, but want to get into the property, they would move down to past either Baya

rd or late Steele and turn. But from leech they all they're going to how they're going to get into your project. That's a protected left turn right there. Right, but they'd be on lead still. You're suggesting that they turn. They may well circle as a U-turn or they would be coming. If they're south, south bound, they may well recognize that moving on to Bayard is a more appropriate way to come into the property and moving eastward on Bayard Northern Colorado Boulevard eastward into the property. Again, they get to Bayard by means of several opportunities. First Avenue, First Avenue, multiple opportunities exist. Okay. All right. Thank you. That's all. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. All right. I see no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 249 is now closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you, Mr. President. I didn't have any questions because I know a lot about this project and this neighborhood and this and the way in which this site looks and. I do want to thank the planners for the very careful consideration they gave of this. And I know that you were looking at neighboring projects and trying to make the best of, you know, what could possibly go here. So I do want to thank you for your hard work. And I guess it was very fortunate that you all heard the conversation about garden carts, homes and the difficulties that there are and the ways in which it has been used that were probably not the original intention of a garden cart home. And it certainly is a garden cart form and it certainly is something that we need to look at again. But that's coming down in the future. That's not coming down tomorrow, that's not going to happen tomorrow, that we're going to limit the size of garden carts. So. This is a difficult decision because it's a difficult site. And there's no agreement and no covenant. And so I have to make my decision based on what is possible on this side. How many? Apartments, could there be given the garden cart form? And that what we heard tonight was probably 54, maybe a little bit more. I heard the number 54. But knowing this site, the way I do it, I have walked it and, you know, have adventures on that bad street, which many of us have. We have a site that has very. Awkward ingress and egress it's at that corner of the lead stale bad Colorado Boulevard that is generally a nightmare in the city knows we have to do something about that intersection good development there might help us leverage some of that but but I do mean good development we have an alley that's it's confusing about whether it is an alley. Whose alley what private alley what

not private alley. And we have a Bayard Street that we're not too sure is a street. Certainly wasn't in some original plats but now is as you know is a one way because you can't fit two cars on it. It's a one way part of the way, except for those who know when to. Disobey the law and get up there when you have to. But certainly I never do th

at. So it's just the most unusual sort of configuration of a site and thinking about what could be possible and the number of units on that site make me really think that it does have implications for the health, safety and welfare of this community that. You know, we're not supposed to talk about transportation or mobility, but we can't worry about health, safety and welfare. Of this site. In the possible amount of numbers that could be on this site. And because that's the only. Thing I have to go on is how many could you build? I would have to vote against this zoning and will urge my council members to do the same. Thank you. Norman Sussman And if I could ask everyone in the chamber to please hold your applause until we get to the end so that we do respect that there are two public hearings following this, and we want to get through as expeditiously as possible. Councilman Espinosa. So I apologize to both sides actually for not having moved my own measure on the garden court sooner, since I've been opining it for 12 months. Because I think if we had addressed the capacity and density of these forms, we're probably having a different discussion here today. But that's why that covenant was crucial. Absolutely crucial because the form allowed in that you see in this zone district that being proposed is allows densities that far, far surpass any planning recommendation that we have. And, you know, putting a covenant that that restricted, that limited that would bring that zone district, the proposed own district. It doesn't bring the district in line, but it brings the development potential in line with the plan recommendations. Ideally, we would be talking about some modified zone district to capture this density, the density that is consistent with the plan. But unfortunately, that's not what the applicant put forward or carried to this council. They brought forward a clear RH three without any restrictions, and that has that has allowances for this level of density that is incompatible, incongruent and not supported or by the plan recommendation. So. In. Clearly, it's adjacent. It's you know, when we're talking about this adjacency to an area of stability, this sort of addressing this sort of concern is is pivotal. This is probably going forward, going to be addressed in a future plan update. And I would be curious to see where we end up. But as it's written today, that is a single family duplex recommendation, a 10 to 20 units per acre area and 40 means 54 to 60 units per acre. Is, is, is just it it's just inconsistent. Mean. It's a it's just. It just does not meet that criteria. And and so for that reason, I cannot support allowing a zone district that is that incongruent with our plan recommendations. So I also will be not supporting this rezoning. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro Tem I council members Sussman and Espinosa spoke to some of what I wanted to say. But but I also do

not believe that the criteria have been met. I disagree respectfully with CPD. I don't believe that it's consistent with the comp plan in several respects. We do want to promote infill development in Denver and this is obviously it's a vacant church. It's a site that needs infill. But that doesn't mean that any rezoning will be the appropriate zoning. I don't believe that this is appropriate. One of the things we look for is infrastructure that is adequate to serve the new density that's been proposed. And I believe, in fact, the infrastructure here is lacking, particularly for the street system, as Councilwoman Sussman pointed out. And I don't think it's appropriate to tell people coming from the North that they should turn it First Avenue and cut down Albion Street through the neighborhood for several blocks to get to go around a backyard and come back around to their front door and Colorado Boulevard. This site is uniquely handicapped, I think, by the UN's what I consider to be a long have considered to be an unsafe situation where Leach Dale and Bayard and Colorado Boulevard come together. And so I think it's lacking in that respect and is not consistent with the comp plan. We want to encourage infill that is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. And as Councilman Espinosa pointed out, I don't think that this is the right zoning. There needs to be a rezoning here, but not to this not to this particular category. And the Boulevard Plan, which is quite old, 91, I think it was 1991, but it says that development should that that should improve traffic flow and safety. And I don't believe that making U-turns at Colorado and Leach Dale improves traffic flow and safety. And we should ensure that new development has little or no adverse impacts on adjacent uses. And I believe that this does because of its unique location, at a very troublesome spot on Colorado Boulevard. So for that reason, I and I do do not support this.

Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Councilman Gilmore. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro tem, I want to first say that I apologize that I missed the first public hearing on May 23rd, but have been advised by the city attorneys that I can still vote on this if I have reviewed the video of the hearing and all of the evidence in the record prior to casting my vote. And so I went back and I rewatched everything and we reviewed everything. And, you know, there are two issues around the review criteria that I'm uncomfortable with, the consistency with adopted plan, specifically blueprint. Denver I only can make my decision based upon the evidence that is presented before me. And what I have here is typical densities are between ten and 20 housing units per acre area wide, and that is what I have to go off of. And so with that one, I don't think that this meets that criteria. And then secondly, the, you know, furthering public health, safety and welfare, you know, the ingress and egress. And what really hit me is

I have a 17 year olds who's trying to learn how to drive. And I can never in good faith tell anybody that the way you're going to get into or out of a neighborhood is you're going to have to flip a U-turn. I just from that standpoint, I think that that's a huge infrastructure issue around public health, safety and welfare. And then my second point to that is in my community of Montebello, we have a very, very large apartment building that is, you know, has always had problems with crime. And if you look at that structure, they jam packed people into it. And then when there were issues with the surrounding neighborhood, the powers that be thought that it would be great to put a wrought iron fence around the outside. And so essentially you're trapping people into an area and it is too dense to accommodate the furthering of public health, safety and welfare. And so based on those two right review criteria that I don't feel that it meets, I will not be supporting this rezoning. Tonight. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro Tem. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Councilwoman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. As I said at the hearing, we had in May. I really do believe that density belongs on Colorado Boulevard. Much of Denver was built. I don't know if it was intentionally, but we have huge commercial corridors and they backup to neighborhoods all over our city. Hampton, Colorado Boulevard. My whole district is like that. Evans University, much of our city, Southwest, Denver. And consistently, the people who live in the houses closest to the commercial corridors, they are consistently unhappy. So I just sort of want to acknowledge that it's it's rough living being the the streets that live closest to Colorado Boulevard or to Hampton. I actually live close to both of them and get to listen to them a lot. But. In May. I was going to support this because I'm involved in a similar rezoning on Colorado Boulevard near my own neighborhood, and it is for a suburban context, and it's townhomes. The difference here is that the garden court are not allowed in the suburban context, and so there is not a chance that there would be much greater level density or something that is equivalent to an apartment building. Another difference is in my district. There aren't challenging street configurations. I appreciate what Councilwoman Gilmore said about her kids and what Councilman Flynn said. Quite frankly, when I heard that someone wanted to build density in on that lot, it's so challenging. I can't imagine not that I'm a developer, but if I was, that wouldn't be the place. I would choose to do that. I just think it's such a challenging lot. As we all know, Denver is growing, traffic is increasing. I talked to our traffic engineers today, 58,000 cars a day going down Colorado Boulevard. And I, I don't believe that having a hundred units on that lot is really going to change the traffic on Colorado Boulevard. So I'm not buying that argument, but I do think there are huge chall

enges of how you would get in and out of that, and I question the safety of it. I also found out how many accidents are on that corner. There are about 28 years since 2009, and it's almost double what the typical number of accidents are on that similar kind of roadway. And I think that speaks to the safety of that corner. So my concerns, as I said, are the safety related to the access and then also to some of the criteria. I do again, I do think density does belong on Colorado Boulevard. But the one part that I read of Blueprint Denver that says 10 to 20 units per acre, clearly this is not 10 to 20 units. The orientation to the street. I totally get the garden court problem. It's it's a problem. We're talking about it. And then again, the scale and intensity to the adjacent area of stability. And then also, I don't know that 40 units is moderate density on an acre lot. I've been there many times. I've driven down Colorado Boulevard hundreds of thousands of times in my lifetime. I know it well. I don't know if that meets the criteria either. So I have changed my mind and I will not be supporting it tonight. Thank you, Councilwoman Black. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah, I just. I don't know why I got fixated on the word congruent, which is not the right word. I mean, there's not a congruency

requirement. And so I just want to stress that. But essentially what every time I said congruent, I was basically trying to say when I was saying incongruent, I said I was meaning that does not meet the criteria. And so I want to be I want to simply say that this rezoning, this proposal in district does not meet the criteria. I want to make that very clear because got fixated on that word and kept using it. But I meant to speak to the criteria. And so I want to be clear. Thank you, Councilman. Are there any other comments? Singer and Madam Secretary, Raquel Sussman. No. Black. No. Espinosa. No. Flynn. No. Gilmore. No. Cashman. No. Carnage. Lopez. No. New? No. Ortega. No. Mr. President. No. Did everybody get their vote in their voice and. No. Other vote matching. Is mine. No. I voted. No. I voted. Take a second and just make sure that what you voted on the screen matched what you said or what you would like to vote. All right. Madam Secretary, please close the voting, announce the results. Zero 1's 11 days. Zero 1's 11 days. Council Bill 249 is defeated. All right. And I will ask, because I know there are a lot of people in here, if you could leave as quietly as possible so we can move right into our next one, we would appreciate it. Councilman Cashman, will you please put Council Bill for 73? I mean, sorry, you can stay if you'd like, but if you're going to leave, please leave quietly. Because McAlpin, will you please be comfortable for 73 on the floor for final passage? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 473 be placed on the floor and do pass. All right. We're moving right along here. And last but not least, let's get let's get bills to find a reduc

tion. 553. Great. Councilwoman Kenny had a question. Okay, good or no? I'm sorry. A comment. I correct myself. No vote, though. No vote. Thank you, Mr. President. So 553 this is actually a measure we are referring to the ballot. So for the hundreds of thousands of viewers at home, I thought it was important that we tell you why. We're sending you a question about the Denver preschool program to the ballot. You may remember that you voted last year to approve the Denver preschool tax for another decade, I believe. But what we do in our elections for sales taxes is we try to predict how much money the city is going to get, both from the tax and overall as a city. So we can tell the voters, according to TABOR. And in this case, we I think I'm looking at David, I think we got it right on the sales tax amount, but we were a little low in what the city would take in overall. And so what that means is we need your permission again, because we told you what we thought we were going to take in. We hope that you will tell us again that we should keep the money that we collected for the preschool and use it to get kids head start in life and get them learning their ABCs and safe and quality child care during their start before school. But this will be a vote tonight in our block vote. It appears to send this to you as voters. And so just wanted to make sure folks knew why. And we will need your support to make sure that preschool money keeps in the budget. Thank you. You know what? Thank you so much, Councilman Kennedy, for bringing that up. And we know that kids get a start in preschool, gives them a head start in first and second grade. And so that is data that is proof. So thank you so much for that. Okay. All other bills for introduction are order published. We're ready for the block votes. Councilman Herndon, will you please put the resolution on the floor for adoption? Certainly will. Mr. President, I move that the following resolutions be adopted in a block off series of 2016 601607 372 591 598 604 611 593 595 596. All right. It has been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary Rocha. Flynn, i. Gilmore, i. Herndon, i. Cashman. Hi. Kenny Lopez knew Ortega Susman, my black eye clerk. Espinosa. Abstain. Mr. President. I close voting, announce the results. 12 one abstentions. All right. The resolutions have been adopted. Councilman Hern, please put the bills on final considerations on the floor for final passage. Yes, Mr. President. I move that the following bills for introduction. We place upon final consideration and do pass in a block. I'm sorry. Bill's on final consideration. Do pass, please. On vaccination, do pass. And waiting for the screen. There we go. I'll series 2016 553 564 515 589. Great. It has been moved in second, third roll call. Can each. Lopez New Ortega. Sussman i. Black. I. Clark. I. Espinosa. Flynn. Hi. Gilmore, i. Herndon. Cashman. Hi, Mr. President. I please close the voting and announce the results. Councilman Clark is hanging fir

e. There you go. No problem. Because following us the results. 13 eyes. 13 eyes. The bills on financial consideration have passed. Tonight, there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 42, changing the zoning classification for 45 North Harrison Street. 12 Ice. One Abstention. Oh 12 Eyes Council Bill 549 has passed. Thank you. Congratulations. Councilman Sussman, we please put Council Bill 551 on the floor. Yes, Mr. President. I move that bill 551 be placed on final consideration and do pass. It has been moved. And second it the public hearing for Council Bill 551

is open. May we have the staff report? You may. I'm looking for my. PowerPoint and Miss Lucero to the comments earlier from Councilwoman Canete. Please try and see what page you're on. Okay. When you're turning the page. I'm not seeing my PowerPoint, so I'm going to load it. Okay. But on their. Okay. Sorry for the delay. So for the record, Teresa Lucero with community planning and development. Property we're talking about is 4402 Umatilla Street. Hmm. Soon to get. It is making me. I'm sorry. Are you seeing this? You are seeing this. It does not like. Really just loading the PowerPoint without me looking at an update in a hurry. Madam Secretary, can you. Can you help her up? Three. This is something I did that three times. Tapas. We just. Exchange presentation. We have to activate. Mary Beth, been through enough of these. She's going to go ahead and do the presentation on her screen. Okay. Is this an openness? It meets all the requirements. I mean. Okay. All right. Here. Okay. So 4402 Umatilla Street proposal is to rezone from a former Chapter 59 PD number 358 to urban context. Main Street two storey height limit. Property is in Council District one in the Sunnyside neighborhood. Just at the corner of 44th and Umatilla, the northwest corner south of I-70, east of Federal Boulevard, west of Chaffee Park. I'm sorry. I'm not saying that I'm moving the slides. I am now on request. It was three slides in. It's force of habit. Property is about 12,000 square feet or nearly a third of an acre. It is an existing office sort of industrial use. Property owner is requesting to redevelop the property, add some height, repurpose the existing building, add a new building. So again, the the request is to reason from 8358 to urban context. Main Street two storey. And I'm moving on to the urban neighborhood context. This is a context that has similar use uses to the B to zone districts, which was the basis of the PD commercial land uses and small scale embedded in the neighborhoods, single family and multi-unit primarily located on local or collector streets and multi-unit along mixed use arterials or main streets. And so it is in the urban context and regular pattern of square blocks or rectangular blocks with or without alleys. So again, this is a former Chapter 59 PD. There is also on the property a it's within a view plane, the 51st Avenue and soon a street view plane, which is protecting

a view of downtown from the park at 51st and Zuni. The allowable building height would be 59 to 61 feet, and so would not affect this property because the two storey height limit is way below that. So again, the it's an existing industrial warehouse land use. The PD, the terms of the PD restrict the gross floor area built on the property to about 6000 square feet. The height limit is 25 feet. There are, as I said before, the PD was based on the beat, the old B two zone district, which was a neighborhood serving zone district. So the PD also added a few more intense land, uses special trades, contractor assembly and fabrication, wholesale and retail sales repair, renting and servicing and parking and commercial storage of vehicles. And the PD excluded adult business and single and multi-unit land uses. So I'm moving on to existing context zoning. The we see the existing PD surrounding on the north and east is urban main street two zoning to the south, urban to unit zoning and to the West urban main street to ex zoning. And then to land use existing context. It is an existing one storey building. There are adjacent commercial on either side of 44th Avenue and then adjacent to low density residential land uses on the north and south and then existing context building form and scale slide. These pictures give you an idea of the context we're talking about. The building itself is on the upper right. Another commercial building to the east on the lower right. Duplex across 44th Avenue. On the bottom. Duplex just north of the site on the top. And then another commercial building to the west on the left. So moving on to the process. Notice of receipt of application went out in May of this year. Planning Board heard this on July 20th and by a vote of 8 to 0 recommended approval plan committee saw this on August 16th. And of course, we're here tonight. All of these meetings had the proper public notice and sign postings, as has tonight's meeting. These are the general neighborhood organizations that were notified today. We have no comment letters on this application. So moving on to review criteria, you know this well, consistency with adopted plans. Uniformity of district regulations. Furthering the public health, safety and welfare. Justifying circumstances. Consistency with neighborhood context and zone. District purpose and intent. Review Criteria. The plans that apply our Comprehensive Plan 2000 Blueprint Denver and the Sunnyside Neighborhood Plan, which was adopted in 1992. So consistency with adopted plans. The Comprehensive Plan. Consistency with adopted plans for a comprehensive plan is detailed in your staff report, so I skipped that one. We are on Blueprint Denver. The land use concept is pedestrian shopping corridor, which are these neighborhoods serving areas which are low scaled compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods, similar in land use to our town centers, but definitely lower in scale. And this is property is in an area

of change, which is of course where we want to direct the majority of our growth. Moving on to Blueprint Denver Future Street classification, Umatilla Street is an undesignated locale. West 44th Avenue is a residential collector, and the collector is a balance between mobility and access to the properties and local is more focused on access to properties. So. The Sunnyside Neighborhood Plan. Next slide is has a land use goal of maintaining and stabilizing the residential character of the neighborhood and encouraging small scale shops and offices, particularly in commercial zones along 44th Avenue and Tyrone that would advance and serve the neighborhood. And in their design guidelines for 44th Avenue. They definitely want to discourage auto related or liquor licenses, but encourage development of small scale, neighborhood serving business and small offices and in an economic development recommendation. The plan states we should work towards a goal of concentrated commercial nodes rather than scattered site development. All of the commercial so under review criteria for consistency with adopted plan staff believes this criteria is met by zoning out of a custom zone district to a standard zoned district. We believe we're furthering the uniformity of district regulations citywide, and by implementing our plans, we believe we are furthering the vision for the neighborhood and furthering the public health, safety and welfare. So under justifying circumstances for review criteria, the criteria, the circumstance justifying circumstances changed conditions. The land or its surrounding environs has changed or is changing to a degree that it's in the public interest to encourage redevelopment of the area or recognize the changed character of the area. Property owners cite this as a high profile location with changing conditions and the obsolescence of this. Chapter 59 PD staff believes that changing this building from light industrial to commercial, that is neighborhood serving commercial and implementing the plan and furthering the reinvestment in this in this property is a justified correct is a justifying circumstance for the proposed rezoning. We did talk a little bit about the urban context, single two unit small scale multi-unit commercial land use is usually embedded and the block shapes that are uniform and in a grid street system. The Zone District is intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian scaled commercial and staff believes that this zone district is the appropriate, that this proposal conforms with that. So with that, staff recommends that all of the criteria are met and we do recommend approval. Thank you, Ms.. Lucero. All right. We have one speaker tonight. Ben Gearhart, you have 3 minutes. Good evening. Counsel. Her name's Ben. Gearhart. I'm a resident at 3931 Julian Street. I'm here to answer any questions, so. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. All right. That concludes our speakers. Do we have any questions from members of council? Right.

But we're hearing from Council Bill three, four, two, one is close comments for members of Council Councilman Espinosa. Now, I just want to thank Ben and the applicant and the CBD, but Ben, for taking the time to both talk with my office and with the community, the R.A. and the Pcdi there and having a good dialog before you pursued the eventual application, because I think this is a very sensitive community to the development. There's a certain ethos there, like there are in many other parts of Northwest Denver, and here it's still intact. And so I think they'd love to see neighborhoods serving businesses. I think you're proposing to bring in your development capacity, certainly would allow that. And but to be mindful of that community. And thus far, you have been. So I just hope that that continues as if you pursue any future licensing or anything else along that line. But I do appreciate you being willing to have that dialog with the community. Thank you. Thank you. I will be supporting this rezoning. Thanks. Great. Any other comments by members of council? Madam Secretary, roll call. Espinosa. Hi. Flynn. Hi. Gilmore. Herndon. I can. I can eat. Lopez. Ortega. Sussman. Black. Clark. All right. Mr. President. I please close the voting and announce the results. 12 eyes. Ten Eyes. Resolution 1064 has passed. Congratulations. Council is now convened as the Board of Director of the Gateway Village General Improvement District. Councilwoman Gilmore, will you please put Resolution 1065 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that Resolution 1065 be adopted. It has been moved. One more. Yeah. We got it. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for resolution 165 is open. May we have the staff report? Good evening, board members. Michael Carey again from the Department of Finance Special District Team. I am before you tonight to give the staff report and request approval for the Gateway Village General Improvement District 2017 Annual Work Plan and Budget. The district is located in the northeastern section of the city, northwest of the intersection of I-70 and Chambers Road that consists of approximately 243 acres on the eastern border of Montebello. It is completely developed and primarily consists of residential property. Responsibilities include maintaining the landscaping

and parks within the District. City Council. Approve the formation of the Gateway Village General Improvement District by ordinance number 551 series 1994 and establish City Council as the ex-officio board of Directors of the District. The ordinance also created the District Advisory Board made up of property owners within the guide. The ordinance specified that such property owners are sorry. The ordinance specify that such advisory board should conduct Dimanche, conduct and manage all affairs of the district as the authorized agent of the Board of Directors, including its financial and legal affairs. Pursuant to Resolution Number 32 Series 1995, Denver Ci

ty Council authorized the District's advisory board to create a work plan and budget for approval by the Board of Directors annually. The Gateway Village Guide 2017 Budget proposes overall expenditures of \$315,000 and total revenues of \$484,022. Most of the district's revenue will be generated by a 20 mill levy assessed on real property in the district, which is a 5.7 mil reduction from last year's budget. The major difference between the 16 and 17 budget is that the district will make its final debt payment on December 1st of this year and will no longer have any outstanding debt beginning in 2017. The District intends to create a capital to create a fund to to fund capital projects for 2017. In order to provide a reserve analysis, hire a landscape designer and undertake landscape improvements and tree replacements. City staff has reviewed the 2017 Budget Work Plan and recommends it for approval. Jeffrey Erbe of Center and Vandewalle, legal counsel for the District, is also here and available to answer any questions. Thank you. Thank you, Michael. We have one speaker tonight for this public hearing, Jeffrey Harp. Good evening. My name is Jeffrey Erb. I'm legal counsel for the district. Just here to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you. You can have a seat. This concludes our speakers. Comments by members or questions by members of council. A public hearing for council bill 1065 is closed. Comments by members of council seeing none. It's been first and second at a Madam Secretary roll call. Gilmore. I Cashman. I knew Ortega. I Susman. I black eye. Clark. All right. Espinoza, I. Flynn. Hi. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Ten Eyes. Ten Eyes. Resolution 1065 has passed. Congratulations. The Council is now convene as the board of Directors of the Rhino General Denver General Improvement District. Councilwoman Gilmore, will you please read the resolution? 1066 on the floor? I am trying to find it. Espinosa You want to call out? 1074 question and a vote to postpone? Correct. I move. I move that council bill 1073 placed on final consideration and do pass. Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Catherine Espinosa. We need a motion, so I'm going. And before you do that, actually go ahead and do the motion and then you can make your comments. Okay. I'm going to move that final consideration of Bill 1078 be postponed to Monday, December 5th, to coincide with this other bill we were just discussing. To a date certain. Monday, December 5th. Okay. Um. It's been moved has not been seconded. Okay. It's been moved in. Second comments. Councilman Espinosa. So this is a companion bill to the I mean, I had general questions and I'm sorry, I apologize to everyone. I the date that we were obligated with the 30 day shot clock was the 12th on this one and the 19th on the other one. I wasn't intending to sort of interfere with other other with the project in particular. So I think it's a it's a reasonable c

ompromise to just switch it to a seven day period rather than a 14 day period. And just hopefully Jeff and. Company can can. Get with me right away. Okay. Councilman Herndon. Thank you, Mr. President. A question for Jeff. I was just and I didn't know Kathryn Lopez chimed up earlier. I didn't know if I was going to ask him. I just was curious, is on the west side if this was necessary? I was just trying to figure that out. So that was I. I just want to get to my councilman. Lopez wanted to chime in on that, Mr. President. So I'm from L.A. I'm just curious, I thought. Guzman-Lopez you to chime time and I do not see Jeff Steinberg. You know, I, you know there's you're going to see a series if I, if I can. Mr. President. I'm sorry. I don't want to speak out. Yeah. You're going to see a series. I'll go and look at this. From Public Works. And I think you want to wait till she goes or you want to. Okay. Angela, kasey dec public works. Are you asking if this easement is necessary to go through? What? What is the. Is there a question about the easement? Mine was. Yeah. So just the stopping this how does that the as we start this walking down this path, delaying this, does that have an impact? If we were we're delaying this one vote a week. How does this impact that? I was just going to make sure that wasn't something. I mean, if they if they needed to move forward, they could do that without the easement. It would they would just it would cause an extra step. Okay. And then that's that's just my my concern as a president. That's why I was curious of Councilmember Lopez since he spoke up before, had a concern about that, just delaying for the

sake of delay. I know Councilman Espinosa wanted to line it up. I just wanted to know if what we're if we're possibly missing something. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Councilor Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. Look, I am not a person to just shy away from questions and making sure that all questions are answered. But here's the thing. With Federal Boulevard, it's been in the works for a very long time. There's a lot of moving parts as a lot of different parcels, a lot of different acquisitions, a lot of different things happening. Just and just for folks who understand what this is about, it's adding that northbound lane. It's putting a median down federal boulevard.

Undergrounding utilities, widening the sidewalks, putting trees on some side of it. You know, you want to be able to make federal boulevard walkable and safe. It is one of the it was at 1.1 of the most dangerous strips in the whole state. With that being said, there's a lot of businesses here that have parking lot issues that, you know, whenever we start doing something like this, it literally it's it's throwing a ball bearing into the machine and it could have some unintended consequences. What I don't want to see happen is some of these unintended consequences, being incumbent upon, you know, businesses and, you know, and work hours and things like that.

So, you know, I think if you have questions, ask questions. This is a this is something that's ongoing. You're going to see a lot of these bills come through. That has to do with this with this project. It's part of a bigger it's part of bigger picture of what we want to see is this move forward as fast as possible. Okay. And Alexis. So I just want to clarify for this that this is a utility easement. So we're removing the easement for utilities at this location on a specific area. And so all of those utilities have been moved as part of this project. So there's no there's no controversy. There's no there's no everything's been resolved as far as the easement goes. So, I mean, holding it back is not I mean, there's no there's not any significance to that. I think that's what we need to. I appreciate that. Okay. Council members, we are going to vote on the postponement right now. If the postponement fails, we will then vote again to put this on final consideration and do pass. Okay. It's been moved in second it. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah, I just want to sort of help my colleague. I mean, I think we all understand it, but I just want to clarify that the two bills that I did that I called out are they're only dealing with a very defined piece of property that that is only related to the construction of the new headquarters, not, you know. Well, it might have tangential impact. I mean, relationship to other work does see that as doing you know, we're only talking about things that are within the property lines of that parcel that will then contain the new headquarters in their parking structure like not roadways. All right. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. We're again voting on the postponement of Council Bill 1078. Madam Secretary, Raquel Espinosa Flynn. No Gilmore. No. Herndon, no. Cashman can each. Lopez? No. Ortega, I. Susman. No. Black, no. Clerk, no. Mr. President. No. Close the voting or announce the results. Sorry. Just making sure. So benign. Nice, loving. Four eyes and nine knees. Eight. Sorry, two. Four, eight. NIS. Unless somebody voted incorrectly. Yes, my name. We only have one question. Lopez. Did you mean to vote in favor? I think I voted both. Okay. Just for the record, I voted no, so I know that. Okay. Let's see. So. 12. We have 12 of them. You know, Kelly, I mean, to be a nine. Okay. So so we we have four. We have four eyes. Eight nace. Three eyes. So we have Espinosa Cashman Ortega for I. That's correct. Is that correct? Okay. Three eyes and eight names is that we have. Three and. 939. Okay. This the postponement for Council Bill 1078 fails. Councilman Espinoza, we now move that council bill 1078 to be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It's actually already on the floor, so. Okay. Oh, great. So we can just vote on this. It's been moved in second. Madame Secretary Rocha. Espinosa. No. Flynn. I. Gilmore. Herndon. Cashman. Can eat. Lopez. I. Ortega. I. Assessment I. Black i. Clark, i. Mr. President. I. Close voting

in US results. So just making sure to. Lebanese one day. Okay 11 eyes when they counsel bill 1078 has has passed. Okay. I see no other bill's called out for a separate vote. All other bills for introduction are order published. We now ready for the block vote on resolutions and bills and final consideration councilmembers. Please remember that this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote otherwise. This is a chance to call it a bill for a vote. Because when, Espinosa, will you please vote to put resolutions for adoption and the bills for final consideration on final passage on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the resolutions be adopted in bills on final consideration to be placed on the upon final consideration and do pass in a block for the following items. 1610 4416 1128 1611 3716 1140, 16 1096, 16 1097, 16 1129, 16, ten, six, eight, 16, 11, 21, 1611, 27. 1611 3116 1144 1611 2616 ten 232. 16, 1085, 16, ten, 86, 16, 1088 and 1638. 16, 1038.

All right. It has been moved and seconded. Secretary Roll Call. Flynn I. Gilmore All right. Herndon, I. Cashman can eat. Lopez All right. Ortega I assessment i black. Clark Hi. Espinosa. Hi. Mr. President. I. 12 eyes. 12 eyes. The resolutions have been adopted. The bills have been placed upon final consideration do pass since there are no public hearings, and if there are no objections from members of council, we will not take a recess. Seeing no other business before this body, we stand adjourned. Easier. Council is reconvened. We have one public hearing this evening. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names. If. If you don't mind, in the back. We're going to get started. We all say. It. Excuse me, David. It looks like you have a really adorable baby back there. But if you don't mind, we're going to get started. Tony Massaro. All right. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. If you are here to answer questions only when your name is called, come to the podium, state your name and note that you are available for questions of council speakers. 12 3 minutes. Unless another speaker has yielded his or her time, which would result in a total of 6 minutes on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down. Speakers must stay on topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and refrain from individual or personal attacks. Councilman Cashman, will you please put Council Bill 1034 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move the council bill 1034 we placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded the public hearing for Council Bill 1034 is open. May we have a staff report? Good evening. Theresa is Sarah with community planning and Development. This is a map amendment rez

oning application for 1209 north of Perry Street. The proposed proposal is to rezone from general urban multi-unit, three storey and urban edge to unit to general urban residential mixed use five storeys. So the property is in Council District three in the West Colfax neighborhood, just north of the Perry Street Station and the Lakewood Dry Gulch Park, three blocks south of West Colfax Avenue, four blocks north of West Sixth Avenue. Property is about a quarter of an acre or 11,300 square feet. It is currently vacant. The property owner is requesting the rezoning to prepare the property for redevelopment. So again, the request is to rezone from general urban multi-unit three stories and urban edge two unit to general urban residential mixed use five stories. So the general urban context is characterized by multi-unit residential in a variety of building forms. Low scale commercial imbedded in residential areas. Residential uses primarily located on collectors or local streets. Generally in a grid street pattern. So again general urban multi-unit three stories and urban edge to unit C which is a 6000 square foot lot vacant property surrounding buildings scale of 1 to 2 stories. And on this map I'm not sure you can see well, but there's a darker orange. Those are three properties that are under site plan review for taking advantage of the M3 zoning and building townhomes or a triplex on the smaller property. So we're already seeing redevelopment on this block. Existing zoning general urban multi-unit three storey and urban edge two unit on three sides of the property and south is urban edge two unit. This gives you a little bit of a flavor of the context. Property itself is vacant. To the right is the house just north of the property. And then to the right. Lower right is the property across Perry Street. Then, of course, lower left is the Perry Street Station. And then a property across the alley on the upper left. Most of them. One or two stories, as we said. So informational notice on this went out to all of the registered neighborhood organizations in the area, as well as City Council on August 25th to notify everyone that we had an application that was complete. There was a planning board hearing held on October 19th where planning board voted 10 to 0 to recommend approval of this application. And the application did go to the Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on November 8th and was passed on to this body. And I'm going to take a drink because my thoughts getting dry. And you see here the list of the rhinos that were notified. The West Colfax Association of Neighbors, Sloan's Lake Citizens Group, Villa Park, Neighborhood Association, Denver Neighborhood Association and Inter-Government and Inter Neighborhood Cooperation. Today we have three letters of support that were attached to your staff report. So you know the criteria well, consistency with adopted plans, uniformity of district regulations, furthering the public health

, safety and welfare, justifying circumstances and consistency with neighborhood context and zone district purpose and intent. The plans that apply our current plan 2000 Blueprint Denver and the West Colfax Plan that was adopted in 2006. So comprehensive plan 2000 tells us to protect our air

quality by expanding the use of transit and increasing the mix of uses within our neighborhoods to encourage mixed use transit oriented development to determine the potential for transit oriented development in our station areas in particular, and encourage such opportunities where it is possible. Blueprint. Denver The land use concept is urban residential, a higher density and primarily residential concept, but does include some complementary commercial uses. The property itself is an area of stability and an area of change. It was an area of change. And then the RTD right of way to the south was all an area of stability. And then the alley got relocated to the north of the property. And so we ended up with a little bit of area of stability mixed with the area of change because the blueprint Denver map wasn't changed when the alley was relocated. So the street classifications are Perry Street is a main street collector and 12th Avenue is designated local collectors balance, mobility and the land use. So the West Colfax Plan of 2006 has a framework plan that has future land uses and urban design districts. And this is the section of the plan that speaks to future rezonings of property, and it does designate this property as urban neighborhood station that should be located. These areas are located within a half, half to a quarter mile of the light rail stations. And these the plan says these areas should be single family or multifamily at a scale of 1 to 5 stories. Also in the plan is the concept of growth opportunity, areas that were sort of like areas of change and areas of stability. And this property was designated a growth opportunity area where existing housing stock is dated and declining and it might be appropriate to redevelop the area. And this just shows you that urban neighborhood station designation from the West Colfax plan and this is the showing you the residential growth opportunity area. It's a little hard to read, but the red properties are that residential growth opportunity. The other thing that this map shows is multi-modal green streets, which Perry Street happens to be one where the plan talks about beefing up the urban design and the multi-modal use of this street. It's important because it connects to Colfax and it connects to the St Anthony's redevelopment. So the land use recommendations out of the West Colfax plan are to recommend higher density for housing diversification and higher density in strategic locations like station areas, main streets and town centers, and to support infill development and mixed use projects and says the plan says these are especially appropriate at town centers along Main Streets and in close prox

imity to transit stops. The West Colfax Plan also designates the area in district plans where it talks about the character of the area and talks about in that section of the plan redeveloping the edges of Villa Park and the West Colfax neighborhood. So this just shows you the designation of the Pleasant Hill Station in the West Colfax Plan with that staff believes that this application conforms with all of the plans and furthers the uniform uniformity of district regulations. By going to a standard zone district that's not custom. That will have the same rules throughout the city for that zone district and furthers the public health, safety and welfare by implementing the city's plans. Justifying circumstances, its changed conditions, the land or its surrounding environs has changed or is changing to a degree that it's in the public interest to encourage redevelopment of the area. CPD believes this criteria is met. There is major investment in this area with the light rail. Metro White Light Rail. Redevelopment of St Anthony's within a half mile are the Knox and Perry Street stations. So this area is definitely undergoing change. So we believe there is. Correct. Justifying circumstances. There is changing conditions. And we did talk a little bit about the general urban neighborhood context, multi-unit, residential and a variety of building forms. Low scale commercial embedded within residential areas. Commercial uses in a variety of building forms. The X5 is intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian, scaled, diverse areas and activating the public realm. The mixed use residential mixed use zone district. You can have ground storey retail, but you can't have upper storey retail. You only are allowed lodging or residential uses in the upper storeys and you can also have a strictly commercial building. But if you have a strictly commercial building over 10,000 square feet, I mean strictly commercial building, then you're only allowed a building of 10,000 square feet in that zone district. And there is only one. Building form allowed and that's the shopfront building for. So staff believes that the g r x5 is the appropriate zone district for this property and. And staff recommends approval. Thank you very much. We have two individuals signed up to speak this evening. First up, we have Bruce O'Donnell. Thank you, Mr. President, of members of the council. My name is Bruce O'Donnell, and my address is 386 Emerson Street in Denver. And I'm delighted to be your last matter of business this year. And before you everybody gets out for the holidays, I am not going to repeat Theresa's entire presentation. I'll try to be brief. I do want to point out that we did have good community engagement with two RINO's, as Theresa

said, and have positive community input and feedback in support of the application. This is in a blueprint Denver area of change and in the West Colfax plan. This calls for tod type redevelopment with five storey heights and hundred percent

lot coverage, which is exactly what the proposal on the District of gr5 accomplishes. This zone, district and this rezoning were initiated prior to the moratorium on the slot home form, specifically because this on the street would make it almost impossible to do that with the transparency requirements and the build tos and so forth. And so if that is in your mind at all tonight, this is being done because it's consistent with the moratorium and you're thinking on precluding that building for them. I also am available to answer any questions this evening. Should you have any? But consistent with the staff recommendation for approval and Planning Board's recommendation for approval. I requested City Council approved MAT in the amendment application 2016 i00026 rezoning 1209 Perry Street to grx5. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, David Roybal. Hello. Good evening, counsel. Thank you for the honor to speak names. David Roy Bach, Star Citizen, a large 21 or seven cell. Jason Street, born and raised in this area, went to Lake Middle School. This area means a lot to me of the tragedy that we happened that we had there. Which are we lost? I went to school with the Mother Lake. It's a part of the Midwest. We used to have a time we used to have a studio there. It was called Time Council Studio, and we had a store three blocks away. So when it says General, General Urban, mixed use, I just hope it's an area that can serve the community and it's something that I want to pay attention to. And I hope constituents on Channel eight are paying attention to of the first rezoning on on the south side of Colfax. You know, we already know what happened already on the other side of of Colfax by Lake Middle School. It's a neighborhood I don't know. I don't even know. I grew up there, but I don't look like it. So I just want to be real cautious. If this is the first rezoning that's going to start pushing into the West Side that is affecting all of Villa Park because Villa Park actually goes all the way through the whole Lakewood Gulch. And I've been part of the eminent domain, the light rail, since 2007, and I've seen the long, hard battles that was fought for the property along there. So it's kind of overdue to see a rezoning there after the light rail. It's a huge transit area from the light rail. Kids walk to there from lake a lot of kids it's a kid access to go to school the nine bus so I just hope that it's something that's good and doesn't change it and I just sort to know how they reached out to the Jewish community because that is a huge part of Jewish Denver that's still there, been there for hundreds of years, at least 125 years. And I just speak in support of this, that it's going to help strengthen the community and not bring any gentrification and divide the west side. Thank you very much. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of council. All right, Councilman Espinosa. Theresa, quick question. Is the e utu c a protected zone distri

ct. It is. But in this case, there is an intervening right of way. And so. And we move that right away to the north of the property. But there's still some left now. So the E2 C is on the south border where the train track is. Yes. And there's some right of way there between the station and the property. Yeah. Okay. So enough to. Separate the separate. And so the protected district has no effect. Great. Because that's that's where I was going with that as I was hoping that we were in a upper story setback situation on the south side of this building. So you're just confirming that that is not the case? That is not the case. Wonderful. Thanks. No further questions. Thank you, Councilman, because we know. All right. The public hearing for counsel, Bill 1034 is closed. Comments by members of council and council. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. This particular rezoning started pretty early on. It makes one you know, I was very happy with the the community outreach that took place. As you see, one of the neighborhood associations had signed off on it and they didn't get any letters of opposition from either Villa Park or West Colfax. We can see it kind of speaks for itself, the fact that it's right on 12th and Perrier, where the light rail station is, this is exactly the kind of density that calls for. It is that area of change. But when you when you see where that station is, it's important that that we're able to increase the amount of units and availability for folks to be able to use that light rail station. Otherwise, as a light rail station, it goes through a single family neighborhood. And when you look at the West Colfax plan, when you look at the Villa Park plan, a little parks and older plan, it doesn't account for the library or not the library outside the light rail station. But when you go to that West Colfax plan to the north, it does talk about that particular area picking up. And when you look at blueprints, you know, long standing call for area of change in that area. This is what it is. You know, back in 2010 when we did the citywide rezoning, you know,

we knew that, you know, the opportunity would come where we would actually see more increased development that really utilizes that the West Line and to be able to see, you know, this become a little bit tighter of his own district and find out I think it's a. It's a plus for the community. So you know that we have no opposition. I don't have any opposition to this particular rezoning. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Espinosa. I just want to thank the applicant for moving forward with our x five because of the storefront form. I think we can sort of at least your architecture can turn the corner. I hope that it does and address that. The Gulch and it does provide some ground for activation if you choose to if the opportunity is there. So hopefully you're open to tell what Mr. Roybal is saying and see if there's any need in the community. But I recognize that once the zoning

is in place, it could be 100% residential. And so it goes. At least here's a place where the form based zoning code may get it right. We'll see. But that was it. That's all. I do like this as a zoned district in this sort of context, more so than some of the other ones we've allowed thus far. Thanks. Thank you, Councilman. Seeing no other comments, madam secretary. Raquel Lopez. I knew Ortega a black eye. Espinosa. I flinn. I Herndon. I question can eat, Mr. President. All right. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Tonight. Tonight, Kels Will 1034 has passed. On Tuesday, January 17th, 2017, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 1193, changing the zoning classification for 2099 and 2101 31st Street and a required public hearing on Council Bill 1199 Changing the zoning classification. And depending, we have nothing. All right. Madam Secretary, will you please put the first item up on our screens? And, Councilman Cashman, will you please put Resolution 1324 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, I move the Resolution 1324 be adopted. It has been moved and seconded and comments by members of Council. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. As I shared earlier, I was out of town. I did not have an opportunity to get a briefing, so I'm not sure what this is all about. Therefore, I'm going to be abstaining on the vote on this one tonight. So I'd like it out for a vote. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. See no other comments, Madam Secretary. Rocca. Ortega. I'm sorry. Hold on. Councilman Espinosa, did you. Did your name pop up at the last second there before we went to the screen? Yeah, I was just going to explain my abstinence as well, so I'll be abstaining because I didn't get the briefing as well. And that's on me, so. All right, Madam Secretary. Raquel Ortega. Abstain. Sussman a black eye. Espinosa. Abstain. Flynn, i. Gilmore. Herndon, I. Cashman. I. Can eat. I. Lopez All right. New. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Nice to meet you. Nine eyes, two abstentions. Resolution 1324 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, if you could please put the next item up on our screens. Councilwoman Canete, you've called out comfortable 919 for a comment. Go ahead. Excuse me. Excuse me. Thank you. Communications. Madam Secretary, do we have any communications? None, Mr. President. We do have one proclamation this evening, and I will be reading that as proclamation 0011 2017 celebrating the National Western such stock show Radio Rodeo and Horse Show to Denver. And if you look up here and you're wondering why we all looked so crazy as city councilmembers, that's why. Because it is a national stock show week and I'm read this proclamation. We're asked the annual National Western Stock Show Rodeo and Horse Show opens in Denver for the 111th time on January seven, 2017. And. Whereas, the National Western Stock Show is stored a story treasured of

Denver's pass with a unique and colored history dating all the way back to 1906. Whereas Mayor Robert W Spear declare Wednesday, January 34th first 1906 as Denver Stock Show Day, an official holiday in the city of Denver so everyone could partake in the first ever stock show in Denver. It was on this day that the banks, the banks, department stores and other businesses on every corner of Denver shut their doors at noon while the streetcars hustle from 15th Street, Loup down every 3 minutes to the stockyards site and the Burlington Railroad raged and rush special trains from the Denver Union Depot for a round trip charge of \$0.25. Those were the days. Whereas today the primary mission of the National Western Stock Show is to educate urban and suburban citizens about the importance of understanding and preserving Colorado citizens, about the importance of Western heritage in agriculture, providing city kids a hands on experience with farm animals, and to host one of the world's largest professional rodeo and horse shows. And. WHEREAS, The National Western Stock Show annually attracts more than 600,000 visitors in just a couple of weeks from over 50 states and 40 foreign countries, and contributes approximately 100 million to the Denver economy. And. WHEREAS, activities during the 16 day

event include Wild West shows, show horses, dancing horses, extreme dogs, the Super Bowl of Livestock Shows and Art of the Expedition, and also Colorado's largest agriculture trade show. And. Whereas, The City and county of Denver has embarked on a historic partnership with the National Western Stock Show, Colorado State University, the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. The Colorado History. A History Colorado Museum setting in motion the development. The National Western Center with a mission to become a global destination and agricultural heritage and innovation now therefore being proclaimed by the City and Council, the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that that the Council hereby enthusiastically, as you can see by our dress, welcomes the 100 and left 111th annual national Western Stock Show Rodeo and Horse Show to Denver extends its best wishes for another exciting and successful year and encouraging Denver residents. To saddle up and enjoy the show. Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest and affix a seal to the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and the copy be transmitted to the National Western Stock Show, Rodeo and Horse Show. And I move the proclamation 10011 series of 2017 be adopted. It has been moved. And second it I'll make a couple of comments because I'm sure we'll have a ton of comments by members of council. I'll take us back to 2011, and it was about the spring when there were conversations that we could lose the Fox show . And, you know, there's probably the class that I came in with, which was Councilman Ortega and Councilwoman Kennedy and Councilman Herndon also Sus

sman. One of the things we were all run for office we all heard about was don't let the stock show leave. This is one of the most storied projects and events in our city. And it was amazing because it was every neighborhood was saying how important this event was and how much it means to Denver. And, you know, as someone who was running for office, it allowed me to really understand what Denver is all about and how Denver cares about its hair, its heritage. The other thing that just shocked me was that kids and specifically my three kids, my urban kids, love the stock show more than they love Disneyland, more than they love images, more than they love everything else. They love the Styrofoam, and they can't wait for the stock show to happen because there's something special about kids in the urban environment connecting to our agriculture agricultural roots here in the state of Colorado. And so I'm excited to be supporting this. And now, with our eyes fixed on the future of what the National Western Center can be, this this stock show, this just two or three weeks long, is now going to be a year round venue mix with other institutions so that we start really talking about how to take agriculture throughout the world and what is it truly mean to feed the world. That is the vision of the stock show and we're really excited about it. And I want to say this because I think it's really important. I think any time you do a large project in a city, there's going to be all kind of controversy around it. The stock show last year during the bond initiative to see every precinct in the city of Denver supported, to see every precinct. More than that, the neighborhoods surrounding the stock show enthusiastically support what is happening at the National Western Center. And so it is it is my pleasure to bring this famed proclamation forward. My colleague, Councilwoman Monteiro, brought it four years before me and before her, Councilwoman Ortega as well. And so I'm excited to put this forward and now let my colleagues chime in. Councilman McKinney. Thank you, Mr. President. I don't have much to add to your your glowing proclamation. I will add that in addition to the cultural heritage it brings, we appreciate the job growth that's going to come from both the construction phase as well as the permanent jobs. Many of us have been engaged in conversations about how to make sure that that benefits the residents of the city and really helps build new career pathways. So it's both, you know, once a year show, but coming a year round attraction and a year round facility as well is a goal. I did want to share some bad news that we just got, which is that the parade for this year will not be occurring on Friday as it was scheduled. So for members of the public who may have been planning to go and watch the steers come down the 16th Street Mall appears that the cold weather and snow forecast in the interests of safety. They are not going to be having the parade this year

. So just wanted to let the public know that if you might be watching. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you. Councilwoman, can each councilman do. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to wholeheartedly support the proclamation and just say that Kelly Lee, the executive director of the National Weather Center, gave a wonderful presentation that the Land Use Transportation Committee meeting this morning. And if anyone in the public missed that, they can see it again on Channel eight. It was so informative. He went over what was going to be involved with the West

National Weather Center. The wonderful developments are going to be here. The partnerships are going to be. Developed with the whole center. And if you haven't had a chance to see it, I encourage you to check it out. Generally. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman Nu. All right, Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to say that, you know, I grew up in Denver and I'm a bit of a city slicker. And the first time that I ever saw most of the. Animals that I've ever seen other than the ones living in my yard was at the stock show. And I remember as a kid going there on field trips and going out there and having that experience that I would have never had otherwise. So I'd encourage all families living in the city, get your kids out there. I remember it was the first time literally I ever saw a chicken in my life. Was at the stock. Show. And I think as an environmental educator before this job, that connection, when you're when you're a city dweller, when you live in the city, that connection to the environment but also to where our food comes from is so important and so critical for all of us to really understand. And then I just want to point out that today, even because of the stock show, I had another first for a city slicker like me and that I rode my bike to work, which I do on a daily basis in cowboy boots. Just for this proclamation. So thank you, Mr. President, for bringing this forward. And thank you to the stock show for continuing to push me a little bit out of my comfort zone as a city slicker. That's incredible. It's cold outside. All right, Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to chime in on the comments being made about this annual event, as you indicated in the proclamation, the. The financial contribution that it gives to the city coffers each year is is important, impressive and will only continue to grow once the facility is built out. I appreciate the fact that there continue to be ongoing conversations with the adjacent neighborhoods regarding the build out of the stock show complex. Some of the issues that we heard in testimony earlier prior to this comment about environmental issues are also issues that will have to be addressed as part of the clean up of the soils of the national western complex. And that was part of the \$800 million that was approved by the taxpayers. That includes the build out of this complex. The oppo

tunities that this presents for young people in our community is really important. As a couple of my colleagues have stated, you know, if if it weren't for this event, most inner city kids would never have the opportunity to actually pet some of these animals. And they have a small petting zoo as part of the stock show where you can go up to the top floor and actually have pictures taken with your kids, petting some of the various animals that are in that section. It's an opportunity for farmers and ranchers to be able to purchase some of the equipment that they need for their facilities, for their ranches and farms, and for people like me that like to go look at the apparel, boots, skirts, shirts, jackets, you know, those kinds of things. It's an opportunity. And that's where part of that sales tax revenue comes back to the city of Denver. So for families who have not had a chance to get out there, I would encourage them to take their children. We do have the opportunity where a number of kids get to go with their schools. The schools take tours not just from Denver, but from throughout the metro area. And so it's not unusual to see busses lined up with small kids, you know, going to enjoy this annual event. So to the folks at National Western, thanks for your ongoing work and all of the additional work that's yet to be done that looks at building this out. That brings CSU to be one of the partners in this. I know at some point in 2017, we'll be having a conversation on what that government structure is going to look like. So there's there's still additional conversations yet to be had about, you know, kind of what this is going to look like, not just physically, but how it will function and interface with the city approval processes , etc., etc.. I know that as contracts were being let out, compliance with our cities and BWB goals is another important element that I understand is being complied with as well. So lots of fun and exciting things happening with this overall complex and the things that are yet to come in the future. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. As the council representative for Southwest Denver District two, very proud to be apparently be the only member wearing the white hat tonight as the home of the the former family ranch of longtime stock show CEO and now chairman Patrick Pat Grant. I would just like to say that that it's a wonderful occasion to have the stock show here in January. But I'm a little dumbfounded having always associated the stock show weather with below zero temperatures that we're not going to see the parade this year. Thank you, Mr. Chair. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. When I when I was. Yeah, just as a tween in Wyoming, I just dreaded wearing snaps, shirts with snaps. But I do want to thank the stock show, because now in my elderly years, it's kind of fun. So you guys give me that opportunity to own this fancy hat. And the other on

e I bought this summer and these duds and and it's in, in really just wanted to take this opportunity to say it's a wonderful thing and I'm glad it's been here for a long time and it will be here for a long time . And I want everybody to know that it is a lot of fun and you will find something to do there. So, you know, if you find yourself with. Any time in these next. 22 days or. Whatever it is, get out there and just spend it there and you're going to have a good time. So thank you. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Lopez. Thank you. Council President Brooks, I thank you for bringing this proclamation forward again and again. I love being able to see the stock show in town. But also it's one of those things that's almost like a Grateful Dead concert where you can actually smell it before it comes. Right. Councilman Castro. He's never bought it. No, I used to take the tickets at McNichols and you can hear the you can almost smell the dead heads come in before they walked in the place. The same thing with the stock show the other day. We were outside and my daughter, what's that smell up. Up on as a stock show. And that's how, you know, in Denver, the stock shows in town. And, you know, the good thing is that this year, the second year, we actually get to celebrate the passage of two C and our reinvestment in the stock showing not necessarily keep. It was always going to be in Denver. You know the 100 year lease kept it here. But you know for us as making sure we had the the facilities that that rightfully the stock show deserve. This is the Super Bowl of rodeos. This is the Super Bowl of the stock shows and in the in the U.S. And it deserves that that infrastructure that that was starting to age. And the good thing is that we're keeping it's like an old Chevy. We're keeping the good parts, the nice chrome or polishing, but we're just restoring and taking it to another level. I just want to remind folks that, you know, as as much as we, you know, in the campaign and in this effort, as much as we really, really concentrated on those those facilities and upgrading that stock show and modernizing it, let's remind ourselves that we also are restoring a mile of the Platte River and making a park space out of a connecting to the grid into Elyria in Swansea and Globeville. And it's infrastructure for the community and yes, jobs. But it's also an opportunity if we're going to talk about agriculture, I think we should talk about making sure that that community has a grocery store. Finally, this is a neighborhood that has been dying for a grocery store. It's the one thing that we've always wanted to see happen. And this is the opportunity, if we really wanted to create that that tie to agriculture and teach folks, especially our children, that the food doesn't just magically appear at the store, that it's it's it's harvested. There's a science behind it. There's it's grown, it's picked, there's labor, there's hands, hands like mine. My

grandfathers grew up in all in love that picked these beets, right? That put these on the store shelves. And so there's that whole history there. And that's our opportunity to teach it, but also our opportunity to actually fill in the blanks in some of these areas. And I think the stock show presents that opportunity, and I would love to be able to see that happen sometime soon. And, you know, the stock show, it is it's our culture, it's our history. And it's nothing of the past. And it's much more than just just a style of dress. It's it's who we are in Colorado. And you know what, Councilman Clark, like, you grew up here, but. In Westwood and in Barnum. We had chickens all the time, and they were delicious, man. The goats are delicious. So. Yeah, it doesn't you know, it's not a a rare occurrence to hear roosters in the morning in the West Side or, you know, smell the delicious goat that used to be chewing on your grass at a barbecue not too long. I'm talking about things that we don't permit. Anyway, having said that, I'm really I'm really proud to see the 111th in Denver again. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, I think County Councilman Cashman, you're up. Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for bringing this proclamation forward. It is really exciting to be on Denver City Council in 2017 and and have a role at helping to shape this bright, shiny ever becoming more and new city that we're building for the 21st century and beyond. And where it's probably never been more important that we reach back to our roots that actually define us. There are other cities around the country and around the world that have these bright, shiny new buildings and new infrastructure. But there's not another city in the country that has a celebration of Western culture as the National Western Stock Show. So it's it's institutions like the National Western that truly do that have separated us as a city since our our founding, and we'll continue to as we move forward. So I'm just proud that my name to this proclamation. Thanks, Mr. President. Hey, thank you. Councilman Cashman, Calhoun, Ortega. You back up? Yeah. Just very briefly, I just wanted to ask that when you invite general manager Paul Andrews to come up, if maybe Paul, you wouldn't mind giving us an idea of the size of the purses for the winning cowboys that will be competing in

the rodeo. Bull riding and bronc riding. Thanks. Thank you. Great. This concludes our comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black. Hi. Clark. Hi, Espinosa. Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. Herndon. Hi. Cashman. I can eat by Lopez. All right. New Ortega? Yeah. Sussman Hi. Mr. President. G r. 12 ice. T 39. 1313. I. Yeah, I got a deal right here. I can see it is 13 eyes and proclamation, 11 passes. There is an individual I'd like to bring up. He got here just in the nick of time. We didn't think he was going to make it. He is the CEO of the National Western Stock Show and he has been an incredible partner. As we develop the Nationa

I Western Center, please put your hands together for Mr. Paul Andrews. You guys, you're too kind. Thank you. As a hand. So excuse me for being tardy with the cancelation of the parade. You know, I'm going to go down in history as one of two presidents that have canceled the parade. But I'll explain that to you all here in a moment. But thank you. Before I do, thank you so much for all your great comments. It's humbling to hear all of you speak about the nation of Western, an institution that started in 1906, founded on education and agriculture and celebrating our Western heritage. You all take it very seriously. I can clearly see that. And we're very thankful to have all of you representing this fine city. And I also want to thank Mr. President here, who also is our representative in District nine. We're very lucky, Elvis, to have you. In all seriousness, and look forward to working with you closely in the future as well. The smell that you smell when the stock show is in town actually is the smell of money. And it's the smell of money because we are being visited by almost 600,000 people that are staying in our hotels, that are eating in our restaurants, that are showing their animals at our show. There will be almost all 50 states represented at the National Western Stock Show this year. Last year we had 42 states. We're growing by leaps and bounds. The enthusiasm for the Super Bowl of livestock shows is here and it's here to stay. And Denver is the place that it's going to continue forever. And that's what we're excited about. Rodeos we have, as you know, we start this weekend with our rodeos, three rodeos on opening day, Colorado versus the world champions of Colorado rodeos will face off against the world champions. It has become a spectacle to see. In fact, the Cowboys at the NFR in Las Vegas this year were texting us as the competition was going to confirm that they were going to be here for Colorado versus the world. That is a huge testament to this state, huge testament to this city and the enthusiasm the Cowboys have. So the question was asked by Council Woman Ortega, what is the rodeo purse? We will give out this year? Almost \$700,000 in rodeo prize money. That will make us one of the top five rodeos in the world that will be performing this year. And you really can't count the NFR in Vegas and they are occupying the top few spots. But if you took them out, we'd be in the top three spots. And that is something to be said. And I can assure you as we enter the phases of the National Western Center, we will be able to increase that pot, making it even more lucrative for the Cowboys to come enjoy their 16 days in January right here with us. So enthusiasm is high and the parade usually is our kickoff. And boy, it became very, very crystal clear to me this morning from about 8 to 1030 in the morning with various representatives of Denver law enforcement, as well as meteorologists from all over this city. In consultation with me about

the snow event that will occur Wednesday evening into Thursday, coupled with frigid low temperatures, it is just too risky to put animals out in that. Thus, it will cause potential injury both for the animal as well as any spectator. If you can imagine a horse that has shoes on, walking on ice, potentially, if that horse goes down, we would have a cataclysmic event and me as president and CEO will not allow that to happen. So unfortunately, we're going to usher in stock show this Saturday with the start of Colorado versus the world 800. Both spaces will be open and our trade show that was mentioned, we will have horse shows. We will have a ranch rodeo that day. And we will celebrate on Sunday, the Mexican rodeo extravaganza for two nights on Hispanic Heritage Day. And we will celebrate Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, three nights a PBR bull riding for those of you that just want to watch the Bulls. So again, thank you all for your tremendous support and thank all those voters that might be watching this that have continued to support the National Western Stock Show. Every district in this city voted yes for to see. And that really is a testament to the leadership of all of you and the testament to the deep roots that the Nation of Western Stock Show has here in Denver, Colorado. Thank you. Yeah, thank you, Paul. And thanks for your leadership. Really appreciate it. I just thought that the National Western Stock Show will be alone because there's no Bronco playoffs. So I think you're going to get a lot more attention and probably some more dollars as well. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Looks like you don't need any follow up questions.

Okay. Okay, great. All right, let's see here. Can you pull? Oh, you've got it already. Council Resolution 1240. Councilman Flynn, how would you like once you make your comments and then we can proceed? Thank you, Mr. President. I initially, as you know, intended to call this out for a vote because I had some significant questions about how this contract came to us for a \$5.9 million amendment after it was out for only four months. I received the the administration's response as after we had begun our public comment session. So I haven't had time to read it. So I would like to request the one week postponement under Rule 3.7 and have this up for a vote at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Thank you. Okay. Under our new rules, there will be no vote required. You can just ask for the postponement, and we can. Which I just. Did. Okay, great. Thank you. I just letting the public know. Great. All right, Councilwoman, can you please put. Actually, you don't have to put that on floor. We're going to go straight to your your bail councilwoman can each, which is 919. 12 Eyes Council built in 71 has passed. Congratulations. Thank you, everyone, for your conversations. Councilman Flynn, will you please put Council Bill 1125 two on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move the council bill 1125 series of 2016 be placed up

on final consideration and do pass. All right. It has been moved in second it the public hearing for council bill 1125 is open. May we have the staff report from Ryan whenever. Good evening council president members of city council. Hey, good evening. My name is Ryan Winterberg live with community planning and development here to present rezoning 2016 i00058, which is from 1154 to 1166 South Lincoln Street from RMU 20 waivers and conditions to you are age 2.5 with a waiver. So our subject site is located in Council District seven and it is in the Platte Park statistical neighborhood. Zooming in, we can see that it is located on South Lincoln Street between East Mississippi and East Arizona Avenue. We are on slide four here excuse me. And it is located less than one half of a mile from the Louisiana Pearl Station and less than one half of one mile from the I 25 and Broadway station on two. Slide five, as the property is quite four four of an acre, it is comprised of five parcels and five single family homes constructed in 2015. And the property owners are requesting a rezoning to do a couple of things. So the first is to bring the property into the Denver zoning code and provide a transition from the adjacent lower scale residential uses located to the south and to the east, as well as bring 1166 South Lincoln into compliance with zoning standards due to an unintentional error in development review, the site does currently not conform with its existing zoning, but the proposed zoned district does capture the existing built condition. The rezoning will also change the site from a controlled district to a protected district, with the exception of the proposed waiver that will waive the application of the Protected District Bulk Plan on the Northern property, and we'll talk a little bit more about that. So the request is to resign from army 20 waivers and conditions to you are h 2.5 with a waiver. Our request is within the urban neighborhood context. It is a rowhouse district permitting maximum building heights of 2.5 storeys. So the waiver request, the waiver is specifically intended to waive the protected district designation of the urh2 point five zone district along the northern boundary of the proposed rezoning area. For the purposes of applying a protected district bulk plain to the north on the existing multifamily units located to the north of the subject site. So in effect, the intent of the proposed rezoning would be to keep those existing multi-unit structures located to the north of the rezoning area as conforming structures due to the waiver of that application of the bulk plan and all other protected district standards, including maximum building height, would still apply. And why a waiver in this particular case. Speed policy supports the use of waivers where there is a the waiver helps address an issue that CPD is committed to addressing in a future text amendment. And there are a couple items here that this map amendment case reveale

d to us. The first is that the Denver zoning code does not currently list bulk plains standards as a standard that renders a structure compliant. So through the introduction of a standard, you are h 2.5 some district or any control district. Existing structures would be rendered non-conforming, even though they were built in conformance with the zoned zone district standards at the time of their construction. And we do anticipate that as properties rezone into the Denver zoning code, the interaction of these protected districts in the Denver zoning code with remaining former Chapter 59 control districts, may create additional nonconformity . So if we think to areas like Stapleton, additional parts of Gates and Lowry, of course, this Map Amendment case has brought one of these to light. But this case does warrant the additional need for further analysis and identification of appropriate solutions. So now to existing context and I'm on Slide nine, moving on to ten. So the

subject site is again, RB 20 waivers and conditions resound in 2004 as part of a larger rezoning area. We can see it located to the north and to the east. It is a primarily residential district, while allowing for limited civic and commercial uses. However, the civic and commercial uses are not permitted within 50 feet of any single or two unit use, so they would, in effect, not be allowed at our subject site. On to the specific waivers and there's more detail in your staff report. But the two that are most important today are that the waiver is currently applied to the subject site limit, both permitted uses across the entirety of the site and specifically the southernmost slots. That's the 1166 South Lincoln site. And additionally, height is waived for the 1166 South Lincoln site to 35 feet in height to intended to respond to the scale of adjacent existing structures and provide a transition between new development and existing lower scale residential development. Looking to surrounding zoning. We can see to the south of our subject site you too, you see, and you to be one to the south as are both protected zone districts. And then looking to the west across Lincoln Street, we see RMU 30 with waivers and conditions. Another former Chapter 59 zone district as well as the umx3 zone district and see Annex 12 located along the higher intensity Broadway and Mississippi intersection. And in Slide 13. So there is a general development plan that applies to the subject site. It is the gates is GDP approved in 2007 and it is the 29 acre site and was required by the RMU 23 ME 30 A.M.E. 30 zone district. It essentially contemplates the redevelopment of the former Gates East site. Urban Design Standards and guidelines also applied to the GDP area coterminous with the boundary. You will see that our subjects height is located within sub area two, which is a lower scale residential area. We'll see that reinforced in the GDP as we move on. The site is also within the Washington Park View plane

specifying maximum building heights for all structures. And the view plan does specify a maximum building height of 104 to 105 feet so far above the proposed, knocking them at height of 35 feet. Onto land use. We can see that our subject site is single unit residential. It is surrounded by a single unit and two unit uses to the east and to the south. To the north we see multi-unit users facing onto open space again with some commercial to the north of Mississippi. And we see a large area of vacant property as well as some remaining commercial structures along the Broadway corridor. Now to see photos of our site in the upper left hand corner. This is an image of the five single family homes proposed for rezoning in the upper right hand corner of the multi-unit structures located to the north of the subject site. And then typical photos of the surrounding context. Two units, single unit, as well as the substantial vacant property across the street on Lincoln. Terms of process. The following three registered neighborhood organizations were notified throughout the rezoning process, and we received four letters of support from neighborhood property owners, as well as the plot Per People's Association received on an original application that has since been amended. In terms of process, we receive notice of receipt of application June 17th, 2016. A planning board public hearing was held on August 17th and continued until September 21st. On October 14th, CPD received notice every revised application. So the application before you today. And on October 17, the Planning Board voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of the rezoning at the LUDIE Committee. Move the bill forward on November 14th and notice of today's City Council public hearing was sent on December 19th, on Tuesday 20. So on to the review criteria. Slide 21. For consistency with adaptive plans, we have three plans that apply to the subject site, slide 22. The first is comprehensive plan 2000. We did find the rezoning consistent with comprehensive plan 2000 as seen here and articulated in your staff report. To Slide 23. Blueprint DENVER The city's land use and transportation plan can see that are subject site is called out in an employment concept land use area. So these are areas that include office warehousing like manufacturing and technology. But we do find that this is of limited applicability. So we do look to the surrounding context, such the south of Arizona, we see a recommendation for single family, residential and the resulting development pattern that has occurred within this area, within the redevelopment of the Gates East Plan is consistent with the single family residential, where employment base is significantly smaller than residential. That has occurred within the area. Also see their subject site is located within an area of change where Blueprint Denver specifically recommends addressing edges between areas of change in areas of stability and furthering compatibility between exi

sting and new development. We find that the application of the U. R 2.5 zone district with a waiver not only recognizes the resultant land use pattern consistent with recommendations to the South, but does provide a transition between the lower scale single-family and duplex areas located to the

south, to multi-unit uses located to the north, and higher intensity development that is permitted to the west. Under street classifications means that Lincoln is an undesignated local, so providing local access less influence on traffic volumes. 2.5 Zone District is appropriate for this local classification. And on to the Gates East General Development Plan. Specific Goals and strategies for the plan overall. On Slide 25, our call for the creation of sub areas that respond to a historic block pattern in recognition of the surrounding context, concentrating active users along major streets and locating higher density in areas to prevent, to provide and create gateways and a sense of entry. So the proposed you are age 2.5 zone district does respond to the historic block pattern and recognize this context. If we look to the surrounding areas, we did notice areas of higher intensity zone districts mapped along major streets and gateway corridors. So the zone district request of new RH 2.5 is consistent with this overall recommendation. And the subject site. Page 26 is located within sub area two. This is the lowest intensity sub area of the Gateses general development plan located prominently along local streets and its overall intent and this is reinforced by the urban design standards and guidelines is a residential presence for each street while through design techniques, passing techniques that really unite the public realm and the private realm, and housing density that provides good eyes on the streets along with transparency and entrance requirements. And the GDP also recommends a maximum building height of 35 feet for the southernmost property. So the rezoning requests to you are each 2.5 is consistent with this height recommendation. Onto Page 27. So based upon our analysis of adopted plans, we do find that the rezoning meets adopted plans is consistent. Next onto uniformity of district regulations, we find that the application of the You are 2.5 zone district will result in the uniform application of the zone district standards across similarly zoned properties. Again, it will also bring 1166 South Lincoln into conformance with zoning standards, and the proposed waiver is consistent with a planned amendment to apply to these applicable zoned districts in the future. So therefore, therefore, we find that the application of the waiver specifically will result in the uniform application of zone district standards. We find that the proposed MAP Amendment also furthers the public health, safety and welfare, primarily through the implementation of adopted plans. Onto justifying circumstances as stated in your application, the land or its surrounding envi

rons has changed or is changing, and we find both a change in the property itself as well as the surrounding environs. So the redevelopment of the former Gates rubber factory itself is a substantial change condition and the rezoning to you. RH 2.5 for the waiver recognizes this resulting context and character, and the rezoning also acknowledges the U2 C and you as sub one zone districts that were applied just to the south while providing a transition from those lower scale duplex and single family uses to the higher intensity uses that exist to the north and as well as permitted to the west. Just Slide 29, we find that it is consistent to apply zoning within the urban neighborhood context to the subject site, as explained here and in your staff report. And on to consistency his own district purpose. On Slide 30, we find that the Zone District Purpose statement is appropriate for the subject site and look to consistency with zone district intents as a specific intent statement for the you are each 2.5 zone district and find that it is appropriate to apply to zone district at this particular location. So based upon our review of the five rezoning criteria, CPD does find that the rezoning meets all five and do recommend approval. I'm happy to answer any questions. All right. Thank you, Ryan. Fast and effective as always. All right. We only have one speaker tonight and we call up Scott Moore. You have 3 minutes. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm. My name is Scott Moore. I'm one of the owners of 1166 South Lincoln Street. I'm also the representative of the owners of 54, 56, 60, 64 and 66 South Street in connection with this rezoning application. I don't have a speech prepared for you. I'm just happy to answer any questions you may have. Great. Thank you. This concludes our speakers questions from members of council. Councilman Espinosa I'll be brief because I think I asked this in committee, but I can't remember what was the impetus for this, the rezoning request that. I'm happy that I'll be able to answer that. It was it was a, you know, a series of things. This is a neighborhood that was just being developed. My neighbors and I all bought our houses approximately one year ago. There is, you know, other development that's planned in the neighborhood. And in our discussions, you know, with the you know, the neighborhood association and the neighbors, we realized that our zoning didn't really match our properties. The zoning of our properties dates from the days when it was a parking lot for the suburban factory and was planned for a mixed use, partially commercial type development. So there was a mismatch of the guys behind you across the alley as well, to see if they wanted to be

included or. We're going to probably be speaking with them because there's a you know, there's an issue with the with the current zoning. That is another impetus for it. And I just want to bring up discuss that. But the fact that the current rezoning to be discovered during this

process renders my house non-conforming, that's and one of the reasons they were talking about the waiver here is that that's an issue that affects other properties in the neighborhood. So after this, I do intend to have some discussions with the neighbors and see if this is something they would also like to pursue. I anticipate there's a good chance that the whole neighborhood of single family houses will want to do that. But it's yeah, I'm not a lobbyist. It's hard to organize a group of homeowners. We haven't even had a homeowners association meeting yet. So it's it's kind of easier to get together the neighbors on your street. Okay. And then one quick question for Ryan. The future, your age, 2.5. Are you going to starve? Is it going to cease being a protected district or just when there are certain adjacencies to our new 20 or mixed use zone districts? Great question. So the waiver sets up exactly for that conversation. Through this MAP amendment application. We realized that because a bulk plane is not listed as one of the specific items that renders a structure compliant as opposed to nonconforming. So a determination that offers additional flexibility and rebuild ability that that was revealed to us. But really, the analysis is needed to determine whether there are other standards that may become problematic over time as protected districts are introduced adjacent to control districts. So I don't believe we know the answer at this time about what the appropriate solution may be. But I don't think the intent is to remove the protected district classification from from protected. Districts. That would sort of have unintended, unintended consequences. All right. Thanks. All right. Seeing no other questions because I can't see my screen. This this concludes a public hearing for the council. Bill four 1125 is not close. Comments from members of council. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to say thank you to Scott for reaching out to neighbors, working together. This has taken a little while, but I think as evidenced here today with the everyone in favor and everything worked out, it was complicated. And so thank you for putting this together and working on behalf of not just yourself, but also your neighbors to get this right. And and I'll be happy to support this, this, this evening. And I would encourage all my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Mr. President. Great. Thank you. Councilman Clark, looks like there are no other folks up for comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Clark. I. Espinosa. Flynn, i. Gillmor, i. Herndon, i. Cashman. All right. Can each. Lopez. All right. New assessment. I black. Mr. President. I please close the voting and ask for results. 12 eyes. 12 Eyes counts of 1125 has passed. Congratulations. All right, Councilman Flynn, will you please put Council Bill 1166 on the floor? On 13. Eyes. All right. 13 Eyes Council. But 1193 has passed. Congratulations. Okay. Councilman Ortega, will you pleas

e put Council Bill 1189 on the floor? Mr. President, I move the council bill 1190. 93 right now. You said 99. Next page. 1199. Sorry, I was just looking at the agenda. Celtic 1199 be placed on final consideration. Do pass. Right. It has been moved. And second at the hearing for council 1199 is open. May we have the staff report? Courtland Heiser, Community Planning and Development. All right. Thank you very much. Here to present the proposed rezoning for 4211 Encke Street, Cortland, Hisar and CPD. So moving on to slide two shows the location within City Council District one. Slide three shows the location within the Sunnyside neighborhood. And Slide four shows the specific location of this proposal, said 4211 North Anchor. This is the northwest corner of Anchor Street and 42nd Avenue. This is within the 41st and Fox station area, and specifically one block north of the new pedestrian bridge that was constructed at 41st to connect Sunnyside to the station platform across the tracks and in the Globeville neighborhood. Slide five shows the specific request which affects this property, which is approximately a half acre in size, little smaller than a half acre. The current use as a concrete and construction company. There is no billboard on the site, although the billboard use overlay is currently mapped on the site. The applicant is requesting rezoning to allow for transit oriented development on the site, and the specific request is to go from the Light Industrial Zone District with the billboard use overlay to the S.R. eight district with no overlay. S.R. eight is the urban center residential mixed use eight stories maximum. The Sierra eight district emphasizes residential uses. Commercial uses are secondary to the residential uses within this district, and so properties are allowed to have street level retail office and commercial uses. But the upper stories are limited to residential and lodging uses only. The zone map is shown here on slide seven. The site and surrounding properties have the I.A. you oh two zoning. The exception to this is

to the east where the freight rail tracks have the general industrial zone district. I'd be. And Slide eight shows land use for the site in the surrounding area. The property and properties around it are an industrial use. TCU to the East stands for transportation, communication and utilities. In this case, it's the rail infrastructure. And Slide nine has some images to go along with the map. So starting with the subject property in the upper left hand corner of the slide with the red arrow pointed to it, that shows the current use the concrete and construction company. And then moving clockwise around the slide slide to the upper right shows the property to the north, which shows up on a records as being a vacant property, but in fact has an industrial style storage building located on it. Then to the east, the image below that middle right shows the new improvements that have been made to Inca Street, the m

ulti-use path that was recently installed, and then the freight rail infrastructure to the east beyond that lower right hand corner shows the property to the south across 42nd Avenue, which is another industrial property, and then to the west, across the alley in the lower left corner of the slide. Another industrial use. Moving on to process here in Slide ten. So informational notice was provided when the application was received back in June and then in August to announce the receipt of a revised application. The revised application removed the UO to overlay from the rezoning request. Planning Board was originally scheduled to hear this case back in September, but that hearing was postponed at the applicant's request to allow for additional outreach to the neighborhood and surrounding property owners. It was rescheduled for October, but there was a posting error that required the hearing to instead be delayed again until November. So when Planning Board did hear the case, they recommended approval by a vote of 7 to 0. It was at Luti back in December 6th and then is at City Council tonight. We followed our standard notification procedures throughout all those steps. In terms of public outreach, there are many registered neighborhood organizations within a couple hundred feet of this property. Those are listed here at the top of the slide and each was notified throughout the process. We did receive a good deal of public comments on this particular proposal, including a letter of support from the Sunnyside registered neighborhood organization. They provided a letter initially at the planning board phase of the process, which was included in the staff report as an attachment. And they have since updated that letter, continuing their support, but indicating that they've reached a private agreement with the developer for moving forward. And that was emailed to you directly to the city council inbox just yesterday. In addition to that, and also included as attachments to the staff report, we have five or excuse me, 15 signed statements of support, mostly from surrounding property owners. Slide 12 outlines the five review criteria for rezoning. All of which apply in this circumstance. And so, starting with Slide 13, will begin with consistency with adopted plans, beginning with comprehensive plan 2000. Slide 14 shows of the points of consistency of the proposal with guidance from comp plan 2000. Details on each of these can be found in the staff report. Slide 15 shows consistency with Blueprint. Denver So the proposal is located within a Blueprint Denver area of change. The blueprint land use is urban residential, which is defined as higher density, predominantly residential, including a noteworthy number of commercial uses and with retail or active uses on the ground floor. So the requested district aligns very well with the guidance from Blueprint. In that respect, street classifications for adjacent streets are UN designated local for both INKA and

42nd Avenue. Moving on to Slide 16, this shows the recommended guidance from the Sunnyside Neighborhood Plan, which was adopted back in 1992. That plan does predate Blueprint Denver and the conception of the fast tracks system, and therefore some of the land use guidance within the plan is now out of date and we have more recent plans that would apply in this area. So for current guidance, in this particular location within Sunnyside, we need to look to the station area plan, which is summarized here on Slide 17. The station area plan does not recommend any industrial within the portion of Sunnyside that it covers along the eastern edge of the neighborhood. It recommends urban residential 2 to 8 stories for the majority of the edge along Inca Street, running along the commuter rail corridor. There is an error in this particular plan for this specific location. You can see the red box showing the location of the proposed rezoning and the land use map states. Substation. The substation is actually located a block to the north, so this property is not located co-located with the substation. It is an area in the plan. And so therefore we must infer the land use and building height recommendation from the plan because the land use recommendation is consistent along the entire edge of Inca within this area and there isn't any variability in the

recommendation. It's urban residential to date stories. For every block along that edge, the staff feels comfortable asserting that the intended land use recommendation was urban residential 2 to 8 stories. So wrapping up here on Slide 18, then showing points of consistency with the other four required criteria, starting with uniformity of district regulations. The finding in the staff report is that the proposal is consistent. Number three, it advances the public health, safety and welfare by implementing adopted plans. The justifying circumstances a change or change in condition. In this case, the pending opening of the 41st and Fox station, new pedestrian and bike infrastructure along Inca Street. Ongoing revitalization of the neighborhood. And increased development activity and interest in the station area. And then finally, point five regarding consistency with neighborhood context, zone, district purpose and intent, the finding was that it is also consistent. So Slide 19, the CPD recommendation is approval based on finding that all of the criteria have been met. All right. Thank you for the presentation. We have five speakers. I apologize in advance if I mispronounce any of your names. Well, actually, we have four speakers. Why don't you guys make your way down once I call your name on this front bench? Billy Wang. Mark Stroh. Niles Emerick. Xin Wang. First up will be Billy winning. You'll have 3 minutes, sir. Good evening, councilmembers. My name is Billy Wang. I am a Denver resident here and have been for. About 20 years now I am the applicant to the entity that submitted this rezoning at 4211 Anchor Str

eet, and I'm available for any questions that you may have. All right. Thank you, Mr. Wing. Mark Stroke. Good evening. Thank you. Mark Stroh. I'm a resident of the city. And county of Denver in Sunnyside and. Represent the registered neighborhood organizations. And you say the United Neighbors, and I'm available for questions. All right. Thank you, Mr. Stroh. Niles Emerick. Niles Emmerich, resident of City and County of Denver, board member for Sunnyside United Neighbors. And I'm available for comment. All right. Thank you. And lastly, and Chin Hwang. Sorry if I'm wrong. Hi. My name's Ancient. I'm a resident of Denver, and I'm here for if I can answer any questions. Great. Okay. Congratulations, the four of you. That was the quickest comments I've ever heard. Wow. Okay. Questions by members of council. And I'll actually start them off real quick, Courtland, and just ask you. I've wondered this and I struggle with it a little bit around this forty-firsts and Fox area, the city of Denver, when reaching out and working on this, working on this area plan. Categorize it as C.R. X instead of C-Max instead of. I mean. Tell us a little bit more why it is so stringent on Citrix. So this shows the land use recommendations from that plan. On the slide, if you can see it on your. It's coming to okay on our huge. So the when this plan was created the philosophy was to create a more intensive major urban center on the east side of the tracks, on the Globeville side of the station area. And you can see that in the purple and blue colors that are map there. The uses are pedestrian shopping, district, mixed use office and residential mix. And some of the building heights are 12 stories and more. They go as high as 20 story recommendation there. And then on the sunny side, half of the station area, the philosophy was to focus more on residential development. Just to paraphrase what's in the plan, I think that that was viewed as being more compatible with the residential Sunnyside neighborhood that exists. It needs to step down pretty quickly and intensity from Anchor Street over about a three block period to where you have existing single family homes and duplexes. And so I think that's why the residential mixed use was emphasized. More so than commercial mixed use. Mm hmm. Mm hmm. And so the C, our X, it still promotes ground floor activation and and things like this. So you can still do mixed use development. I've heard folks lately complaining about the C.R. X model not allowing as many uses as the senior MCs. Do you get it? I mean, is that true? Do you have anything to say about that? Well, the big difference between the two would be that in the CRCs, you're required to have residential uses if you have a building that's taller than one story. So your upper floors have to be residential, whereas in a cmcs district, they, they wouldn't be what you could do residential. You wouldn't be required to. Yeah. So this is, you know, the zone district that's suppose

d to promote higher density and mid density residential. Yeah. Okay. Councilman Ortega and then Councilman Espinosa. Yes. Courtland, if you could just stay there for a second, I want to ask some of the same questions I asked on the previous zoning, because this one also is adjacent to rail. So number one, have you been through the training with Evelyn Baker? No, I have not. Okay. So my second question is, did the issue of proximity to rail come up in your conversation with the neighborhood, with the developer? And if so, how was that addressed? It has been a topic of conversation. The focus of the conversations, though, have been the the transit, the commuter rail

in this particular location. That's just one type of rail that's located there, the freight rail. There's a great deal of that just to the east of the site. And that was not discussed nearly as much as the the TOD opportunity associated with commuter rail. So I know this this is a little different than the developments that we've done on the east side of the tracks because those actually have the commuter rail as the buffer from the the cargo. And so on this side, I'm I'm not sure that there is a buffer from the freight tracks or the the cargo being carried on those freight trains. Is that something that you all looked at at the planning department? Did you have any feedback from the agencies? You know, we used to get all the agency input as part of the applications. But I guess in the rewrite of the zoning code, we don't see that level of detail anymore. So can you tell me whether there was any input from the fire department, environmental health around the proximity to rail and in any of the health safety concerns? So we do have agency feedback summarized in the in the staff report. I'm just looking for the specific page. That it's on. So that's summarized on the staff report beginning on page 11. You can see the agencies that commented and what they had to say. I don't recall any of the agencies calling out freight rail specifically in their comments. I'm just scanning through to see if that's the case. And I'm wondering if it's because we are not yet using the checkoff box on the application form that is supposed to be coming. I'm looking at the information that you. Directed us to. There are some environmental concerns about the Vasquez I-70 Superfund site and potential soils contamination. That would have to be addressed as part of their cleanup of the site. Assuming there's any of that on there, but I don't see anything in here related to rail. Okay. That's that's all my questions. Thank you. Yeah, thank you, counselor. Take it, Councilman Espinosa. Yeah, sort of. Actually, I wasn't going to talk about it, but since it's come up twice with both these rezonings, I want to say that I support the idea of a checkbox because I think it would sort of force us to at least ask the question. But again, I go back to sort of my frustration about traffic concerns, which I hear a lot

about as the District one representative. And and a lot of times we can't do mitigation because it doesn't hit that threshold of of a problem. You know, we design those solutions to a certain percentile of counts. Councilman, I just this is the question section. Is that is there a question sort of answering, Councilman Ortega because it was my you know, I could have at some point raised my own concern relative to the real safety and the proximity of this project, but chose not to. And what it amounts to is that there's there that the well, there is a hazard and it is present. We have other mechanisms to address that. And then the sort of prevalence see of how much of the hours of the day does that? Is that issue present sort of has to factor in. We can design for that the sort of rarity of that event and compel a new development to address it when, you know. So I think I welcome the discussion and I do think the checkbox would sort of help in sort of promoting people looking into that. But I'm not sure that it would consequently change the sort of whole scale development options that are available in the future. So I do have two questions and I'm sorry. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. I appreciate that. The the. I wanted to say that because I don't think you mention it. There are agreements between the the R.A. that is present and represented and the owner. Is that correct? Yes, there is. And I mentioned it is just that it was emailed to you yesterday. Okay. So to the users, I think those agreements modify the uses to some degree. So Councilor, Councilman Mean President Brooks has concerns about the full gamut of uses that are available in our acts are sort of shaped by that in those agreements is that there's somebody from the R.A. or the owner want to say so? Or I would say that from the city perspective, the agreement can limit the users. It couldn't add users. They would be entitled to have whatever use is allowed under the zoning that's in place. But for specifics on the agreement itself, I'd refer you to the applicant in the neighborhood. Yeah. I mean, you don't need to go into detail if you don't want, but I do think that it actually truncates the total amount of users available. Is that correct? That is correct. Councilman Espinosa, we have gotten to a memo you right now which will adopt and record with the city once the the actual closing occurs at the end of the month. And specifically, the use would add commercial space on that ground for to activate the the first level to engage more community orient oriented destination on the INC side. Now that doesn't preclude the fact that we may also look into the 42nd site as well. But for sure our agreement with the Sunnyside and even the East Sunnyside R.A. is to to activate that with a minimum requirement of 2000 square feet of commercial, retail or office space. So thank you, guys. I'm glad your questions are led to mind so that it's some of that stuff. Some of those does nuance mean those

details could be shared? Thank you. And if I could add one more councilmembers, I think I was talking to my architect in addressing the life safety issue. Some of that is, I believe, encompassed in the building and the fire codes that we have to adapt to when we do the design phase itself. Mm hmm. Great. Okay. Any other questions from members of council? All right. Public hearing for Council Bill 1189 is now closed. This is the comment portion of our time, Councilman Espinosa. Go ahead. Yeah. So I'd like to thank the applicant for doing robust outreach when it appeared that none had been done. Initially, the applicant reached out further and wider than ordinarily expected, which was critical because there aren't a lot of directly impacted property owners. But recognized that the greater community would be impacted by these initial redevelopments at this rail station. The community itself has conducted a thoughtful dialog and authored a small area plan for East Sunnyside to get ahead of redevelopment of the redevelopment conversation. The community's work speaks to the nature of redevelopment of redevelopment projects that would marry the generalities of the adopted station area plan for the 41st and Fox station and focuses these recommendations to suit the vision and needs of the current and future Sunnyside neighborhood. The agreements between the applicant, owner and the R.A. accompanying this rezoning are welcome voluntary commitment by all involved and for the people of North Denver to comment mean to commit to address the concerns communicated to the owner and the applicant. I want to thank the applicant and future owner Billy Wang for negotiating in good faith. And I want to thank Marc and Niles for their volunteer efforts to assert to to to get these to reach these agreements, to communicate these agreements, and to advocate for the language that addresses these community concerns. So well done, all of you. Thank you very much. With that, I will be supporting this rezoning. All right. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. And, you know, I just want to underline to both parties, thank you for coming to the table. You know, the developer, the coming in, sitting down with the neighborhood. We're finding there's issues all over the city dealing with this that folks are not able to reach a compromise. But to those who are developing into the neighbors, it's our city. And so how do we begin to come together? So I really appreciate you reaching out, just echoing and Councilman Espinosa's comments. All right. It has been moved in, seconded. Um. No more comments by members of council's. Madam Secretary, Roll Call Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. Herndon Cashman. I can eat. Lopez. I knew Ortega. I Sussman. Black Clark. Mr. President. This is they realized it was going to be the same night I'm doing the bills. Yeah. This is a Councilwoman Ortega show tonight. Okay. Madam Secretary, can you please pull out the first resolution 1294? All right, Councilwoman Ortega,

do you. These are both for quick question. Yeah. So go ahead. QUESTION Yeah. So in the information that was filed with the bill, it states that this is registered as a foreign company. And I just wanted to ask if someone here can tell us if there are other projects that Cross Check LLC has done here in Denver and if you could provide that information to us. Yeah. Looks like we have Lisa Lumley from Department of Real Estate coming up. Good evening. Lisa Lemley Division of Real Estate. Councilwoman, I am not aware of other transactions with them. I can check on that for you, but I was not aware of it when we negotiated this particular deal. Okay. Thank you. Do you know what foreign company? Foreign. It says it registered as a foreign company. Do we know what country they're registered with? I need to go back and look because we received the W-9 in order to do the contract. And I do not remember it being a foreign entity. Okay. That's that's what our records show. So I will double. Council has reconvened. We have one public hearing this evening. Speaker should begin the remarks by telling the council their names, the cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. If you're here to answer questions only when your name is called, come to the podium. State your name and note that you are available for questions by members of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes unless another speaker has yielded his or her time, which would result in a total of 6 minutes. The Presentation Monitor. On the wall you will see your time and counting down. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to council members. Please refrain from profane and obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and refrain from individual personal attacks. Councilman Herndon, will you please put Council Bill 19 approving First Amendments to the service plans for the Denver Union Station Metropolitan Districts. One, two, three, four and five on the floor. Yes, Mr. President, I move that council bill 19 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right. It has been moved and seconded. A public hearing for Council Bill 19 is open. May we have the staff report? Good evening. My name is Andrew Johnston. I'm with the Department of Finance Special

District Team. The ordinance before you tonight will amend the service plans for each of the five Denver Union Station metropolitan districts, which were originally approved by Ordinance 399 Series 2008. The amendments will bring the service plans into alignment with the terms of the new Denver Union Station loan approved by Council on January 17th, 2017. The key aspects are to address acknowledgment of the existing intergovernmental agreements, utilization of the debt authorization and planning for the future. The service plan amendments will be applicable to each of the five metropolitan districts include the following specifics. Defining the Denver Union Station

Project Mill levy not to exceed 15 mills for districts two and three, acknowledging each district's ability to enter into inter-governmental agreements with the other Denver Union Station metropolitan districts authorizing each district to issue up to \$50 million of debt to finance district improvements and ensuring a board of directors can be appointed by the organizer until such time as qualified electors can serve. Kathy Canada is also here to answer any questions you may have regarding the service plant amendments, and I thank you for your time. All right, we have Madam Secretary, one speaker. Yes. Yes. We have one speaker this evening. We'll call her to the front. Kathy, Canada. Hi. My name is Kathy Condom, general counsel for the Denver Union Station Metropolitan Districts. My address is 450 East 17th. Avenue, Suite 400 Denver. And I'm here solely to answer questions. Great. Thank you. You can have a seat. Thank you. Misconduct. All right. This concludes our speakers this evening. Are there any questions by members of council? Talkative Bunch this evening. Okay. This concludes our public hearing. Do we have now. Comments by members of council councilwoman each. Thank you, Mr. President. I decided to torture or to spare the staff the tortured leading question to instead just will make the point, which is this very long titled service plan amendment before us is really made requirement in order to pay off a federal loan, simplify the governance structure for this project, and help allow it to close out the books as we pay off debt, which we are doing above the pace that was expected. So that's my non technical version. This came to committee and it was good for everyone to understand the success the project has had and how quickly it's paying things off. And I just thought it would be nice before we vote to have a little translation. So yes, and kudos to the staff who put together, which not only will this help continue to pay off ahead of time, but it'll probably save us quite a bit of money in the overhead of managing the complex structure. So it's a cost savings measure as well. With that, I'm exclusive. Stickley going to be supporting it tonight. Thank you, Councilwoman. Can can each Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. Just because I heard, you know, \$50 million for future projects and whatnot, I just want to sort of address a personal pet peeve that I have heard from constituents. And I hope that one day addressing the curbside pick up and drop off situation on both sides of the station are part of the plan. On whether that is working as well as it could or not. Thanks. And I'll just say to that low point, Cindy Patten is is on that and would love to have a conversation with those constituents. And also you, Councilman Espinosa. But just the kudos. This is this is a landmark project for the city of Denver and even nationally. And thank all you all for your hard work on that and just excited to be supportive of it. With that, Madam Secretary,

Roll Call. Black Eye Clark Espinosa. When i. Gilmore, I, Herndon, I Cashman I can eat Lopez. All right. New Ortega Susman. Mr. President. I please close the voting and announce results. 12 Ic 12 ICE Council Spell 19 has passed. Congratulations. See no other reason for this body. We stand adjourned. Please refrain from profane and obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and refrain from individual or personal attacks. Councilwoman, can you please put Council 84 on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move Council 84 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right. It has been moved and seconded. Public hearing for Council 84 is open. May we have the staff report? Teresa Lucero, good to see you. Good evening. Teresa Lucero with community planning and development. This is a property located at 12150 East Andrews Drive. The request is to rezone from suburban single unit F to Suburban Multi-unit. Three stories. This property is located in District eight in the Montebello neighborhood, southeast corner of East Andrews and North Peoria Street, north of Interstate 70, south of the U.S. Army Training Center, northeast of the Montebello Public Library and Civic Center. It is about three acres, 149,000 square feet. There is an existing church on the property and a vacant elementary school. The applicant is requesting to redevelop the elementary school into a senior enlisted assisted living facility. So again, rezoning from single unit to multi-unit in the suburban context. And we'll talk about the suburban context in a little later. The existing zoning, again, single suburban single unit F is an 8500 square foot zone, not

a current use. Again, a church and a vacant elementary school. The building is 1 to 2 stories and the neighborhood is 1 to 2 stories, essentially. This is the existing zoning. North is assumed. East is as you find to the west is industrial mixed use three story. The existing land use is a civic land. Use a church. And you'll note that across Peoria's Street is another school that's a montessori school. To the north, another church, small church, and then industrial uses and office uses. But on the east side of Peoria, mostly single family and then some multi-family a little further south. So the existing building form, as I said, 1 to 2 stories, the church itself is pictured here in the top of the pictures, the church across the across Andrews Drive, top right to single family homes to the east and to the south are the two lower pictures left and right. And then the Montessori school is the upper left hand picture. So building scale 1 to 2 stories informational notice on this went out in November of 2016. Planning Board held a hearing on January 18th and unanimously recommended approval of this application. We were at Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on February 7th and we were here at the public hearing tonight. All of the public notice for all of these meetings was appropriately done a

nd correctly done. We want to note that you do have four letters of support from various RINO's in the Montebello neighborhood. Those letters are attached to your staff report. So you know the criteria. Well, consistency with adopted plan, uniformity of district regulations, furthering the public health, safety and welfare. Justifying circumstances. Consistency with neighborhood context and zone. District purpose and intent. The plans that apply our plan 2000 Blueprint Denver and the Montebello Green Valley Ranch Neighborhood Plan, which is a 1991 plan. So current plan tells us to conserve raw materials by promoting efforts to adapt existing buildings to new uses to conserve land, by promoting development at sites where infrastructure is already in place, and to encourage development of housing that meets the increasing diverse needs of our present and future residents. Blueprint and Blueprint on the Blueprint Denver Map. This is Single-Family area of stability. That is an area where we want to see predominantly single family, very low density, and where the housing base is significantly larger than the employment base area of stability. This is where we're trying to maintain the character of the neighborhood while accommodating some new redevelopment, inappropriate locations. Future Street classification for East Andrews Drive as a residential collector for North Peoria is a residential arterial. The Green Valley, Montebello, Green Valley Ranch Neighborhood Plan. You'll notice on Slide 17, the darker areas are areas where there are specific recommendations for the site we're talking about. There is no specific recommendation, but they do talk about protecting the existing character, the area that's the over writing goal in the plan and encouraging single family residential infill on the east side of Peoria and not expanding the commercial zoning. So staff believes that this is consistent with current plan 2000 with the Green Valley Ranch Plan and that we are this is a small step in redevelopment and that we are furthering the uniformity of district regulations by using our standard districts and furthering the public health, safety and welfare, by allowing this civic use to reinvent part of its use to further serve the community and by implementing our plans. The changed circumstances, the closure of the churches, elementary school, development of a wide variety of nonresidential uses across Peoria Street. And just basically the overall demographic shift that everyone is facing with increased senior housing, very much a need of this community and the city. So staff believes that it's an appropriate changed condition to justify this rezoning. The suburban neighborhood context, as we said a little earlier, is characterized by single unit and multi-unit residential, commercial strips and centers, office parks, multi-unit buildings, typically separated from single unit buildings. The SMU three zone district is intended to promote and protect residen

tial neighborhoods and allow multi-unit districts, but not to such an extent that it detracts from the overall image and character of the typically suburban residential area. Staff believes that this proposal is in conformance with these intents and with that staff recommends approval. Thank you. Ms.. Lucero We have five speakers for Council Bill 84. I'll call the first five individuals and you can have a seat up front next to Ms.. Lucero, Peter Haynes, John Martin, Richard E, Paul James Coleman and Ms.. Isobel Allen. The. This is. Peter Haynes, your first. Thank you. President Brooks. Miss Lucero. Councilman Hardin and all the other members of the Diversity Council for your unwavering leadership. I'm here tonight humbly request that you consider and support our map amendment for 12150 East Andrews Drive. Since the late 1960s, St Andrew Lutheran Church and School has graced the Mypillow community. Today we at Saint Andrew find ourselves responding

to changes brought by time in transition. Proudly positioned at the corner of Peoria and East Andrews, St Andrew has long provided both spiritual and educational care to residents, young and old. After four decades of service, the school has succumbed to market and demographic transitions whilst the church continues to serve the community. Today, with your help, St Andrew can begin writing a new chapter and we have a new verse. On behalf of community and congregation, I'm requesting our current zoning single-family house to be changed to multi-unit. This change will allow Saint Andrew the framework to weave that verse of assisted living into its new chapter. Montebello has shown its support for assisted living. The Saint Andrew Congregation is ready to grow and the school is ready for repurpose in front of its you are our project highlights and that I'll just touch on they are revitalization, repurpose and redevelopment, activation, beautification and investment. All this through our desire to just position 30 beds of assisted living within the community. Only with your support can this request corner move forward at Saint Andrew. With your vote of yes for this rezoning, St Andrew would continue as a spiritual leader in Marbella, and our seniors will be housed with respect, dignity and care. Make no mistake, our plan is to provide assisted living residents to our seniors that they can't afford next to the church where they have been able to worship for years. We will also be able to cultivate their grandchildren, both spiritually and playfully. But to achieve this complex and lofty goal, we do need your help. So your vote of yes is a vote for Marbella? It's a vote for our seniors. And it's a vote for our spirits. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Haynes. John Martin. Thank you for letting me speak. I'm John Martin. I'm one of the elders at St Andrew's Lutheran Church. I live in Aurora, but we attend churches there in Denver. As Peter said, when we decided to close the. School, we started looking around for diff

erent ways to. Use the land and the buildings that we. Had to. Service the community. And we were. Quite surprised when we started doing. The public hearings. As soon as the. Hearings were were done, we started getting inquiries as to when we were going to start. The waiting list. We've had to, you know, put that off. But what I'm getting from the community members that are coming to us, there's waiting lists of up to five. Years for assisted living, and some of them. Are running ten and \$12,000 per month. Our goal is to. Assisted living facility right there in. Montebello. Close to the communities that and the services. That residents have enjoyed for their whole lives, most of them. And keep it at a. Reasonable cost levels. And we working a lot with. Medicaid or Medicare, Medicaid. And try to keep it Medicaid reimbursable so that it's affordable. So I'm asking for your support in allowing us to move forward with this. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Martin. Richard E Pool. Thank you very much. The President books and thank all of you and counsel people who have who have allowed us to come before you tonight. I'd like to thank specifically Councilman Herndon and Councilperson Kip Gilmore, who have been supportive in this process from a distance in terms of providing us with the assistance of their AIDS. I my family has been a member of of St Andrew's Lutheran Church for 45 years. And we have seen it grow. And we have seen it. I believe you could say disappear in some respects because when the school closed three years ago, a lot of the members of the church had left there as well. And so this assisted living facility is an effort to reinvent the church as well as to repurpose the church. And we feel that there is a mission yet for the church in that community. And with the support of the council, we would be, I think, on the road to rebirth. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Paul. Representative James Coleman. But Councilman Kennedy, did you ever. He just asked me to let folks know he was here to support the amendment, but had another engagement and regrets that he had to leave. All right. Thank you. All right. Miss Isabel Allen. Good evening, councilman and council women. We are happy to be here with you this evening. I don't want to be redundant, but I may have to because some of the things that you've already heard me say them again, the far northeast in the last four or five years. Has just grown and grown and grown and. The people that are there that really need help. Is the seniors. They need housing and they need services. We are very proud of our. Council person, Mrs. Gilmore, who kind of recognized that and she started dialog in the community on what can we do to better serve our seniors. And after her getting me initiated, the dialog with churches and the community organizations. The outgrowth of that was St Lutheran Church who came to the rescue and said, You know, our school is closing. And we thought of the idea of making this site an a

ssisted living site for seniors. What a blessing. We were just glad to do whatever we can as president of the Far Northeast Neighbors Association. We joined in with them to help them in whatever way we could to make this become a reality. I want you to know that this is not just going

to be a site. It comes with services. And services that the people that will be living there will get like daily routine care. Welfare services. Educational services. Accessibility to technology. And, you know, the church remains. It will be there. And so also their religious needs will be taken care of. And then I heard Mr. Hines here say it's who's representing the developer. Um. Oh, we're going to have a small ice cream shop in there. Hmm. And I said to him, Count me in. I'll be there. So there is a dire need for this facility, and we need you to join in with our council people who have initiated this task, Ms.. Allan, to support this effort. Your time is yours. I don't want I don't want to interrupt you because you are so good. But I have to be judicious to all the folks who are speaking for 3 minutes. But thank you for your words. All right. This concludes our speakers questions by members of council. Councilman Espinosa had a question for Teresa as a couple, and I apologize. I want people in the audience who are sort of new to rezonings. My questions are going to be sort of. Technical and they have almost nothing. I mean, they they have everything to do with this rezoning, but nothing to do with whether this is an acceptable rezoning or not, which I. Based on all the evidence I've I've been presented both here in committee totally fine with. But two things did come to mind as that didn't come up to me in committee and I just wanted to sort of bounce and laugh you. In because religious use, you know, is essentially allowed anywhere. You know, it could be any zone district. Is that but does that use capture? Does it capture multifamily housing? No. So even if it was a religious organization that was running it, they wouldn't just be allowed to do that in his own district. Okay. And then would this site have qualified for campus zoning? Can I just elaborate a little bit? Multi-unit use is its own separate use. Religious assembly is of use. Okay. But multi-unit residential is a separate use. So even so, it. Would be in a single unit zoned district that property currently has. You can't do multi-unit. Great. So would it. Was this parcel big enough? I mean, the zone lot big enough to qualify for a campus zoned district. I don't think that we we particularly have a. Acreage. The thought was because the used the first use, the church wants to stay. We really just wanted to enable the assisted living portion to happen legally. And so that's why we came to the multi-unit. The only reason I ask this is more in respect to what areas that I'm familiar with, where these church properties or sort of significant landmarks in the neighborhoods and areas and, you know, preserve

, preserving sort of that role, place that that sort of cultural role, social role that the church had, even if it's not functionally but visually sort of have value. And I don't know that that's the case here, but I think it is. So that to me is one of those latitudes. That it's kind of small. So that's why our sort of thought process went to just, uh, accommodating the, the new proposed use. Yeah. In which I think the IMU obviously does that very well, captures the use, allows the church to pursue the assembly to persist and all that. And that's why I want to assure everybody that there's no issue here. But with respect to how do we capture sort of those sort of those other those other sort of things? Well, I think that I've got another zoning that is actually going to a campus zone district. In that case, it's a full block. It's. Trying to think of how many buildings one, two, three, four, four or five structures on that block. Um, so that, that to us is a campus. Yeah. When it's one structure with an attached school, I guess that's why we didn't, our mind didn't go to campus because it wasn't multiple buildings that all had to relate to each other and all needed, you know, um. One. Some flexibility on location. There is not going to be new construction. And. In terms of expanding the building. Um, so that's why we came to this own district that we came to. Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you. You're welcome. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. All right. This concludes our speakers are questions by members of council public hearing for council bill 84 is now closed. Comes by members of council councilman herndon. Thank you, Mr. President. When they showed the. Map, I was going to. Pull this up, but just give everyone a geography lesson as this property is on the southeast side of Peoria and Andrews. Had it been on the. Which is in Council District 811 on the northeast side, you would have been in Council District 11. So the border Andrews is the border between District eight and District 11. And Councilman Gilmore has been a great partner in making sure that we can support Mom Bella as we both represented on council. I was I was looking at my calendar to see the first time that I came to this property to have a conversation about this and some other things, this in November of 2015. I was surprised, like, oh my goodness, it has been this long because that's when we first started having conversations about it and they were sharing their ideas with me. I thought, What a great idea for this space. State Representative Coleman, as Councilman Kennedy said, had to leave, but he posted this on Facebook. And since it's on Facebook, I feel I have no problem reading this. And it said and I'll just read parts of it. Thank you for recognizing my

support for the development at St Andrews near Peoria and Andrews Drive in fellow to create housing options for seniors. This is another avenue for residents to consider as they age. Excuse me and are looking to downsi

de. And lastly, this would allow our seniors to live in our community, truly providing them a choice. It's important not only to welcome new residents to our communities. But also do our best to make to take care of those who. Raised us. That was from State Representative James Coleman, who I thought very eloquently put that, you know, when we talk about those that are vulnerable to the fluctuations in our housing price process, the ones that should come first and foremost are our seniors and mom. Bell Specifically, I think about my Bella Manor, which is a senior housing that we have 79 units with, had a waiting unit of almost 100. And then we did a groundbreaking for a second man, Bell Manor 85 units and those quickly filled up as well. And so this is a need that we still need more options available. And particularly in communities like Marbella, where there is a I think a high senior population because people want to stay and the communities that they grew up lived in raised their children and continue to love. And so I think this is a great opportunity. To do so. I'm very supportive of this and would encourage my colleagues to support this as well. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Herndon, to the other side of my fellow Councilwoman Gilmore. Thank you, President Brooks. I am fully in support of this rezoning. And I have to say, you know, Mr. Hines, some of your comments about, you know, rebirth. And, you know, it's the first day of spring. And this corner in the Montebello community has always been a very active church and had the honor this summer to. Attend. A community barbecue and first found. Out about what was going on. And the longevity of your membership. At this particular church is amazing. And to be able to. Reactivate and reuse. And really repurpose this to respect our elders and the community. And make sure that folks can age. Within the community and, you know, look across the street and see all the youngsters that are going to school. On the other side of Peoria, but really maintain. The community, the residential feel. Of our neighborhood. And I look forward to seeing this development, having it activated and. And going over and visiting with some of our amazing elders who live in our community. But I definitely have to give, you know, definitely respect and to Miss Isabella Allen and Mr. Poole. Because they have definitely carried a large part. Of the community outreach, the community engagement. Scheduling, the meetings, the list of the four registered neighborhood organizations that, you know, gave letters of support. Towards this project. Really, I think the credit. Needs to go to Ms.. Allen and Mr. Poole for really carrying this project forward and look forward to seeing the work on this site. So thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Councilwoman Black. A very quick comment. I just want to say, this is the biggest feelgood moment after the crisis on a park overlay district. I will defini

tely be supporting this. Thank you. Councilwoman Black and I will be supporting this as well. I started my career in Denver in the MONDELLO neighborhood, 15475 Andrews Drive, and then so excited to see this community preserve and think about the legacy of the community and its elders. So thank you so much. And with that, it's been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary. Brokaw Herndon, High Cashman. I can eat. LOPEZ All right. New assessment, black eye. CLARK Hi. Espinosa. Hi. Gilmore, I. Mr. President. I. Police close voting announce results. Lebanese 11 eyes spell 84 has passed. Congratulations. All right, we have. You can clap. You can clap. Okay, we have one more public hearing. Councilwoman, can we please put council to 77 on the floor? Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to council members. Please refrain from profane and obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and refrain from personal attacks. Councilman Herndon, will you please place Council Bill 311 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bill 311 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and second it. Councilwoman Sussman, go ahead and offer your motion to amend. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council bill 311 be amended in the following particulars on page two, line 17 Strike April 27th, 2017, and replaced with May 5th, 2017. Okay. It's been moved. And second, it comes from Sussman. Sure. Thank you, Mr. President. This minute we'll align the effective date of the proposed text amendment bundle to coincide with the proposed amendment to the small light parking exemptions so that they could all go in the same bundle. By aligning the dates, the city is able to save republishing costs and reduce redundant staff time. Great. Putting it all together as it should have been. All right. Actually, Madam Secretary, do we need to vote on this or we're okay? We can vote on the amendment. We can't vote. Okay. It's only

the second. Madam Secretary, call. SUSSMAN All right. BLACK All right. Espinosa No. Flynn. I. Gillmor, I. Herndon. Cashman. I can eat. Lopez. I knew. Ortega, I. Why would you, Mr. President? Please close the voting and announce the results. See? Sorry someone hasn't voted. Ortega, I said I. Ortega. I just voted. Okay. I take to Councilman Clark. Hmm. Councilman Clark, you're on a voter list. You got to hit it on your screen. I'm glad you can join me. 12 eyes, one one. Nay. The Amendment Council Bill 311 has been amended. The public hearing for Council Bill 311 is open. May we have the staff report? Sarah? White. Good evening. I'm sorry. It was CPD here to present the staff report for the 2016 proposed text amendment bundle. Today, I'll go over the purpose of what these bundles do, the process that we've gone through so far, given that the bundle does have 78 separate items and there has been council member briefings and alluding info item throughout this process, I will just

be doing a big picture, high level highlights of what's included and then go through the review criteria and staff recommendation. So the purpose of these bundle text amendments is part of the city's ongoing effort to keep the Denver zoning code modern, clear and user friendly. And CPD Department will propose a new series of text to the code. City staff periodically reviews the Denver zoning code and prioritizes potential updates in response to customer and community feedback, industry changes and other factors. Text amendment packages are proposed when the number of hyper updates reaches a mass. Many of these updates that we do as part of these bundles come in direct response to feedback from permit customers and residents. And the most previous bundle, the most recent bundle previous to this was adopted by City Council in June of 2015. We started this process early last year with a meeting with ANC to brief the scope of the bundle. A summary of the text amendment was posted to the website for public review in November. We had a televised info item at Planning Board in December as well as a televised info item at Luti. The red line draft of the text amendment was posted to the website for public review and notice was sent to Arnaud's and Council members in January. In February we had a series of three office hours for the public, four walk in hours to answer any questions that may come up. We had them at different times of the day one in the morning, one in the midday, and one in the evening to cover all availability. And then ahead of the planning board public hearing, we again sent notice to the registered Arnaud's and Council members. The Planning Board Staff Report and Red Lion was posted to the website in February and March 1st was the Planning Board public hearing with a unanimous recommendation of approval. The Council Adoption Red Line Draft was posted March 9th and Luti voted to move this bill forward on March 14th. We had first reading on March 28th and it was noticed appropriately on April 3rd. We also did outreach via the email newsletter from CPD, the Development Services Code Alert Newsletter, Development Services, annual newsletters and meetings with other interested groups to answer questions about the proposed bundle. We did receive four written comments before the staff report was published and an additional one after the staff report was published. The four letters we received before that were included in your packet were from various industry folks supporting several of the amendments that we're doing related to manufacturers, sales rooms and telecommunications standards, as well as a letter from the Colfax Mayfair bid in support of our revisions to surface parking between the building and the street. We did receive a letter from Robert Schmidt with general comments on the clarity of the draft and several suggestions on the draft, as well as suggestions on other topics not related to the bundle and the letter we received afte

r the staff report went out and should have been distributed to you afterwards was from the Clayton neighborhood R.A. writing in general support of the bundle, but opposing the inclusion of the RCS three zone districts with the preference for the edition instead of an hour x two zone district. So the summary document has been posted on the website and was organized into eight groups. Generally summarizing what the bundle does. Revising general provisions. Talking about neighborhood context design standards. Our General Design Standards Parking Standards uses our zoning procedures, our rules of measurements and definitions. And then entire cloak code clarifications and corrections. So again, some of the the big picture highlights of things that we're doing this bundle, there are several items that are related to vehicle access standards, encouraging alley access where appropriate and possible. Several items across the board that encourage or allow the adaptive reuse of existing buildings, including old drive thrus and industrial buildings. A significant amount of cleaning up conflicting provisions related to the Federal Fair Housing Act requirements, federal telecommunications requirements, state liquor store licensing and local retail

marijuana licensing. Another big thing that we're doing is removing the minimum area requirements for map amendments, conservation overlays and design overlays. A revised approach to siting parking on zone lots with multiple street frontages and multiple buildings for parking between the buildings and the streets. And a revised approach for the use restriction in the urban house and duplex building form. So you may be familiar with the fact that we are adding a use restriction to the duplex and urban house building forms in the general urban neighborhood. And what has changed since the briefings on that is simply adding an effective date so that existing buildings are able to still use the multi-unit provision to split up existing structures. And the review criteria that we use to evaluate tax amendments. The first is consistency with the city's adopted plans and policies. Comprehensive Plan 2000. This is consistent with the requirements that the zoning code remain flexible and accommodating of current and future land use needs. And it also promotes the adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Blueprint Denver has language about amendments and the creation of new zone districts that are recommended to implement adopted plans and improve compatibility with existing plans. Furthering the public health, safety and general welfare is the second criteria. The proposed amendment provides clarity and predictability by facilitating planned and desired private enterprise and route development. And it continues to implement adopted plans to regulatory changes. And the third criteria is that the amendment results in regulations that are uniform. So the amendment regulations are uniform in their application to buildings and land u

ses within each zone district. And the amendment improves greater consistency in zoning regulations and removes conflicting provisions, which improves the city's ability to administer and enforce the code uniformly. Playing Boards recommendation at their public hearing on March 1st was approval, with the condition to allow for revisions, for clarity and correctness. So given that all three criteria have been met, staff does recommend that City Council approve the Denver Zoning Code Text Amendment 2016 bundle, and I'm happy to answer any questions about specific items. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Tonight, we have zero speakers. So we'll go straight to questions by members of council. Councilman Ortega said that Councilman Councilwoman Sussman had her. Yeah, I think it was. Was that from the amendment? Okay. So I wanted to ask two questions. The first is where most of these originally came from. Was there a committee that was formed based on complaints or issues that were being brought forward? Or were they identified in-house as recommendations for changes? I'm just curious how they all came about. So we keep a running list of texts, amendments, suggestions that we receive both from internal staff, from the public, from Arnaud's, from council members. And we are always accepting additions to that. And every time that we get to scoping a bundle, we review that list and at that time review the resources that we have available and go through every amendment suggestion and make scoping packages at that time, which is then approved by CPD management. Okay. So one of the issues that I don't believe was part of this conversation is ordinance 565, which regulates the group home section of the zoning code. And we have. A provision in that ordinance that will be expiring next year. So are you aware of any internal conversations that have begun to start to look at this issue? Because I've talked to a number of folks in the city about the fact that we don't want to wait till it expires in. This specifically regulates not only our shelters where, you know, if there are changes that we want to make to that ordinance, we should begin having a conversation about it. But in addition to that, the specific provision is around the community correction facilities. And Sarah, I don't know if you're more familiar with any internal conversations that are that are beginning to happen, but I, for one, would like to know, you know, is there an update on where that's at and how does that play into proposed changes down the road? Because I think it was sometime last year that I started talking to folks in the city about it. So I'm sure I can give you a brief update. I'm Sara Showalter, the citywide planning supervisor, CPD. And I know that there's definitely conversation where our our staff is definitely aware of the fact that next year we need to have an update or address this issue. And I know we've been talking closely with the mayor's office about what is the right a

gency to help lead this conversation. So we'll definitely be part a partner and be very active in it because it will involve changes to the zoning code, but it also impacts a lot of other agencies. So it's also likely that it would be the kind of amendment we might run on its own instead of packaging into a bundle like you have before you tonight. So the list that Sara mentioned, we have multiple types of amendments on there that could happen to the code and some are often big enough in scope or need enough outreach or coordination that we run them on their own. So it would likely be one of

those instead of packaged into a bundle. But it's definitely on our radar and we're talking to the mayor's office to figure out who the right agency is to lead the conversation. Well, I would like to be part of that conversation, but I also want to make sure that we've got Greg Morrow, who oversees all the community corrections facilities out of the manager's office manager safety, as well as our shelter providers. Sure. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you. Councilman Ortega and Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. Thank you for this great work. I want it eight days sooner. That's why I voted no. Can I just ask for a clean. I mean, the sort of final proposed section that has the x three in it either, you know, sent to me because it's relevant to an upcoming rezoning. Sure, I can. I can make sure that you get a clean copy of that. But the red lines are available on the website, if you want to start with that on our text, my web page. Yeah, but we'd be happy to get that to you. No, I can do that. I was looking through it in art for the red lines in our documents, and I didn't see it. But I'll go to the website. That's fine. Thank you. Councilman? No. Sarah Hood. Just a few of the poets watching this tonight. Just give you just our last two or three things that you think the public will notice about these changes that they would. I think a lot of what this bundle is doing is making things easier for our customers who come to our development services counter. A lot of things that are part of these bundles are clarifications or solidifying of practices that may be confusing currently. So one helps our development services staff be clearer with our customers of what's expected and also fixes some of the issues that they're seeing when they're trying to get their projects through. I think another big one, given the ongoing conversation about Slack homes, is the addition of the use restriction to the duplex building form in the general urban context, because that has been something that we have seen result in multi-unit development that is in the character of this home. So it's kind of helping to start that conversation as well. So from a developer point of view, some of the permitting process will be improved by some of the changes. Yes, it should be great. It's a big issue that I know you hear a lot about it, I'm sure. So thank you very much. Great. Thank y

ou. Councilman new. I'm sure a small lots would be improved as well. I just. I just next week. Okay. Okay. We have no. More. And we open comments back. With no more questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 311 is now closed. Comments by members of Council. Oh. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. Mostly because I do, in fact, have the website up, so don't leave because I need help and I can't find it. But yeah, I just wanted to say thank you to the CPD staff and. Well, Sarah and. Tara. They're both serious. Both Sarah. It was like suddenly for the great work. And I really appreciate you guys coming through with these and looking forward to voting yes on these. Thank you. All right. Good job on this. You guys, I think, you know, we originally took the smaller out because it was so contentious among this council parking on those little bitty lots. But I'm excited to have the conversation next week. And thank you, Sarah, Sarah, for making sure that we are friendly to our customers. That was very nice to be able to read that in the preamble of this bill. It has been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary, roll call. Need a motion to pass as amended. So I, I I'm pretty sure that Councilwoman Sussman did that. It did. Your amendment now needs to pass. Okay. So we need a yeah, we need a motion to move as amended. All right, Councilman Herndon, can you put can spell. I'm sorry. 311. 311. Yes, I. Move the council bill. 311 be placed upon final consideration and do pass as amended. Nice. It has been moved and seconded by Secretary Call. SUSSMAN My black eye. CLARK All right. Espinosa. Hi, Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. I'm. Printed caption Carnage. Lopez. Nu Ortega. Mr. President, I. Police Close Voting US Results. 3939. Kingsville 311 has passed as amended seeing no other business for this body, we stand adjourned. None, Mr. President. Okay. Communications. Do we have any communications? None. Mr. President, we have one proclamation this evening comes from Councilwoman Sussman. Will you please read Proclamation 731? Certainly. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a proclamation designate designating the week of June 26 through June 30th as Bike Week and Wednesday, June 28th, as Bike to Work Day in Denver. Whereas the city and county of Denver partners with the Denver Regional Council of Governments, local bicycling organizations and cycling enthusiasts each year to plan activities and events intended to promote awareness of the benefits of bicycling. And. WHEREAS, Bike to Work Day is an annual event designed to encourage people to ride their bicycles for transportation on a consistent basis to reduce congestion, improve air quality, and benefit public health. And. Whereas, the Department of Public Works hosts the Civic Center Park Breakfast Station, one of the largest in the region where cyclists celebrate their commute to work with free snacks, raffle prizes, music and educational outreach as well offered by organizations in

the region. And. Whereas, the Department of Public

Works is a major contributor in the planning and implementation of Denver's Bicycle Network, implementing at least 15 miles of new bikeways annually, and this year installing protected bikeways on 14th Avenue, ninth Avenue and 14th Street. And whose neighborhood bikeways along Knox Court and West 35th Street will be the first in the city, and whose plans to install additional bike infrastructure and to upgrade existing bike infrastructure are contributing to Denver's designation as a top bicycling city. And. WHEREAS, The Department of Public Works continues to build out the city's bicycle network to provide people with convenient and connected access with the goal of ensuring every household is within a two minute bike ride or one quarter of a mile of a comfortable and low stress facility. And. Whereas, Denver is supporting bicycling in the other new and creative ways included on street bike corrals, bike repair stations and bike sharing near places where people gather with the goal of supporting local businesses and making bike riding an attractive way to get around for more of Denver's residents. And. Whereas, bicycle and pedestrian safety continues to be a top priority for the Denver City Council of the City and County of Denver, which is supporting funding for additional and expedited multimodal improvements that will increase bicycling in our city. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the City Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Council designates the week June 26 through June 30th, 2017 as Bike Week, and June 28th as Bike to Work Day and encourages citizens to stay safe this summer. No matter what your mode of travel. Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall affix to seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy here of be forwarded to the manager of Public Works. Thank you. Council assistant your motion to adopt. I move that the proclamation be adopted. All right. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you, Mr. President. I was just delighted to be asked to do this particular proclamation. I used to be a really fanatic biker. I've fallen off from biking a little. Well, not from my bike, but. And I want to get back into it. Councilman Brooks asked me if I had intended to ride my bike into council tonight, and I wish I thought of that. That would have been kind of a fun thing to do. But certainly biking and walking and transit are very high priorities in our city. And the improvements that the city has made the intention of the city to make even more the will of the council is to make our city much more bike friendly than it already is. We have wonderful trail systems. We need to, of course, increase the opportunities for bike commuters and just make our streets safer for bicyclists and for pedestrians. And I'm so pleased with what Public Works has done and what the mayor has done and what our city council has

done to promote this wonderful kind of way to get around the city. Thank you. Councilman Sassaman, Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm really excited about the proclamation. Thank you, Councilwoman, for bringing forward my bike pin on today. And to celebrate the beginning of bike week. I did ride my bike today, you know, which is very unusual for me. I'm so excited about this week because I am hoping that there are people all across the city who will get as excited as I am about bicycling in this city. And I think because we we need this. We are growing by 40 new people a day and we can't expand our roads and single occupancy vehicle our way out of the growth that we're experiencing. But not just because it's what is great for our city, but because every single day the favorite part of my day is my right in my right back. And I, you know, I could talk for a couple of hours on this. I will try and control myself and just share the story that changed my life when it came to biking. And hopefully this week somebody out there will take a chance. It'll change their life and you'll never look at commuting the same. You also will never be truly happy in a car again once you have found the awesomeness that is riding your bike to work and everywhere else. I went and got my milk from the grocery store yesterday on my bike and it was awesome. But what changed it for me is the city was participating in the Green Lanes project and I got to talk to a gentleman. I was doing a bike ride with him in Amsterdam where there are bicycle bicyclists everywhere trying to solve what is what is working here and how did they get here. And he was wearing a suit jacket on this bike tour that he was giving us and talking about how he doesn't own a car and he bikes everywhere. And someone in our group asked him, said, so, you know, don't you get to work all sweaty and need to take a shower? And he looked at all of us like we are from a foreign planet. And he said, no, if I start to sweat, I stopped pedaling. It's as simple as that. And I think that that little thing completely changed for me. It was always, I have to put on my bike appropriate clothes and I have to try and get there faster than I could have in a car. And I have to

bike, bike, bike, bike, bike. And we have this spandex bike culture. And I think if there's one thing that we could do that would transform the number of people who feel like biking works for them, it would be if you start sweating, stop pedaling, look up at our awesome tree lined streets and how beautiful it is and how quiet it is and go off that main road and go into that side street and look at paint colors on houses that you might paint your house. And it is awesome and transformational. And I ride my bike to work every day in my work clothes I have never needed to. Pack different clothes for work, because if I start sweating, I start pedaling. So that's my lesson for this week. Very excited about this proclamation. Thank you for bri

nging it. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Clark. And thank you, Councilwoman Sussman, for bringing this forward. You know, I'll just say that this is something that is incredibly important, I think, for us as a city and for me as a council person who represents the urban core. And, you know, I went on one of those Green Lane project trips, and it changed me as well. And I came back to Denver determined to be the first African-American in a suit riding a bike. And that's not a joke, because every time I ride through five points, I'm reminded of that. But I think it's incredibly important for us to think about different modes of transportation. And we know that when we start creating protected bike lanes, it dramatically increases participation in people riding their bikes because they feel safe, because the lane is connected and it connects them to the rest of the city. And so I am extremely supportive of this. I'm extremely supportive of us becoming a multi-modal city. But this proclamation should remind us, as people who drive cars not to be distracted because we have a very high rate in this city and cities all over America of hitting of distracted drivers, hitting pedestrians and bicyclists. And so this should remind us to stay focused if we choose to drive a vehicle and make sure to know that there are more and more people who are deciding to ride, bike and walk as pedestrians. And we need to create a safe city. And we do have a zero vision zero here in this city. It is a priority for us. And so we need to think about that. All right. Madam Secretary, roll call. Sussman I Black I Clark I Espinosa I Flinn I Gilmore I Herndon High. Cashman High. Can each new? Yeah. Ortega, I Mr. President. I please. Scott. Very nice results. 12 Eyes. 12 Eyes. Proclamation 731 has been adopted. Ms.. Councilwoman Sussman, is there anyone you want to bring up? There certainly is. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to ask Dan Raine and Dylan Monk to come forward. Good evening. Castle could see all like to introduce Dylan Monk. Dylan has planned details, everything for our Back to Work Day event at the Civic Center Park. His enthusiasm not only for setting up the event, but encouraging coworkers to ride to work as this guy rides to work every day. And he's going to be driving The Slowpoke on Wednesday. I've been biking to the train, but I haven't done the full trip in a while. We live out in Southeast Aurora, so it's good to have a rabbit in front of you and someone to chase. Charles Point. Yeah, you know, we join the rest of the nation with bike to workweek and celebrating bicycling and giving. Folks, you know, an option to. Try it out. A really fun, friendly way to do it. You know, people do stop riding for a while, you know, reasons or my case, I had issue with health. They kind of took me off the bike for a while. But, you know, it's just like riding a bicycle. They say. Get back up, just. Get back to doing it. And, you know, we're going

to continue to expand the network with low stress, high use of use facilities. And cast member. Back to your point, vision zero, no death. That's acceptable. And we're continuing to work towards making a safer environment and more mobility options for all. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Ceiling. Yes, thank you again, Councilwoman Sussman. And just a quick reminder to pay attention, everyone, tomorrow, because I think your your flow of traffic will be a little lighter because of how many people are on their bikes. And it is crazy, but it happens. On. Wednesday. There you go. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. All right. Madame Secretary, can you please read the resolutions. Tonight, three nays. Resolution 687 is passed. Madam Secretary, will you please bring up the next deal on our screen? I believe it is. Council Bill 680. All right. So, Councilwoman Sussman. Let's see. Actually, you know what, Councilman Herndon? I'll need you to put Council Bill 680 on the floor. Yes, Mr.. President. I move the council bills 680 be taken out of order. Okay, it's been moved. I need a second. I get. Do I have a second for Councilwoman? All right. It's been moved and taken it. Since this motion is not debatable. Madam Secretary, Raquel Sussman. I. Uh. Let's see. Sorry, I'm looking. Clarke by Espinosa, I. Flynn. Hi. Gilmore. Herndon Cashman. Kenny Lopez. I knew Ortega, I. Mr. President. I. Police. Kosovo ring announcer results. 12 eyes. Are right. Well, let me just make sure. Here. Okay. 680 has been taken out of order. Councilman Turner, we

need a motion to pass. Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bill six zero be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. Questions. Comments come from Cessna. Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Per the request to the applicant, council is being asked tonight to vote no on this bill because the applicant has withdrawn the application. Oh. All right. All right. Any other members of council? Council members. Just a reminder to vote no. Madam Secretary, Rocco Susman. No. CLARK. No. Espinosa No. Flynn No. Gilmore No. Herndon No. Cashman can eat. Lopez. No. New? No. No Ortega. No, Mr. President. No, please. Close. Very nice results. Zero 1's and 12 nays. 12 nays. Council Bill 680 has been defeated. This concludes all the items that need to be called out. We're now ready for the block votes on resolutions and bills and finally consideration council members. Remember, this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote otherwise. This is your last chance to call out an item for a separate vote. Councilman Herndon, will you put the resolutions for adoption and bills and final consideration for final passage on the floor? Yes, Mr. President, I move that the resolutions be adopted and the. Bills on. Final consideration be placed. Upon final consideration do. Pass in the block of the following items. All serious 2017 unless you hear otherwise. 774776 777. 781 676. 769 778 779. 777, 71 759. And that

is it. All right. Has been moving. Second secretary, call. Flynn. I. Gilmore, Herndon, Cashman, Canete, Lopez. All right, new Ortega. Hi, Susman. Hi. Clerk Hi. Espinosa Hi. Mr. President, I. Was running as a result. 12 eyes. 12 eyes. The resolutions have been placed, have been adopted and the place one final consideration and do pass. Since there are no public hearings and there are no objections from members of council, we will not take a recess. 12 Eyes Council Bill 728 House Pass. Congratulations, Councilwoman Gilmore, will you please put Council Bill 729 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bill 729 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. Public hearing for Council Bill 729 is now open. May we have the staff report? Andrew Webb, welcome. Thank you. Mr. President. Councilors, will this open up here? Thank you. Andrew Webb here with Community Planning and Development to present on this request to rezone two parcels at 1414 36 South Irving from PWD 180 to SMU three. That's a suburban neighborhood context residential multi-unit, up to three stories. This request is in Council District three. It is in the Marley neighborhood near the intersection of Florida Avenue and Federal Boulevard. The site is currently occupied by five three story apartment buildings and one single family home. And hopefully, as you can see in this aerial here, it is comprised of two parcels. The surrounding zoning here is a mix of single and multi-unit residential. There are quite a few instances of the SMU three zoned on nearby properties. Land uses in the area are primarily residential, with a mix of single and multi-unit development. Commercial land uses. Federal Boulevard there to the east and to the south is a church with a school and a child care center. As you can see in this area, all the multi-unit development immediately to the north of the site is very similar in scale and layout, built in a suburban form with apartments arranged around internal parking and open space. This next slide shows a couple of views of the site. The top looking northwest along Irving and at the bottom southwest along Arkansas. These photos show the house at the northwest corner of the subject site, as well as the multi-unit development to the north. And then this photo shows single unit development to the west of the subject site. So the existing planned unit development, or PUD Zone District, was established in 1985 after the apartment complex had already been built. Permits 116 residential units on site and calls for three storey buildings with setbacks, landscaping and other design standards. Essentially, based on what existed at the time, the PD also specified that a commercial use that was in operation on the single family home in the single family home at the time of adoption could continue. The current PD 180 is the second PD established on the site. The first was PD three, which was adopted in 1978 when the owner at the ti

me wanted to seek a redevelopment of the property. PD three was based on plans for five apartment clusters, each of which were to contain 22 one bedroom units and one two bedroom unit for a total of 115 units, plus the single unit house . Building permits were issued in 1980 and 81 for the five structures. Some of them listed the total number of units at 23, some listed at at 24, and some had a number scratched out without any explanation or replacement figure. No subsequent building permits for renovations or reconfigurations were found in city records, and staff believes that the five structures were built at that time with 24 one bedroom units for a total of 120 apartment units. The slide shows some of those building permits. And you can see that there are differences and discrepancies between the number of units each each structure could contain. So in 1985, the

apartment developer realized that the map for PD three I'm sorry, for PD one three had emitted the single unit house, which had been envisioned early on as like a manager's unit or some other amenity for apartment residents. So I proposed a new. PDP 8180. That would did add the single unit house at the corner of Arkansas and Irving into the boundary. But the documentation was not updated to show the actual number of units on the site. The development was the apartment complex was recently acquired by a new owner who learned late last year that from the city that the properties existing improvements were not in conformance with the plan unit development zoning. Due to this discrepancy between the number of units specified in the number of units actually built on site. This slide does show shows some of the language from PD one A.D., including the reason for its adoption and the maximum number of units shown at 116 year. So as I mentioned upfront, the applicant proposes to rezone the property from the current PUD to SAMU three. That's a multi-unit residential zone in the suburban neighborhood context. This neighborhood context is characterized by single and multi-unit development with lower building heights, larger lots and deeper setbacks than the city's urban neighborhood context. With regard to the process to date that this request was considered by the Planning Board on June 7th and the land use and transportation or land use, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on June 27, both of which recommended approval. Staff has received several inquiries about the application, but no public comments. As you're aware, to approve a rezoning, the Council must find that these five criteria established by the Denver Zoning Code are met with regard to consistency with adopted plans to plan impact the subject site. The Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint Denver staff finds that this proposed rezoning would further several comprehensive plan objectives and goals, including preservation of existing housing stock, support for affordable rental housing, near transit services such as those availabl

e on federal nearby, and recommendations to simplify and update the city's land use and regulatory system whenever possible. Blueprint, Denver established a single family residential concept land use for this area as described in detail in the staff report. Staff considers this proposed rezoning to be consistent with that concept land use because it allows the continued operation and reinvestment in an existing residential use and would actually reduce the opportunities for commercial uses on the site. With regard to the other criteria, this request will result in the uniform application of building form, use and design regulations for the SMU three zone district. It will further the public welfare by enabling the continuing operation and maintenance of affordable multi-unit housing, by establishing regulations for future redevelopment to create safe, active pedestrian spaces, thereby implementing adopted land use plans and policies. Staff agrees with the applicant's proposed justifying circumstance as the existing PUD adopted in 1985 should have accurately reflected the number of units on site that at the time of its adoption. And finally, staff finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the surrounding suburban neighborhood context. So with that, CPD recommends approval based on a finding that all review criteria have been met. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. All right, thank you, Andrew. Appreciate it. All right. We have two speakers this evening. If they would come up when their name is called and you have 3 minutes each, we have Mark Lampert and Chairman Sekou. Again. Good evening. My name is Mark Lippert. I'm here on behalf of the ownership and applicants Parkwood Plaza, and I work with the owner, Mark Venegas. And during our due diligence process late last year, we discovered this discrepancy between the number of units that exist at the property and the number of units that the current zoning calls out . So we're here tonight to address that zoning issue and bring the property back into compliance and answer any other further questions. Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Stay cool. Yes. Once again, Chairman Sekou Blackstar Action Movement, advocacy group for poor, working, poor, homeless and senior citizens. We support the journey. We support the zoning change for a couple of reasons. One. From since I've been coming down here for the last almost ten years advocating for. Our constituency. What has become evidently clear is that the zoning is crazy. And it's antiquated. And city council is always coming up with at the moment seeing contradictions and then trying to smooth the path so that the process is fair. And so we think that this is a fair process that in order to be consistent with the zoning, that this is necessary to approve it. And also suggests to city council that a review be done of all zoning stuff that's inconsistent and make that into a package so that people don't have to spend inordinate amounts of money t

rying to straighten out city council business that should have been straightened out a long time ago. It's unfair. Persistence is also unfair for you guys have to go through that and spend time with that.

So in addition to that, I just want to suggest to the folks who are anticipating these different projects, especially for our folks that we represent rapidly. Black folks are becoming an endangered species in this town. The neighborhood that I grew up in for 67 years at five points is now 72% white. And I know many times we talk about the gentrification and the unintentional consequences. But at some point, you know, it's very interesting to find out in order to. Abort a moral code. We come up with these terms like Donald Trump alternative facts. And the truth is we can no longer turn our back. So we suggest for folks who are doing these development projects, and I know it doesn't have much to do with the zoning that you're not required to do any of this. Anticipate the possibility that for us to be able to live in this town, we have to be able to work in this town. And we have plenty of skilled labor. Councilperson President is working with unions and whatnot to develop a better skill test of plumbers and pipefitters and those kind of things. And over time. And so there are plenty of folks who have skills. Who aren't even considered or when they show up to apply for these jobs. Their applications thrown in the trash. Now, folks call that one thing. Other folks call that the other thing. But the real deal, we're talking about a systematic and it needs to stop if we're talking about diversity in this town, which includes black people. And I say that unapologetically. They deserve the same opportunities as other people in this town to work in this town and make this their home. Thank you very much. Chairman Cycle, your time is up. Thank you, sir. All right. This concludes our speakers for the evening. Questions by members of council. All right. The hearing, public hearing for council Bill 729 is now closed. Comments by members of Council. Guzman-Lopez I believe this is in your district. Yes, it is. Thank you, Mr. President. So, first of all, I mean, I mean, thank you for doing this. So this came it was brought to our attention because it was out of compliance. And rather than having them go through all kinds of or all kinds of craziness, so to speak, you know, this this district was proposed just to kind of bring it back into compliance. But also, you know, here's here's one of the things I remember and one of the previous counsels sitting on some of these pads are so restrictive, they're not they don't know. They some of them were created in error, not anticipating growth, not anticipating the neighborhoods around them as they developed. And when you look at this property, the important thing about this property, you know, I appreciate one of the speakers speaking about this, but. Is that it is. Are you one of the few remaining original apartment

s that are still affordable? This is still affordable housing. It's not new, but it's affordable. And some of these some of these units, some of these pads, the apartments, like they're spread out, spread throughout the city as they've aged and they've stayed in their pod in the world around them and the zoning world around them. And the land use around them has changed. Right. And to the point where they're obsolete. And so instead of watching this go down an abyss of being obsolete or having them struggle as as they not only improve the units, but improve the living standards and do maintenance , it's important that we keep up with it. And so I here's the thing. There are a lot of these different pads around this the city, a lot of these kind of apartments scattered around the city. Not all of them have been brought to our attention. But I really appreciate this one being brought to our attention. It's an important part of our neighborhood, and I know this real intimately because I had an uncle and aunt that lived here, had had neighbors that lived here, and there's some awesome little apartments, but they do need upgrading. And in order to do that, we have you have to have you have to come in. You have to bring it into conformity. So. Mr. President, without further ado, I support this rezoning, and I think it's something that is a long time overdue. So it's the right zoned district. It's not asking for anything else, just to just to come into compliance. I agree. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. See no other comments, Madam Secretary, roll call. Lopez. I know you. Took a drink. ORTEGA Hi. SUSSMAN Hi. Black eye, I. Clark, i. Espinoza, i. I. When I. Gilmore, I. Herndon High. Catherine. High. Can each. Mr. President. I please call the voting and announce the results. 12 Eyes. 12 eyes. Council Bill 729 has been adopted. Congratulations. And just like that, we are on to our last bill of the evening bills, I should say, of the evening. Councilwoman Gilmore, will you please put Council Bill 812 on the floor? And we want to make that known to the public that we will be debating this next week, one hour for the public. All right. Madam Secretary, Madam Secretary, put the next item on our screen. Councilman Cashman, go ahead and offer your comment. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to take a minute to offer up. Thanks and congratulations to the folks at Denver International Airport at a time when so much of our small business and our restaurants are getting swallowed up by mega, mega chains around the country. It's really heartening to see Dan take the opportunity to bring another set of Denver businesses to shine the spotlight on them at Denver International Airport. I think we're up to about 55 million

passengers. And now, as am I in the ballpark. 58, 58 million. So that's a lot of bodies to be walking by local businesses. And I hope you'll take the opportunity to bring more down the line. So thank you. That's all, Mr. President. You run the show

. No, no, no. That's okay. We got it. All right. Madam Secretary, please put the first item on a screen. 811. All right, Councilman Espinosa, please put council resolution on the floor. I move that council resolution 811 be adopted. All right. It's been moved. And second, it comes from the council councilman. Thank you, Mr. President. It's with great confidence. I now remind myself that this was a request to the city attorney's office to ask to defeat this resolution. It was inadvertently filed as a resolution. It should have been filed as a two reading bill. It's a companion to Council Bill 810, which is going to have a public hearing tonight on final consideration. So the delay of final consideration of this companion item will not impact the timeline for the Emily Griffith Opportunity School urban redevelopment. Apologize. Just taking over here. Are there any other. Councilman Espinosa, there are some dead. Yeah, I just had a quick question. Can you say that again? I missed that. Why are we defeating the bill? You know, I would love to defer to our city attorney's office with even greater confidence to describe this to you. David Broadwell, Assistant City Attorney. Cooperation agreements are a form of intergovernmental agreement between us and Dora, which by Charter need to be approved by Bill. This was inadvertently filed as a resolution. Elsewhere on your agenda tonight. The bill does appear on first reading to rectify the error. Everybody remember this is asking for a no vote on the motion. Thank you. All right. Well, perfectly clear now. Thank you. All right. So as a reminder, this is an ask for us to vote no. Madam Secretary, roll call. Can each. No Lopez. No new. No Ortega. No assessment. No. Black? No. CLARK. No. Espinosa No. FLYNN No. Gilmore No. All right. Is that everybody? Madam Secretary, can you close the voting and announce the results? Zero. Everybody we missed. I'm sorry. Did we miss somebody? Our president is out of the room. Zero eyes, 12 nays. All right. Zero 1's, 12 nays. Council Resolution 811 has been defeated. Madam Secretary, can you please put the next item on our screens? Councilman Espinosa, will you go ahead and put counseled Bill 819 on the floor. 11 eyes. 11 eyes. Constable 752 has passed. Councilman. Clerk, will you please put up Council Bill 750 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bills 715 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 750 is open. We have the staff report. Teresa Lucero. So seriously. Sarah With community planning and development, this is a rezoning of 1208 North Quitman Street. The request is to rezone from general urban multi-unit three storey to general urban residential mixed use five storeys. So the property is located in District three in the West Colfax neighborhood. It is adjacent to the Perry Street Light Rail Station and Lakewood Dry Gulch Park, four blocks south of Saint Anthony redevelopment and

Sloan's Lake Park, three blocks west of Colfax Avenue and four blocks north of West Sixth Avenue. Property is about 10,000, almost 10,500 square feet or about a quarter of an acre. There is a single family structure on the property. The applicant is requesting rezoning to redevelop the property. And again, the request is to go from a multi-unit three storey to a residential mixed use. Five storey. General Urban is one of our more intense zone districts or sorry not doing districts contexts characterized by multi-unit residential variety of building forms. Low scale commercial imbedded in the area. Commercial uses can be a variety of building forms. And then the generics five zone district is primarily residential, but there can be a mixture of uses if the mix, if the nonresidential uses are on the first level. Otherwise the structure has to be residential. And if the structure is solely commercial, then the size of the structure is limited to 10,000 square feet and the allowed building height would be 70 feet. So again, existing zoning is multi-unit. Three land use in the area is a mixture of single and multi-unit residential one, two, three stories. Zoning North gm u three South e t u c which is two unit and open space for the City Park East rx5 and West Open space for the park that's there, the Liquid Dry Gulch Park. These pictures give you kind of a flavor of the building form and scale. The existing site is the top one. The vacant districts five site to the east is top right. Station itself is bottom right. Park is bottom left. And then the series of single family homes adjacent to the site are north of the site is top left. Land use in the area mixed between low scale multi-unit and single family. Informational notice on this application went out on April 9th, a planning board hearing and on June 21st. There, of course, all of the electronic notification and signs were posted correctly for that hearing, and there was a vote of 6 to 3 in favor of recommending approval on this application. This application was also at Land Use Committee on July 11th. And then, of course,

we're here tonight. There are. Three or four local arenas in the area you have in your packet with your staff report 27 postcards and letters in opposition to this and 26 letters in support. And one of the letters of support is from the Sloan's Lake Citizens Group. So the criteria consistency with adopted plans. We have current plan 2000 Blueprint Denver and the West Colfax Plan, which is a 2006 plan, can't plan, protect and improve air quality by reducing vehicular pollution, by expanding the land use, the use of transit encourage redevelopment of housing that meets the increasing diverse needs of our residents. Encourage mixed use transit oriented development. And in three different ways. Strategies encourage mixed use and transit oriented development blueprint. Denver The land use concept is urban residential, a higher density primarily residential land use concept with a

noteworthy number of commercial uses. And the subject property isn't within an area of change, which is, of course, where we want to direct growth. Future street classification for equipment is an undesignated local basically tailored to local access. The West Colfax Plan consists of two parts a framework plan and then as district plans. The framework plan is the part of the plan that tells that the plan tells and should be used for guiding our zoning decisions. The district plan is. Says it does not imply zoning changes but is included to provide guidance for appropriate character and scale in an area. So within the framework plan. This site is designated an urban neighborhood station, so single family and multi-family residential with development pattern that's variable and compact highest intensity focused around the station platform with a scale of 1 to 5 stories within the plan are also. Residential growth opportunity areas where existing housing stock is dated and declining and may be appropriate for redevelopment. Land use recommendations include establishing zoning tools that provide for a mix of building types and uses, promoting a range of housing types, supporting infill development and mixed use projects, particularly at the station areas. And to the greatest extent possible, focus both structural and use intensity at Main Streets, transit stations and town centers. So this is a picture of the plan in the the future land use concept in the West Colfax Plan, urban neighborhood station. As you can see residential growth opportunity area on there urban design concept map. So within the district plan, the plan tells us to establish appropriate regulatory conditions and incentives to facilitate the redevelopment of the Villa Park and West Colfax neighborhoods near rail facilities, and talks about the pace of development in the area. And again, this is a 2006 plan. Light rail started in 2013, so it pre-dates light rail, but talks about how development in this area might be gradual because there are not large assemblages of property. So staff believes that this request is consistent with the area plans that by using our standard zone district we are furthering the uniformity of district regulations and by establishing more development at our transit stations, we're contributing to hopefully helping our air quality and contributing to further furthering public health, safety and welfare. And by implementing our plans, we're doing the same. Justifying circumstances is changed. Conditions, the land or surrounding environments has changed or is changing to a degree that it's in the public interest to encourage redevelopment. Of course, where you have the light rail that opened in 2013, the redevelopment of the Saint Anthony site, also within this area in just the last three years, we have eight new multi units built in just the blocks adjacent to this block and this block. And we have four more under review. So we're seeing rather rapid redevelo

pment of the area based on the MMU three zoning. So staff believes this is an appropriate changed condition and an appropriate justifying circumstance. We didn't already talk a little bit about the general urban context, promoting safe, active, pedestrian oriented, diverse areas, enhancing convenience and enjoyment of transit, walking shopping, ensuring new development contributes positively to excuse me, to establish neighborhoods and other our five zone district primarily intended for residential uses and with that staff recommends approval of this application. And of course, I'm here for questions. Thank you, Miss Lucero. All right. We have seven speakers for this council. Bill. Two are identified as speaking for 6 minutes because someone else gave their time. So I'm going to call all I'm going to call the first five. When I call your name, please come to the first bench to save a little time. Bruce O'Donnell. Brandon Gill. Justin Herman. John Buckner. The second and Laurie Smith. Bruce O'Donnell, you first. Good evening again, Mr. President, of members of council. And unlike the eclipse, I'm coming around again more, more quickly, I guess, this evening. Thank you for your time tonight. This site, 12 Quitman is immediately adjacent to and in fact abuts the RTD W Line rail platform at the Perry Street Station. And so it's a tremendous total

opportunity. In fact, nine months ago, the city of Denver rezone the adjacent property to the east. 1209 Perry Street to the same gr x five zone district in the fact pattern is identical here the it's adjacent to rail. There is significant plan support and in fact the West Colfax Plan from 2006 is explicit and unambiguous and it says it wants to see buildings one, two, five stories in height at this exact location. So we have had numerous meetings with two RINO's we can the West Colfax, R.A. and also the Sloan's Lake Citizen Group. This site is embedded wholly in both of those no boundaries. And the Sloan's Lake Citizens Group took action in support of this rezoning request. We can does not do that. In any event, in his is knowledgeable about this but does not take a position. In addition to that, we have 25 letters of support, most of those from property owners in the neighborhood. As Teresa Lucero from CPD explained. There's been tremendous change going on in this neighborhood in fact, right today there are 21 site development plans that have either been approved or are under review, transforming this neighborhood primarily in multi-story buildings north of here between 12th Avenue and 13th Avenue. As was stated, there has been some opposition from neighbors as well in this opposition is primarily been over heights, allowed of five stories in this group's five zone district. And we've listened to those neighbors and considered their input. And in response to that, last week recorded a protective covenant and deed restriction on this property that should this zoning pass this evening, the deed restr

iction would limit building heights to four storeys at this site. And so while x five would allow five, we've committed that we would only be able to go to four with this protective covenant. So we hope that that's a good balance between the two D objectives and the plan support and the justifying circumstances. And that compromising on four storeys makes sense in the neighborhood. That also allows us to take advantage of the total opportunity and implement the city's comprehensive plan. I want to reiterate that this rezoning application meets every review criteria that Council is asked to consider. It has plan support and it has justifying circumstances. It has a recommendation of approval from the Planning Department and also from the Planning Board. And so, in summary, I ask that you weigh that criteria and consider the covenants reducing it to four storeys and vote to approve this rezoning this evening. Thank you for your time. Thank you, Mr. O'Donnell. Brant and Gil. You have 3 minutes. Oh, actually, yeah. Come to the mike. Mm hmm. Yes. I'm Brandon Gayle. I'm the property owner. I actually didn't. Elect to speak. I was just here to answer any questions. Thank you. Justin Herman, you have 3 minutes. Thank you. I live just to the. North of the property. The one thing that was kind of stressed in the planning. Can you introduce yourself for the record, please? Yes. Justin Herman, I live at 1246 equipment. One thing that was stressed in the. Planning development meeting was. That this. Would keep the character of the neighborhood. There's no five story buildings within 200 feet of this property or even. Really visible from this property unless you go to Colfax. You know, just because the property of the East was rezone doesn't mean that it's right for the neighborhood. Yes, there's development going on. The. Immediate area. But again, five story zoning is not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Three stories, kind of. The max that you see there. And you know that I think it would just kind of look. Out of place. To be honest with you. The compromise. That they talked about. Would only. Limit the height restriction for 20 years. So it doesn't talk about anything. What what would happen with after that? You know, if they built a building that. You could add on top of that would increase then. In height and. Support the commercial aspect of the property. But again, the height is kind of more of the main issue here. I would increase parking. There's already kind of an issue with parking on the street just with the way that the properties are designed. And now they have garage garages that face equipment. So parking, that street parking is already kind of limited with higher density, but also increase to this issue that you already have on the street. People park on the street, walk to the light rail. Station and, you know, it's kind of an issue. So again. I would recommend the applicant amend their request. To grx3. Zoning. I know that. It

wasn't available when they made the initial application, but it is available now. And so that that would be my recommend recommendation to the Council. Thank you, Miss Herman. John Buckner. Good evening, Council members. Mr. President. My name is John W Buckner, the second I'm the homeowner at 1267 Equipment Street. I appreciate the opportunity today to speak on behalf of my fellow neighbors and opposition to the proposed rezoning of 12 away equipment three property. My property is just outside the 200 feet radius to sign the official protest. However, I trust my concerns will be heard by this council if I believe this proposed development will negatively affect the lives of

those within the radius and its surrounding area. I've been a homeowner on Quitman since 2013, just before the light rail came in. At this time there were a total of 22 homes on the cul de sac, plus or minus two, and we're calling from memory some duplexes. For reference, the 1200 block of women dead ends on the south side of the street into the Perry Street light rail station has been mentioned since 2013. Three single family homes on our block have been scraped and in their place, an eight unit condominium development has already been completed on one lot. And construction is underway for another 12 units on the other two lots. Likewise, the home directly next to mine has been sold to the same developer I just mentioned who erected the new eight unit condominium development with plans to build an identical eight unit condominium structure where a single family home once stood. In total, the development on our block has added 25, I should say, had and will add 25 new homes to our cul de sac, raising the total to 47 homes on a block that once held 22. This is not including the proposed unit in the building we are here to oppose. And it is important to note that all of the new proposed development at 12 away Equipment Street, all of them except for the proposed development equip the street have conform to the Existing GMU. Three zoning. My fellow my fellow residents who are opposed to the proposed zoning will speak to the inconsistency with the character of the neighborhood that agr5 development will create, as well as this gentleman speaking to the infrastructure challenges. I echo their sentiment as neighborhood elders can barely recognize their community as it is. And although one could contend that development is a benefit resulting in a higher property value for each of us, and that development in our neighborhood was inevitable outcome due to the Denver's sustained growth in our neighborhoods. Proximity to downtown, however development have we, as we have experienced it, is both a benefit and a curse. Thus, in addition to the character issues this proposed structure will cause. I'd like to raise the topic of infrastructure as it pertains to the proposed rezoning and the challenges and frustrations of this proposed development will create for current residents as well a

s their new neighbors. I know personally of neighbors who can no longer grow gardens due to the height of GMU three buildings, let alone five casting shadows or four in this case casting shadows over the dwarfed one storey homes. Parking on our block is increasingly challenging as more residents occupiers, street developers build largely one car garages for multiple occupancy homes like real commuters who do not live on equipment, treat the street like a park and right already occupying vital spaces on an already cramped street and making some simple activities like unloading groceries or putting trash on the curb. A hassle for homeowners that least structure. Your time is up. In 3 minutes goes quick. If I may just conclude in saying that I appreciate you sharing my considerations and I appreciate your consideration in weighing these options. Thank you, Mr. Buckner. Laurie Smith, you have 6 minutes. Oh, yeah. Oh, no, you don't. Perhaps someone with you can put it together while you're getting going. Here we go. Yeah, we can see that. I wanted to fight. You want to go to the mic right here and then introduce yourself for the record? Okay. My name is Laurie Smith. You've probably all received emails from me in some form. I have an I'm an owner at 1275 Tennyson and have a contract under a house under contract on Perry Street, all within four blocks of this property. Which is why I'm interested party. I want to do two things. First of all, I want to set the context of what we're looking at within that 200 feet boundaries of the property zone of the property. I'm going to walk over here and I'm going to speak. We you know, we actually need you in the mike. And so if someone can just can hold that for her as be great. Excellent. Thank you. All right. So within this 200 feet, the yellow represents the parts that the city owns. The slashed green represents the part that developers own. And this the slash, the purple horizontal slash represent the part that are owned. But nobody that people don't live there. They're being rented out. The owners don't live there. They're being rented out. The red represents the part that are owner residents, and those are the people that signed the petition against this rezoning. So within 200 feet. Every owner except to sign the petition. One has a conflict of interest. In the other two, we could just never contact. We could never get a hold of. So I want that. I want that to be. I want you to see how many people within that area are against this free zone. Okay. The second thing I would like to do is talk about finding that balance between increasing density around, particularly around light rail stations. Balancing that with preserving the look and character of our community and our neighbor neighborhood. I'm pro-development, but it's got to be wise and thoughtful, not patchwork. We've got to have a plan. It has to make sense. So if you look through all those city of Denver plans, comprehensive plan, blueprint plan, Wes

t Colfax Plan, Todd Plan and the Denver zoning zoning of 2010 and reviewed and revised in 2017, you see a push pull between achieving greater density, especially around light rail stations or transit stations and preserving the character of the neighborhood. So our our neighbors are the group of us are trying to strike that balance as you are and as the city is. That's important. Okay. So we feel that the gr3 is striking that balance, that particular property is going from a single unit to if it goes to three stories , it will end with the shop front. Our X is the shop front on the first floor and then the next two floors are residential. If it goes to that, that will change the zoning density from one to up to 20 units, which is a dramatic increase in density. The three story. We believe part of it will still be able to preserve that character of the neighborhood, which is one, one, two, three. And we acknowledge that the applicant has made an offer. We feel like that has no teeth. I've talked with city council staff and I've talked with our R.A. and both said, unfortunately, it's a gesture that would be very difficult to enforce if the eventual developer, which we understand the owner, is not the eventual developer, if that eventual developer does not abide by this attached covenant. Um, again, we are we it is really important to us to preserve the character of that, of that neighborhood character. And look, the neighborhood, which is all 1 to 3 stories. Lots of those homes have been redone, including the for the for next to this property. And then there, you know, other other properties as well that have been remodeled. I want to quote Mayor Hancock from a July 10th speech. Begin, quote, Development shouldn't happen to us. It should conform to our values. Here's how we're making it happen. Residents are partnering with the city to preserve the look and character of their neighborhoods. The city's partnering with the neighborhoods to determine their futures through neighborhood plans, which we need to update our Colfax plan. And neighborhoods are partnering with the city and developers to find ways to build projects that provide the stores and services that residents need . Again, development shouldn't happen to us. It should conform to our values. And here's how we're making it happen. Residents are partnering with the city to preserve the look and character of their neighborhoods. So again, I would ask that you would oppose the request of g, rx5 and that you would recommend that the applicant reapply for grx3. I did it. I got it. Thank you. So much. I really appreciate. It. Okay. I'm going to ask the the five that are up here to grab your seats. And we have two more, Stephanie Wickman and Mr. Siku and Stephanie Wickman. You are first. You have 3 minutes. Good evening. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Stephanie Wickman. I live at 1218 Quitman Street. This is the property directly adjacent to the north of the property in question.

I am the homeowner and resident at 1218 Quitman. I've lived at 1218 equipment for ten years. At the time of my purchase in 2007, the light rail, I knew about it. It was underway. I've I've weathered the construction and enjoyed the, the perks of the new station. But when I purchased in this neighborhood, it was in large part due to the charm and character of the existing structures, mostly single family, Victorian or bungalow type homes. Mine being a Victorian built in 1892. There are four currently Victorians in a row directly to the north of this property and we're all one, one and a half storeys. My concern. Somewhat selfish is the shadow or lack of sunlight that my property will receive. With the development of a five storey up to 75 foot tall structure that with the GM x five, if I understand correctly, can build completely to the lot lines. So this would block not only sunlight, but also views to to the south for my property and my neighbors to the north. I support the recommended GM x three. Request of some of my fellow neighbors. And I am also the person, the person who gathered the petition of protest signatures, four of six resident owners within 200 feet , and that represents 12 of the properties within 200 feet of the subject. Property. So I'm here also speaking on their behalf because I spoke to each of these property owners, my neighbors directly, and we all have share the same concerns. Not only the term and character of the existing neighborhood, but the parking as that has been mentioned before. Parking is a large issue on our street. It is a cul de sac with a large area turn around for fire department vehicles at the bottom. That allows no street parking for a majority of of that. And I've already seen. Oh, my time is up. Well, thank you. That 5 seconds when. I use it. Thank you. And I just want to say, I. To me, quality of life is more important to the than the property value. Now, your times are Miss Workman. Thank me. Thank you. Yeah. Mr. Psycho messed up. Time starts when I start talking, right? I'm talking now. I just want to set it up properly. Okay. Everybody knows who I am. For the record. For the record, my name is Chairman Sekou, not Sekou. Chairman Sekou. And I am the founder organizer for the Black Star Action Movement, which is a public advocacy group for poor, working, poor, homeless and senior citizens. Okay. Baseball. Two strikes. I got one more strike. We're going to try

this one more time, only we're going to make it basic. Paul, I need your help with this. We have a test for city council. It is to see if you are paying attention to us. And I believe there's a president. BROOKS If I'm not correct, there's a 160 rule that city councilman tells about in terms of you got to pay attention. Otherwise, this stuff can be overthrown and thrown out of court. Every decision you make is a 160 rule. And we used to bust Charlie Brown up in here. You remember Charlie Brown. You almost had a heart attack. We caught him ready

ng sports page. Well, there was public hearing. And then Charlie had this issue, medical issue with his feet where he had neuropathy and he had these cowboy boots and he would not wash his socks. And when he took off his shoes to spread his feet, it would be so funky up in here. We could smell it all the way to the back of the room. And so we had to go get this spray to be scary. And he would call who peo potpourri before you go to the toilet? 750 We want to talk to the bill. 750 spoke to it. So we're getting it. So here we go. Help me pour five words. Repeat after me. Help me. Just so I know, you pay the rent. It was a cycle. Wait, wait. Speak to the bill. This is the bill. This is a bill. You're speaking to a council person. Work with me. The rent is too high. You said. No, this is the one. I'm going to give you a heart attack. The rent is too high. The rent is too high. The rent is too high. The rents too high. The risk too high. The rent is too high. We cannot afford it. Poor people. Now, this is a solution. And this called them for help because they're getting ready to have a heart attack up here because they pro-development rent control. What they tell you best. Rent control is the solution to the problem of development because it has to be planned according to recent not 2000 to not 2014. Whatever that I'm talking about right now with the influx of the marijuana, people are coming in. You've got to have 10,000 people every month where you put them and then you replaced mistakes. Thank you. Those who can afford it. Thank you. The rate is too high. Thank you. Rent control is the only. Thank you. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you very much. Yeah. Have a seat. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Laker. All right. Rent control is illegal in the state of Colorado. Just for just justice, for fact. Just tell the tell you right amendment. I have I have a question. This is we're in question time now. And I have a question, Nate Lucero, because this has come up a couple of times around the legal protest. Where are we in this bill with the legal protest? So the manager of CPD has made a determination that the protest petition that was filed didn't meet the requirements. And what's the threshold? Just for folks. So it's I believe in Theresa may knows better than me. So if I'm wrong, she could correct me. But I believe it's 20% of the owners within the area to be re zoned or 20% of the owners within 200 feet of the property to be resolved. That correct owners of 20% of the area. 20% of the area. Okay. And so I just wanted to state it for the record, because we did get some communication that it was legal practice and it wasn't. And so just for the record, it's not a legal protest, but if it was, it would had to have met 20% of the area. Correct? Okay. Thank you. All right, Councilman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. I have a long list of short questions. The neighbors. If anyone wants to answer my question, did you all oppose the rezoning of the lot next door that is no

w rezoning x five? Across the street. Is there a. Answer that. You have. To go you've got to come to the mike. Mike and maybe a neighbor representative. Yeah. Come on up to the mike. Thank you. Introduce yourself again. I'm Laurie Smith. And had we known, had we been aware of that, we would have protested. Okay. Okay. So. All right. Thank you. And and I would say that some labor should probably stay here, and you're probably gonna get a lot of questions. So the rest of your neighborhood is zoned GMU three. And so I know Mr. Buckner was talking about the kinds of density development that is going in that does comply with that, that zone district. So I heard from you that you're not happy with that, but it's already zoned that way. So you know this. Whatever happens tonight, the rest of that can still happen. So I just want. Are you aware of that? We are not. Opposing the. Current model of redevelopment. It does fit within our region. Although I did cite some instances of the gee, the three story units at this point causing some conflicts for people as far as overshadowing their own homes. We recognize that in the spirit of Denver and where it's heading, this is consistent with what's happening in Denver. Five stories in our neighborhood is unheard of. And then we think we'd also present the other problems that we recommended that are on this street, in particular with the cul de sac. The number of units that would be included in a five story building versus a three story building will add significantly more numbers of cars on the street without any parking for them. Not to mention the challenges that we have with the light rail itself. The last plan for our area was ten years ago, prior to the light rail coming in, and I don't think

anyone foresaw Quitman Street after the Perry Street Station named for Perry. But the train actually pulls in on Quitman being as heavily trafficked as it is right now for parking people, leaving their cars, not paying a fee and driving into the city excusing, taking the train into the city. So it's not the three story structures that we are opposed to. It is changing that everyone that has come into our area thus far has stayed within that range of three. Five would be unheard of in our neighborhood. So is is your primary concern the parking? Is that your biggest. No. I would say parking is second to the character of the neighborhood. My home was built in 1890 as well. So the many of us bought in this neighborhood for the sheer fact that it was single family homes, traditional homes, bungalows and Victorians. People take great care in restoring these homes. And what's happening is that a lot of these people are then being forced out of these homes based on the the cost of taxes as they go up and other things. And those are all subsidiary factors here. But ultimately, it is the character of the neighborhood that we think is at cost most. But I won't say that that's. Not the only. Factor, because the parking is also bec

oming a huge problem as a result of people going outside of what is traditionally accustomed to in this common in these in this neighborhood. So one final question. So the GMU three. Really is what I'm hearing from you. This is a question is is that's really inconsistent with your neighborhood of single family homes. It is. And it is inconsistent. But we all recognize that in a three story home that does bring retail to our neighborhood, which could very much change the dynamics of our neighborhood and does stay consistent with what we see happening along the light rail line. It is also consistent to our partners in the north at Saint Anthony and I will say the St Anthony's a very different community around Sloan's Lake than what we have in our sleepy neighborhood just south of Colfax. So some similarities there. So, yes, we do see that it is inconsistent with the neighborhood, but is really the height that is dramatically inconsistent. It's not the effort to bring in retail in addition to homes. Okay. So what I was referring to, though, is the GMU three, that the current zoning of your neighborhood is inconsistent with the character of your neighborhood because you're talking about the single family homes and the Victorian homes. And so the current zoning you have really. It is extremely inconsistent, however, consistent with Denver as far as what Denver is doing around the entire city, as far as where properties are going, we're all getting the shipping container look in our properties. I think we all recognize shipping containers with third stories. Yeah, it's not that the we're opposing, it's the five story 70 feet and a neighborhood that traditionally had single family, one and a half storey bungalows now going five stories 70 feet and right along Lakewood Gulch. So, yes, we do think that is very inconsistent. I understand your point. The Jimmy three is also inconsistent with the neighborhood, but not to that extent. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Yes. Thank you. All right. You have more. You want to come back? Okay. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. Let me first ask Andrew Webb. Are you still here or that was you. Okay, sorry about that. So the. There was reference made to the Greeks zoning category that it's now available. So originally there was no gr3 and in the last bundle we created the Greeks three zone district. I think that's the. What, though, was that available when this application was filed? Uh. Where's Bruce? Mr. O'Donnell, can you answer that question? I'm not sure you're next on my list anyway, so. Grace three was not available at the time we filed the application. It was made available more recently. Okay. So let me ask you my other questions. So the this is a 10,480 square foot lot, correct? 0.024. Yes. Point two. Four acres. So first of all, on the 20 year covenant that would be placed on the property. Has that been filed or at what point would that be filed? Yes, I personally filed in the clerk in recorder's office las

t Thursday. Okay. And that is for 20 years, correct? It might be 25. I'll double check, but it's not in perpetuity. Okay. Councilman Lopez is saying he's reading something that says it's 25. Right. Okay. So that that goes with the land for the next 25 years, regardless of who owns it, correct? Correct. Okay. And then in terms of the number of units that could be on this site. So we're talking about four stories. So people keep saying it's five stories, but your covenant caps it at four. Yes, that's correct. Does that include your age back and all of that stuff on top? So the the way the covenant reads is that it's four stories and also 55 feet, and that would cover all of parapets, age, HVAC, mechanical, all that type of thing would be within that limit. Does that include like rooftop patios, everything? Yes. Okay. And then how many how many units can you get into that? That amount of. Properly. We haven't studied that yet, but it's anticipated that the ground floor would be all parking, likely with three floors of residential units above. And so maybe in the 15 to 18 range of total. In. So I know

that oftentimes a lender will not provide financing if you don't have some parking on your development. I'm just saying, you're looking at 15 units. What is the anticipated number of parking spaces per unit? Most likely one per unit. And are we talking about predominantly one bedroom, two bedroom. So some mix of that there. I want to be cautious in this discussion. There is no development plan today. I understand. I understand that. But schematically, I mean, you can we're trying to figure out what you can actually fit on the site. Right. Right. Okay. Um. I think those are all the questions I have right now. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman do. Theresa, a couple questions, please. On the planning board. Three members voted against this rezoning. What were the reasons or the issues they talked about? It was the tension between the framework plan and the West Colfax Plan and the District Plan in the back that talks about the character in the framework plan. Is the urban residential station or urban? I can't remember the exact term, but the station 1 to 5 stories. But in the district plan in the back talks about gradual change in the neighborhood, discrete changes. And it was that tension. Some members believed that. This was too intense of a change. Do they, do they have a discussion about the height of this project or. Well, yes. Whether the discussion was because the plan talks about discrete changes in that I want to talk about, say, the back part of the plan. And so what's discrete the discussion was, is five 3 to 5 discrete. So the property adjacent Councilman Black was talking about that was done. There was reason ten months ago that I hear this. Unanimously. And I hear Rose's word. Did not know about it. Was there no notification of that? There's always notification if some. And here we did you Hamlet? Yes, I did. Was there any opp

osition to that? No. Okay. How did council vote on that? Unanimously. Okay. Well, the. But that the summer questions. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman and Councilman Castro. Thank you, Mr. President. First questions for Attorney Lucero. The covenant that we're hearing about, is it in? Does it in fact. Limit development on this parcel to four stories for 25 years. KELLERMAN Katherine, I have not reviewed that deed restriction. So I can't say whether or not it does. It's a private covenant that was inflicted upon the property by the developer. It's not something that's required by the zoning. Okay. Mr. O'Donnell, please. Do you refresh my memory? Are you involved with the partial to the East? That was recent? Yes, I was the owners rep for that rezoning. And is there a development planned for that parcel at this point? It has been in to the city for a concept review. I'm wondering if there would be a possibility of a covenant on that parcel as well. Have you considered that at all? Well, I have nothing to do with it. It's okay. It's out of your hands at this, correct? Yeah. Okay. Thank you. See if I have. Anything else? No, that's all I have. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you. Councilman Cashman. Counselor Flynn. Thanks, Mr. President. Teresa on the. The 200 foot radius and the. The requirements for legal protest. As I'm looking at the document that we were given in the staff, the new staff report. In the calculation of total land area of which you need 20%. Do we include the park? We do. And the RTD light rail? We do. So in other words, to get 20%, we in many cases, we might have to get the city to sign off on a legal protest. Do we include the streets? We do include streets. So when we count the square footage of the folks who signed the protest, do we count the square footage just of the parcel they own, or do we count out to the middle of the street? We count the parcel they own? Okay, so the streets always count against a protest. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Flynn, I'm glad you brought that up because that was one of the I've stressed that before. When the community is successful, I will have questions for you, Theresa. But after first, actually for you, actually. But that 20% is very, very difficult to achieve because particularly when you're adjacent to right of way big right away and public entities that own property. If we were to actually do the numbers here, there are 21. If you look at that map, there are 21 parcels, seven have complete. So a third of them had satisfactory signatures. One had a split, four had rejected signatures. So between a third and half of the actual property owners that weren't public entities or streets did in fact sign. But that threshold of 20%, I mean, I would be happy to for us to reconsider how we define that. So questions for that was just follow up to Councilman Flynn. Are you aware that sounds like citizens group I

ike we can does not take positions. No. Because they didn't take a position on this rezoning. No. Their letter only gave the results of a straw poll. Okay. But it's really frustrating for me personally, because I wish they did take positions because because because of the fact that the city has put us in this situation and we have a tool to codify these sorts of tweaks through the waivers and

conditions process. But since we don't use them in this situation, we enter into these public, private I mean, these private party agreements. And when you have an R.A. that doesn't take a position, it makes it very, very difficult. We've been successful, but only because we have bids in our nose that take positions, so to speak. So I do have other questions. Perry, are Perry equipment in the same street classification? No. What is Perry? Perry is a collector. And equipment is a local. So those are very, very different in the eyes of the zoning code, are they not? In some cases, yes. No. But are X is something is a new sort of is a sort of different animal. The but so in looking at the adopted plan justification, the AMAX has a storefront and we've talked a lot about the sort of mixed use, but all the plans point to urban residential where there is no mention that's single-family and multifamily . How did CPD come to this idea that a mixed use zone district with storefront and nonresidential uses was a was consistent with an urban residential use? I'm not getting your question. I think. Specifically on your slide deck. Which one? They're not numbers. It's the one said review criteria, consistency with adopted plans. Okay. That might be. Well, okay. Actually. Let's go to the next slide first. Justifying circumstances. Yeah, it says urban station. Urban neighborhood station, single family and multi-family residential. It doesn't say, oh. I don't think I'm on the same slide as you. Further earlier in the presentation, we're talking about consistency with adopted class. Still further. Well, it's. Perhaps you can just just outline it there. One more right there. So the very first thing we're talking about, the West Colfax framework plan and it talks there's there's really. All the other plans roll up into this urban, residential, urban, urban neighborhood station. Urban, residential. There is some talk about. Mixed use projects, but our mixed use zoning is specific for those collectors, not for the local residential streets, are they not? Well, I'd have to pull out my code. But some of our mixed use is, as you know, from the last time I was here on the church or on local streets, like two X in particular. So that would be a two storey zone district is sort of far less intensive. I mean, by design that is what are zoned it district is for an s sort of context a suburban, you know, a single unit context. Well, that was an urban context. Yes. I mean, yeah, I'm sorry, but a single unit context or a t you context, we would go into it in a two zone district. Does that

mean we don't use it to vaccinate in a in a downtown Denver pharmacy? So I'm just trying to understand how CPD came to me to equate a local. I mean, treat Quitman the same as it did Perry, which are two dramatically different streets when these two plans this slide in the slide before talk about how these new zone districts is since clearly in the slide before this. It says the district plans quote do not imply zoning changes. So we're in a situation where we have a Jim U3, which is an urban residential zone district, and we're electing to go into a mixed use zone district. It's mixed use lite. Granted. Granted. But the plans don't say mixed use on local streets. So how did CPD come to the conclusion that this was appropriate? I think because of the adjacency to the transit station. But this is not oriented to the transit station. It is oriented to equipment going. To be oriented. Can you orient a building to the adjacent properties owned by RTD? Mm hmm. Can you orient your building towards the adjacent property? You could you a storefront? It depends on what you build. As you know, we've been seeing. The zoning provisions. Mandate form, but are several multi-unit next to each other. But this is the our zone district. So it has a storefront requirement. Is that storefront requirement on an interior side side sideline or is. It on the primary street, which is Quitman? Yes. So I'm still trying to because trust me, I've been promoting that we orient these buildings to the right away. Mm hmm. But this is a situation where we're not oriented right away. We're orienting to a slice of property that is clearly owned by RTD. Mm hmm. And so that's a side interior lot, not a primary street or some other thing. So I'm just trying to grapple with how CPD felt like what was appropriate and I supported for Perry is deemed appropriate for Quitman when they're two completely different street characters classifications. Again, I think it was the proximity to the transit station that swayed us. Sweet. So I so we have a new criteria in CPD that says transit station in proximity trumps sort of all or other. No. Okay. Council them all. Okay. But our plan recommendations. And other our. Plan recommendations do not say on local streets where we designate where we call for urban, residential, single family and multi-family, that we should be entering into sort of a mixed use zone district. So if we if that is our new idea, we should update our plans to sort of reflect that. That is the new criteria that overrides our small area plans. No. When you look at Blueprint Denver, the Land Use Council, that's. Not a small area plan, though. No, these are small area plans, which I would think. Both of them are what we look at. But it doesn't do in our small area plans that are newer and more recently adopted. Trump are sort of prior thinking that predate this. Well, we have a 2003 plan in Blueprint. We have a 2006 plan in the West Colfax plan.

And so I would say generally, we

think that the West Colfax plan would trump the blueprint plan. However, I think that with all that's been happening in this neighborhood, staff believes that the West Colfax plan is fairly outdated as well . Yeah, I wish you've heard me before, because I actually think that you guys are trying to get to the right thing. But I wish we would empower you with more ability to use our waivers and conditions policies to actually shape and work with the developer and the community to slim down. That in the past. Yeah, it didn't work. Let's do it again. We tried that. Okay, Councilman, can I. Can I get to some other folks and I'll put you down the list? That's the fine. All right. Thank you.

Councilwoman Black, can I get to Councilman Lopez? Councilor Lopez? Yeah. Thank you. Just a couple quick questions. I don't know if this is. For you or for Laureen. Then I wanted to ask Lorene a question as well. To the property. Behind it was the one that was resolved. Right? That's if I look. Closely at 1209, Perry. And that was a reason to cheer. Now watch your. X53rx5. What's on the other side. So what? What faces this property? Are you talking about zoning? Yeah. Okay. Let me get to a zoning map. There you are. Is that always a. Oh, it's a city park. So it's a park. And the property north to it. Jim. Jim, you three. Also faces the park. Yes. Okay. Thank you, Teresa. If I may ask Laurie to come up, please. I just have a couple of questions. Or do you own the property? Excuse me? You own the property? I am an owner of 1275 Tennyson. And I have a contract. I'm talking about the property of question in question right now. Oh, you're the owner. Oh, yes. No, we have no. Okay. Remind me what your position was on this. You're a yes. Yeah. You encouraged us to vote yes, right? Yes. In Laureen. My my position. Hmm. So you you own part. You don't own property. You don't own that property. You own property in the neighborhood. I own property four blocks over on Tennyson, the 1200 block of Tennyson. That where you live? No, I do not live there. We are we have a townhome under contract on Perry Street, the 1500 block of Perry Street. Just north of Colfax. Yes, it's yes, exactly. So you're by the new development with the slums like area. Oh, I'm sorry. You're so. You're. Were you owned properties in the Stones Lake area? Yes. Okay. Okay. I just I wasn't sure many of you actually lived in the neighborhood or own property right there in West Colfax, so. I own property. I do not live there. Okay. Thank you. That counts for right now. Okay. And okay. Councilman. Councilman Black, back up. Thank you, Mr. President. Teresa. Can you tell me what can be built in G three and how tall they can be. In a moment? Apartment forms four stories, three stories, up to 45 feet. So it is a three story. So industry which I wanted to get. What? Here is my old cheat sheet. So urban house in 80 you duplex garden court rowhouse house and apartment and then in the grs5, by contrast, just a shopfro

nt building form. And as the councilman said, 35 feet is the height limit versus the 70 that we're talking about with the. Or five. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. O'Donnell, your covenant would limit it to 55 feet. Yes, that's correct. And also for stories. Okay. I know people are asking about the covenant and I think Miss Smith had a concern about it. I will say in my own district, there is a covenant, a piece of property by the South Moor Station that. The property owner and the neighborhood association agreed upon in 1997. And it's a 50 year agreement and it is attached to the property and there have been multiple property owners and it is still attached to that property, which is why there's nothing there. So I do know that they they are legally binding, so. All right. That was my only question. Thanks. Thank you. Councilwoman Black. Councilwoman Ortega. I've asked my questions. Thank you. Well. Carl's menu. Did you have something else or you didn't care? Bruce, the just want to follow up on the property adjacent there. Do you know what the what they're planning on building there on that property. On the 1209 Perry? Yes. They're hoping to build for sale condominiums there. Do you know what the size of that building is going to be? Four stories. For some reason, it would be similar to yours. What you're with there? That's my understanding, yes. 55 feet. I believe it. Four stories is what I've been told. I don't know. The feed requirement for stories is for the. We don't have a four stories owned district, so I don't know if. It is it normally 55 feet. I a story. What's five? What's five stories? 73. 73 stories is what? 40 or 35. Okay. So it's about 55 feet. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Gilmore. Thank you, President Pro tem. I had a question. I believe it would be directed to the city attorney. Some of the residents had mentioned concerns about a shadow that could be created by, I guess, what will be in a covenant four storey building with 55 additional feet. And and I remember us talking a little bit about, you know, the requirements that that we need to look at to approve or not approve a zoning. And I wanted to make sure, you know, the shadow question. Are we able to

consider anything around shadows that a building might create as criteria to not approve a rezoning? Kels, when Gilmore, Councilwoman Gilmore for this particular zone district. It's going to depend on what the setbacks require. And since we're completely within the Denver zoning code in this area. I don't think it takes into consideration like the protected zone district when you have a transition from old zoning code to the new zoning code. So I don't think that there's any entitlements to sunlight. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, thank you. Councilwoman Gilmore and Councilman Espinosa. So quickly, Mr. O'Donnell is the property owner, the sole parcel party on the covenant. I'm sorry. I didn't quite catch the question. Is th

e property owner the sole party on the covenant? Yes. The the property and or signed in. There's no memo you or agreement or anything with anybody. It was done voluntarily. Yeah, that's an important thing that I wanted to bring up, simply because when we've done this in the past, it has been with similar to what Councilwoman Black had mentioned, it's a two party covenant where an R.A. or a bid with the owner because you to amend or remove the covenant, you only need the parties that are involved. And so well it's well intended. The owner could change at any point I mean, remove the mean on record that that covenant at their discretion. So we approached we can last week in and I attended their board meeting and asked if they would please be a counterparty to an agreement and they'd said no. Yeah. And so that's what's driving it. And in the. The those who have expressed concern over five stories are individuals. In in so we we attempted to but we could not identify a counterparty in. So since Denver does not have a four story zone district, we decided the right thing to do in response to this input was to go ahead and record the covenant on our own. So let me ask you this, and I don't know if you have owner the owner here, but and maybe Miss missed that one one way we've addressed this in the past I think it was on the on the Saint Dominic's is actually Saint Dominic's was willing to in their covenant or in an M.O., I forget which mechanism they used but to cover the legal expenses, if the other party, I mean, sort of the other party pursued a judgment on a violation of the covenant. It's pretty easy to count four stories versus more than four stories. You know, would you guys be willing to do add that language or create that sort of protection if one of the concerned members of the neighborhood would be a party to that covenant? So because we couldn't find another party, I think we've taken the best and kind of only step we could to memorialize our intent and commitment to only build four stories. And the fact is, is that if anyone were to pull title work even today, this would show up as an exception to title. And so when this site is up for development and they try to get financing or design, get in step started anything this will appear in and I don't think it can be violated because they won't get financing. But that would just during your title work you could simply cure that. And but to do that, you'd simply go to the owner and say, look, I need to remove this. There's this covenant because this is preventing me from maximizing my ARX five zoning that I have on the property. I the, the owner is here tonight and is available to answer questions. I would say that if we've clearly expressed our intent and commitment to this four story issue, and it may be that we could explore a more solid way to to make it bulletproof. But we've we've done what we could do alone and with the tools available to us that I'm aware of now. Well, I appreciate that.

And I would just encourage any of my colleagues that are supporting this rezoning on the basis of that risk, voluntary restriction that you press the applicant and the owner to sort of a more robust measure. Do I have any other questions? I don't think. So. All right. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. This concludes the question portion and closes the public hearing for Council Bill 750. We're now on to comments. Kamal Lopez, this is your district. Yes. This is the real district three. Legendary. House of the legendary. That's right. So I am I want first, I want to thank everybody for for being here and these kind of rezonings often, you know, they're head scratchers, especially when they are along light rail lines and especially when they split neighborhoods right on right across the street is Villa Park with a plan that's 1992 . West Colfax has been behind me, the more nuanced plan, a lot more involvement, and is consistently being tinkered with. So I totally was was very careful not to engage in any of the conversations, any of the meetings, anything like that. I wanted to be absolutely removed from the process so I can make have with a clear head, take a look at this and then hear from folks in the hearing. And although, you know, I absolutely I absolutely respect and really want to see a lot of the folks who are here. And thank you for being here. There's a lot of folks who are here. Right. And so we have to really think about this in context in terms of, okay, this is a big neighborhood, big neighborhood to the north and in the south. You

know, for me, I'm thinking of thinking about context. And I think of. How it came in the Council with support from planning board. Yes, there were some no votes and I paid attention to those no no votes, took a look at those, dived into some of the reasoning. But when you look at the criteria that we have and you look at the criteria that we have in terms of rezoning. This meets the criteria from CPD. It's in compliance with our plans. It's in compliance with the West Colfax Neighborhood Plan. And it's not the only development in the neighborhood. Just to the north. You have stones like. And it's growing like crazy. Yes, you do. I'm from the neighborhood. I've been there. A heck of a lot longer than you guys have. All right. So the second is on Perry. Perry is growing. You see development on Perry happening like nobody's business. I haven't seen any any opposition to that. Right. Third, when you look at 12 or nine, I'm asking why hasn't there why was there opposition to that? If you're looking at one property on Perry and this is where I disagree with my colleague here, you're looking at the property that faces Perry adjacent to the light rail station. Right. And you look at the property right behind it and the property in question doesn't face anything else but a park. It's different when you're talking about a neighborhood or units or lots on a neighborhood that face each other. Right. It's absolute

y different. It really makes no sense. To restrict height and to restrict density, especially at a light rail station on Perry. And, you know, we can't consider affordability, but affordability doesn't equate to less units. And so that, you know, what was spoken here earlier in that testimony is kind of out the window. It doesn't make sense. I actually was looking for opposition. We can did not oppose it that I'm kind of frustrated as well to the organized neighborhood association in the neighborhood isn't isn't present the an issue that Villa Park neighborhood which is right across the street within 200 feet. They didn't submit any kind of opposition. And then also I don't see the outcry in the room. Where is the outcry? If it was such a big issue, you think this would be filled. And I'm sorry I called you up. I had. That's that's just the thing. If I see the property owner here who's supporting it. And then I hear testimony from folks that don't even live in that neighborhood. And they live in a neighborhood that's even denser. So for me. You know, I don't think that there was a necessity for a restriction, but the restriction exists. So that that deed restriction is limited in height for 25 years. As much as I understand it, if this rezoning is approved. The other thing is this yes the area cost of 20% for for a protest but. What we saw and what we saw in front of us is 16 signatures, 16 signatures, eight of which were valid. To have a real protest to give us the the legal justification to oppose it. There has to be more than eight signatures. And so and that for me. That's a big deal. I can. It's hard for us to oppose something if the opposition is not in the room. It's big. That's that violates any one of those criteria that we have or that we'd only have a legal protest for. I've been in this room. When we had rezonings on any matter where we've been here till 3 a.m.. Because it's packed, because there is a legal protest filed over one or two properties. I've been here long enough to know the difference. And I would I would really encourage that if if there is that activity, if there is that groundswell of folks that don't want to see the density or don't want to see this kind of zoning in the neighborhood around light rail stations, folks. Then you need to be able to have it in the chambers or in a legal protest. So that. That's where I'm at with this. I you know, I have remained as far away from the intermingling conversations that have had. Take a look at this objectively. And that's what we do in zoning, is that you have to take a look at this absolutely objective objectively. And I just don't see any reason to oppose it. Any legal reason to oppose it? And you can laugh and snicker here. But, you know, this is my neighborhood as well, too. May I speak to why we're snickering? What is this? This is. This is the comment period. Sorry, buddy. You had your. You had a. Chance. I had my 3 minutes. But I think it's very. Interesting that you g

ive developers more time to talk. But no, no, no, no. I can. I can. Categorically. Sir, sir, everything that Mr. Lopez just said. Okay. Excuse me for breaking decorum, sir. Thank you. All right. Okay. Okay. Are there? You can call us. All right. Are there any other members of council? One of my coming calls for an well. Is what it is. I just want to explain my vote in that. I'm trying to look back. I'm trying to compare old zoning versus new zoning. I mean, there was a woman, Stephanie Wickman, who lives who signed that protest petition, lives immediately adjacent to this parcel, who will definitely be impacted in a way by this. The amount of zone lot coverage and the drastic changes in parking versus, you know, anybody who owned in that area prior to 2010. And that's just going to give you three, which is the the culprit of transformation in Jefferson Park that everyone sort of recognizes as like, you know, this is this is this is a foreign thing . So, Jim, you three is no

great shakes. And that's what that's what this area is is is plagued with, in my opinion, in going to this Joan district. This is a good zone district. And philosophically, I'm all for density at our rail stations. But how we got here isn't how we should get here to density. It is very clear to me that this is a real stretch of old adopted plans in that flies in the face of recent adopted plans and with very, very, very detrimental impact to a local street. And so, again, philosophically, my heart's in this sort of zone district, but I cannot support it because I don't think it has the valid plan support that it needs in order to for us to sort of grossly say that the criteria has been met. But I so I just I'm not saying that you guys can't see it, but I don't see it. And I wanted people, Bruce, particularly, because he he knows that I feel that we should have density here. And I work with other developers time and time again, but I try to work in, you know, in a way that we're actually recognizing the needs of the community, recognizing the needs of developer and trying to find a middle ground. And I think that was what the tool that I've mentioned before is the covenant. That's how we've used it in the past. I wish we didn't. We can do it through zoning, particularly when we had our and it was a lack of our know strength or willingness or bid. And it's really, really difficult when we don't have the ability to sort of use our tools or use third parties to get to that compromise. Because I do think there's a compromise to be made here, one that orients a new development towards the towards the Lakewood Gulch, one that satisfies parking and architectural concerns and street lighting concerns, permitting, you know, future residential permits, which you can't do unless he brings a mixed use on that ground floor. And there's a real way to sort of get to grapple with our station areas in a way that is constructive and not destructive. But our M.O. is to zone to something that is.

That is just so. So I don't know. So. I don't know the loss for words of how pathetic our zoning code is on adapting to the real world contexts of our neighborhoods because they're so applicable citywide that they don't recognize that a Lakewood Gulch and a Jefferson Park are different than an MLK and Central, you know, just completely different animals, but same zoning tool. And we should be able to sort of reach that compromise. And I and I think Bruce has proven time and time again that he's capable of doing that and willing to do that. But he doesn't have to go any further than where the city takes him or demands and. And that's really unfortunate. Right. So I've been on that on that on that soapbox for a long time now. Thanks. All right. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a very interesting rezoning. And as my earlier questioning sort of alluded to, I think. The issues in the neighborhood are really the GMU three rezoning. And I know a lot of the west side of town is is getting some really awful buildings built in residential neighborhoods and and. That that zone district is is. Is going to hurt your single-family residential neighborhood. And I feel like that's more of a problem than this building that is adjacent to the light rail station. And as we do our work, we really are trying to encourage density at the light rail stations. To get people to use that the train. And I feel like the adjacent lot that is grx5 makes this appropriate in the fact that nobody came to oppose that. I think it's a legitimate transition to the GM, you three. Parking is not how we should plan our city. We spend a lot of time talking about parking. You guys can work with. With our parking department on maybe some residential permits. I don't know. But I appreciate the developer considering a covenant. I think that they would be willing to work with the neighbors on other things. I am going to support it. It does meet the legal criteria that we are required to look at. And so I will be supporting you. Thank you, Councilwoman Black. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. I think that the all of the criteria we heard in the staff report would also support the the new generics three. And it does bother me listening to Councilman Espinosa and talking about Equipment Street being a dead end and being completely different from the collector nature of Paris Street that this might be the even with the restriction in the covenant to force storeys puts significantly more traffic on a dead end street than would occur on that lot that's on Perry. And so I am struggling with that because I think the very same arguments that are made and the criteria that fit the Greeks five also fit the generics. Three And I know Mr. O'Donnell said that that came along after the application had begun, but I wish that that had been explored more fully, because I think that might be the more appropriate song for this and would be very justifi

able. So thank you, Mr. President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Yeah. Well, actually, I'm sorry, Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman can each popped in at that time? She hasn't spoke yet? No. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank the folks who spoke today and also a number of you wrote letters and emails. Laurie, I think I got your letters, so I appreciate you communicating with us

in advance to share your concerns. I just wanted to speak for a moment about one of the criteria that's been in dispute a little bit, which is about the adopted plans in terms of the West Colfax plan and its age. I know 26 feels like a long time ago to us, but it is more up to date. That is a more recent plan than we have in many areas of the city. And I also don't have any reason to believe that we wouldn't come up with similar recommendations because the stuff that went into that plan is so similar to that which is coming out in other plans with other station areas like this. And so it is definitely, in my mind, still a criteria that has been met because I you know, it was still planning for transit. It was still planning for some of the things that the open space was there. So none of those things that went into that plan have changed. So there's not a lot of belief that I have that the plan would come out necessarily differently. The other thing I wanted to just distinguish, because I know folks are bringing out transportation concerns, is this is a little different than what we talked about a couple zoning ago. Go with the street and the whole area in that and you have a dead end into an entire development. In this case, you have a dead end into a park. It's not like the development is extending beyond. And so I think that there's not a lot of purpose, there's no other destination there. So when we when we think about what's going to happen with traffic and a dead end, it's now people are going to the grocery store and then have to get back out again. The only people who are going to go out, the dead under, the people who are going to be parking there so it doesn't have the same traffic implications as is the earlier one. So. And so, you know, I just you know, I appreciate the concerns and it's always hardest for the folks who live closest in terms of the impacts of change. And so really sensitive to that. I think there should be a lot of conversation here about step backs on the backside of that building. If it if it doesn't have a protected district element to it. And owner, I hope that you will be really sensitive in thinking about that. But I to see that the criteria are met and just wanted to speak for a moment about distinguishing why in particular, I think the plan has been met in spite of the fact that folks are concerned about the plan being from 2006. So with that, I will be supporting it today. But I do hope that you all will stay in dialog and I appreciate your constructive approach tonight. You've been very respectful and communicative

and it's very much appreciated. Your your concerns are heard even even if they don't necessarily change the weighing of the legal criteria. Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Thank you. Yeah, I just I know that the comments have been made on parking, but we can't consider anything when it comes to parking and parking's an issue. Parking from the stadium is becoming an issue all the way that far south. And we have to consider tags, literally tags that you hang on your car to keep people from parking on your spot. And that's not even your spot. Public Streets, Public Street. But that's a whole nother issue. We can't consider parking as part of a zoning, especially a zoning application space, especially here. It's just not part of the criteria. And I really, really want to underscore that. And the other point is exactly the brilliance that my calling it was. Just displaying was. That isn't. To other development. It's a dead end, but it's a dead end to a light rail station. And if we really, really want to be able to increase access and just looking at that, increase access to light rail and stepping down from using vehicles, these are the locations in the way we do it. This is where you have density and it's not fair for folks to live on a light rail station and not even be able to have access to it or just to limit that access to a few. To a few. What good is a light rail station around bunch of single family homes? With cars. There you have it. So I just want to make that extra point. All right. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. See no other comments. I'll just say this. Number one, everyone who's still here at 9:00, it's an early night for us. But for you, it's a late night. You've come through security, you paid for parking. And so I just want to thank you for voice, in your opinion, I think is incredibly important. I think this makes our city much, much better. I went on I went on a ride with Councilman Espinosa in his district of Jefferson Park, and I got a chance to see the the development that was happening. And it is a bit ridiculous and overwhelming for the community. And so we began to have this conversation about what do you what do you do? Where do you what do you kind of go from here? And I have a a proposal coming in my district. And I'm glad you brought up the the three story. The the what was I think it was a game, you three that's around here. We have the same issue in a part of five points in San Rafael and the neighbors and they have 80% of the neighborhood on board too downs on the neighborhood because of this fear. And and although we're talking about this one spot here, I think there's a larger conversation for your entire neighborhood to be had. The thing and Councilman Flynn touched on it that I'm really upset and kind of bothered on is is the Greeks three from CPD. I don't understand how later in a process that becomes it comes up as a possibility and not in the beginning of the process. And so I wasn't in

on those. I I'm sitting

here as, you know, an objective, you know, councilperson now. But. This is the third or fourth time we've had a conversation where this could have been taken care of on the front end between the neighborhood and the community. And now we're dealing with it on the back end. And so at. I don't I don't get that. And I don't understand that. And it's very frustrating. I. This is a tough one because, you know, obviously, I think the neighborhood has a lot of concerns and they're their right concerns. And at the same time, we have a criteria. And at the same time, this is a light rail station. And and so this is tough. But I guess my message is twofold. One, I want to have a conversation with CPD on on these enlightenment moments that happen. As the conversation is going with the proposer and then something changes 6 to 12 weeks down the road. I just I don't get that. You've done this study. Why is it changing? So I just need an explanation on that. And then to if the neighbors are really wanting to take this to the next level, what does it look like to look at the entire context of the community? So with that, Madam Secretary, Rocco. Lopez. I knew Ortega. I. Black eye. Clark. Right. Espinosa. Yes. Flynn No. Gilmore I caution. Can each. ESPINOZA No. Mr. President? No. Please consider bringing us the results. Sorry. 1/2. Not everyone's. Felt sorry. Yeah. Can you. Just. Change that screen? Eight eyes, three nays. Council Bill 715 passes on Monday, August 28th. Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 883, creating establishing a Denver tourism district, appointing initial members of the Board of Directors of the district and improving initial plan a preliminary 2018 budget. Right. All right. Next up, and before I read this proclamation, those of you needing a translation, Spanish translation, we do have it. And I apologize. There she is with your hands in the air. I do apologize for mentioned that late. So we do have that. All right. I will read Proclamation 993. There's a 2017 honoring the board of directors for the Denver Union Station Project Authority for its service. Whereas Denver Union Station Project Authority, otherwise known as BA, is a Colorado nonprofit corporation and instrumental instrument of the city, creating pursuant to Ordinance Number 334 series of 2008 adopted by the City Council of the of the City on June 28 and was created for the purpose of financing, equipping, designing, constructing, renovating and taking such other actions as necessary with respect to the redevelopment of the Denver Union Station. And. Whereas, since its formation, Duster has operated as in partnership with the city and the Regional Transportation District, RTD and the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Denver Regional Council of Governments and Denver Union Stations, Metropolitan District, collectively the partner organizations. And. Whereas, since its formation, Duster has been managed and controlled by a board of directors com

prised of 13 appointees representing each partner organization, the board. And. Whereas, the past nine years, the following individuals have served on the board generously donating their time effort to steward the redevelopment of Denver Union Station. And I will read those. And there are a lot of them. The Honorable Elvira Wedgeworth, Gerald Glick, Alora Eldredge, Ralph Aspen, the Honorable Kent Bagley. William A Banjo. Alvis Brooks. Mario Carrera. Peggy Catlin. Russell. George. Barbara. Grogan Thomas. Gogan. Brendan Hanlon. Terry Howard. Donald Hunt. Mark Imhoff. Stephan Stephan. Stephen Kaplan. The Honorable Carrie Kennedy. The Honorable Robin Kennett. Marla Lehne. Heather McKillop The Honorable Judy Monteiro. Mr. Year. Okay. Clot Pamela Jacob. Rigger Jennifer. Shift shuffling. Ed Schultz, Mark Smith and Michael West. Whereas the visionary outlook and tireless service of these individuals help to transform the Denver Union Station into a vibrant transportation hub and community gathering destination, offering local and commuter rail service by RTD Regional and across across the country. Rail Service by Amtrak modernization of Underground Bus Pavilion, a luxury hotel, a commercial and residential space, popular eating and drinking, established and establishments and a thriving community plaza. Now, therefore, may be proclaimed by the Council of the City County of Denver that the city and county, though the Council of the City and County of Denver hereby recognize and honor all these members. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for your services. The Board of Directors for the Denver Union Station Project Authority, both past and and current. The Clerk of the city of the County of Denver shall affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and copy be transmitted to every board member. And I move that proclamation 993 be adopted. It has been moved and second it. Thank you so much and I'll just open with comments. I get the awesome opportunity to have Union Station in my district and literally I've put nothing into Union Station. This is all about leaders in the community and several mayors for the last couple decades investing in

this incredible opportunity, in this incredible location. And, you know, one of the coolest thing is I have colleagues all over the country, mayors and city council folks who come to Denver just to see Union Station come to Denver to see how we have created this this hub. But it's not just about the hub, because there's incredible development opportunities that have happened in Union Station. And the ratio of of public money versus our private investment is about 1 to 4. So every dollar of public money we put in, we've received a \$4 return on our private investment. It is an incredible I think it's incredibly representative of who we are as Colorado as Denver to come together for this collaborative project and see it be so successful. So that doesn't happen by accident. It's something in our DNA in Col

orado, something in our DNA in Denver to make these things happen. And what I love most about it is it's preserving and it's remembering our incredible history in Denver, our entrepreneur, our pioneer spirit. So I'm excited to bring this proclamation forward, and I hope my colleagues can support it. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I want to ask that my name be added and just share a very brief bit of history. So this used to be part of my council district when I represented District nine, and I actually had worked for Sal Carpio, and he was the catalyst that worked towards taking what had been vacant, an abandoned railroad land that that was not contributing to the city tax base. And it was his vision to see the Central Platte Valley redeveloped. And, you know, fast forward to today. Lots of things have happened down there. But I also want to give my thanks and kudos to the entire team. It took a large number of not only individuals, but different entities coming together to make our train station become a reality. And even looking back to 2011, when I decided to run, to come back to serve on this body, I took some pictures from the Millennium Bridge. And many of those buildings that are down there right now in in what is still known to many of us as the Central Platte Valley, some people now call it Riverfront Park. None of those buildings were there. And it's almost entirely built out right now. So, you know, that project has been a catalyst. It also raises some some challenges that some of us have have worked on and talked about. And that's the issue of railroad safety and the fact that we've got a lot of development that comes through there where we have our railroads. But, you know, it's created some many, many opportunities for more folks to utilize our. Our train that goes up to Winter Park, as well as our trains that now serve folks going out to the airport. But we will have other lines that will be coming online soon. So thanks for all of your work. I see some of the folks sitting in the audience. This is this is a great a great night to celebrate. Thanks. Great. Counselor Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to chime in very briefly to say that it's truly remarkable what the city has done with its what I still call the old warehouse district. The first time I came to Denver in the early seventies and saw railroad cars ply freight cars, plying those streets on railroad tracks and then seeing it sort of wither on the vine and almost losing it, almost losing it to demolition and how different the rail yards could have been had we followed up on some of the earlier plans that we saw down there that in one case, voters had rejected. And to see it today as the thriving, almost, almost the center of gravity now for downtown, moving to the north, down to the old, the older old rail yards. And to see that station revitalized is just a remarkable thing that Mr. President I never thought I would live to see, but I just

wanted to add my congratulations to the Denver Union Station Project Authority for a job well done. Thank you. And thank you, Councilman Flynn. All right. Seeing no other comments. Madam Secretary. Raquel Black. Clerk Hi. Espinosa. Flynn. Hi, Cashman. Lopez Hi, Ortega, I. Sussman Hi, Mr. President. I please close voting and other results. One's missing. Let's see. Oh, yeah. Let's see who we're missing this time. Cashman. Cashman. Here you go. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Sorry to tell you. Yeah, it's okay. 99 nine I's Council Bill 9093 has been adopted. Congratulations. I want to call up to the podium. My predecessor for four Denver City Council. Former president of Denver City Council. Now she's the chief government and community relations officer at Denver Health. The Honorable Deborah Edgeworth and also Jerry Glick, the managing partner at Columbia Group and vice president of Display since 2008. Please head to the. Head to the podium. Council President Brooks and members of City Council. Thanks for having us here tonight. This is a perfect example of a coordination between a number of public bodies. Without the city's participation, our TDS, Dr. COG and C Dots. This project probably wouldn't have happened. So we finished ahead of budget, ahead of schedule. We refinanced the debt 22 years earlier than was projected. And the ordinance that you're going to look at tonight does the final thing for us. It

puts us out of business, which is what we'd like to do. So thank you very much. We appreciate your support. And Gary Alper Wedgeworth. I serve as the president of the board and have for the last nine years. And on. Behalf of the board. It's been an amazing nine years for volunteering. For this project. And we're very proud of the. Leadership that we've provided to this project. It's been a long. Road. But it's been worth every step for us because this is an. Incredible local, state and national. Model for multimodal. And we really feel nationally we've kind of hit the mark in terms of future. Projects. In this country and it being. More important, a lasting legacy for many generations. To come. So I'd like to thank the city council, of course, along with Mayor Hancock and the previous mayors. Also the council representatives that have been on the board. Council president Perks. Councilwoman Monteiro and Councilwoman Canete. So thank you very much. Thank you. And I just want to make sure we get this right. I didn't know that it was 22 years early for the refinance. We just refinanced all the bonds and is 22 years early. Wow. At 22 years earlier than was originally projected when the forecast. Wow. Congratulations. Okay. It's good to be in Denver, huh? Wow. Okay, we have another proclamation. Councilman Ortega, will you please read Proclamation 994? And I look forward to more partnerships like that. Great. All right. Let's bring the next item up, which is 973. And I believe we're going to put that on the floor. Councilwoman Canete,

will you please put on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bill 973 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right, it's been moved. I need a second. In a second. All right. It's been moved and seconded. Comments for members of Council Council Gilmore. Thank you, President Brooks. I will be abstaining from the vote on this due to my brother in law having an interest in the Great Hall Project. All right. Thank you. Seen no other comments by members of council. Madam Secretary, roll call. Gilmore. Abstain. Cashman. Kinney. Lopez. Nu Ortega. Sussman. High Black Clerk. Espinosa. I. Flynn. I. Mr. President. I. Police close voting. Announce the results. 11 eyes. One Abstention. 11 I. One abstention. 973 passes. Okay, please bring up 939. Great Councilwoman. 99 is up. Councilman Ortega. Mr. President. How about communications? None. Mr. President. We do have two proclamations. Councilman Clark, will you please read Proclamation 1174? Thank you, Mr. President. I have proclamation number 17, dash 117 for celebrating Denver afterschool programs and the 2017 annual National Lights On After School Day. Whereas the Denver City Council recognizes that afterschool programs make a lifelong difference for kids and their parents. And. WHEREAS, students who regularly attend high quality afterschool programs benefit in terms of academic performance, social and emotional learning and health and wellness. And. Whereas, a strong focus on social, emotional and academic learning impacts students positive social behaviors and attitudes, skills such as empathy and self-confidence and academic achievement, providing youth with lifelong skills and setting them up for success in school, work and beyond. And. Whereas, the Denver Afterschool Alliance connects and unites providers, school and city officials, families, funders and youth to create a long term collaborative, collaborative plan for high quality afterschool programs citywide. And. Whereas, the Denver City Council has supported afterschool programs so that Denver's children and families have access to programs that support their success and strengthen our city. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Denver City Council recognizes the outstanding leadership of the Denver Afterschool Alliance in bringing together all stakeholders to create a collaborative, long term plan for our city's after school system and recognizes the 2017 National Lights on Afterschool Day at Thursday, October 26th of 2017. Section two that the clerk of the city and County of Denver shall attest and affects the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and transmit it to the Office of Children's Affairs. All right. Thank you, Councilman. Clerk, your motion to adopt. I move that proclamation 1174 be adopted. And it has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council. Councilman. Clerk Thank you, Mr. President. It is always an excitin

g day when we have kids in the chamber. As we heard with the Pledge of Allegiance, they bring an energy and a spirit and a fire to things. So I want to thank all of you for coming out and hanging out with us. You can come hang out every Monday if you'd like. Not a lot of head nods for that one, but we're very excited to have you today. I'm very excited to bring this proclamation forward. I have a fourth grader and a fifth grader. You know, I spent my career working with kids. There is no better investment than we can make as a city than in our future. And right here in front of us, we're in those awesome shirts. You are the future of our city. You are our future police officers and

firefighters and council people and mayor and everything that we can hope and dream for is in you. And so taking good care of you is always an important priority. I've got to work with the Afterschool Alliance, and they just do a phenomenal job in a space that is so critical and so important for kids to be successful and have all of the tools that they need to succeed. And so I'm very excited to celebrate the annual National Lights On After Day School and all of our kids and the work of the Afterschool Alliance today. And I hope everyone will help me in supporting this proclamation. Thank you, Mr. President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Clark. And I'll just say to the young folks, I when I grew up, I was a latchkey kid. I mean, my parents worked really late. And so I was dependent on all these programs and organizations to raise me. And he did a pretty good job. And not to say that my parents didn't raise me, that kind of sounded bad. But I'm telling you, I know. Please do not tell my mama whatever y'all do. But I just want to tell you how important it is. And I think Councilman Clark did an amazing job. But number one, we think you're beautiful. We really do. And we want to let you all know that anything that we can do to make you guys successful in this city, we will do it. And as a matter of fact, if you're not experiencing success, we're not successful as a city. You are our future. And so just so glad that you guys are here. And to the adults that are in the room, you are transforming lives. And thank you for your investment as well. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to briefly echo the comments, how wonderful it is to have the kids in the Chambers tonight and the Importance of the Proclamation that the councilman brought forward. I'm wondering where our young folks are from this evening. I think after we vote, we're going to get into we're going to be here and we'll hear from that. All of them, one by one. One by one. They're each going to take 3 minutes seated time and got six here. Thank you, Mr.. That was pretty funny. Madam Secretary, roll call. Clark, i. Espinosa, i. Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. i. Herndon. Cashman. I can eat. Lopez. I knew. Ortega. Hi. Sussman My black eye. Mr. Preside

nt. I police close voting and as a result. Sorry a few people than fill it in. 3913 EIS Proclamation 1174 has been adopted. Congratulations. Well. Okay. Who's first to talk for 3 minutes, Councilman Clark. So first up, the first two that I will bring up are Reagans who hailed from the Denver after school alliance. And I'm going to bring up Josephine Rangel, who is a fifth grader at the Boys and Girls Club of Metro Denver, but who goes to school at Guardsman Elementary School in Luckey, District seven? So you two want to come up and maybe you can talk about where the other schools that are represented as well. Thank you so much for having us this evening. We really appreciate your time and we're thrilled to be here. And we're joined by youth from several different afterschool programs, the Boys and Girls Clubs of Metro, Denver Scholars Unlimited and Denver Parks and Rec. So thank you again to the adults and everybody coming on down here. We've got more than 26, maybe 27 kids. I better double check my head count before I leave the building. Right. Joining us this evening from grades K through five and representing a number of different districts, we've got Councilman Herndon, Councilman Clark and Councilman Brooks districts all here this evening. Everybody else wanted to come by. As you can tell, they're busy doing STEM programing and tutoring and arts and culture activities and whatnot. So the Denver Afterschool Alliance is the collaboration between the city and county of Denver, the Office of Children's Affairs, Denver Public Schools and more than 400 youth service organizations in every nook and cranny of Denver that come together in order to support afterschool and summer programs for kids. We currently are supporting 420 some odd organizations, reaching 17,000 Denver youth. So the work that we do is important. We are involved in strengthening staff practices, ensuring that we have robust data to work from filling access and gaps of opportunity to make sure that really there's high quality programs represented throughout the entire city and county of Denver. I'm going to have Josephine come take the microphone and she's going to tell you a little bit about what she likes about her program and why it is that she attends. Hi. My name is Josephine and I go to the Guardsmen, Boys and Girls Club. The Boys and Girls Club is an after school program that is offered at the school, allowing me and my friends a safe place to go. We get fed, we get help with homework, can interact with new people and take fun and engaging classes. I have been part of the Boys and Girls Club for four years. Sometimes we don't have time. Sometimes I don't have time to do things like homework or extra fun activities when we're at home. Some parents can help their kids with homework either. The Boys and Girls Club helps with this. They make you feel welcome. They help you complete your homework. If you didn't have Boys and Girls Club, you would be bored at home and wouldn't be

able to interact with people much. Boys and Girls Club allows kids to open up and find things that they like to do at guardsman. We get to do programs we have never been able to do before, like sewing flight school, right brain or torch club. People really feel like they belong in the program. I really like that. They can help me with my homework. They also allow me to learn new things and get to know new people every day. There are always a lot of fun activities. It's really fun for me to make new friends. We also get to go on many field trips. It is really nice to have the opportunity to go places we have never been before. My favorite field trips have been a Broncos game, bike building competitions and a mid air adventures where we went ziplining and also the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. I have really enjoyed the Boys and Girls Club and I feel like this after school program has given me and my school many opportunities. Thank you. I think we found the future councilwoman of Lucky District seven. Josephine, you did a great job. Thank you guys all for coming. I'm sorry. I want to hear from more that. Okay. All right. Thank you, guys. You did an excellent job. Well done. All right. We have another proclamation this evening. Councilwoman Ortega, will you please read 11, seven, nine? Thank you, President Pro tem. Now, I'll do a quick recap on the resolutions we have. Nothing has been called out under bills for introduction. Nothing has been called out under bills for final consideration. And Councilman Cashman has called out Council Bill 1125, the Breathe Easy Ordinance four amendments and under pending no items have been caught out. Madam Secretary, please bring up 1125. Councilman. Clerk, please put 1125 on the floor. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council 1125 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved in second and councilman second. Oh, sorry. I need a second from the left side or the or one person on the right side. All right, Councilman Cashman, thank you. It's moved in second. Did Councilman Castro, you want to offer your your motion to amend it? Thank you, Mr. President. I moved to amend Bill number 17, dash 1125 as follows On page three after line 20 to add a new section, the entitled reporting requirement, the Denver Police Department shall prepare a report concerning tickets issued pursuant to this ordinance and distributed to the City Council Quarterly. Councilman. I believe you. You got a second? Okay. First, it's been first, and second it comes members of Council Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. So, as you're aware, I will also be preparing a follow up amendment to add a sunset clause. I want to read comments regarding both. At this time, I am fully in support of discouraging smoking in public places. I have no question that secondhand smoke is a public health hazard. I'm dealing right now with a family member who never smoked herself, but due to her parents heavy cigaret habits is

struggling with the effects of COPD. If the result of this legislation is improved health health outcomes for visitors to the 16th Street Mall, I will consider the bill to have fulfilled perhaps our most basic charge as legislators to protect the health and safety of the community. My concern, however, since I first heard of this proposal or something similar a couple of years ago, is that it could be unfairly wielded to harass particular groups of people in an effort to sanitize the mall, not from health impacts, but from the visual impact of those members of Denver's community whose presence casts a bit of a shadow on the All is rosy in Denver backdrop that businesses would like visitors to experience while visiting the mall. I'm aware that should this ordinance pass this evening, those mall denizens who wish to exercise their God given right to threaten their own health have only to walk 51 feet down a side street to avoid the bill's reach and find a spot to light up outside the reach of the long arm of the law. I just want to be absolutely sure that those who decide to not take that stroll, either due to obstinance or ignorance, are warned or ticketed without regard as to whether they are 17th Street lawyers. Conventioneers in town from L.A. or New York. Or those who are on the streets because they have no home to which they can retreat. Mr. President, I am very much appreciative of your willingness, your your indication of your willingness to incorporate in this legislation, this requirement that the police department report regularly to council with information as to who is being cited under the requirements of this bill. I know you felt the data could be gathered through rules and regulations, and I thank you for your honoring the feelings of those concerned that the extra weight of ordinance would ensure compliance. I think another important element of this bill is missing. As I mentioned, it will be addressed soon. That is a sunset requirement that would force council to fully assess the result of this ordinance two years down the line to ensure it is being enforced in the interest of public health and not just for public relations. I fully agree that a sunset clause should not be used indiscriminately, and I would point out that this is the first time in my time on council that I have requested such inclusion. I urge my colleagues to

consider supporting both of these amendments. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Castro. And I just want to alert members of council the way that we have it. We were going to do Councilman Cashman's other bill for other amendment first, but he read his data amendment first. So just just so you're keeping up with that. He's going to read his Sunset Amendment next. And in there, just so you're clear. Okay, Councilman Flynn, you're. Thanks, Mr. President. If I could through the through your chair, direct a question to Councilman Cashman, because I'm curious that there it's a very barebones amendme

nt and it doesn't address the type of data that I would expect to see. So in other words, the DPD could comply with this simply by giving us a number each quarter since we issued, you know, 38 tickets. Should there have been a requirement in here as to what pin what measures of data you were seeking? Sure. No, I intentionally left it. The General I'm working with Chief Kenyan us, who has told me that they will be able to report if a person is transient or if they list an address for a homeless shelter. The addresses they report will also tell us if they're local residents or from out of town in discussions with our city attorney. It was suggested that we keep the ordinance a bit. Flat, clean. And so as to allow for changes. We might want to add additional information down the line. So I look forward to working with the department on that. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for that clarification. Thank you. And thank you, Councilman Flynn. And also say two members of council before this was brought up. I misspoke and said it was going to be in rules and regulations. It's actually going to be in the training bulletin for the police for this specific ordinance. And that in the ordinance, I think you're going to have that greater flexibility of what kind of data you want to see. So that's right on. Councilman Espinosa, you're up. No, I just wanted to thank Councilman Cashman for bringing forward this amendment. I think it. You know, it's an important component for me to support this this legislation because it, you know, it helps to allow us to, to, um, review and monitor, um, the, the, the effect that this, I mean, who's been affected by this ordinance and if anybody is disproportionately affected by this ordinance. Our committee I, I went over the the that the CBO, the National Institutes of Health, the CDC sorry. Center for Disease Control. And their statistics on who smokes and how certain populations are disproportionately smokers and that it should look like an ordinance without this sort of provision could and the subsequent sunset provision could simply go in the direction not of public health outcomes, but to sort of disproportionately affect a very, very specific population. And in that is not a sort of a good use of government to sort of, you know, bring a heavy hammer down on a very, very specific street in Denver under the guise of health concerns, because we have these health concerns citywide. And so thank you for bringing both amendments forward, because I think there are two very vital components. And I do think the sunset is important as well, because when we did, you know, one of the first things we had to address when I was a new member of council was the sunset on the marijuana moratorium. And I think, ah, the legwork that this body did in the run up to addressing that sunset improved our legislation going forward. And I think that's what this has the potential to do, is let's give it a shot in this limited way, see what sort

of outcomes we're getting and compel us or future councils to, um, to, to sort of make the necessary tweaks and improve or expand, you know, because if we are getting genuine great health outcomes, there would be no reason to sort of try and capture that in a larger area. So thank you, Councilman Cashman. All right, Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I also wanted to chime in on this. I think this amendment makes a lot of sense. You know, I know that there are some concerns out there in the community. And I wanted to make sure I mean, a lot of the folks here, I think almost everybody shares those concerns. I think, you know, Councilman Brooks, in his in the ordinance addressed a lot of the things that we were concerned about in terms of does this kind of does the violation lead to any kind of incarceration? It does not. Does it lead to the courts and getting tied up with with too many fines? It doesn't. You know, I think we also have to remember that folks that smoke. Wear different clothes, have different titles, are from all walks of life. And it is not just the, you know, smoking is not a crime. But making sure that you at the same time policies like this are very common, especially that the Mall is becoming more than just a pass through a walk through mall that people have. People are sitting down having meals with their families, especially on the actual mall property. And I think when you when you think of air, when you think of healthy environments, that's one of them. So does this end up with somebody becoming arrested? It does not. Does this end up with somebody, somebody in court over a fine?

Most likely not. It is not a criminal violation. What it does is I think it gives folks an opportunity to educate folks about where and where not to smoke. You know, my conversations with Councilman Brooks, it seems like all those bases are covered. I think that the data collection is important. Right, because I've seen the data in other cities and it's disproportionate. And so I want to make sure that in our cities and I think this is why I support this amendment, that we measure it, we make sure we have a good understanding of who's who's in violation and who isn't, and then and then move from there. But at the end of the day, I think it's a good amendment where. Good audience. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to speak in support of this amendment. It is critical that we have fair application of the law.

Otherwise, I think we if the data shows that there is disproportionate application, it would subject the ordinance to a potential legal challenge at some point in time in the future. And so this ensures that we are, you know, applying equally across the board. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Hey. And I will just say this. You know, I want to thank the folks who came up. The opponents of the bill, actually, Denver homicide allowed to have the conv

ersation because it allowed us to talk about the depth in which we went in to develop this ordinance to address those issues . And I just want to go into them just a little bit in this section of the code, which does not allow smoking on our municipal and hospital buildings. It is a criminal violation today. This section of the code makes it a civil infraction. And so when we add the 16th Street Mile, that is a civil infraction, meaning that there can be no fines up to \$99 or, you know, time in jail. One, two. We have something in this city. You know, we have these programs in the city, homeless court, drug court and things like that, which waive all fines for folks experiencing transition, homelessness, all kinds of things in their life. And so that happens every day. And we wanted to make sure that this was a part of this as well. And lastly, we are already doing audits on the 16th Street Mall and Denver Health is doing that. And we just had an audit of for 3 hours, there's more people smoking on the mall than I even realized, 3 hours, people smoking in the mall, five blocks over 80 people and just less than a handful were people in transition or people experiencing homelessness. And so I think it's important that we track that. I think it's critical, but it also it's also critical for us to see what is the original intent of this bill, what was the original intent of the Clean Indoor Act when we passed that, it was because of health issues. And so this is a campaign and if it's not shown as a campaign, we'll go back and look at it. And so I'm going to be in support of this, even though from the very beginning we were going to put it in the training bulletin. I think. I think if we put it within the ordinance, it strengthens it and lets folks know that we're serious about it. So I'll be supporting this councilman as well. Is there anybody here to answer a question or is it. Yeah, there are people here. Who are you? So I just have one, two questions because I keep thinking about the unintended consequences of sort of the third door down and each direction from the mall. The first question is, is there a smoking ban on Larimer Street right now? No. The only smoking smoke free zone is on the pavilions within Union Station. Okay. Because that is my concern. And I don't know how we'll address it in real time if it becomes one where, again, people might congregate in those still desirable places to hang out, you know, 50 feet away from the 16th Street Mall. And just the last piece and I think Councilman Lopez brought this up, 4500 municipalities take it to the next level of smoke free zones, more than 16th Street Mall, more than their municipal buildings, but parks, every commercial area. And so this is just a small step for the city of Denver. Madam Secretary, roll call on the amendment Cashman. I can each I Lopez. II. Ortega. I. Black. Clark, I. Espinosa. Hi, Flynn. Hi. Mr. President. I please close the voting and thus

results. Sorry one is missing. Oh, that's me. Right. Okay. Sorry. Nine eyes. All right, nine eyes. The council. Bill 1125 has been amended. Councilman Castro, I want you offer up your Second Amendment. Thank you, Mr. President. I move to amend council bill number 17, dash 1125 as follows On page three, line 23, after the year 2017, add the following language to the sentence and sections 20 4-3, oh four B6 and 30 8-9 will be repealed two years after the effective date. All right. It has been moved and seconded. Comments. Members Council Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. As I said, I made my comments earlier. I would just reiterate that I think having the sunset as Councilwoman Espinosa recalled earlier regarding the marijuana ordinance causes us to take a little bit more in-depth look. Okay. So that's the reasoning behind this. Okay. No other members. Um, Councilman Flynn, can I. Can I go first? Just. Just as a sponsor? Just to set the tone a little bit? No. Oh, okay. Okay. Thank you. I tell you, Flynn boy, he's must be the Broncos

playing tonight. So. So I'll just say, you know, I appreciate, you know, the councilman with his concern and, you know, sun for me, I have a personal deal with sunsets, unless it's a financial or fiscal issue to the taxpayer. But to put a sunset on this is to say, what is the importance of us doing this health initiative in the first place? We might as well not do it. We might as well not take the step in addressing secondhand smoke. We might as well not do this important initiative that cities are doing this all over the country. And so I am against this sunset. And I think it actually hurts the overall amendment. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. I, again, maybe would like to through you asked Councilman Cashman why the two years? Because I'm generally very predisposed to sunsets, especially on new policies, so that we are forced to evaluate them. But two years seems like too short of a time. We talked before the meeting and I had suggested five years. And so, Mr. President, through you, maybe Councilman Cashman could address that. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Yeah. The reason for the two years is if and I do not expect this to be the case, but if the ordinance was being inappropriately applied or inordinately applied in a certain direction, I wouldn't want to wait five years to correct that. So I think two years would be sufficient time to assess the legislation. All right. Thank you. Although I would point out that we could repeal it the next week that we saw a problem. So I do have a problem with just two years. Thank you. All right, Councilman, I it. Thank you. I just want to remind folks, when we created the lower downtown historic district in the changes to the B seven zone, we had two year reviews with a six year sunset. And, you know, it gave everybody a chance to see how the program worked. And at the end of the second two year review, everybody said, this is wo

rking fine, let's remove the sunset. I think this gives us an opportunity to really monitor, to look at the data, to figure out, is this working the way we anticipated it? I mean, at any time we could amend the ordinance, we could institute a sunset, we could remove the ordinance. But I think by having this in there, it just ensures that we're going to do a deeper look at the end of the two year time frame and determine, do we want to keep it? Is it making sense? No different than what we did with the lower downtown historic district. And I mean, you see the success of what we have down there today. So I'm supporting it. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. I just want to point out one more just quick point, because I think context matters in the context of health initiatives in the city, in the context of this ordinance that we're actually looking at as a larger bill. We have never did any kind of sunset over that. So when we said, hey, we're going to look at municipal buildings and hospitals, we didn't say, you know what, let's look at who it's disproportionately affecting and let's put a sunset on that. And that's why I feel like it's a little different when we talk about health initiatives. Councilman Lopez Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I do have a question. If you if it's okay and Chief Quinonez, if you want to come to the microphone. So my question is, Chief, as this ordinance, as it becomes law and somebody smoking in one of the zones on 16th Street Mall, that's not allowed. What is the protocol? Is the protocol to issue a ticket right then and there or is there a warning? How many warnings is it at the discretion of an officer? Is it necessary to give a ticket? I mean, I just want to just kind of figure out from a law enforcement perspective what the protocol is, what the approach is to an ordinance like this. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, David Cannon is deputy. Chief of operations for the Denver Police Department. We are still working on the training bulletin that was referenced earlier. I anticipate this being like other civil violations where our first preference is an advisement. Really, we want to stop the. Behavior if a. Verbal advisement suffices and then that's the preference. If we don't write any citations and we eliminate the smoking on the Mall, we consider that a success. Really, it's going to be the responses that we get from the people that we're trying to advise that that may dictate going to the next step, which could be a written warning . Or then the citation really the citation will be the last course of action that we'd. Like to see. Okay. So it's not necessary for an officer to write a ticket right then and there? It is not necessary. They do have discretion to do that. But like I said, we are doing the training bulletin. As we speak, we're waiting to see the final draft of the language and then we'll put that in place. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. I just wanted to ask you a question. Co

uncil President Brooks, in your conversations with the Downtown Denver Partnership, can you talk about what kind of signage, how, how frequent that's expected to be up and down? Yeah. Great question. Understand, they don't need to wait to have an officer come and tell them, you know, you can't smoke on the mall. Can you talk about that? Great question. Thank you for telling that up. After all, this is a campaign. And so, you know, there are downtown Denver partnership folks in the

audience here. But when we presented we presented the sign in committee. The plan right now is to have the sign every other block. We're starting this December 1st. And one of the things we're going to do is twofold. We have \$10,000 from Denver Health for signage. And we're going to get some signs on the busses up and down the mall. We're going to pass out leaflets to individuals up and down the mall that will be designed by the bid in our office and will work with them in conjunction. And if we feel like we need to beef up kind of signage and things like that, we'll have that definite conversation. I think that's important, but it's at least going to take us a good 30 days ahead of time to start ramping this up. And talking to Chief Quinonez, one of the things we talked about is. People don't need to. This is not a citation driven exercise. It is a please go 50 feet over there, please. We're trying to do not smoke in front of someone. Please be respectful. And there's not a just chief canyon as their security on the mall as well from the downtown partnership. And there also is RTD security on the mall saw a lot of individuals being able to to, you know, tell folks what to do and give them direction. So can you just answer one last question that also includes the managers of the building so that adequate notification is also within each building, you know, maybe as people are walking outside or whatever, so that, you know, they know they have to be 50 feet off. Yeah. I mean, this is one of the nice things about the business improvement district and also, you know, which is within the downtown of our partnership is we've been meeting with those individuals, we meet with all of the restaurateurs, we meet with all the businesses, all the building owners to talk about the kind of signage and the kind of education that they need to get their folks in the building. I just want to make one last statement, and that is that. I personally have a hard time being around smoke because I have asthma and when I am around it it is very challenging to breathe. So I support the ordinance, but I think the amendment is important as well. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Espinoza. Yeah. Just hearing this conversation again, I already mentioned my concern about unintended consequences. But I do think there are actually more things that even coming to mind as we're talking. You know, if we're if we're illicit means solicited and if we're involving other security officials to sort of help with

the reminders, you know, I'm worried about there being different sorts of confrontations and other things that have been prevalent on the Mall. And so I think that that only reinforces my desire to have a sunset to so that we're we're doing that sort of in-depth, deep dove with the FA, meaning the police on the data that they have on the sort of interactions that are going on with the Downtown Denver Partnership and and sort of what kind of outcomes are being happening. You know, because also, you know, one of the concerns we keep hearing from our visitors and stuff like that about the mall, you know, again, if we're pushing a concentrated group of smoking population 50 feet off the mall, if that happens to be in the direction of a particular hotel or the convention center, you're going to get some feedback, different feedback there as well. And so I just think having a two year sunset forces us to have this conversation about all the things that we're not talking about or thinking about right now. So it's easy to recognize that there are definite health benefits to not having secondhand smoke in a particular area where they're high concentrations of people and getting that out of there and doing it in a respectful way, you know, and not prohibiting people from coming back, obviously, after they have their smoke. But if they're lingering in that one spot for that smoke and there's a concentration, you know, or there's some aggressive behavior because somebody is trying to exercise their civil liberties, you know, it would just be good that we're sort of making sure that we're having that conversation in two years time. I think I think you, Councilman Espinosa, two quick points. The security on the Mall nor the RTD security are permitted to write tickets. One, two, since the security mall has been in effect, we've seen a 15% drop in criminal activity and confrontations and things like that. And so I hear you. I hear what you're saying, but we haven't seen those issues three since. The pavilions in front of Union Station is a smoke free zone. And I've said this a number of times. That is the perfect test case for how this is going to go, because you would see you would think that there would be groups of individuals on each side of Union Station, but there's so many people and Denver is so dispersed that it just kind of spreads out evenly. So it's it's very interesting to feel like we have a great test model and we're excited to see it move on. Councilman Lopez, I saw you back in the queue. Yeah, I just I just wanted to just to chime in on the amendment overall and look. You know, I have a great deal of honor and respect and admiration for, uh, for Councilman Kash, and I think he is. With this amendment, I think it's, you know, it shares a lot of our sentiment about, you know, making sure that we're doing right, making sure that the citations are not something punitive. It's going to land on

somebody's case for a record, but potentially get

a job, things like that. You know, I do understand the intent for the sunset. I absolutely do. But I keep thinking about. And this wasn't too long ago and this was when we had the ban at smoking. Denver health and for a long time you know in council in Boise and brought it forward for a long time I was I was very neutral on it because I thought to myself, man, well, what if we're going to get the wrong people? What if this is the folks that are hanging out outside of the hospital? What if this is I mean, this is just is it going after the nurses? Is it going after, you know, folks who are just stressed out and need a quick smoke? And it's sort of the idea of the sunset, but the idea that the reason why I didn't support it then and and and I'm not going to support the amendment now is because I think that data when you have that data requirement, we didn't collect the data and now this one does. It takes time for that data to to kick in. Right. To really learn from it. However, you know, in no way is my opposition to the amendment and opposition of of the idea or than the need to bring it back to constantly review our policies . I think we always should. Or Councilman Cashman's, heart or mind on this. I, um, I just think we need a little bit more time to study that data. And, and also because this is just comes from my experience being on the council when we did this for Denver Health and all the property, all the public property around . And that is a very big property. Right. So and it has proved to be not a big deal. And as a matter of fact, it is. I went there all the time. You don't smell. You don't smell any smoke around around the hospital. And I spent a lot of time, unfortunately, there with family. And that was the one thing I, I felt good about, especially with with a grandmother who had smoked all her life and was no longer smoking. When she would smell, she'd want one and bring having her walk around without having that was a good deal. So, you know, respectfully, uh, you know, I won't support the amendment, but I do support the data collection. I think we're heading in the right. Direction, Councilman. All right. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Espinosa, back up. Yeah, I just wanted to stress that my concern isn't actually the effective efficacy of this ordinance on the 16th Street Mall itself. It's the unintended consequences to the rest of our businesses and and in downtown Denver that are not in this area that has got this, uh, this special civil rule. So. Well, it definitely, you know, has an effect at Union Station. Union Station is, is, you know, you just have to be on the sidewalk and you're you're sort of unbowed. This is definitely a situation where, um, where you will displace U.S. people with this addiction. And, and, you know, we definitely, you know, it won't be in the reporting that the police department's doing if it's having an effect on businesses, you know, uh, adjacent to the mall, uh, public spaces a

djacent to the mall, Skyline Park, Larimer Square, um, you know, Lazy Street, uh, the, the, the, the mall shuttle, I mean, not the mall, the, and so it is, you know, the Renaissance Hotel or something like that. There's a lot of other, uh, you know, uh, participants here that are within, you know, just, just outside that 50 foot zone that might in fact, impact. I mean, is that going to be enough for us to address a different sort of set of ordinances? And how do we get that if we don't actually open this up for a conversation, a designed, uh, and planned conversation and some at some point in time? The concern also is, you know, you're very mindful of the concern about the the concerns about the camping ban. And I would not want to find us in a situation where a population is being disproportionately impacted or there might be some unintended consequences that we're then having to try to, you know, tiptoe around or address with other means when in fact, we could just revisit the originating ordinance in a manner that actually would do sort of multiple things. So having a sunset date, I think, forces us to have that conversation in a way that we otherwise just wouldn't voluntarily do. All right, Madam Secretary, it's been moved and seconded, voting on the amendment to sunset on 1125. Now Secretary Raquel. Cashman. I can eat. Lopez. No. Ortega Black No. Clark No. Espinosa, I. Mr. President. No. Please. About me. Oh, yeah. I about to say no. All right. Please close voting on the results. Three eyes, six nays. Three eyes, six nays. The amendment fails. Councilman. Clerk, will you please put Council Bill 1125 as to be order published as amended? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that council, go one 1 to 5, be ordered, published as amended. It has been moved in second it. No comments from members of council. Madam Secretary, roll call. Cashman I. Can eat. Lopez I. Ortega I. Black Eye. Clark, I. Espinoza, i. Flynn, i. Mr. President. I. Please. I was wondering about the results. Nine eyes. Nine Eyes Council Bill 1125 has been ordered. Excuse me. President Brooks, may I just clarify? It was brought to my attention that there was something in the motion that suggested it needed to be published, which that's not

the case. This is a final reading that is substantive amendment. This was a non substantive amendment. This is the data requirement. That's right. Okay. So do we vote again? Why don't you make a new motion, a motion to approve on final reading and then vote again? Yes. Okay. All right. It's good to have lawyers in the room, huh? Okay. I move. That counts. About 1125 be ordered. No, no, no, no. You must be adopted to be adopted as amendment. As amended? Yep. Be adopted as amended. Can I get it? Can I get a man? Our second. One of the two. All right. It's been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary, roll call. Cashman. I can eat right. Lopez Ortega. Black Eye. Clark Espinosa. Flynn. I. Mr. President. I. Please. Please close the voting and announce the re

sults. Missing. Missing one vote. Who's hanging? Fire your vote. Say this one vote. Boy, I must be ready for the game. Okay. All right. I'm so sorry, everyone. Um, please close voting. And as a result, nine eyes. Nine eyes. Proclamation. Proclamation. Council. Bill 1125 has been adopted. All right. This concludes items be called out. All of the bills for introduction have been ordered. Publish. We are now ready for the block votes and resolutions on bills for funding consideration. Council members remember this is a consent or block vote. You will need to vote otherwise your last. This is your last chance to call it an item for a separate vote. Councilman. Clerk, will you put the resolutions for adoption and bills for final consideration on final passage on the floor? Thank you, Mr. President. I move that resolution, resolutions be adopted, and bills on final consideration be placed upon final consideration and do pass in a block for the following items. 114611351077.

1136113911481150113411541226110111041105110611071108110911 ten

111111121113114111511161117. 111811191103. And I think that's it. Madam Secretary, did you get all of them? Yes. Just checking. The president pro tem is work. Very good. All right. It's been moved in. Second. Second it. Madam Secretary, recall. Black high clerk. I Espinosa. I Flynn. I Cashman. I can eat. Lopez. All right, Ortega. Mr. President. I. Pluto's wondering about the results. Nine eyes. Nine eyes. The resolution have been adopted, and the bills have been placed upon final consideration. Do pass since there are no public hearings, and if there are no objections from members of this Council will not take a recess. Thank you. We got your back. All right. Great. Thank you. Excellent. Thank you, Councilwoman. All right, we're on to the second proclamation. I'm going to have Councilman Ortega please read Proclamation 1290. I will be happy to. Proclamation number 1290 Series of 2017 in recognition of 2017 National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week in Denver, the Denver metro area. Whereas everyone has a right to healthy food and a safe place to live. And. Whereas, everyone of any age, background or zip code can be affected by hunger and homelessness. And. Whereas, according to the Colorado Children's Campaign, nearly one in six. Let me say that again. One in six Colorado kids face hunger every day. They may receive their only meal at school. And. WHEREAS, thousands of people in Denver work hard to secure a better future but must choose between paying rent, buying needed medications and purchasing groceries. And. WHEREAS, systemic issues of hunger and homelessness have a wide ranging and harmful impact on individuals and on our community. And. Whereas, lack of sufficient healthy food stunts, brain development and physical growth diminishes motivation and productivity, hinders education and deteriorates one's health. And. Whereas, support programs for people without enough money for food and housing help build a foundat

ion for a better, healthier lives and a better, healthier Denver. Whereas, government agencies, along with food pantries, shelters, faith based groups and other community based organizations strive to address the needs in our community. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one Hunger and Homeless Awareness Awareness Week is intended to educate the public, raise awareness about poverty in our community , and encourage people to get involved in anti-poverty organizations. In Section two, we recognize that many community organizations do impactful work to fight hunger and poverty, organize volunteers, and provide much needed food and services that lift our entire community, including hunger free. Colorado Metro Kerry. Bienvenidos Denver. Inner City Paris. Sid de la Raza Community Ministry and local organized local school organized effort such as Teller Backpack Friends, among many others. Section three November 13 through 19 is declared as Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week, and you are urged to donate to these organizations mentioned or a local food bank in your community or the food bank of the Rockies. Section four that the clerk of the city and county of Denver affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy be transmitted to hunger free Colorado metro carrying then beneath those Denver inner city Paris said

vicious de la, a community ministry and teller backpack friends. Thank you, Councilman. Your motion to adopt. Mr. President, I move for the adoption of proclamation number 1290. It has been moved and seconded. It comes by the council. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, we're fortunate that Denver is a city that has many organizations who step forward and come to the aid of folks in our community who are struggling. I'm aware of many, many different churches and both nonprofit and for profit organizations that step up and provide food to people in our community. It's not unusual to see in the park across the street different organizations who come down and provide a meal to people who are in the park, many of whom are homeless or we have. And in many cases, they're both nonprofit and for profit organizations. We have a group that serves one meal a month over at Saint Elizabeth's Church, on the area campus that provides a hot meal. And I'm sure there are different organizations there every Sunday after mass providing a meal to two folks in our community when some of our day shelters are closed during the weekends. So oftentimes they provide a meal. But when they're closed, you know, that's a day when people otherwise wouldn't be getting food. And so the fact that we have organizations that gather their friends and other volunteers to prepare the meals and to bring them down and to serve them and to not just provide the meal, but to be a kind face on the other end. Because oftentimes we find that many of our homel

ess folks feel so isolated. But to learn that we have so many families also in our community that are struggling. And when you see the cranes across our metro area, including our downtown and in all the development and construction, you would think that we wouldn't have this kind of poverty and challenge in our community. But it does exist. And this is the time of year when people. You know, open up their hearts and their pocketbooks and they're committed to trying to help their fellow neighbor, their fellow man that has found themselves in a situation of need. And there's nothing worse than just going hungry and not having access to food. So I want to first say thank you to all of the organizations in the city of Denver that do this day in and day out or shelters do this day in and day out. So I just want to encourage the adoption by my colleagues, and I want to thank Joe Wood for my staff who helped put the proclamation together. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. And thank you for bringing this forward. See no other comments, Madam Secretary. Raquel Ortega. I SUSSMAN High Black. Clark High. Espinosa High. Flynn, I Gilmore. Herndon, I Cashman High Kennedy I Lopez. I knew Mr. President. I Please close the voting and announce the results. We have somebody hanging fire. All right, please close voting in us. Results 3913 I Proclamation 1290 has been adopted. Councilwoman, is there anyone you want to bring in there? I have a couple of folks, so I'd like to ask Vicky O'Neil, who's the senior vice president with Hunger-Free, Colorado. She'll be introducing Andrea Fuller. And then we have Vincent Marnell with the Teller Backpack Friends, Joyce Neufeld with community ministry and Linda Jamison with Denver Inner City Parish, who will be speaking. Go ahead. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega, and thank you to Joe Wood for coordinating our presence here. And thank you to the entire council for the proclamation. It takes public private partnerships to successfully address a problem in our community like hunger. And we've been very fortunate to enjoy very robust and meaningful partnerships with organizations like Denver Human Services. And I want to shout out to their leaders Don Morris and Todd Jorgensen, for their support over the years in tackling this issue and also the many nonprofit organizations, food banks, food pantries in the city who are doing this work. Like you said, every day we are actually seeing the impacts of these partnerships. When Hunger Free Colorado started in 2009, Colorado had the fastest growing child poverty rate in the United States. And at that same time, our children had the lowest participation rate in the federal food nutrition programs. And so, for example, we were 44th in the nation for school breakfast participation and today were 12th. Back then, in 2009, one in six of the general Colorado population were experiencing hunger. Today, that's one in ten. And as you mentioned, today, we're one in six children e

xperiencing hunger. In 2015, that number was one in five. So you can see that we're moving the needle, but we still have quite a bit of work left to do. And in order to do that, we need the public and private sectors to come together collaboratively to work on solving this very solvable issue. Tonight we have Andrea Fuller here to talk for a moment about her experience with this issue. Thank you. Good evening, Council. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega, for putting this proclamation in order. I want to ask a couple of questions. How many of you have ever had to go hungry or.

Missed a meal, but not by choice? What would you do if you did not know how you were going to feed your family? This is the reality for thousands of mothers, children, fathers and others in metro Denver. Food, health and housing are inextricably linked together. And I know this from experience. I am a mom. Owner of three small businesses, an entrepreneur. I have completed two college degrees. I work from 7 a.m. to almost midnight most days and work 6 to 7 days per week. And yet rent. Is over 50%. Of my income. And without snap, I would not be able to buy. The food that. All of my family needs to stay healthy and to continue working. I have had to skip meals or eat less. I have. Experienced illness due to not. Eating enough. There's absolutely no reason that anyone in this great state or city should go hungry. It is thanks to organizations such as Hunger Free Colorado and many others that were mentioned, including Metro Caring. And the opportunity to advocate through them that I am here in front of you today. This proclamation is a start, but there's so much more that we need to do. Affordable housing must be built and more prominently intentionally placed throughout the city. Laws and policies promoting less food waste and more readily accessible. Resources. In areas used most, such as Montebello, Globeville and North Park Hill, providing preventative health care. All of these needs are within reach if we work together as policymakers, advocates. Businesses, nonprofits and the community. Thank you for listening. And let's put words. And proclamation into real action. Thank you. Thank you. Is Vincent here? Vincent Munnell with the Tiller Backpack program. I can't echo her sentiments enough. Thank you very much for seeing me. This was a very kind surprise with the tell it back to our program. If anybody here knows the Teller Elementary, we're in Congress Park. We have a pretty simple goal. We have a lot of kids that come to school for food. Kids shouldn't have to go to elementary school for food. They should want to learn. They just want to play. They should want to be kids. They should want to be led and mentored. They shouldn't in a community such as ours that was built on giving. It was built on taking care of one another that come together for any number of reasons. They're always there with with an open hand. Yeah. We have kids who walk to school past my very house. The

Just want a bite to eat. So we we recognize the need about three years ago. Unfortunately, every year the need has grown. We went from helping five families to seven families, and now we're up to about 34. It's it's a very, very unfortunate circumstance when you live in a community that's surrounded by. For sale signs for homes that are, you know, seven or \$800,000. And we have we have families that can't put food on the table for for young minds. So this is definitely a step in the right direction. The Tell Her Backpack program is it's a lofty goal to help end childhood hunger. But with, you know, with steps like this and with with groups like the Tell It Backpack Program and every other group, it's it's definitely achievable goal. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you. And then we have one last speaker. Excuse me. I think we have two more Joyce Neufeld and then Linda Jemison. Well, thank you for allowing us to be here tonight and for also this proclamation. My agency, Community Ministry of Southwest Denver, serves about 35,000 individuals a year, and that's just a drop in the bucket in southwest Denver. So making people aware of hunger and homelessness is really important. And Andrea is an example of who we see the most of. It's the working poor. It's not necessarily a lot of homeless people, but it's the working poor people who struggle on a daily basis to put food on their tables. During the past two years, about six major food pantries have closed. Denver Urban Matters was one of the most recent that closed and that impacted the whole Colfax corridor there. They're moving their work to Saint Francis Center, but that's becoming more and more common that the smaller pantries are closing. Even the bigger pantries are closing due to lack of funding. So although we're aware of hunger and homelessness this week and especially during Thanksgiving holidays, we see a lot of people suddenly increase their awareness. It's all year round. The people are hungry. And so I'd ask that, you know, every day is Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week, and that every day we can have an impact on the lives of the kids. And organizations like Hunger Free Colorado are making a huge, huge impact, as well as all the other agencies that impact in so many different ways the garden, the food rescues. So many agencies are working together to make a difference in this community. So don't forget us all the rest of the year, not just at this time. Thank you. Thank you for that important reminder. Linda Jamison, are you here? Okay. Come on forward, Larry. And then, Mr. President, Rudy Gonzales from Sid Vicious would like to make a few comments as well. Good evening. My name's Larry Martinez with Denver, inner city Paris. I'd like to say thank you to Councilwoman Ortega as well as the rest of city council for this proclamation and helping raise awareness. This is a very important issue and one that is solvable. You know, we live in a state where one out of nine people in Col

orado struggle with hunger. I echo a lot of what was already said here tonight. The work that these organizations are doing is very important. Inner city parish, we're distributing over £35,000 of food every month and we're serving 1100 and duplicated individuals every month. And that number continues to grow and grow. And here, you know, at the same time, we're having organizations close and resources are getting more scarce. So like Joy said, you know, remember us throughout the year and Colorado gives us also coming up and remember us then. Thank you. Thank you. Rudy, are you going to be the one speaking? Okay. If you can come forward. This is Rudy Gonzalez with Sid Vicious. La Raza. Yes. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you. Council. City Council. With me is Neva Martinez, Ortega, who's our director of our emergency services program for Servicios de la Raza. We're probably the largest one stop culturally responsive, linguistically specific provider in the state now providing multiple human services. And one of our turnkey programs is emergency services, which we have been providing our communities now for probably over 35 years. And we're a 45 year old agency fiscal year. We served over £170,000 of food to 15 to 16,000 people. And that's infants, that's children, adolescents, disabled veterans, homeless, foster care. Every population you can think of, we have served we serve our elderly. We work with them on a lot of different levels to try to keep them sustainable and in their home hygiene. In-Home. So. We want to thank you for this proclamation, Councilwoman, and thank you for all of your votes. It is important we are serving those in crisis, the vulnerable, trying to get them to a safe level, a stable level, and get them to thriving. And so I just want to introduce Neva Martinez, Ortega, who has a little challenge for a city council. Thank you, really. And thank you again, Councilman Ortega. As Rudy mentioned, we always struggle with funding in these programs. And currently our basic emergency services program, Food Pantry, is completely unfunded. But we are still working with our community partners and relying on our community to still make our holiday season and our everyday food bank happen. So I brought you all a little gift in bringing up this proclamation of a reusable grocery bag with our information, but also an opportunity to participate in our holiday events where we'll be providing 900 food boxes to the community. So I don't know who to give this to to give to you all. Thank you. But with that is an opportunity to help our organization and helping our community provide those food boxes. Thank you and thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Right. Councilwoman Black Last Proclamation, 1291, please. All right. Let's bring up 352 Council Resolution 352. Councilman Ortega has a question here. Well, find the right page on this one. Some Page ten. Okay. Mr. President, this is for our temporary. Well, I guess it's. Ah, what will

be a permanent shelter at 43, 30 East 48th Avenue. And I'm trying to clarify where the \$1.55 million is coming from for those improvements. And I'd like to know what we actually got for the \$450,000 that was already spent. Was this anticipated when we acquired this property that we would be spending these additional dollars and we're already housing people at this site, as I recall. And so is this for an area that we're currently housing people, or is this part of the building we're expanding to? So can I get someone from our Department of Human Services? I have somebody. Go ahead. Hi. My name is Cara Ladd. I'm from Public Works. Just to clarify, the \$450,000 has not yet been contracted. There is no scope associated with that. That's just our threshold for on-call construction contracts. And what we are requesting approval from council is to utilize a to amend the capacity of our work order limit just for this one single work order so that we can move forward with the full scope, which is about approximately the 1.5 million. What do we get for the 1.5 million? So we do get the full permanent restrooms that's required to house the entire shelter worth of. Oh, not just for the women, it's for everybody. It's for the full build out of permanent restrooms and the plumbing and electrical associated with that. And is there an NBA participation? And if so, who's this that's doing work on the project? The goal is set at 18% and I do not have the information, but I can follow up with you on who the sub is for the plumbing. Okay. If you can send that to me. I appreciate it. Thank you. No, thank you. I'm fine on that one. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. All right. We're going to go to 341, Resolution three 4041. This is going to be for a moment in a vote. And are you didn't do 1395. Can't hear you. 1395. That's next. I'm sorry, 1341. I said 341 1341 for a vote. And Councilman Cashman, can you put this on the floor, please? Councilwoman Ortega, where you put Council Bill 1421 on the floor. Mr. President, I move the Council 1421 be placed on final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 1421 is open. May we have the staff report? Well, good evening, Mr. President. Members of the council. This is Andrew Webb from Community Planning and

Development. And this is a request for a rezoning of a parcel at 14 2038 street from its current R.M. you 30 with waivers. Former Chapter 59 zoning to see Annex eight. This request is in Council District nine. It's right at the kind of the northern edge of the Five Points neighborhood. This is a property of just under and under an acre. It's right near the intersection of Blake and Downing, directly across the street from the 38th and Blake RTD Station. The property is currently vacant with some building footings remaining. The surrounding zoning is a mix of of similar zoning to the request CMC's eight on some neighboring properties and then also I

.A and IP zoning. I should note that much of the IEA and IP zoning is proposed to change as part of the larger 38th and Blake Project base rezoning, which you'll be considering next month. The existing land use on the subject site is vacant. Nearby is industrial uses to the north and to the south and then along walnut. Some storefront type uses, including a brewery. And then from there, the industrial and commercial uses transition into residential as you get further to the south. The purpose of this request is to deal with a challenge of sort of a zoning technicality. The project or the property is currently, as I mentioned, zoned with former Chapter 30 or 59 zoning. The request is to allow the relocation to the site of the tiny home village which currently exists on a property on Walnut, just over the alley from the subject site here. The tiny home village is operating under a six month temporary unlisted use permit, which is an allowance in the current zoning code. The 2010 zoning code for uses that were not had not been considered in the zoning code. That particular allowance does not apply to former Chapter 59 zoning. So the request here is to rezone this property to a former Chapter 59 zoned district so that a new temporary use permit can be issued. This current temporary use permit expires later this month. This property was actually originally part of the larger 38th and Blake Base rezoning. This proposed zoned district is the same zoned district that was proposed as part of that base rezoning. This aerial kind of gives you a feel for the scale of development in the area, as you can see along along Walnut. More of a storefront style of development. And then as you get further to the north and west, there are larger scale industrial uses. And you can see here the proximity to the rail station and also the current site of the tiny home village. Here are a couple of photographs of the subject site. One looking generally to the northwest and the other looking to the southwest. This is a development occurring directly across Downing from the subject site. It's going to be an eight storey office development. So this request is for CMC's eight. That's urban center neighborhood context mixed use with a maximum height of eight stories. This is a zone district that promotes dense, mixed use centers with moderate to high building heights, prioritizes a high quality pedestrian realm, and is appropriate for, you know, transit oriented development in compact, mixed use areas near rail stations, near transit stations. In terms of the process to date, this has had this particular project because of its connection to the 38th and Blake larger rezoning has had a role, an extraordinary amount of public outreach and multiple meetings and workshops. We've done two rounds of mailings to property owners in the area to make people aware of what's planned for this area. I did have a planning board hearing on December six, and the planni

ng board unanimously recommended approval of this rezoning. There are quite a few registered neighborhood organizations that consider this property to be within their boundaries. All have been notified of this request. We haven't received any comments specific to this particular rezoning at this property, but we have received several written indications of support from R.A. as for the larger 38th and Blake rezoning proposal. As you're aware, to adopt a zone change, the council must find that the proposal does meet these five criteria from the Denver zoning code. There are several plans in this area that impact this property, including a comprehensive plan, of course, and blueprint the River North Plan Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan, Elyria and Swansea, a neighborhood plan and the 38th and Blake stationary height amendments in terms of the comprehensive plan. This proposal does further many of the strategies and goals of the comprehensive plan to promote walkable, mixed use development near transit that allow for people to live in places where they can have all of their needs met in one place with a minimal driving. Blueprint calls this area out for a future land use of transit oriented development and does identify it as an area of change. The area is well-served by residential and mixed use arterials and transit services appropriate for a mixed use district. The River North plan for proposed concept land use of transit oriented development. Mixed use at the site, as does the 38th and Blake Station area plan called the site out as a kind of a mixed use transit oriented development core for the 30th and

Blake Station area. The Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan recommended future land use of transit oriented development at the site, and the Elyria and Swansea neighborhood plan also recommends a mixed use for this for this property. Then finally, the 318 and Blake Station area height amendments, which is the guiding document for the larger incentive and design overlay, is currently in progress. I know many of you are familiar with recommended base heights of eight storeys at this height at the site with an incentive height of 16 stories. So this request is consistent with the recommendations of the height amendments adopted in 2016. As to the other criteria, this request will further the public health, safety and welfare by implementing adopted plans for walkable development. In terms of justifying circumstances, CPD agrees with the property owners propose circumstance that the River North area in general has seen considerable new mixed use development and redevelopment, especially since the opening in 2016 of the Align Station. And finally, this request is consistent with the urban center neighborhood context, which is appropriate for dense mixed use centers and near transit stations. So with that, CPD does recommend approval based on the finding that these review criteria have been met, and I'd be happy to answer any questions. That

Thank you very much. We have five people signed up to speak on this tonight. I'll ask all five if you could come sit in this front row so that we can get through everybody as quickly as possible. And first up, we have Marc Marshall. The microphone is yours. Well. Let's see something happen. Good evening, council members. I'm Mark Marshall. I work with Urban Land Conservancy. We are the owners of the 30th and Blake site. Initially when we purchased the site, we were looking at it fully as affordable housing. As the Hyde Amendment came through. We started looking at different options to be able to take full advantage of the rezoning going from eight up to 16 storey. So this is the first step in the process to take us beyond the RMU 30 current zoning to CMCs eight. We have two partners on the site. We parcel at the site out. One part is the site that the Tiny Homes Village is moving from 38th and Walnut. We partner with Medici Development Corporation to develop 65 units of affordable housing on that site. On the Blake Street side, we are partnering with Mcwhinney. Mcwhinney proposes to build 325 market rate apartments on this site. I like to thank the staff, Andrew and Abe, for expediting this process for us, getting the application process aligned, for us to be able to move quickly to allow Tiny Homes Village to meet their time schedule of being off the site in 180 days, which is the 12th of January. We've had overwhelming support for the Tiny Homes Village and we are very much in support of seeing it continue and moving and moving over to our Blake Street side as well. And we appreciate your support and thank you very much. Thank you. Next up, Lauren Dibble. Oh, Laura. We're together. Oh. All right. Amanda. Amanda? Lyle. Hello. I'm Amanda Lyle and my beloved grandma. I live at the village and I'm with the Colorado Village Collaborative. I just wanted to say, first of all, thank y'all for I know this has gone through probably a little faster than most stuff like this usually does, and I appreciate that. Just to speak on why it's important to us, the villagers, we really love living in five points. We love where we live and we love our area. We know our community really well and we know our community members really well. We love the whole neighborhood. We love the rhino. Jamie Lego has been awesome with us. We just really love living there. And it's been, it's, it's, it's been really cool seeing how much the community likes having us there and how much they like to come visit us and do things for us and stuff. And it's just it's really crucial to us that, that we get to stay there. It's it's hard enough having to be displaced again after already having been displaced many times. Most of us. But but being able to stay in our area is really, really awesome. So I just really appreciate all yeah is on the phone. Thank you. Thank you. Cole Chandler. Good evening, counsel. My name is Cole Chandler and I'm also with the Colorado Village Collaborative an

I'm also a resident of Council District nine. I'm one of many organizers on this project. And of course, the specific reason that I'm here is to advocate for this proposed rezoning ordinance. But the broader context which brings this issue to the floor tonight is the reality that we are in an affordable housing crisis. This is not news to you all, but this is the context that brings this ordinance before us. This is the context that makes this vote matter. This evening, in the midst of this crisis, people on the streets have worked diligently to find a new way to create safe, dignified housing, where they would not merely be able to survive the elements, but find themselves able to thrive in the shelter of community. And so I have come to report to you all that this model has been exceptionally successful. So here are some facts and figures that I'd like to share with you about

this model. The beloved Community Village features 11 tiny homes, one community space, one shared bathhouse and currently houses 16 residents. This village was built for a total cost of \$250,000, which comes out to about \$22,000 per unit. This compares to a traditional affordable housing unit, which costs nearly \$285,000 to build thanks to in-kind contributions from a number of sources. Our actual costs on this only came out to \$140,000 and that was financed upfront. By raising money. We were able to pay for it upfront. The village was built in two months time, utilizing over 5000 hours of volunteer service compared to a traditional development project that might take two years to plan and construct and permit. So that's some of the development side of things. In terms of operations, this village prioritizes those with fewer options in the shelter system, including couples, LGBTQ people, people with pets, people with jobs and people with disabilities. And 180 days of operation the village has provided nearly 2700 nights of safe, dignified housing to people who would otherwise be on the streets. In that time, there have been zero police calls to the village and zero people have returned to the streets. 80% of the residents are employed and one resident has transitioned with tears on her face and the permanent housing. Every resident has connected with a resource navigator from Bayard Enterprises, who works with the villagers to establish sustainability and employment and housing. Even with all of those successful outcomes, the village has operated at the extremely low cost of \$5.80 per person per night. In the midst of our affordable housing crisis, people on the streets have dreamed of, worked for, created and now for six months successfully operated a new and better model of housing that has been exceptionally successful. At present. The least sustainable aspect of our model is the mandate that these villages must move every 180 days. This move disturbs community, it disrupts the villagers progress, it creates trauma and wastes valuable time and resources. We need a long

term home for this village and we need permanent zoning to do so. But in the meantime, we need to pass this ordinance so that the villagers can get back to doing what they do best, which is build a beloved community. Thank you. Thank you. Last up, we have Chairman Scoop. Good evening. My name is Chairman Sekou. I represent the Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense. Advocacy for poor working, poor homeless. And senior citizens. We stand enthusiastically in support of this ordinance. And we stand here for a couple of reasons and not to be redundant in terms of what it's already been shared about. The Tiny Homes Village and some of the complications regarding their struggle against constantly being relocated. We see this as a step in the right direction. And so I want to applaud council for making these moves and making these ordinance changes so that there is less trauma to interrupt the process of success and also to enhance the process even further as we continue to employ poor people to solve the problem who live it every day and who are experts at making this thing work. Now, the track record is already impeccable. So there's no conversation on that. So that's what has to be done. And so my expectations this evening on this ordinance is to have a unanimous vote on this thing. Secondly, of all, there is something that has to be included that we need to consider as we continue to go forward with this process. And that is public safety and police protection as you go 16 floors up. There has to be issues around parking and protection. That's a lot of people for that corner and that particular area. So we're talking about really packing folks in jacked 16 floors up. That's serious. That's serious. And that's new for the city. That's new for the city. So there has to be constant oversight on this thing to make sure that all the aspects are done in a planned way so that we don't have a mess on top of a mess. Now, the other issue that we have to deal with is resident parking 16 storeys up. Where are you going to put the cars? Now we all we've got traffic issue going on. And can you imagine all of these folks 16 floors up trying to come through that little viaduct and that little 38th Avenue Street trying to get home? Are you serious? There's some serious work that has to be done in terms of consideration of how do you make that move. Now, as this process is built so that we don't have the current traffic mess that we got going on, and with the new influx of more people coming in and the shortage of housing, we have to consider the traffic. This place, Colorado, starting to look like New York City, Jack. And to preserve the character of who we are. We are not New York. We are not L.A.. We plan and learn from the mistakes of other cities and move forward now planning what we build now, including all the aspects that we can consider. So there's a lot of work to be done. So this is a simple process and yet it has a lot of detail and complexity.

So the community has to be engaged in all levels of this, and we demand a place where decisions and policies are being made as we organize this thing. And community folks are not just a piece to

be listened to, but we actually participate in the development of the policy because we're the ones who are going to have to live there. And so it's only fair. So as we go about empowering communities. Which is a responsibility of each and every city council person is too much work for 13 people. Y'all need help for real. And we are willing and able to do that and do our service willingly. Cheerfully. And engage in a democratic process so that we are now practicing democracy in terms of what we preach. So thank you very much for participating in that process. And then last but not least, oh, man, look, jobs, economic opportunities to build this. And then also poor people be empowered with the economic resources to actually move into the units in which they participated in developing policy and build and then occupy it. So now we're talking about housing. That's not affordable housing that we can afford to pay for. And there's a big difference between affordable housing and you're talking about hundreds and thousands of dollars versus folks who don't have money to come with that. And so we have to go 60%, whatever that little thing is. Doo doo doo doo doo BMI, whatever that is on the income level. And make sure that happens. You had to explain that point to exactly what that means in terms of that ordinance or that requirement that allows poor people to come in below market and see as we can get as many below market houses that poor people can afford to occupy that. So we're moving on down the road to a permanent solution to this homelessness thing, to this homelessness thing. So congratulations, the city council people outstanding is very rare and is getting more to be accustomed that I'm getting real proud of you guys through because you're actually doing some stuff, man. That. I really, really love to see happen. Right. So congratulations and keep on working and I'll learn how to be like godmother. But take and push gently, you know, and diplomatically. We keep this thing smooth and we keep you smiling. Everybody can have a great time because the name of this game is It Takes Teamwork. And I'm sorry your time is up. Thank you very much. All right. That concludes our speakers questions for members of Council Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro Tem Andrew. I'm just wondering, is there a discussion underway about a zoning that would allow for tiny homes to have a reasonable stay in the community? Yes, absolutely. You know, this this is sort of a stopgap measure at this point, but CPD and partner agencies and community members are in the early stages right now of a project to look at the zoning codes, regulations on group living in general. And among the the hoped for outcomes of that project is a building forum, an appropriate zoned dist

rict for a development like a tiny home village. I, I know that the, the tiny home element is been put together in that group home discussion. But have you gotten around to tiny homes yet? We're actually just getting started with that project. So we're, you know, just in the process of getting consultants on board and kind of laying out the work program. So we haven't gotten quite that specific, but certainly are aware that that is one of the one of the emerging types of land uses that we need to consider as part of that project. Yeah. At a time where we're not allowing people to sleep outside and we have a project that successful at bringing people inside. I would hope we could accelerate that discussion. There's been a lot of talk about it for about a year now, and I would hope that there would be something brought forward in the near future. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Espinosa. Question for Mr. Marshall. When did you when did you lc acquire the land that is being free zone? Oh, we purchased it in 2011, 2011. So in the seven years that you have owned it, was it occupied? It's not been occupied. So the current proposed temporary use of would that have been a burden if it had been there for six years? Not under the plans that we had just we got our tax credit. We submitted three tax that tax credit applications were awarded on the third. We have not had any type of activity on the site up until this point of getting the award of tax credits in this past June round. Thank you very much. Question for Mr. Chandler as well. You, sir. Have you ever asked CPD for a text amendment for to make this one exception, this one temporary use renewable. Yes, we have. And we've been told that we would not have the ability to renew. But with a simple text amendment, we could make a carve out. We could use essentially all the same language that we're creating this temporary use and say that this is one exception, that if we have a landowner because these tax credit projects, they go for round after round after round and they he life fellow the entire time that you could actually get in a situation where it's still temporary but it's prolonged temporary you know, with a simple text amendment. And so did they. Have they ever entertain them? We asked if we would be able to reapply as we got into the process and started looking at New Land and we're told that there would not be able to be a reapplication or a renewal. One of the reasons was that these tiny homes were built to meet

temporary building code, which and that's one of the areas where the 180 days came in. And so that was one of the answers that we were given in that regard. But I certainly agree with your line of questioning. So I'm glad. And to stay tuned because my next question is to CPD, what is the difference between six months on one site and six months on another site versus 12 months on one site? So I'd be more than happy to try to bring folks together for a la

rger discussion of this. But the currently because the tiny home village as a use or is not actually contemplated in the zoning code in any way. The temporary nonrenewable unlisted use permit is something that does exist in the zoning code. So that was the one tool that was in the toolbox basically when when they came and asked for, for the permit. So it's essentially the only option that that CPD had to allow a use like this. So thank you for that. You know, I didn't necessarily mean to put you on the spot, but just know that I'm going to follow up in my comments basically and ask that CPD recognize that, you know, you might be able I mean, I know we can legally and technically make this 1 to 1 exception to these nonrenewable temporary use and carve it out so long as the property owner, if it's acceptable for six months, we should be able to sort of renew that, you know, and sort of preserve, I mean, you know, activate the ground that would otherwise be inactive, you know, and I think that's sort of low hanging fruit. And I be looking for CPD's leadership on on that front. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. Pro Tem. I appreciate this line of questioning that has come up because. We changed the code to do the things we want it to do when we want to do things. My question is for Mr. Marshall, if you wouldn't mind coming forward. So in total, what you all will be seeing put on the property that's been resumed is 65 units of affordable. And that's where you just got your recent low income tax credits. Correct. We are moving from the site. The Walnut and 38th site is where we will be developing 35 units of affordable housing on the site that we propose to move. The tiny home village on. The Blake and 38th site is a partnership with Mcwhinney and they propose to build 325 units by market rate. Okay. So the 65 units that you talked about that would be affordable? Yes. Those would be at 38th and Walnut, correct. Okay. Is that the total number of units that's going in there? So all of them will be affordable? That's correct. And will be 100% affordable. And at what range of the area median income. Of initially the tax credit allows for up to 60%. And what we're working with is the incentive, height, incentive. There is a pay in lieu of and what we would really like to do is work with the affordable and the market rate developer Mcwhinney to have their payment in lieu of go toward subsidizing the 65 units to allow us to get down to 30 and 40% ami levels. Okay. So to do the 65 is that reliant on McQueeney being able to build the full 325 other location? I know we will be building the 65 units regardless with the tax credits. It's just a matter of that payment in lieu of would allow us to reach a lower level of affordability. Okay. And has there been a commitment made that the payment in lieu dollars would be earmarked for the 38th and walnut site? We've been in conversations with both zoning and OSD

about that arrangement, and McQueeney is very supportive of that as well. So that didn't answer my question about whether OED has made a commitment to the in lieu payments that would be made to be earmarked to that because those have to be approved by. Oh, yeah. We yeah. First we have to go through the entire process of the overlay and getting that approved before the, the commitment for commitment can be made. Okay. So stay tuned. Is the answer? Yes. Okay. I have no further questions at this point. Thank you. The councilwoman. Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you very much, Mr. Tem. I wanted to just follow up on a question that Councilman Espinosa asked, and I guess I wanted to ask it to Nate Lucero. I have the code sections up. I don't see the word nonrenewable in the code. So can you just explain to me why the permit is nonrenewable? Because I just. I can't find that word. Thank you. Councilman Nathan Lucero, Assistant City Attorney. The reason that the permit was limited to six months is there's a number of different reasons. One is the temporary nature of it. As Andrew explained, this use is not recognized in the Denver zoning code. And there were discussions early on in the process about trying to make this work as a pilot project. But you're right, I don't recall myself seeing the word non nonrenewable in the zoning code. So to answer that piece the question. But there's more to it. With respect to the temporary nature of the of the buildings themselves and the fact that the building department is only able or willing to issue building permits for temporary structures for up to six months or 180 days. So there was a lot that went into the analysis and the reasoning why the zoning administrator was only able to issue this use determination for a period of six months. Okay. I'll reserve for comments. Thank you. Thank

you, Councilwoman. Councilman. Mr. Marshall. On the 38th and Blake side, you know where you belong, the 300 plus market rate units, are you going to be using that entire site? I mean, if the Tony Homes goes to that site there for six months, is that fit into the development of that entire site? I mean, when you start your 300 unit development, is that going to take play time with a ton of homes have to be moved again. That is the plan. Right now. It's projected that both the market rate of units and the affordable units will be breaking ground toward the latter part of the year fourth quarter 2018. So you'd really need that space where the tiny homes is going to for the the market rate development. Yes. Is there a plan for the tiny homes to move somewhere else? There would have to be. I know a couple can speak to that a little bit more. But at the time that we selected to go across to our Blake Street site there, there are a couple of more sites under consideration. And I think there were a couple talk on that when he can talk a little bit more exactly on that. Okay. Great color. Color. There have been some other sites determined. Ye

s. So we met with several landowners and three different landowners, gave us the opportunity to pursue moving to their site. All of them had a similar development timeline to the one which Mr. Marshall has mentioned. And so the villagers decided that rather than moving across town on a similar kind of timeline, they would prefer to stay in their neighborhood. That being said, it is our plan to move in July and it's our goal and intention over the next very short amount of time to find a piece of land that could be a long term home for this village. And so we request the the assistance of this council in that process to find a piece of land that could be a long term home for this village so that we don't have to move every 180 days. All right. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Espinosa, something else? Yeah. One more question for Mr. Marshall. Do you know what the payment in lieu amount would be for the 335 unit project? It's in the range of 1.7 to 1.9 million. And do you know how many units would satisfy their requirement? The number that we're looking for in that 30 to 40% range would be a roughly 2022 units of 32 six or 30 to 40%. Amy. No, I meant mcwhinney for them to build their 335 units. How many would they. Have if they had to build 10% of the units? Roughly. Roughly 18 units. Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you. And and can I just talk real quickly about the neighborhood? This is really important and critical development in this neighborhood, the tiny Homes Village, as well as the upcoming affordable units, the Five Points Coal Gas neighborhood. It's right at the intersection of three neighborhoods and part of this larger rhino district. And there have been significant changes in that neighborhood over the last five years. And we've seen a lot of displacement happening in the neighborhood. And we would like to see as much as affordability remain, we're we're adding some units and we're looking at other development opportunities to do the same on other properties. And I don't know if there is a land, it'd be great to be able to have tiny homes village remain in this neighborhood. There's been a lot of support and a lot of favorable comments made about the the community and how much it adds to the richness of this particular neighborhood. And we would really support see in the neighborhood, the village, stay in this neighborhood, or very much in support of finding a permanent home for them after they leave the 38th and Blake site. Councilman Espinosa, are you all done with your questions? Yes, thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. I have one last question for Mr. Marshall. Did the city assist Urban Land Conservancy at all with any dollars towards the acquisition of this site, either the 38 mile or 30th and Blake site? There was some city money that was that assisted us on the initial payment and we also use the TOD Fund to purchase it. And we paid off the TOD loan in 2015, early 16. Okay. So when you're purchasing pr

oerties, particularly with city assistance, is there an obligation to ensure affordability on the sites that you all are managing and then either reselling or assisting in the building of housing on those sites? Yes, there is a there is a requirement. And specifically, the city was involved through the TOD Fund, and there is a specific requirement of providing affordability through the TOD program, the total fund program. Okay. And we have met and exceeded those numbers for the number of units required. And in 65 units, the max that could be built on the 38th and walnut site. On the 38th and walnut site is it's a it's a matter more of the development cost economics on it that limit us to five storeys and the building as the size as is the footprint now is that it's max size based on the construction type that would allow us to support the the affordable units we were really considering. How could we get a higher density early on before the Hyde Amendment came through? How could we reach a higher density? But just the economics that go to type one steel, concrete, construction. The cost to those that construction type would not allow us with the rents that we're receiving

through the tax credits to support that construction type. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 1421 is now closed. Comments by members of Council Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. I do want to first state that the staff report and the presentation seem very clear that the criteria are met and that all of the appropriate pieces of our zoning code really do point to this as the right zoning for this site in the long term, regardless of any current or temporary uses . So I'm satisfied and I'll be voting for this zoning tonight, but because I think we are having a little bit of a conversation about this temporary use as the impetus. So I guess I first just want to say thank you to you all for being willing to put the land forward for this use. And thank you to the staff and all those who worked on the application to make this happen. I am a little bit concerned because Councilwoman Ortega and I are going to be the council representatives on the the working group for, you know, a whole bunch of zone zoning code categories that are involving group living. So shelters are in their group homes, correctional facilities, things like that. And it's, you know, it's going to take some time. It's a pretty big project. And, you know, there's a dance about do you bring each little piece forward or do you bring forward a whole package? And so there's no way in the timeline I've seen this will come back before the next six months expires. So I actually do think the city does have to deal with the question of renew ability. Now, we can't just kick the can down the road and say that process is going to bring an answer because it's not going to bring it before another six month expiration. So and I guess I as

I read the zoning code, I just want to read the the phrase that I think jumps out at me here, which is that the zoning administrator may allow and impose limitations on unlisted temporary uses. It doesn't say must impose limitations. And so I guess I hear the analysis, but the building code doesn't fly with me because the buildings are moving across the street. So the buildings aren't going out of use in six months. And also, if making the structures more permanent was something you wanted, I imagine they would be willing to do that if they knew the building could stay. So, too. You know, it's kind of to say the building code is what's causing the zoning to have to be unreviewable. To me, I'm not sure I'm there and understanding that legal analysis. And so I think that those are good justifications for a policy decision the city made to say that you weren't going to renew. This was also, frankly, unproven. We didn't know how smoothly it would go. And, you know, so I would really ask and I you know, I don't serve on duty, but it seems to me that Rudy should ask for a fuller discussion of the city revisiting this question of renew ability. Nothing in the code is dictating it. There may be some analysis that it was a good, prudent way to go forward, but to say that it has to be nonrenewable, I guess I don't see that yet. And so so I think that we I think the city does need to have that conversation because we aren't going to get a replacement zoning code amendment, you know, through a community process and then through a council process. And so anyway, so, so I think there's some work to do. But again, the criteria are met here. This is a very straightforward zoning decision and so I'll be supporting it. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Councilman Espinosa. And I just wanted to second those thoughts. You know, the maybe maybe it falls down to make sure there's a private party agreement between the the tiny home community that's temporarily occupying versus with a property owner and the zoning inspector essentially putting a condition on there that there's a six month structural integrity check to make sure that the building hasn't been altered in a way that represents a sort of potential threat, a danger to the occupant. But, you know, these things are very well-built, sound structures. I think they'll pass every single time. And so long as there's cooperation between the people living there and the property owner, I think I think we have all the conditions we need to sort of allow that use to sort of persist in its prolonged temporary state. It's not what you're getting at, but I think that's part of a much longer, more robust discussion that the city is already prepared to undertake. So but I do think I look forward to supporting some sort of temporary some text amendment or not. It's a matter of policy. Like like the councilwoman said, you know, I only I'm ready to welcome that. So. Thank you. With that. So you don't see any any issues at all

with the recommended zoning that's before us tonight. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, President Pro tem. I will second the appropriateness of the zoning that's being requested. Look forward to approving that. Earlier this year, a number of us went out to to Portland to talk to the people out in Portland about how they go about solving their problems. And the first morning session was a discussion of homelessness with Mayor Hancock

and Mayor Ted Wheeler of Portland. And the first Mayor Wheeler spoke first, and the first words out of his mouth have stuck with me ever since. And he started his comments by saying, we have a humanitarian crisis on our streets. And I don't think I'd ever heard it put so simply and so directly what homelessness means to a community. And those same words obviously can apply to Denver and any other city around the country. We have a humanitarian crisis on our streets, housing 16, 18 people. I'm sorry, I forget the number doesn't solve that, but it is an important step and another option in solving that crisis. And I'm not feeling any urgency from the administration. Zero urgency. And I don't think that's appropriate. A year later to be hearing we haven't gotten started on that yet is not good enough. So I would ask the administration to please move this a little bit closer to the front burner so we can have some sort of an answer to this conundrum before these folks get ready to move again. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. Putin. Mr.. So when we have city money in any of our properties or projects, that's the hook that gives us the the right to ask for greater affordability. That's why I asked my question about whether or not there was city money in the original acquisition of either of these two properties. So I'm not sure we needed to wait for this zoning change to happen to be able to ask for more affordability on the tiny home issue as long as we keep talking about temporary. We're going to keep talking about continuing to see this move. I would love to see us find some land where we can see some permanency to the existence of the tiny home village. So that I mean, it's already been proven that it works. There haven't been problems at the site. We've got responsible people living there who are working and committed to being, you know, responsible neighbors. And I'd hate to see this continue to be moved all around the city because there's development proposed on every site that they're moved to. You know, you travel all around the world and you see tiny home villages in different communities. And there is no reason why Denver, Colorado, couldn't have a tiny home community that is permanent, like other communities across the country have done so. And I share the concern that, Councilwoman, you mentioned about the fact that the committee that she and I will serve on are probably not going to have recommendations for all the different sec

tions of the group home ordinance for probably close to a year. That is way too long to deal with this next round of when the tiny home village would have to be relocated again. So I agree with the the sort of urgency to look at some. I think the renew ability is a good short term solution to addressing that. But I would like to see a long term commitment to us being able to have a permanent tiny home village in the city and not necessarily limit it to just one because this is creating truly affordable housing where people today cannot afford to live in. You know, and I've said this before, it's so ironic that we have never seen more housing development happen in this city at the same time all over the place. Very, very limited of those units are actually affordable. So the fact that we've got units that can be built at a truly affordable rate and provide quality living, you know, with some of the amenities is is pretty awesome. And so I'd like to see us do more of that. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilman Lopez. And thank you, Mr. President. I. You know, I. I don't want to repeat everything that my colleagues have said. I think this is a good temporary fix for right now. But I all I just want to underscore the fact that, you know, it's it's January. It's it's it's not typically this warm. It's usually very cold. And this winter is a cold one. And there are human beings that are out in the cold. And although I'm I'm a fan of the tiny home village, I have seen it and seen other examples of it. I agree with my colleague, Councilor Taylor. We can't just be in the village everywhere as soon as development pops up. I think this is one of the many different parts of the solution to to end homelessness. A human being deserves a home, plain and simple. Right. And in this. And this thriving economy that we have, we've see in development pop up everywhere in cranes all over Denver. It's sad to think that that we just don't have enough units and that we're not building enough units. And, you know, next, I think. I just keep thinking in my head, you know, there are cities that are whose sidewalks are lined with tents and they're lined with just cars. And the fact that you have some of these tiny home villages where, you know, folks have a little bit of privacy, you get ready for work, they can sleep under under a roof. It's better than a tent, but it's it's only second to a real unit. And so until we until we have those units and until we make a real good progress made great progress in having those units, this is what I would rather see happen. In the interim instead of folks on sidewalks instead of folks in crowded shelters. Right. This is one of those solutions. You all did a tremendous job in bringing this forward and saying, hey, let's give this a shot. I don't want to see this move everywhere. Every time we see that, we have some kind of development. And I think this is a good temporary fix. But I think we've it's proven to be something

that

absolutely is a working tool. For human beings. So. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Seeing no other comments, Madam Secretary, roll call. Black Eye. Espinosa. Flynn. Gillmor Eye. Herndon. Cashman. Carnage. Lopez. I knew Ortega. I. Susman. I. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting. Announce results. 11 eyes. 11 eyes. Comfortable. 1421 has passed. Next up, Councilwoman Ortega, will you put comfortable 1448 on the floor? Abstention, Iraqis, three nays, one abstention. The Port Authority, 47 passes. Okay. We are moving on to Councilwoman. Councilwoman Ortega, would you like to put. So I have a question on this, and I want to thank Lisa Lumley for getting back to me today to address my question. This is for 11,970 square feet of surplus surplus city land that is on a corner. And, you know, every time we have issues about cities selling land or leasing new properties, I raise questions about where is our. Our, our master plan for real estate. Ah, real estate master plan that helps us look at ongoing needs and how we are disposing of properties. I was raising questions about the price, so we're selling this parcel, which is an L-shaped parcel for \$10,000. And when you look at real estate around the city, that much land anywhere else is far in excess of that amount that we are charging for this parcel. Understand, it would be acquired by the adjacent property owner, which is an RV business that would want to use that. So I, I appreciate again, Lisa, you providing the information. I still think that as a city, we need to have a real estate master plan because as we have city land anywhere that is potentially developable in assisting us to address the affordable housing issue, which I understand this is not one of those. And you might want to just speak to why we would not use it for affordable housing. It's important for us to know that because we would have a real estate master plan sort of guides, guides, all of that. And I've not seen a master plan or ask for that for the last three years and just still and you know, that was one of my items that was on our budget retreat that we had, but we still don't have that. But Lisa, would you address the issue of why we couldn't do affordable housing on this? Sure. Good evening, Lisa Lumley, division of Real Estate. So the first piece of this is just to be clear on any time, any time the city disposes of a piece of land like this, we go through a clearance and release process. So it is sent to a number of departments and agencies so that they can weigh in on whether there is something going on within the city right of way related, affordable housing related, that if we need to pull it back or have a conversation, we can have that first. So it's only after it passes that hurdle that then we would consider moving forward with a sale. As it relates to the master planning councilwoman, our master planning is done by the key agencies, quite frankly, which is what drives our some of o

ur real estate needs versus a master plan for individual properties. And I'm happy to speak to you about that at another time. But on this particular site, the uniqueness is that the parcel is, I believe, if I remember correctly, approximately 28 feet wide because it is an L-shape, it runs parallel to 40th and Ulster. It actually is strangely configured that on the 40th side he owns the property on either side. So this is more just kind of completing what he has, which has buildings already there. So he's not building on it, but it's finishing it out in terms of landscaping and lighting and things like that. Lisa, will you just tell us how we arrived at the \$10,000 price? Sure. We did not do an appraisal. We normally don't do an appraisal on something small in value. If it's if we're looking at existing comps in the general area and there was a range of comps, we discounted it based on the fact that it is not buildable, first and foremost, that it's right at an intersection. We also realize that there's a cost avoidance because of maintenance and it'll put it back on tax rolls. Okay. Thank you very much for addressing my questions. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman. I take it, Councilman Herndon. Thank you, Mr. President. This is it says District nine. That's not correct. It's an district date. I'm very familiar with this. I've been working with the property owner for a while. He acquired the the property. He'd been trying to do some grading improvements, but he can't because the city owns part of the land. And it greatly complicates it when there are multiple property owners. And so these conversations have been going on for months and I've been talking with this gentleman and his frustration. So I'm happy to see that this is finally coming to council so that he can do this. And I appreciate it's trying to support this business. As Lisa talked about, it's an L-shaped property and it's north of the train tracks in Quebec Square. So the store commercial there, there is no residential in this area. So that would even be a consideration, not even taking into account the fact, the consideration. So I, I am I'm supporting this and I'm thankful that. This has finally come to the. Point where we can support this business owner. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman

Herning intensively. Thank you, Mr. President. I don't mean to belabor this, but I just want to be clear, Lisa, when this came through committee on consent a few weeks ago, we had a phone conversation. About it. And a couple of things struck me as odd about this, and you were able to answer them, but something is different tonight. Are we actually conveying the entire L or is it only the lower leg? Well, no. And you're right, when we spoke, which is there was a different exhibit that I sent out. I thought you got it as well, because I know when Councilman Espinosa had also asked the question. So there is the smaller L, so it does have a leg to it. And then there is the larger

piece that is the second conversation, not with real estate, but public works. That is the longer. Right. Yes. And in that case, I think we're just talking about another vacation. Correct. So then it would revert to the adjoining property. And then the last funny thing about this is what we actually call 40th Avenue here, where people drive on if they choose to go to the east there. That's actually this owner's property. Correct. That's why. We continue after this sale where we continue to have a right of access for the public to reach that otherwise landlocked parcel down towards San Creek. Well, and that parcel part of one is ours. And yes, there is an access agreement that runs through there. Thank you. That's all I'm saying. All right. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. Also, I agree that this is just sort of worthless parcel to the city. But that said, it is not worthless to the property owner and that is what I take issue with here. I'm glad that we're charging \$10,000 in this case and not giving away like one and a half acres that we gave to CDOT for their headquarters. But that said, land in this area and if this gentleman did just buy it is in the 8 to \$9 a square foot range for the industrial land. And we're doing this at a fraction in that delta between. And it is worth more to him because it becomes part of his assemblage than it is to the city. That is an \$80,000 gap that that granted that is peanuts on the grand scheme of things in the city. But that is three tiny homes that that in the tiny home village that we just did. And so that is real dollars that could go to something. And we should ask for it. And maybe we did in this. This guy was totally unreasonable. But if it is as challenging as is, it is. You know, that's one of those things that I just wish real estate would push more in this situation, because that is a public asset, even though it's sort of an odd shaped sliver that is, like I said, functionalist, unless you acquire it and put it as part of an assemblage, because then he can develop 11 towers, you know, redevelop that property sometime in the future, which is going to benefit from other projects that we're doing in the city. So it's more just the philosophical thing. I think you guys have heard me say that enough. But I just wanted to not belittle this and say that it's just this little disposable thing. It has real value. And we're not charging at less than a dollar a square foot. We're not charging that value. Thanks. All right. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa, just wanted to put this on the floor, correct? Initially I had questions. I wasn't sure if I was going to call it out for a vote. And so my questions were answered. And I appreciate Lisa taking the time to call me this afternoon and review them with me. I mean, I agree that this is not a developable site, this parcel. But at some point in time, this landowner may choose to sell

this property, which makes it even more valuable. It could be developed. It's near Smiths Road, you know, which is considered a TOD site, you know, at various locations along that corridor. You know, we've worked really hard to make sure that we do have affordable housing. And in housing, near rail is part of Stapleton. And, you know, that's through an agreement that we have with Forest City and work that was done by colleagues that I served with back before term limits went into effect. So I'm satisfied with the information tonight and don't plan to call it out. Thank you, Councilman. Or take them. Okay. This concludes all the items and needs to be called out. We're now ready for the block. Votes on resolutions and bills for funding consideration council members. This is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote. Otherwise it's your last opportunity to call on an item for supper vote. Councilman Herndon, would you please put the resolutions for adoption and the bills on final consideration? Final passage on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that the resolutions be adopted. And bills on final consideration be placed upon final consideration do pass in a block for the following. Items all 2018 unless I say otherwise. 38, 39, 41, 49, 50, 24, 4052, 1144, 45, 42, 46, 48, 57, 27, 28. And that is it. All right. Madam Secretary, do you concur? Yes. All right. It's been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary. Raquel Black, clerk. ALL Espinosa. Hi, Flynn. I earned. I can eat. Lopez. All right. New Ortega I sesan II. Mr. President. I am pleased to announce the results. 1212. As resolutions have been adopted, the bills have been placed for final consideration and do pass. Since there are no public hearings this evening, there are no objections by members

of council will not take a recess. 11 I's council, 14 and 19 has passed. All right. We passed four bills and we still have another one. Now you see why this took over two years. So why don't you come up? Councilman Espinosa, please put 15 on the floor. And move the council bill. 15 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. All right. It has been moved in. Second it. The public hearing for council bill 15 is now open. Andrew, can we have a high level staff report of what you have in front of you? Thank you. Thank you. Good evening, Mr. President. Council members. So what you've already voted on tonight in terms of map amendments is a map amendment that establishes the incentive, height and river north design overlays on properties that already have mixed use zoning. This application aims to address some of the properties that don't currently have a height based, mixed use based zoning in this area. Essentially, as you'll see, it'll fill in some of the holes in the zoning map that you've already reviewed this evening, which is, of course, in Council District nine and spans four neighborhoods. This particular rezoning focuses on the area where the incentive height overlay is intended to apply, w

hich is shown here in blue, and you'll see that shape show up on several maps here. Further through the presentation, this map shows this rezoning relationship to the larger river north overlay the design overlay boundaries shown there in red. And this map shows the actual rezonings proposed as part of this proposal. So this is this proposal would rezone properties with a mix of C-Max and IMAX zoned districts with three, five and eight storey maximum heights that sync with the incentive height overlay system that you've already heard about and discussed this evening. And it affects properties that currently have non height based zoned districts like I.B. in a in some former Chapter 59 zoning. It does not affect properties with custom zoning, such as some of the pods that already exist in the area and some former Chapter 59 zoning with waivers. As I've already explained, existing zoning in this area is a mix of industrial, commercial and mixed use. Zoning land uses reflect that that varied mix of zoning and uses lots of industrial mixed with commercial and residential in this area. This image shows the southwestern half of the incentive height overlay area gives you a feel for the scale of. Development. There. This is the end of the development of the area is a mix of newer residential with some industrial uses. This aerial shows the the other in the. Northeastern half of the project area. And you can see that this is this area is characterized by heavier industrial uses. These images show some examples of existing and and recent development in the area. As I mentioned up front, this is proposing a mix of IMX and CMA zone districts. The CMA Zone District is appropriate for urban centers and transit oriented development promotes an active industry in realms with a mix of uses. In this particular application, it's proposed where a preponderance of adopted land use recommendations are for transit oriented development, mixed use, or something similar to that, and where existing land uses are primarily residential and commercial. The IMX zone districts are proposed where existing land uses are industrial or residential, and this is a district that promotes pedestrian scale, mixed use development similar to CMAs with an active street level, but also permits many industrial uses that currently exist similar to how they're regulated in the IB and air zone. So it's appropriate for areas that are transitioning from industrial to more of a mix of uses. Abe already covered the the extensive public process for this. I won't go into much detail here, but I did want to highlight that during the discussion of this base rezoning, we did two mailed notices and held two meetings specifically for property owners interested in learning. More about this proposed. Rezoning. There are about 20 registered neighborhood organizations that follow whose boundaries include properties proposed as part of this rezoning. All have been notified and you've already heard from

quite a few of them this evening. With regard to the criteria, as you know, for a legislative rezoning, the Council must find that these three criteria have been met with regard to adopted plans besides the comprehensive planning blueprint. Denver There are about five small area plans that impact properties in this area, and I'll walk through that, an overview of those policies here shortly. This proposal would implement comprehensive plan policies, generally speaking, to redevelopment or in development in areas near transit stations with a mix of uses and pedestrian friendly environment. The Blueprint Plan calls for a mix of transit oriented development, a mixed use, industrial and employment mixed uses in this area, reflecting some of the the small area plans in this area as well. The station area served, of course, by a network of mixed use streets and high quality bus and commuter rail access appropriate for transit oriented development. This is the the area plan that kind of brought together all of the kind of reconciled all of the height recommendations from the

many area plans impacting properties in this area while carrying forward their their height recommendations. This is the 2016 and 38th and Blake Height amendments and this is essentially the core policy from which this incentive program was created as has already been explained several times. The base heights are shown there in numbers and then the proposed incentive heights, the allowable instead of heights are shown in Color River North Plan established recommended a mix of transit oriented industrial mixed use and commercial mixed use for this area 30th and Blake Station area plan also recommended a mix of transit oriented development or tree core closest to the station with residential and employment mixed use. As you get closer or further away from the station, the Elyria and Swansea Neighborhood Plan recommended a mix of of transit oriented development, industrial mixed use and then general mixed use in the area. With regard to the other criteria, this request is consistent with the requirement that the request result in the uniform application of district regulations that will result in the uniform application of the CMCs and Impact Zone districts. And finally, this request will implement further public health, safety and welfare by implementing many adopted plans in the area for walkable development and mixed uses near high quality transit. So with that, CPD recommends approval of this base rezoning, and I'm happy to answer any questions. Andrew, we're all proud of you. Well done. Thank you. I have good news and even better news. We have two speakers this evening and they have both left. So questions by members of council. Do we have any question, Councilwoman Ortega. I'd like to ask whether or not this creates any nonconforming uses. So, for example, we have marijuana growers allowed in the industrial zones. And I'd like to know if this creates nonconforming use

s within. With with the zone change. I believe that for some existing uses it might create some compliant uses. So those uses that may no longer be permitted in a new zone district would be allowed to continue as long as they as long as they do. But once they're those uses are ceased. There may be some uses that that are no longer permitted. Okay. And then I would like to know if part of the discussion with these specific boundaries, which abut the Globeville rail yards, included any conversation about buffering or complying with the new the new policy that, you know, when folks come in and want to develop, they've got to now check the box and be able to address how they're going to deal with that issue. This particular rezoning does not directly address that issue, but any any single development that comes in and goes through the site planning approval process would that that is the point at which those types of issues would be addressed. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Andrew, could you explain the parcels that are in the opt out and what of what's happening with those? They are we are not rezoning those parcels. We did put we did put the overlay, the two overlays on them. Councilman Flynn Actually, the the properties that requested to be opted out will retain their existing base zoning. So the, if they do not have a mixed use zoning today, the overlays will not apply. In some cases they may have lower intensity or they may have. IMX versus the proposed. CMCs. In those cases, the overlays will apply if the existing base zoning is a mixed use zoned district. However, those properties that opted to keep iby or if zoning overlays will not apply. And those are shown on the slide that I just pulled up here. Okay. Thank you. That's all. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Seeing no other questions. Public hearing for Council Bill 15 is now closed. Comments by members of council. You know, I'll just say I didn't get a chance to say too much about Andrew and his work in this sort of new to the CPD team and getting thrown into one of the most complex projects and rezoning. Some of these based on districts where people don't understand about this whole project is that we had to bring it into compliance of of what the plans that you guys voted on 12th September 2016 were like. So thank you. It was not easy work. A lot of confused folks. But I got a chance to talk to two homeowners in the Cole neighborhood who really appreciated the outreach and how you took the complexities of this issue. I made a very simple so really appreciate your work and just want to say to everyone who's still standing, scratch that sitting in those chairs. Thank you so much for being a part of this, no matter what your view was, no matter what your. We really appreciate you being engaged this way. Excited, too. This is. One tool. Of 700 that we're working on, you know, and so really appreciate you guys. Councilman Espinos

a Yeah, I'm both grateful that surprised that there are no speakers because more than anything, we just passed. To me, the reason why I'll be voting no on this is that this is that this is the gentrification problem. This is the the displacement problem. This wholesale rezoning. Lifting the base of these properties is that lost opportunity that I was just speaking to on my prior comments,

which is the incentive overlay could be applied to the existing zoning as it is. And that delta between this new base and what is entitlement today could also then be captured as incentive and get to those deeper assets that we are talking about. It is the fact that we have such liberal base zone districts that create the problem that we have in trying to leverage value capture to get better outcomes. Because, you know, and we have tools in the zoning code to address all of those things, but then that takes other resources, general fund resources, dedication of staff in time. And so for ten years now for yeah well for eight years that we've had the zoning code, the only places aside from this that have gone through overlays . Honey did it by themselves for five years. Yeah. Curtis Park. All the tools of zoning really take community resources. Councilman Cashman had the Christina Park again. Community led efforts to try and address all the other conditions that are wrought by this base, very generous base zoning. And so it is frustrating for me that we we would choose we already have plans that support these sorts of changes. We now have the incentive overlay we should have used these tools to sort of compel a sort of better outcomes in this area. We're going to get outcomes regardless of whether we did it or not. But we could have been more comprehensive in a more holistic in that approach. You've heard the concerns in the prior issue about the the sort of weakness of the tools, the the discrepancy between needs and what we're doing. And it's just it really bothers me that this is being pursued and it's in again, I'm surprised because this is more than anything, you know, the redevelopment opportunity was here. The incentive was the real. The incentive was the to pedestrian crossings. The incentive is all the infrastructure that we're putting into this area, the incentives is the Brighton Boulevard improvements. The incentive is the National Western Center is an incentive is the align. You know, development was going to occur here so it wasn't the height. But now we just raised the base about around a whole bunch of properties and and you know, so I'm going to I'm done talking. Let's go our evening. But that is to me, this is the missed opportunity in this whole thing. And and this is what's going to result in rapid displacement of the entire area and a real transformative character going forward. Thanks. All right, Councilwoman Ortega. Mr. President, I believe that the Salvation Army is within these boundaries. Correct? Let's see here. Y

ou know what I know. Yes, it is. Yep. Okay. So, Brad, this is an opportunity where we have a nonprofit that actually owns our own land in this area that wants to rebuild. And and I'm hoping that they will be given the same consideration as they move forward and want to rebuild and put a brand new facility there that we're giving to all the other developers that are that are building in this area. And this would be an opportunity where we would see truly affordable housing in a development that will look totally unlike what it looks like today, that will serve people in a completely different way. And they will have to go through a separate reason application process. If this passes tonight, I don't know how many other nonprofits actually own land in this area. I know that we're still trying to do our hardest housing in this area. Correct. And I think that's moving along so that that will be another attractive development for this site that is trying to help keep artists in this area. I mean, you know, we saw this same thing happen to lower downtown. You know, this was an artist community. And once we started seeing the investment and people wanting to go in and build these build out the historic buildings in lower downtown. And, you know, we did have a \$750,000 revolving loan fund to assist some of them with their, you know, gap financing and whatnot. But in that area, they got pushed out. They couldn't afford to stay. You know, my hope is this one project helps some of those folks. We think to some degree, the ordinance that we passed and the funding to assist the DIY folks is helping until their particular buildings are developed. But, you know, that's a short term gap in in helping those folks. But. I am hopeful that we can get there with Salvation Army being able to to do what they want to do on that site. And, you know, this is a case where we will prioritize people over project. So thank you. I thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. See no other comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black Eye. Clark Espinosa No. Flynn I. Herndon Cashman. Kenny G. Lopez. No. New Ortega. Sussman, I. Mr. President. I. Please also voting. Announce the results. You are missing. Well, we got. We got them all. Oh, sorry. Tonight's to name. Tonight's two names council will 15 has passed on Monday, March 12th, 2018. Council will hold a required public hearing of Council Bill 009 for change zoning classification of 3050 Colorado Boulevard in Hilltop and require a public hearing a council bill 129, which places a moratorium on certain development plans. All right. 12 Eyes Council vote. 1461 has passed. Congratulations. Okay, Madam Secretary, we have a couple of bills we need to put on the floor here. How would you like to do this? Just put one on the floor and you can include the others. I was one at a time on the floor. Okay. Councilman

Espinosa, would you put Council Bill 16 on the floor? I move that council Bill 16 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. And I apo

logize for not being here after the recess last night. It's okay. It's been moved and seconded. Councilman, will you please put Council Bill 17 on floor? No, it's fine just to have 16 on the floor right now. Okay. And you want to you want to handle this when we get done with the public here? Yes. Okay. All right. It's been moved and seconded. The combined public hearing for 16 and 17 is now open. May we have the staff report? Mr. Barge, I'm going to yield my time due to due to we as having a lot of speakers and I'll make my comments there in the comments section. So do you want to bring up Brad Buchanan first? Yes. Brad, are you nearby? He's coming. He's hustling in. Sorry for the delay. You were quicker than I expected. It's no problem. Good evening, Mr. President, members of the council. I'm Brad Buchanan, the executive director with Denver Community Planning and Development. And here to make a couple of quick introductory comments before the staff report about this family of amendments you're going to be considering this evening. I'm very pleased and proud to be part of the team presenting this significant new tool and how we create the future for our city. On the surface, it's a text amendment and a map amendment. It is, in fact, much more than that. As our city wrestles with all that comes with the historic levels of investment we are currently experiencing. There are many tools, both proactive and reactive, that must be employed. This is yet another arrow in the quiver to help the the progress our city's experiencing be something that everyone enjoys, not just those who can afford it. Well, the ordinance you will decide on tonight will not singularly disappear are affordable housing challenges. They create tools that to date have not existed in our city, nor in all but a few U.S. cities. First, the process that the legislation requires is better than we've seen in the past. Often, cities up zoned areas only based on plan recommendations. And while this requirement is a critical one, this legislation recognizes that in addition to planning density in the right places, in the right ways, that development and a hot, hot economy come with strings attached. Rising housing prices, increasing rents, displacement, gentrification, all impacts of the incredible investment confidence we're seeing in Denver right now. This family of ordinances created a conversation between the development interests interested in developing around 38th and Blake and the neighbors. A conversation that in this case started two years ago to discuss what kind of future all of the stakeholders wanted to see in Reno and around the station area. Yes, of course, density makes sense around a significant station area, but how much, how tall and what are the impacts going to be and what is needed to mitigate those the impacts of that development. Tonight, you will hear the answers that the surrounding neighborhoods gave to us to those very questions. They said they wanted afforda

ble housing to help mitigate displacement and gentrification. They said they wanted to see better design quality and they wanted better results in terms of community serve and businesses as the area develops . So tonight, you hear about an approach that gives our communities a real voice in this conversation, in the decision making of how our city develops, not just in in the plans we make that we're creating with Denver. Right. And blueprint Denver right now. But in the actual crafting of what is allowed in and around the 38th and Blake Station area. Secondly, what is before you this evening creates a value sharing between the community and developers. Do you want to build higher? Yes, you can do that. But at a price, a price that the community helped to set and to define. Will this solve all of our problems? No, it will not. Some say it doesn't go far enough. Yes, they do. Do others say that we've gone too far? Yes, again. But through the feasibility study process, we ground in ground and honed in to get to the right numbers, to get to a place where we can maximize and optimize to get the outcomes we want without getting into the zone where projects become impossible to finance or underwrite. While not the panacea to all our city issues. This this legislation will create a significant new tool for our city to use in bringing our neighborhoods to the table and in crafting the future of their community. I look forward to the discussion tonight. Thank you very much. A barge with community planning and development is up next. Thank you, Brad. Before you do that, I neglected to make a comment tonight. Councilman Lopez Espanol repeat that we have Espanol or Spanish translation for anybody who needs it. Can you repeat that, please, in espanol? Dang. Come on, brother. As you're trying to speak Spanish to me. Yeah. All right. You're doing all right. The animals introduction in Espanol parallels can associate them. Gracias. All right. Okay. A bunch. You're up. Thank you. Council President Brooks. Members of city council and Brad for your introduction. I'm also joined by Laura Brzezinski from the department or the Office of Economic

Development, who will help out with the part of the presentation that deals with the specific affordable housing requirements that are part of the system. This is all about implementing the adopted 38th and Blake Hite amendments that you adopted in September of 2016 with those key goals that Brad talked about. It's about promoting greater design quality, promoting higher intensity development to support transit, while ensuring that that development gives back to the community in the form of specific benefits, especially affordable housing. That plan amendment process was its own very significant process that involved over 13 major meetings, including five community workshops. There was a steering committee that guided the process. Members of the steering committee included representatives from all of the surrounding neighborhoods.

There were also presentations to R.A. meetings, newsletters and a project website. As we move through this presentation, I'll try to keep you oriented because there are several related components here. The first are the zoning code, text and map amendments. Those are over on the left hand side of this slide in green and orange. That is part of one package of text amendments and then is implemented through a first a math amendment that we'll discuss as part of this public hearing to apply the proposed overlays to existing properties with existing mixed use zoning. And then later this evening, we'll have a separate public hearing on an additional map amendment to rezone properties that don't have mixed use zoning and apply the overlays. The text amendment includes two distinct components the River North Design Overlay and the 30th and Blake Incentive Overlay. The design overlay is all about that enhanced design quality that the adopted plan amendments recommend. The incentive overlay is about promoting that density to support the transit, but ensuring that the density provides in this case, a very specific and tangible community benefits. The incentive overlay in the zoning text amendment is then related to a proposed amendment to the municipal code to introduce a new article that will include the incentive affordable housing requirements that are related to this overlay and provide a placeholder for any future similar overlays and the requirements that would be associated with those overlays. So on the zoning side, the incentive overlay enables the greater height and intensity. And the municipal code amendment then includes the specific requirements that are tied to that in terms of affordable housing. And then finally, there's an ordinance to establish a new fund to house the funds collected through the incentive system. So I spoke about the significant process that went into the plan amendments. And then there's also been a significant process as part of this implementation effort that included quite a few community and stakeholder meetings, as well as information item discussions with planning board and the City Council Committee. So we've heard a lot through all of that. But at the very high level, I'll just talk to you about some themes. There is a lot of excitement that we've heard regarding the future of this area and what kind of place it can be, and general public support for having an incentive system and specific design requirements. There are some concerns generally about growth and change and also about how that growth and change relates to the infrastructure capacity of the city and this neighborhood in particular. For some concerns about the removal of minimum parking requirements, in some cases that will go through. That's part of the design overlay as well as the required amount of affordable housing, both that it's too much for development or that it's not enough. And then some specific property owner

and development concerns about there's an active use frontage requirement that we'll talk about in a moment that we've heard from developers that have some concerns about that, as well as some concerns about the specific rules and regulations about how affordable units are provided, exactly when they're required, and the ease of negotiating a community benefits option that I'll also talk about in a moment. So to begin with the details, I'll talk about the proposed River North design overlay first. So again, this is one of the two major components of the text amendment. The component that deals with enhanced design quality. There are two major categories of design that the overlay addresses building design and massing and street level activation. And to give you some examples in each category in terms of building design and massing, there are requirements that address the design of structured parking. I know we've all seen some of the larger new buildings that are dominated by structured parking that looms over the street and has a very cold, inactive appearance. This design overlay would require that 70% of that frontage be wrapped with another use other than parking, or that 100% of the frontage be designed to mitigate the impacts of the visual impacts of the parked cars like headlights and security lighting, as well as to integrate the design of the parking levels into the overall facade design. Also, there is a new requirement in the

design overlay for incremental mass reduction. That's a fancy name. The intent is to ensure that larger buildings. This would only apply to buildings on zone lots over 150 feet in width, incorporate reductions in mass that help promote more creative building design so that buildings, the largest buildings, are less blocky and also preserve more light and air at the street and preserve more of a sense of human scale. The requirements increase as a building increases in height. So in some parts of the area that we're talking about, the incentive overlay would allow buildings of up to 16 storeys near the transit, and that's where the mass reduction requirements would be highest.

The River North Art District and other proponents were very interested in having requirements that would help promote creative building design. So the incremental mass reduction is pretty flexible. Just see, a couple of examples of different ways of meeting this requirement as part of the intent is that it's very flexible, but there's a mass reduction that's increasing as the building rises in height. In terms of street level activation, some of the important tools, street level, active use. There are special requirements in the design overlay that go over and above what we have in our existing mixed use in Main Street districts today in Denver. So for the largest projects, there would be a requirement on a primary street that at least 50% of the frontage be used

her than residential or parking or storage. And so that could be uses like office or art spaces. It also could be retail or restaurants because smaller projects may have frontages that are entirely residential and bigger projects could still have some residential. There's also a requirement that the street level be designed to accommodate potential future changes in use. And so it requires that the height of the street level be a minimum of six feet, which facilitates that. And then the final tool I'll talk about addresses the street level residential specifically. So when there are residential units built on a street level frontage that they actually be set back from the street by a minimum of seven feet and that there be an entry feature for each street level dwelling. This is a concept you'll see as the text amendment to address slot homes comes forward as well. And just looking on the left of this slide, you see just a basic diagram of a building meeting those requirements. On the corner, there's something other than residential units could be the building lobby or retail or a restaurant, but where there are those residential units there, there's set back and there's a transition to the street because we've often seen when residential units are built right along the sidewalk edge, as is allowed at a zero setback in mixed use districts, that they have a very defensive design to protect the privacy of those units. This allows for a more natural transition. And then just a couple of additional tools. The design overlay actually removes the minimum vehicular parking requirement within a half a mile of the commuter rail station at 38th and Blake to promote transit use. It also provides additional criteria for how primary streets are designated. So the zoning administrator, according to various criteria, has the ability to determine which streets are primary, which means which streets get the highest level requirements in terms of transparency and other measures. This sets additional standards that will ensure that the most important streets in the area are designated as primary, including the riverfront. So just addressing the important criteria for consideration of the text amendment. Just in terms of the design overlay portion of the text amendment, the comprehensive plan recommends encouraging quality infill development that's consistent with neighborhood character and also directs us to focus design standards and review efforts on new and evolving districts that are undergoing the most dramatic change, as is certainly the case here. Blueprint Denver recommends creating new or modified zoned districts where there is not an existing zone district that allows the appropriate uses densities and design standards. We're not proposing to specifically create new base zone districts, but the overlay district is a mechanism to introduce the appropriate standards here. The 30th and Blake Station area height amendments make very specific

recommendations related to the design overlay, including adopting a new regular regulatory approach to ensure greater design quality throughout the station area. And finally, the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan from 2011 recommends promoting pedestrian orientation and minimizing the visible visual impacts of structured parking and locating commercial uses on the ground floor to activate buildings and the street. So I'll move. On to the second, a major component of the text amendment. And then while discussing this component, will also weave in the related proposal to create a new article in the Municipal Code to include the affordable housing requirements that are related to the overlay as well as the incentive fee fund. So just looking at the

components that address height and density in the area or proposed to on the text amendment side is establishing a new category of design overlay called an incentive overlay that doesn't exist now. And this is something that could be used in the future to create other kinds of incentive systems other than what we're proposing tonight. Then establish the first of those as incentive overlays as the 30th. And Blake stationary incentive overlay, which will allow from 1 to 11 stories of additional height over and above what the base zoning allows. And I'll show you a map. It depends on the part of the plan area. Specify the height transitions that are required adjacent to the neighborhoods, and then it cross-references the affordable housing requirements that will be on the right hand side of the slide in the proposed new Article six of Chapter 27 of the revised Municipal Code. And that. So when you're using this incentive height, what do you have to do? And in very broad summary, what you have to do depends on what type of project it is. A primarily residential project using incentive height would have to build affordable units. That's the only option. And the requirement for affordable units is expressed as being the same requirement as applies citywide when using the linkage fees build alternative program, which is the alternative to build units instead of paying the fee applied to the whole building and then just applied to the incentive height, those additional stories allowed by the overlay a requirement to build four times that many affordable units. And so another way to look at it is that the base citywide requirement applies to the lower part of the building, and then the incentive stories are required to build five times as much affordable housing as would be required elsewhere. For a project that's primarily nonresidential, there'd be more flexibility because it can be challenging to provide units on site so they would have the option of building the affordable units or they could pay a fee. And the fee structure is similar to the affordable unit structure that I just went over that essentially on the incentive portion of the building, it it comes out to five times the fee that would have appli

ed to that square footage elsewhere in the city. And then finally they'd have an option to meet the incentive portion of the requirement by negotiating a community benefits agreement that I'll provide more details on in a moment. The incentive fee fund is then related to those amendments and is a new fund only to house money generated by fees charged on the incentive stories of of a building. So this is the map that's included in the text amendment for the incentive overlay. And this is the map that sets up the incentive heights. So the base heights are addressed in the underlying zoning. It's the maximum height in your zone district. But you can build taller than that according to those affordable housing conditions. Up to the maximum height specified on this map and where you see actresses, actresses on this map primarily adjacent to lower scale neighborhoods. There actually are specific height transitions that are required in the text of the text amendment to ensure that the taller development steps down towards the neighborhood. And I'm going to turn it over to Laurie Brzezinski from the Office of Economic Development now to go through some scenarios for how the incentive could be used. Just to help you understand that and just looking at this map, again, the examples that she'll use will use a property that would have a base height of five stories . So let's say the underlying zoning was IMX five with a height limit of five stories and an incentive height of 12. So that would be true of some of the properties in on this part of the map, for example. Hello. Members of Council Laura brzezinski, Office of Economic Development. I am going to take the numbers that Abe showed you just two slide ago and break it down in an example project, just to help understand this a little bit better. Just before I do that, I want to highlight the fact that as we approached this process, a CPD city attorney's office, we had a couple of core goals that we were bringing to this approach, similar to what we brought with the linkage fee that was adopted in the fall of 2016. One of those was to introduce equity across different development types, including residential and commercial development types. Another of those values was to build a program that was predictable for developing the development community and finally to build an overlay and an approach that was replicable. So those were some of the main components that we brought as values to this program. So first, we are going to walk through what the citywide linkage fee would look like in a typical five storey development. So this is the citywide program. So in this example, we have 75 gross 75,000 gross square feet in a five story building. As you're aware, we have two options for this residential developer, and we're going to walk through residential first and commercial second. Certainly there's the option in the citywide program to pay the linkage fee that's a dollar 50 per square foot. Or to use the calc

ulations outlined in the citywide linkage fee ordinance to determine what number of units would be produced to offset that linkage fee and would have to be produced. In this case, we results in one unit to offset the linkage fee requirement for this five story building. In the incentive program. As Abe mentioned, we're using the example of five stories, up to 12 stories. The first step in our process is certainly, as May eight mentioned, there is no option for a fee here. So we are only utilizing that unit calculation, unit conversion that's calculated on a per square foot basis to determine what number of units would be produced. So our first step on the residential side is to determine what is the contribution and the number of units that are required to offset the citywide calculation. So in this case, because we've gone from 75,000 gross square feet up to 180 gross square feet, that results in three units that would need to be produce produced to offset the citywide linkage fee requirement that exists here as well as everywhere else. The second component of this analysis is to look at what the additional requirement is, because this developer utilized up to the maximum allowable storeys in this height incentive. As I've mentioned, this requirement is four times what's required by the citywide, but just on the square footage above the base. So our step next is to add those seven units that are required to offset the incentive overlay requirements with the three units for a total of ten units. So this gives us, as you can see in this example, because the overlay existed even with the requirements we're required to get to that maximum height and set an incentive, a net gain of nine affordable units compared to what would have been developed if the developer only builds up to the five stories that was previously previously allowed by zoning. So as you can see, that's ten times the number of affordable housing units that would have been produced if that developer only built to the five storey base. So I'm going to walk through a commercial example, but the logic remains the same. We're doing 5 to 12 stories here as well. Certainly there is the fee option for commercial development. Again, that's one times the citywide requirement. It's a dollar 70 per square foot on the total square footage and then four times that citywide linkage fee just on the area above the base. In this case, it brings us to a little over \$1,000,000 that would be contributed to the fund. Apologies. We're missing a dollar sign there. The commercial developer who utilizes this incentive, just like in the citywide linkage fee, also has the option to build affordable units on site or off site within the overlay area. In this scenario, the same calculations apply at one times the citywide and then four times for the area above the base, up to a total of 414 units that would be required. There is a third option, and it's going to talk a little bit more about some of the details of

this option in just a moment. To provide a community use of a portion of square footage in the building or in the overlay area for community serving users. In this scenario, we are still paying the city wide linkage fee, but there is a negotiated agreement with the Office of Economic Development for exactly what that community serving use is, how much space is required for it, and what the length of time that it would be affordable for. So in this scenario, for the unit option, it would be 14 times what would otherwise be provided by that five story similar to what we saw on the page before. And just a little bit of additional background on what these affordability requirements are. This the rules and regulations for the citywide linkage fee are applicable for this overlay area, except for one unique piece about the overlay area in this overlay or in within the report affordability requirements of this overlay. The units can be built on site or off site somewhere within that overlay, like the citywide linkage fee. The units have to be affordable at 80% AMI or lower, and the units have to be in a mix in size that's comparable to the market rate units. So if all of the market rate units are one bedrooms, the affordable units could be one bedrooms. But if the market rate units are a mix of 1 to 3 bedrooms, the affordable units would have to be in a ratio that would match the market rate units. So those units that are built offsite have some specific rules in our existing rules and regulations for the linkage fee, including requirements for an escrow and a specific timeline for construction. And there is also a requirement with our citywide linkage fee, as with this overlay, that the market rate units, the affordable units that are provided as an offset to the market rate units have to be of the same tenure type as the market rate units. So if the market rate units are for sale, the affordable units would have to be for sale. Likewise with rental. One thing we do want to note though is because we have fees paid to an incentive fee fund as well as units produced on site. We do have the onsite units produced at 80% AMI or lower, but the fees collected through the commercial development would also be invested in a consistent way with our other federal and local resources to address housing along the full spectrum. We have our housing plan coming to council next week that outlines some specific targets for the investment of our resources along the

income spectrum, and the comprehensive housing plan would be applicable for funds are collected under this incentive overlay. And then one last note on the fees collected as part of the part of the incentive overlay would be collected into a new incentive fee fund. And that's necessary because the linkage fees go into their own fund, which is for the exclusive use of those linkage fees. So we do have a separate fund for the collection of the incentive fees under this overlay, and the uses are consistent w

ith our dedicated housing fund. Okay. Thank you, Laura. We're getting closer. I just want to mention a few of the details of that final option that, you know, certainly in our conversations with the community were we're well aware of that the needs of the surrounding residents go beyond affordable housing. And that as a as an area like the area around the 30th and Blake Station changes, the kinds of things that can afford to be in the neighborhood sometimes don't serve a diverse spectrum of residents. And so this system includes a proposal for an option that would just be for primarily non residential development because residential development has to build affordable units. So primarily nonresidential units, instead of paying the incentive fee for additional height, could execute a community benefits agreement administered by the Office of Economic Development. That agreement would meet the incentive requirements only, so the project would still have to pay the affordable housing linkage fee on all of its square footage. The agreement would translate, in general, the value of that fee into an agreement to provide community serving users such as art studios and maker spaces or neighborhood services like childcare or community kitchens and community serving nonprofit spaces. The agreement would need to address the rent reduction that would be necessary for the tenant. The terms and timeline of the agreement, as well as the recourse if the agreement was not in good standing. That is, if the developer or property owner lost the community serving tenant or some other non community serving use in the space . And Jeff Romaine from the Office of Economic Development is with us here tonight, who can help answer detailed questions about this. So just looking at the incentive overlay component of the proposed text amendment, just run through consistency with adopted plans. The comprehensive plan recommends encouraging mixed use transit oriented development that makes effective use of existing transportation infrastructure. The adopted height amendments for this area recommend adopting a new regulatory approach to integrate affordable housing and mixed income development within the 38 Timberlake station area. That's exactly what this implementation effort is. Delivery on Swansea. A neighborhood plan from 2015 recommends neighborhood collaboration to determine whether taller building heights may be appropriate near the 30th and Blake Station. That neighborhood collaboration was embodied in the public process for the plan amendments themselves to determine those appropriate incentive heights and what it would take to get there. And then finally, the 38 template station area plan from 2009 recommends providing financial incentives to include flexible zoning and provision of density bonuses in this area. The text amendment introduces some criteria that would apply only to creation of a new incentive overlay or mapping of an incentive overlay thro

ugh a map amendment. And that includes a finding that the incentive overlay district will provide community benefits that provide that further one or more adopted city policies, that those benefits have been determined to be best achieved through incentives rather than direct requirements, that the incentive overlay district will ensure clear and predictable outcomes consistent with the applicable neighborhood context, building forms and the stated purpose of the zone district, and that the incentive overlay district will apply equally to all similar projects in an area or district to provide equitable outcomes. So the staff recommendation, community planning and development staff do recommend approval of the text amendment that includes both the design and the incentive overlay is based on a finding that the review criteria have been met, that the special review criteria for an incentive overlay district consistency with adopted plans, that they further the public health, safety and general welfare and results and regulations that are uniform across the District Office of Economic Development Staff and Budget Management. Office staff also recommend approval of the related Municipal Code Amendment and the ordinance establishing the Incentive Fee Fund. So we have one last piece to go through. And just to reorient now we're talking so far have been talking about establishing this new framework of regulations on the books, in the zoning code and in the municipal code. This next item is about mapping them on the ground, determining where they apply. And so this proposed map amendment would. Why the design overlay and incentive overlay

two properties that have mixed use zoning already in the area, which is entirely within Council District nine. And looking at this map, the blue area are properties with existing mixed use zoning that are right around the 30th and Blake Station that are in the area of the plan amendment. They're proposed for application of both of the overlays. The remaining area is the remainder of the Reno Business Improvement District. It's proposed for application of the design overlay. That's DOT seven. Only the reason for this is that the Reno art district, basically, concurrent to the conversations we were having about implementation of the plan, made a request for a design overlay to cover all of Reno looking to promote enhanced design quality. Their desire was very similar to the objectives coming out of the plan amendment effort. So this MAP amendment proposes to take that design overlay developed to apply at 30th and Blake and extend it to the rest of the Reno area. So the existing land use in the area, it's a large area. There are a lot of land uses now, however, that that kind of purple color is industrial. And so you can see that it is still primarily an industrial area and much of the zoning is split between industrial and mixed use now. And there's a variety of new and old building forms in the district. Now there

's some large new developments that are already near completion on the north and west side of the tracks, such as the catalyst development that's on the lower left. And but a lot of the area is characterized by buildings like you see on the middle right there, low scale one, one and a half, sorry, industrial buildings. And then I just want to mention that the last item on the agenda tonight is a separate public hearing for an additional math amendment sponsored by Council President Brooks, which seeks to change the underlying zoning for a number of properties in this area that don't have mixed use zoning now. So change the base zone district and apply the overlays. And assuming that both amendments passed, what we'd be looking at in the area is that everything in yellow there on the map would have the overlays applied. So you see that there are still some little missing pieces. That's primarily because we haven't proactively proposed to apply the overlays to planned unit developments PUDs. Also, Council President Brooks gave the opportunity to property owners with existing industrial zoning to opt out of changing that to mixed use at this time and applying the overlays. And so a couple of large properties took advantage of that consistency with adopted plans. The Blueprint Denver Land Use recommendation is primarily mixed use for the area, as well as transit oriented development south of the station. It does include a recommendation for industrial. Primarily north of the station and then the 30th and Blake plan amendments includes this map that really gives us our marching orders in terms of those incentive heights. And this map, the colors are the incentive heights that are recommended for the maximum available heights. And the numbers on this map are the base heights. And those numbers are essentially consistent with all of the previous adopted plan recommendations, as well as much of the existing zoning in the area. And then the colors are consistent with the new vision for greater height, but requiring the additional community benefits. And Illyria and Swansea. A neighborhood plan includes a recommendation for City Council member initiated rezonings to implement the plan vision, which is what's happening tonight as part of Council President Brooke's proposal. So finally, community planning and development staff recommend approval of the MAP amendment based on a finding that all the review criteria have been met, that it meets the review criteria that are special for an incentive overlay district consistency with adaptive plans that it furthers the public health, safety and general welfare and results in regulations that are uniform across the district. Thank you. Hey, thank you. Well done. Take a break. We're going to start the public hearing now with everybody's here. So if I need this bench right here cleared, if you can please find a seat somewhere else, that will be great. And I'm going to call the first five members.

We have 26 speakers tonight. And this is a public hearing that is open. So we're going to get through them all. Ryan Kinney, Mercedes Gonzalez, Andrew Feinstein, Angelina Torres and Jamie Lit Co. You are the first five. Please grab a seat here, Abe, if you can. If you can find a seat elsewhere. I'm sorry, buddy. All right, Ryan, Kenny, you're up first with 3 minutes. Greetings, Council members. My name is Ryan Kinney and I live in Denver at 1920 South University Boulevard. I'm here to speak in favor of the bills relating to the rezoning of the area around the 38th and Blake Commuter Rail Station. I'm supporting these bills for several reasons, but I'd like to talk about just two of them here. One is that in the face of the housing crisis, these amendments would increase the number of units that could be built in our city. Adding more units to the housing stock will apply downward pressure on housing prices citywide. This will at least slow the rate of price

increase, which is good. But if enough units are built, prices can actually go down. As evidence for this earlier in this year. Seattle Intense infill development has caused rents to decline by an average of \$50 a month as compared to the previous quarter. Beyond this, if the affordable housing incentive in this rezoning one courage more units to be provided at below market rates further helping the affordability cause in River North District. My second major reason for supporting this is because it facilitates more walking, biking and transit use. Increased adoption of these modes of travels is good for our health and essential and fighting climate change. One of Mayor Hancock's 2030 sustainability goals is to lower single occupant vehicle commuter mode share to 50%. Changing city policy to allow people, services and workplaces to intensely concentrate around transit stations is essential if we want to achieve this goal. The rezoning of the 38th and Blake Station area is in line with this and if built out would substantially increase the walkability of the area and increase the number of destinations that can be conveniently accessed by Denver's transit system. Because this rezoning would sustainably and responsibly allow for more homes to be built for people who want to live in our city. I support these bills. I urge you all to vote in favor. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Kinney. Mercedes Gonzalez is up next, and she will have translation, so she will have 6 minutes. When the service. Good afternoon. Good evening. You're part of the. Love you, but can. You put her. Right down just a little bit? Pull your mike down just a little bit. I sorry. I am part of the GSA coalition. Los Requisitos. They are psychobilly. They're not all Sufi scientists. Then you went to Latin and Latin America. Well, there is plus Sarmiento. David has said it must go on. S.A. Elizondo. The requirements for affordability are not. Some are not enough considering the dynamic, the actual dynamic of displacement. There sho

uld be more consideration about this issue. Do you think analysts are long been but as excessively analysts are commonly that business to radical investors. Based in those you need to analyze this well so that it could be affordable to our communities our neighbors that live in our in our neighborhoods. Well, when Politico Directo Martin Quintanilla subpoenas L.A. as he does this, the best. Scenario a good politician should consider and take into consideration the opinions the needs of the neighborhood either. Podera Sara opposes the connection. Central Proyecto Vivir Sarmiento because that's also. The end goal. And to be able to support and make connections between the project and the displacement that is occurring. LBC scenario play I poco por there get the Annette Prather opinion this sobre los. Proyectos através del Proceso. The neighborhood is losing the little bit of power that they have to give projects in regards to projects through the process of rezoning vacation. If the proposed. Decision is contrary to all this, are all this arroyo liberato. For always in the idea and this proposal is against the. It's against a development that should be led by the neighborhood. Not will study on not my. Your participation in. This Arroyo thereby seen the ideal. We would like to have more participation a better participation in the development of our neighborhood. Kenosha cannot give way to accommodate costume. Wearing and for us not to be left out the way we usually are along réseau prom maybe. Or the area. The am I? General by aumentar in all scenarios connected sro yoga. This blessed one must not be seen on must vulnérables. It will in general increase in the neighborhoods where this development will be, and it will displace even more neighbors that are now vulnerable. So I still have a little bit of time. Yes. Man is there yall is. We are political poquito. The amoebas in the. I want to taste that. But my neighborhood. Controlled those proyectos e want to see a needle. With all the people that are moving in is more party to your in English. A U.S. store. Is since Corazon Castile. Latimer the church that I go to a sacred heart of this is to replace the. Restaurantes. Suarez and there is a ton it's it's full of restaurants and. I knew Pasado Iglesia so for the vandalism all. Last year my church suffered a vandalism unknown but intro ideas through your to Allah see my goodness, a man went in and destroyed all the images. Outside the mosque idea. In this instant, this ninos is the person that sold us. So your padre in El Paso. Hello. Idle. And thank God that there was kids and there was adults there. In the end, the father went up and and nothing happened. And Don says or returning to. Iglesia is dumb. We tequila as a puzzle cameras the altar definition. And now we our church is very well watched over. We have high definition cameras, etc. We improve capacity. It's something that's very. Close lost muscle mass, one that is lacking the. Body and the t

he people who are most vulnerable to this are the poorest. People or halacha or status where there is the nosotros podemos. Brentano na un departamento abajo Paris. You and I hope that we can really, truly be able to rent a a unit that is at a lower cost. Going to venues. A study in. Cinco Puntos

and I have been in five points for five for 20 years now, of course, and we put. Occupancy in the infirmary across this solution mentality that will move procurement. And this is something that's very concerning. I think that we could even get sick. Our mental health is at risk because this is something that worries us a lot, is. Very moschino's considering those mass vulnerables. We hope that you consider the most vulnerable dresses. Thank you. Thank you. Ms.. Gonzalez. Andrew Feinstein, 3 minutes. Thank you. Council President Brooks. Fellow members of City Council. My name is Andrew Feinstein. I am the chairman of the River North Art District and have served in that role for the past seven plus years. I'm also a fifth generation, fifth generation Denver. My family came to Curtis Park in 1870, six years before Colorado was a state and co-founded the synagogue. That stands today at 24th in Curtis, which today is a home for working artists that are members of the art district that we have the privilege of serving. I am speaking in favor of this legislation this evening, not just as chairman of Rhino, but also as a business owner. I am the owner of the Tracks Nightclub and the two event center, two venues that I hope most of you have had an opportunity to patronize in the last few months. And we have over 100 employees in the neighborhood in Reno. So I have a front row seat to these challenges, and I see the challenges that our employees face in terms of both affordability and mobility. And I believe that this legislation tackles both of those challenges with one piece of legislation. And I was very privileged and fortunate to work with Councilman Brooks, Community Planning and Development and other committee leaders from all the neighborhoods represented here this evening to craft this legislation over the last two years. And we're going to talk a lot tonight about affordability, but I'd like to pick up on it. Ryan just mentioned on the mobility front, you know, we never really talk about. How many cars expensive. You know, you talk about gas, you talk about upkeep, your payments, your insurance, maintenance, and then parking. And just time the time it takes to own a car, to drive a car. If we can densify our development around transit, if we can get people out of their cars, just as the mayor has asked us to get people out of their cars, walking to work, biking to work, taking the train. Just think about all the money these folks are going to save, in addition. To the amount of productivity that's going to be unleashed by all these folks getting them out of their cars. So that's just a note that I want everyone to consider this evening as you consider vo

ting for this legislation, because in addition to the improvements for affordability, in addition to the improvements for Street Activation, Master ductlon and the other aspects of this legislation that we've worked hard on, I think mobility is really important. So I encourage everyone in City Council to vote yes this evening. And again, we really thank you for your time. And I especially want to thank not just Councilman Brooks, but the folks from the Community Planning Department and the Office of Economic Development for working on this so hard over the last two years. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Feinstein. Angelina Torres. You have 6 minutes with the translation. Recycling, attorneys say part of the LA Coalition. My name is Angelina Torres and I am part of the coalition. Well. Good evening, everyone. If I said, honest to the opera, wear color but I wear camo. Make a meteorite impact. Alice blossom. Into. The recommendation would be to make to do a study to to see to mitigate the impact of displacement in the neighborhood. And you don't think that's. For my own Grupo. Administrative loss component the asset me that and to form a group that would administer. The components of affordability etc. here in crear una. Comunidad. Exclusive are. Vecino locales tambien. And to work to create a community that is inclusive even for the neighbor, for the local neighbors as well. Aggregate under kizito parochial project those advancing. To add a requirement so that the projects can advance. But will need to see a la. That and to meet with the community. Incluso si noise necesario leasing la sonification. Even if it's not necessary to have a news notification or a zoning Elago asked that competition refrain Get this I'm going to share a saying that says this not the his, but I'm gonna look at. But as I said, you don't wait till tomorrow to do something you could do today. Manas, Alora. Let's get to work. Get us in. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Press. Jimmy Legault. Good evening. Members of Council Council President Brooks. My name is Jamie Legault. I'm the president of the Reno Art District. I'm here tonight to speak in support of these bills. And I'd like to start by thanking Council President, President Brooks city staff and the many community members of Reno of the neighborhoods that were a part of that were at the table, actively engaged in the significant effort and putting in the time it took to get us to this point. This to your effort is a significant, important step. It is bold, it is complex. And we recognize that it may also be imperfect as we move towards implementation. We will be learning a lot, a lot that can be addressed as this potential effort gets expanded to other parts of Denver. That said, we

believe it will bring opportunity for affordability and livability that otherwise may not happen and in all probability would not happen. Our district prides itself on taking risks and on piloting new ideas. Complex challenges like affordability, as we

all know, require that we attract a problem from a multitude of angles. And this is a piece of that. The three elements of this overall initiative are uniquely assembled to come at affordability and livability from multiple angles. The rezoning brings clarity and predictability to a rapidly changing area. The design overlay puts a focus on livability and creates opportunities for affordability from not only a residential perspective, but also a commercial one, as well as the incentive overlay, which gives us tools to mandate that affordability happens in Reno. Does it push far enough is the question that many have asked? It pushes, and I think that's a really important start. Reno is supportive of tonight's bills. But in the end, we also recognize that this is just a step. Its implementation must be done right. And with the continued participation of the community. And this cannot be the only step that we take to make a dent in affordability for all. The toolbox must also include more resources going into affordable housing, citywide moves against displacement, supporting other important concepts such as community land trusts, opening up city owned assets for affordable opportunities just like the tiny home village and rhino. And continued creative thinking. As to tonight's proposed bill, it's critical that we do everything we can to get the highest impact from this. And to that end, a few questions and comments to leave with you, Council President Brooks, to make sure that we understand how we can keep the dollars local, as was the intent of the program. And I want to ask tonight that if developers buy out, that money comes back to Rhino to support affordability on site and understand how we can achieve that, that we find ways to get beyond 80% Army units. We've run out of time. Thank you. You heard the main points. Yeah, we heard it. Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate it. All right. Thank you. For those five speakers. We have the next five, Ray G and Hayes, Kandi CdeBaca, Tracy Wild and Alice Gordon. Reggie, you're up first. You have 3 minutes. All right. Good evening, everybody. How you guys doing? I just want. To first off put on record that you can't Metro Denver was was listed as a supporter and we I am a board member of you match a Denver and we haven't completely decided to either supporter. Or be against the bill. So I just want to make sure you guys know that and. Say hi to my wife and kids who are watching that didn't get a chance to come here and run. Amok. So I just really want to. Let you guys know. I know I've heard a lot of this. Introduce yourself for the record. Oh, okay. Reggie, I live in Globerville. I'm a fourth. Generation North Denver resident, so I actually. Live in the neighborhood that. This is really affecting. And, you know, many times I've heard that the city has said that they want to find a solution to a lot of this affordable housing that's going on here in the community. And many people here in our community are fac

ing displacement weekly. There's quite a lot everybody there's there's a lot of people who are who are living out of the neighborhoods that can't. Afford the property taxes that are. That are being raised, all the development, all these new units that are being put in here. So I just want to make sure that people know this is a crisis. It is affecting a lot of people in our community and. Allowing these developers to come in and have a free pass to just. Build as many units as they want in this red zone ification. And I know that's not a word, but it's it's using zoning as gentrify gentrification. So I made it up so you can. Go and put that in your notes. And basically, with more and more of these units are being built, you know, they're being built without any repercussions or any recognition of the impact that it's going to be having on the surrounding community. And, you know, we do need to first start solving the housing crisis. First. Before we start moving on to moving more. People in here. Because basically all it's doing, you know, when you add more units into these neighborhoods, it's just exacerbate. Exacerbating the problem, which is causing. Basically a raise in the local army have the, you know, the of the community there. So it's pushing affordability out of reach of the people who are making less than a quarter of of the AM out of the entire city. So it's not affordable to the people in the community. And 65 units or ten units per building is nothing. It's a drop in the bucket compared to a thousand people that come into Denver every month. So you guys have to really consider that that, you know, there's so many people coming in here. How is it going to be enough units that. Are affordable. For people who are already in the community to actually stay there? And, you know, just really quickly, as a homeowner and as somebody who lives in the community who's facing rising taxes and struggling with this, it's a big problem. And just building more units, allowing these developers to come in here is just like handing. Weights to

people who are drowning and reaching out for a life preserver. So just keep that in mind when you guys are voting tonight. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you, Mr. G. And he's. Members of Council President Brooks. My name is Hayes and I am a resident of Denver. I also sit on the Rhino Art District Board, and I'm also a developer in the rhino neighborhood. Denver is a great city, and because of that, we are welcoming new residences and seeing new businesses, new business growth every day. This is a sign of a strong and healthy city and the bill is under consideration tonight, which I support help to address the challenges of the gross growth. We are experiencing a number of ways. First, these bills direct density to a location that allows for greater utilization of our transit infrastructure, which will result in less dependence on the automobile. As well. Directing density to this

location also help support attracting a variety of community serving retail and businesses that make their location decisions on adjacent population and business counts. This will directly benefit the adjacent neighborhoods by bringing these kinds of services into it. Directing density. This location also will provide the neighborhood with a variety of new job opportunities, something that I know that these neighborhoods greatly desire. It is important to note that this new density will not happen just because of this incentive. It will be driven by market demand, which will take time to build. But by creating this new overlay district now, there is a greater chance that will happen. And when it does happen, the city will benefit from this density being tied to the creation of affordable housing. Which will be important to the neighborhood. This new legislation is a positive and proactive move by the city to draw our future density to the right locations that will result in community benefit where it is needed and supports. Also a long history of local area planning. So I encourage city council to vote yes tonight on this legislation. I would also ask that the city consider that any dollars generated from this particular overlay district be applied to affordable housing or community service. Benefits within the district or in its adjacent neighborhoods. I also ask the city to consider working with the neighborhood to help establish priorities on how these. Dollars are. Are distributed. In other words, perhaps we need less, you know, more AMI 30% AMI And not so much 80% I. And that's something that we would love to have a discussion with the city about. I also want to state my support for the River North Design Overlay, which is also under consideration tonight that will produce a higher level of architectural excellence. In the neighborhood. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you, Ms.. Hayes. Candi CdeBaca. My name is Candy CdeBaca. I'm a fifth generation Northeast Denver resident. I'm here to oppose the 38th and Blake zoning overlay. I'm a co-founder of an R.A. in the area called Cross-community Coalition. We have, as a community, been forcing attention to the extreme housing crisis our residents are facing, and we've had little support from our councilman in meaningfully addressing our concerns. Mayor Hancock has been quoted after the INC protest saying essentially that city elected officials have little control over gentrification and they are not telling developers to build in gentrifying communities. Well, this ordinance is a perfect example of policy or zoning, paving the way for developers to more easily build in one of the most vulnerable areas of Denver. This overlay is government expediting involuntary displacement. The bundling of the zoning with the affordability overlay, the design overlay and the temporary use of zoning changes is unfair and inappropriate given the conditions in our city right now. We have had many conversations

about the inadequacy of efforts toward increasing affordability in housing. This overlay is coming at the request of bids and deeds, and it will only make it easier to develop faster with fewer opportunities for citizen engagement and voice. In fact, community rights are being further diminished as residents will not have the typical ability to comment on individual projects and rezoning proposals. There is no coincidence that community groups supporting anti displacement efforts were not included in this two year long process. A two year long process that did not address potential impact of gentrifying of gentrification until very recently reveals a complete disregard for communities pleas for more responsible development in our city. This incentive overlay is wildly insufficient and will absolutely exacerbate the problems we have yet to solve with regard to housing. I support higher design quality and a much higher affordability housing affordability in housing percentages and targeting to a lower am-I. I do not support this zoning overlay at this time and true leaders would HALTZMAN overlay. And so we have meaningful housing solutions. The incentive is a minimal is minimal and won't produce units within the foreseeable future. In fact, it's not even a requirement. It's an incentive. And right now we need requirements. City funding is down 30% for

affordable housing since 2010, despite tripling and increase triple increases in property values and 100,000 people moving. 100,000 people in population growth. Delisting of the Superfund site that this zoning is in is also. A concern because the land use change and more than half of the overlay is not consistent with neighborhood plans as they were supposed to stay industrial north of 38th and Blake and makes due south of it less than one unit per floor is unacceptable. So I urge you all to vote no. And especially Mr. Brooks. You should be ashamed of yourself. Thank you. Thank you, Ms.. CdeBaca. Tracy, while you're up next. Okay. Hello, City Council. Thank you so much for having me and letting me speak my voice. My name is Tracy. While I am a five points resident, I've been the resident for 18 years. I live in the overlay district that is being proposed tonight. I'm also an artist and the co-founder of the Rhino Art District. So last week, Council President Brooks came to our neighborhood meeting and he said to give us an update on, you know, what he was up to and that kind of stuff. And he said, you know, he asked us, you know, what do we love about what we're doing? What do we love about our neighborhood? What are we excited about? Well, you know, I just want you to know that I'm excited about this proposed affordable overlay district and the design overlay, too. This is work that we need to be doing. This is how we make a proactive change. Affordable space in the rhino. Our district is on top of our list as a community. We've worked hard over the past two years to do our due diligence on t

his project and try to make a difference in our ever changing city . This zoning proposal has great merit and is a step in the right direction for affordability in our community, not only for our artists and galleries, but for our residents, residents and small business owners. We have to think collectively and holistically. The Reno art district is part of four historic neighborhoods. We are here to help amplify their voices every day. The issue of affordability in our community comes up every day in order to have a vibrant and culturally rich community. We have to include everyone. We can't have an art district without artists. I'm optimistic. This is a solid step in the right direction. We are trying to shift the paradigm in the Reno art district 2 to 1 that empowers our neighborhood and lets all ships rise together. We owe this to the ones that came before us. I think it's very important that if a developer chooses to buy out of this affordability a requirement, that those dollars go directly back to our community and not into a general fund. We need to be able to earmark these dollars and be a part of the decisions of where these funds are best used. I would encourage City. Council to move forward with this plan. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Mr.. While. All right. Is Elise Gordon here? Oh, there she is. Ms.. Gordon, you're up. Thank you. Hi. My name is Elise Gordon and I am a resident of what I feel the city of Denver and all the llang metro areas. I'm a native and I have what I feel bounced from council meetings to council meetings because I think the whole city is getting out of control with the way it's building. We don't have a housing shortage. We have an affordable housing shortage. And the problem is the buildings out of control. The architecture is out of control. The height restrictions are getting out of control. I have lived here my entire life. I like to see the mountains. I like to say if you go west, you see the mountains. Now I see brick and mortar everywhere around us. Like we're being built into a tunnel and a cave and a box. The architecture down near the eighth Street Vay Viaduct. When you go near the railroad tracks, they look like Legoland. It's boxes with smiley faces. And I'm very disappointed. I've been in real estate my whole life. My father was a developer here in Colorado, and the developers have become completely irresponsible developers. If they have deep pockets, they buy their way out of affordable housing. Because I've seen it done in a lot of projects I was on that I had to sell and we are so worried about the people moving in. Why are we not worried about the people who live here and grew up here and they deserve to have the housing in the neighborhoods they live in. They should absolutely not be forced out by higher homes, higher density. We don't need it. We just plain don't need it. And everything they're building around, they look like mousetraps. The city is becoming ugly. I don't even know where yo

u go anymore to enjoy the beauty you get out by the northwest corner of Arvada. You've got the same problem. You've got \$6 million land transactions being sold for \$30 for incentive programs that are going on throughout this city to protect the development. And you know what? I love my car. I like the light rail. I think it's awesome. And we should all use it when we need to use it. But a lot of people don't live near the light rail. They need to own a car. So don't make it sound like if you own a car, you shouldn't even be driving. You should be on the light rail. It's not a perfect fix. You haven't perfected it, but you're driving people in. We need to work on infrastructure and not so much

more on building and development, work on fixing the streets. I have switched to another industry that I know is making this city tens and thousands and millions and billions of dollars, and you need to start using them to improve the city instead of making it into what just looks like a box with eyes and a height restriction that lets you go to the sky anywhere you want , because all it does is let the next guy come in and we will never see our mountains again. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Gordon. I'm going to call the next five up. John Rickey. Jesse Paris. John Hayton. Darrell Watson. And Chairman Sekou. John. Ricky, you're up first. You have 3 minutes. Hello. My name is John Ricky. I live at 945 Washington Street and Capitol Hill. I find myself of two minds regarding this proposed incentive zoning. On the one hand, it fixes one of Denver's what I feel most underappreciated problems, which is the underutilization of our rail stations. It allows much needed density, which would work to support ridership. Our tax base and our multibillion dollar investment replaces acres of parking and low density zoning with a plethora of people. It also adds affordable housing, a stated goal of both supporters and opponents. This incentive explicitly requires affordable units when increased floors are built. It also adds customers for local businesses. People ask for grocery stores, doctor's offices, hardware stores, restaurants, the whole gamut of services, which should be available in a city neighborhood. And this overlay will provide the customers to support those businesses. These are all good things. On the other hand, it adds costs. Units which must be sold below market, which may not cover construction costs. It adds complexity to what I would argue is already a frightening code. It would also. I would also note that dialing in incentives is a difficult game. Other cities have seen unintended consequences from such attempts. This new overlay is supposed to be precisely balanced to get the results we wish for. And it may work. But will neighborhood conditions still support this precise mix in five years? In ten, why not get out of the way? Instead, make it easier for to get the things we want rather than more difficult. Every neighborhood is experiencing high demand.

The answer is not to choke off investment and growth. It's to add opportunities for investment and growth all over the city, at every rail station, in every neighborhood. We will never be financially solvent and have the infrastructure we desire with the low density development we've been allowed by people who oppose this kind of change in every single neighborhood. We need to build our city not just to be able to pay our bills, but to provide much needed housing and to continue to be welcome and affordable for all people. Restricting new housing does not lower prices. So in the end, I find the solution flawed but necessary. It adds what we need density. A mix of uses. It adds more people and affordability. It works within the current paradigm to get what we need. But we can't let it end here. We must fight for similar solutions all across our city. And since I have a few more seconds, I'll suggest something which shows how much further we could go instead of always stepping it down the station height to meet the single family homes. Why not step up the single family homes to meet the station? That way we get the most use out of our stations and provide even more housing for people. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Mr. Rickey. Jesse Paris. Good evening. Members of council. My name is Jesse Paris. I'm here representing for Denver, homeless out loud. We are a homeless advocacy group that advocates for the homeless and those that have been displaced by way of gentrification in the city of Denver. Okay. Members of council I am voting against I am against this bill. As has been previously stated by other members, I have spoken today. This is not the solution. More gentrification in an already gentrified area is not the solution. More displacement of people that have been long time residents. I myself am a third generation northeast Denver native. This is not the solution. Giving more lead way to gentrification and. Is this opening the door for more people that are not native to this area, to the city? You are literally opening a door for them and closing the door shuts for already existing natives, which is adding to the already existing homeless problem that is going on in metro Denver in all areas, specifically northeast Denver. The city likes to claim that they are responsible for the tiny home village, but this is not true. We have literally been pushing for three years to allow them to allow a space for a tiny home village that I would like to ask for. The record has to move every six months. So this area in question is exactly in that area. And for the past two years, at least, the areas it's been going to rap rampant and gentrification rapid development for those that are not. Natives, but out of towners and business developers, this city seems to value commerce over humanity. And we are here to let you know that we are not letting up on this. This has to stop. This is not a solution. This is literally putting a Band-Aid on an already existing

issue. These developments are not anywhere close to affordable. There is no talk about attainable housing in any of this. All I keep hearing is affordable this, affordable this and affordable that. Affordable for who? It's definitely not affordable to the second, third, fourth and fifth generations of native to have already spoken tonight. It's only affordable to those from other states that have the money to afford to live in these expensive units. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Pierce. Darrell Watson. Oops. Hold on. I'm sorry. John. Hey, you are next. Hello. Members of council. My name is John Hayden. I live at 2418 Champs Street in the Five Points neighborhood. I'm a resident there. For 23 years, and I'm the president of Curtis Park Neighbors, the registered neighborhood organization of four, that area of the city and are registered neighbors organization Curtis Park Neighbors is in support of these amendments because. Community planning development has done. A great deal of work to make sure this has. Been an extensive and inclusive process, to find a. Way to add the needed density around. Stations while respecting the low dense neighborhoods. Historic neighborhoods such as Five Points, Cole and Elyria, Swansea and Globeville. The area that's being that is being zoned for the greatest heights is the industrial area around the station. And then the the heights steps down, respecting the lower density neighborhoods around us. This proposal strikes a balance that helps check rising housing costs by both adding much needed supply to meet the pent up demand. For housing and by incentivizing affordable housing in. Exchange for greater density. This is essential if we're going to keep. Neighbors who've been in our community for a long time here. What we have found is. That. The majority of people who are displaced from their neighborhoods leave for one of two reasons either because they cannot have access to services that they need, such as good schools, shopping, transportation, or because they can no longer afford the housing in the neighborhood. This proposal seeks to address both of those issues first, by providing greater supply to market rate, to bring market rate housing into line, and to by incentivizing actual affordable housing for people who can't afford market rate housing. And three, by incentivizing mixed. Use development so that there are the services there that people need in order to stay in their community long term. So this this absolutely certainly isn't perfect, but it is it is the. Best we have seen in. Terms of addressing gentrification in our neighborhood by addressing the things that are displacing people. Affordability of housing and access to services. And I hope that the city will use this as a model to go throughout the city and bring greater affordability and mix of uses to the to all of Denver. It is only by doing that that we will really address the affordability in this city. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Hayden. Darr

ell Watson. Good evening, members of Council Councilman Brooks. I want to start off first by saying, Councilman Brooks, thank you for leading us through this process. There are many of us in your district that are extremely proud of you and extremely proud of the work that you do and your willingness to listen to neighbors who support you and those who do not so know that you have folks in this community and folks that are here tonight that support the work that you have done and the work that the city has done. My mother's watching tonight, as she does every night. She calls me and says, hey, I saw what's going on in city council in a council meeting. And so tomorrow I want to say, I know for one thing, for many years my mother resided with me in Whittier neighborhood, lived with me for about six, seven years. I know she's grateful for the affordable housing and Curtis Park that she was able to move out of my house. Not that we didn't have a great relationship, but she's excited that she can have her own independence and living in affordable housing. And I say that to make a point. I think every apartment, every home that is affordable is worth doing. My mother lives in Curtis Park and can. Remain in District nine because of the affordability provided by City Council and other leaders that have come before the leaders tonight. Looking at this this plan. I stand here strongly in support of all of these requirements within the legislation. I support these because, number one. They're consistent not only with a two year plan for. Seeking input on this, but close to. 20 years of. Work within the city and county of Denver from the Denver Comprehensive Plan, straight through to the final plan. This has been a process of engaging community for decades and. The. Consistency, consistent consistency of this plan. It's one of the reasons why. I encourage you within City Council to continue this process and to support these this overlay district. It promotes taller building heights to support transit oriented development. Living in a Whittier neighborhood for 21 years and being a homeowner and also being a part of the neighborhood planning process. But Whittier Neighborhood Association and one of the original members of the Land Use Transportation and Advisory Council that helped to develop the Denver Comprehensive Plan. I know that we support density around transit oriented development. That's

why in Whittier we built or supported a building of the Downing Street Lofts and also supported the fourth quarter for housing for veterans. I strongly encourage City Council to vote in favor of this. I strongly encourage City Council to continue to look for ways to increase affordable housing. But this step, no matter how small. Many who do not support, they say, say it is. This step. Gives affordability. To 1 to 1012 residents that would not otherwise be living in Denver. Thank you, Mr. Watson. All right. Chairman Sekou. Actually. Let me see. Yes terms they cal

I you are first up and on my call the next four. Marc Marshall. Vanessa Gwen Dana. Justin Craft and Andy since. Oh. Okay. German Psycho Black Star Action Movement. Service for poor, working, poor, homeless and senior citizens. I have no. In my life of 65 years of living in this city. Her spoken word from this podium. The most outstanding gentrification lullaby ever in the history of mankind. It was beautiful. That first guy that was there. Oh, man. I got to learn a lesson from how to bring it. I mean, for real. I have never seen anything that smooth with a bunch of lies, distortions, and straight up madness. You take a look at the pictures that was on the wall and it showed community layout and people in there shopping and whatnot. What did you notice? All white people. All of them, right? All of them. Every last one of them. And a picture is worth a thousand word. Because even for some of the people some of the time. But for those of us who are paying attention to the details, man, come on with that. You got to tell your boy, man, who's doing the graphics, he got to do better than that. The last time we did that, at least the last time they showed it, they made all the pictures great because he brought up again, this ain't the first time. And we've been doing this for a long, long time, ever since you got here. Ten years plus. But I told you then about that United Nations violation human rights thing with that genocide gentrification thing. Y'all didn't notice because I think I was playing. Last August, the United Nations sends monitors into this country in nine cities, Denver, to monitor this kind of mass, to gather information about the charges that have been filed . And I told you the last guy who got jacked from Yugoslavia went to jail for life and his government was locked up. They're here now. Now to preserve the record. I won't tell you one more time. You better pay attention to what you're doing. Because I'm gonna tell you right now. I know you guys. Come on. Been with you all for almost ten years. I don't think there's one too young to design the one to do this. You don't want to do this. You don't see some of the outstanding human beings. But you're in court in a vise, a systematic bias. All right. This ain't the first time that this has happened. In human civilization. Councilman Cashman. Come on, tell me. Seriously, could. This list not address the council and your time is up? Well, you just have to thank you. Give it to me. It's too much. Time's up. Thank you, sir. So thank you very much. And have a good evening. Mark Marshall, you're up. Council President Bert Brooks. Council. My name is Mark Marshall. I am the director of real estate at the Urban Land Conservancy. We are a nonprofit group that provides affordable housing, office space. Schools and commercial are community space. With the acquisitions of land that we purchased. I'm here tonight to provide our to give our conditional support for these bills tonight. The as a land ow

ner, we have a 1.5 acre site immediately in front of the 38th and Blake Station. Our goal has always been twofold to maximize the density at this site and also to maximize the affordability. We have a plan in place to meet both of those measures. We are partnering with one group, Commodity Community, our development group, to provide 65 units of permanently affordable housing on the Walnut Street portion of our site. And we are partnering with another group, Mcwhinney Development, to provide the density at this site with the market rate development that they will be bringing in. The idea of density has always been at the forefront for for us. Long before this conversation and the Hyde Amendment started, we were in support and we were looking at ways to get higher density at the site. We recognized the need and support the need to have a robust ridership for a expanding rail station. So we are fully in support of the Hyde Amendment. On the affordability, there are a couple of issues that we have concern with. At the time that these conversations first came about, we drafted a letter to Mr. Buchanan Brad and then head of OED Paul Washington. In this letter, we requested that 25% of the A of the development that happens in the up zoning be affordable right now as it is, there's 10% of affordability in this up zoned area. So for instance this eight stories gets another eight that eight that eight story increase gets 10% affordability which results in 5% of affordability for the entire building. By increasing the affordability to 25%, we get close to 12 and a half to ten, 12 and a half percent affordability for the for the building. The other issue that I want to talk about tonight is permanent permanent affordability.

Right now, as I understand it, there is a 20 year requirement for affordability in the properties in the units that are being developed. 20 years goes by quickly at the rate that it's going right now. You see the property that we own with you will be the last remaining site with permanency of permanently affordability after this 20 years burns out because in order to reach this affordability, you've got to have the lower land basis. And we are one of the few groups that have that in time. Your time is up. Thank you. Thank you, counsel. Yeah. Vanessa Quintana. It's Quintana. If you interact with your residents, you would know that. So, Vanessa Quintana I was from the east side until your lovely friends here gentrified and made it unaffordable. Since your friend over here. I think his name. Can you speak. To the substance of the. Of what we have in Ferguson? He was an expert. So I'm going to say I'm an expert. I grew up in poverty, concentrated poverty, because I was the east side, formerly no are now known as Rhino. And I have experience of poverty. This project here is not affordable. Affordable, affordable to who? Because it is in my people who is being displaced. It's not my people who cannot live in this city. It's not my peop

Ie who's who's been here for decades. Let me get back to the script, because these people are pissing me off. This project gives an illusion that it is a solution to the housing crisis all Democrats are experiencing, including myself. However, this is not a solution proposing. This is not a solution. It is proposing it. Proposing a development project to offer residents relief with affordable housing. This is a mere, merely a gift to your campaign financiers, the developers. To further gentrify my community, the neighborhood I grew up in but cannot afford to live in. The project only requires 10% of affordable housing units. Remember, let's put that in quotes. Affordable because that's 80% AMI. And that's not affordable. 10%, literally. Are you serious? 10%. What does that do? Drop in the bucket. Oh, boy. Over there said oh. Every unit is appreciated. It. No, it's not. Because that does not go to my community. Let's get to the real problem. Furthermore, the project defines affordable as 80% of the annual median income, according to the Colorado Fiscal Institute, the Army. This is back in 2015 is 56,258. Who the hell? Okay, let's get to that point. 80% of that is 45,000. So your project is proposing to support those with the 45,000 annual income. What about those who are on fixed income? Who? What about everybody else who's been here, living here? Not for those folks who are coming in. Not for the transplants, not for their offspring, not for the recent graduates. No, no. We need it. We need housing for the people right now. So. So according to the to this to the report that I read, that means your project will be will will cost 1200 or 1400. Who could afford that? Mr. Councilman Brooks, have you forgot about your families that are being displaced in your district? Have you forgot about the families living below the poverty threshold? Because I know I can't. My mom lives on a fixed income. She lives on disability. She's dependent on that. In case you all forgot what affordable is. That is \$700. Tell me. I mean, I don't know if you know math that well, but who could afford that apartment with 700 bucks a month? Who could afford to live in this city? The city they call home. The city they were born and raised in was \$700. Nobody can. Then that's a goddamn shame. None of you guys are doing anything about my bad. There are a couple of you guys who are, but most of you guys aren't. How could anybody live with that? Thank you. Your time. Your time is up, right? Thank you. You're lucky. Appreciate it. I want subsidized housing for low income families. Appreciate it. Okay, Justin Croft, you're up. Good evening, members of council. My name is Justin Croft. I am the chair of the Rhino Business Improvement District. I also sit on the Reinhardt District Board and I served on the steering Committee for both the. Affordability and the design components. Of. This bill in front of you tonight. I'm here to support this bill with reservations on the des

ign component. I think that that piece. Is. Critical. Rhino worked on it for a long time. The focus of the design component. Really is in the form of. Buildings. We intentionally tried to not get caught up in necessarily finishes and sort of demonstrations of buildings because those don't necessarily affect how the project lives day to day. You'll notice that what's in there is things more about flexibility for buildings over time, how buildings interact with the street. One of the key components is having a front door on apartment units that face buildings so that people actually are interacting with the neighborhood around them and not just driving in and kind of entering. Into more of a dormitory. Style development. It also allows for creative expression and design in the way that buildings are designed and doesn't overburden that that aspect of the regulation. On the affordability piece. We've been working on this for. 2 to 3 years and here we are. Two years later. And I wonder. If there's maybe something a little more that we could have done. That said, I am in

support of this bill. I think it's. It's a it's a tool. It's a small tool. Towards what we're experiencing in Denver. But displacement has reached a fever pitch in the past three years. And I'm concerned that this small tool could be ultimately a distraction from the size of the disparity that currently exists between wages and housing and the attendant size of the solutions that are ultimately going to be required. So again, I support this tool, but I would really encourage you to look towards the next set of tools. What we are experiencing is basically becoming a public crisis, and there needs to be a sweeping commitment to solving that and addressing that for Denver to keep it. So a couple of things that I want to call out specific to this bill. The community serving businesses component of it, which I think is really interesting, you'll notice, is not specifically defined or particularly defined so far. I would ask that there be exploration of a tool similar to small business enterprise designations, which I suspect Dynamic Development currently has, that businesses, nonprofits, etc. could sign up. For. That designation. And that way a developer can go to a pre vetted list. And basically. Figure out what organizations could move in and ultimately meet that requirement. Otherwise, I fear that this will not be used by anyone because at this point it's a little too nebulous. So to the degree that the city can vet out organizations, that will really be assets, the need to stay. In the community. I would support that. I also think that, as you've heard tonight, the linkage fee for those who buy out of this needs to be spent. Within. This area. Right now, if you have the units going into another building, they have to be within the station area. The linkage fee, I don't believe, is currently held to that restriction. So I would encourage you to look at. That as well. Thank you. Thank yo

u, Mr. Cross. Andy, since. Thank you. My name is Andy Sense. I'm a resident of Denver. I'm neither a bid nor a jet. I'm actually just a school teacher. And because of honestly, because of a recent life change, I'm somebody who's probably looking for housing soon. And so I'm desperate for us to say yes to all housing and not say no to it. Some folks seem to want a very tight and specific filter on the kinds of housing that we say yes to and when we say yes to it. And many of the objections that I've seen, probably mostly on the Internet, are from people who are usually and rightly bemoaning our housing shortage and and the price tag that goes along with housing. And yet, you know, those same people right now for some reason are asking you to say no to this housing opportunity, and we can't do that. The good thing is you already have a filter for saying yes to this housing. You've already voted unanimously on a filter that you've said was good, the filter of the 38th and Blake Street Station neighborhood plan. You've all said yes to that. And that plan, and for my understanding, requires this running rezoning or reunification to go forward. I think. Right. We obviously have to do way more for affordable housing and nobody's up here trying to claim that this is somehow going to solve the affordability problem. Why this has to be an either or argument escapes me. I think we have to say yes to housing at all price points and also work for a much bigger, affordable housing fund. Housing shortages have never disenfranchized wealthy people because wealthy people have the means to find it. And nobody ever beat gentrification by saying no to housing. When there's a shortage of market rate housing, people with means displace people with fewer financial resources. And the fact that developers are building market rate housing right now and filling it up means there are folks buying it who would otherwise be displacing more people. So let's definitely keep our eyes on the prize and work towards increasing the affordable housing fund by at least \$110 million, like all in Denver is asking for. And also say yes to this. This is the housing opportunity that's before us today. And here's why you should say yes to it. This housing opportunity creates the city's first ever incentive to create an affordable housing, to create affordable housing in a mixed income format. The guidelines for this housing opportunity were arrived at after a two year community process. This housing opportunity is in line with the adjacent neighborhood plans and is reflective of the goals suggested by the new Denver housing plan and blueprint. Denver. This housing opportunity comes with an embedded design overlay which will enforce a higher quality built environment and improve the pedestrian experience. This housing opportunity supports transit by increasing density. This housing opportunity incentivizes more housing, which all of us desperately need. We can't afford to say no to housing,

and we also can't afford to have thoughtful, community derived plans like these get derailed by folks with political axes to grind. Mr.. Since your time is up. Thank you. Please. Thank you. All right, we're going to call the next five. Mr. Kraft, you can head back to your seat. Ryan Tobin to bed. Lock. Frank Lock and tour. John Dwight and Joel Noble. Mr. President, members of council. My name is Ryan Tobin. I'm a resident of 2515 Lawrence Street in the District and also a commercial land

owner in and around the light rail station. My work is involved around developing affordable housing. I've been a member of the stakeholder group, the resident group, and attended almost all of the meetings as time permitted. And trust me, there were a lot of meetings collectively. Getting everybody's thoughts around this topic is obviously, as we've seen from tonight. Challenging, but also rewarding. And what I can tell you through the process is that not only did CPD staff do well at presenting the material, discussing the issues, but making themselves available for comment and consideration through the development of the plan. Hats off to you, Mr. Brooks, for continuing down this journey and actually listening to those of us in and around the neighborhood and seeing the change that's around that. I'm encouraged by the proposed zoning and the overlays. I think that it will create an opportunity that we can create a minimum affordable housing to the percentages that are out there. But oftentimes what's not discussed is what opportunities may be created for those that choose not to build affordable housing. So we all know that that is a very challenging industry to bring the financing together. But long term preservation of that particular topic is something that I'm set out to do and certainly through property with an incentive to build higher in around TOD. It's a whole nother discussion about taking advantage of the system and the empowerment that we can do to those residents that do have lower incomes around the light rail stations. But nonetheless, I think that there are a lot of tools in the zoning. The tools are what give developers like myself the ability to solve the problems, at least make an attempt at dealing with challenging issues, but then also bringing that in the context of how we'd like to see the city shape and form through its built context. And so I just wanted to come here today, obviously, and support the bill and hear what everybody else has to say so that as we continue this path, this is just the first step. We're not going to see housing overnight as a result of this. I mean, they're still two years down the road before you're seeing these products come to light. And so the vision is an early vision. But with those here, I think in support of this, you'll see that that vision right down through the community businesses that we support will turn this into a vibrant neighborhood, and it'll be a successful neighborhood at that, benefiting

all incomes throughout the city in county, Denver. Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Tobin. Tie a bit to you. Well, hello, everybody. My name is Taya and my husband John and I own Eric Motorsports. We've been in the neighborhood for over 20 years and we were actually the first retail business in Reno. And I also live in the Whittier neighborhood. I've been there for ten years and I employ about 25 people at my dealership and oh, I'd say probably about ten years ago, three or four of my employees could no longer afford to live in the neighborhood, and they had to move out, which meant that they were living in suburbs surrounding Denver and they were driving 20 or 30 minutes into work and they really wanted to be back in the neighborhood, but they couldn't afford it. So when I look at a proposal like this, I say, Woo hoo, go city council, because this will bring my employees back to Reno. And it's going to also give people an opportunity to live around a transit station that helps alleviate the need for the upkeep of a vehicle and allows for things like motorcycles and greener transportation, like Vespas and bicycles. I mean, I'm all for this plan, and I believe that by providing affordable housing, we are giving developers the chance to be true partners in our neighborhood and set a precedent that I can only hope becomes the standard going forward in our fast growing and quickly evolving city. And I realize that some people in this room don't think that this bill is perfect, but unfortunately, there is nothing that is perfect. And I think that daily Reno becomes a more vibrant, safe neighborhood, an example of how an industrial neighborhood can involve to can evolve and to be able to house people and create jobs. And that's what I think this overlay brings to Reno, and I'm really excited about it. Thanks. Thank you. Mr. Bill Duck. Frank likened to. Good evening. Thank you. Council President Brooks and good evening, council members. My name is Frank looking for I live in City Park West and I. Am a huge supporter of affordable housing. We need more. We need a heck of a lot more. And there's no two ways about it. And you all know that, and you're all doing things to help on that. You've done things in the past, and I'm sure you're going to do things in the future that are that is going to increase the affordable housing situation. I am reminded of when I first moved here, yes, I'm a transplant, and I don't think that that makes me evil. I looked at I lived in a number of different places and I chose Colorado and Colorado and Denver are an awesome place. And me and my friends who are natives here and I saw them living in two separate apartments, got married, moved into one apartment that freed up an apartment. Then they had a couple of kids and now one of those kids is away to college. Another one is about to go away to college. Pretty soon those two kids are going to be done with college.

You're going to move back and they're going to need their own places. Those natives of Colorado propagated and there's nothing wrong with that. And but now that is. Causing more of a need for housing. In Colorado. So regardless of evil folks like me moving into the state, there are people that are natives of the state that are also requiring more housing, too. And that's why we need to do something. And so I appreciate the efforts. And yes, is it enough? No, it's not enough. Of course it's not enough. Are you going to be doing something after this? I really hope that you are. And I have a lot of confidence that you are. Is this a development around a rail station that can give people the opportunity to not. Have a car if they don't want one? Yes, it's able to do that. So I am. In support of this. But just like everybody else, it's not enough. It needs to be more. And I really encourage you to be doing more as quickly as possible, to be helping to make the prices be more affordable. Thanks. Thank you. This is like a tour and. A good job. John. Dwight. Good evening, council members and Council President Brooks. My name is John Dwight. Living at 2100 Gainey Street. I'm speaking tonight in favor of the bills sitting in front of you. We own or control over 140,000 square feet of land in Reno. All within about three or four blocks of the train station or less. It's a pretty exciting night to be here and watch this process over the past two years. An ordinance of this magnitude is daunting. It's a daunting undertaking for everybody involved. But the results of the bills in front of you are impressive. I want to start by thanking the officers of the community planning, economic development, the Ryan Arts District and their boards, all the committees, the business owners, and most importantly, the residents of Rhino in the surrounding neighborhoods. Dealing with growth is never easy, but it's a reality. It requires making tough decisions. And the city of Denver isn't the only city across this. Country that's dealing with it. It's most places. Nobody's ever going to be perfectly happy. It's hard. But. I see great progress. And great innovation moving forward. I'm going to encourage you to vote yes on these bills in front of you tonight. But with any new ordinance of this magnitude, there's still lots of work to be done. As I mentioned earlier. Our properties, we're focused on residential for sale product and that's one of our main goals. And we hope to build residences that people own and living in this community. It's not an easy environment to build. For sale residential today, there's all kinds of strikes against us just right out of the gate. With the passing of HB 1279 last year, it was a good start. But there's still a long ways to go and there's a lot of. Hurdles to. Overcome. So I'd like to encourage CPD and OED. To continue the work on the underlying regulations for affordable housing. As Miss Hayes stated earlier tonight, I think there's an opportunity to provide more 35% AMI versus 80% AMI, but it's going to

take some work. One of the coolest things that hasn't been talked about tonight is we had an amazing investment in this train network over the past number of years in this in this city, in the Rhino neighborhood, I think is one of the first communities to really leverage the train. It can connect anybody throughout this entire city with a public transportation system. Thank you very much for all your hard work. Thank you, Mr. DeWitt. We have three more folks. Oh, you know what? Before you go, John Noble I'm just going to invite up an Elizabeth and Keith Prior. And Joel Noble. You'll be next. This is the last three. Good evening, Council President, City Council. My name is Joel Noble. I live at 2705. Stout Street. And I'm speaking tonight. Only for myself. I'm happy to be here to share my thoughts on the process that got us here and the bills before you to evaluate the bills before you. The key criteria you're looking at as as usually is are they consistent with adopted plans and the the plans that that these speak to are the amended plans that were approved in 2016. Those discussions started in 2015 with a full, large, legitimate public process. Will all the Arnaud's, all the neighbors came together with there were huge public meetings to answer the question. Of the overlapping plans that have evolved over time, each one of them taking a piece of the station area and sequentially revising upwards the vision for density. What do we want the overall picture for density to be guided by our comprehensive plan? Guided by Blueprint Denver that talks about investment in density of transit oriented development. The community said yes. But the community had conditions. And those conditions are the things that you're seeing tonight. We wanted to see required affordability at levels above what the inclusionary housing ordinance at the time required above what the impact fee now requires. We want to see. Affordability that comes for for sale. As well as for rent. And we want to see affordability for commercial as well as residential because this. Is, after all, the Reno. Arts District and one of the first groups to lose their their space or the affordable artists spaces. So how can we get that back?

In addition, the community was already working on design. Standards that have been. Rolled into the work here. As you'll recall, there were R.A. letters from. All the surrounding Arnaud's in 2016 in favor of this, and there was no controversy at the public hearing. And you supported the plan Amendment 13 zero. So today, after over a year of work, the city has done a tremendous amount of effort doing what Councilwoman Kennedy rightly pointed out. At. The ludie committee is something they said couldn't be done for ten years, was do incentives get some value capture? Say, we want something that we can't get any other way, like requiring affordable rental as well as for sale, requiring affordable commercial, provided it's in the context of an incentive that

could be opted into. You probably want to build these additional floors. You have to give back. I believe that this package together squarely meets the community's vision, and I appreciate if you would vote for it. There are a lot of people here said a lot of things. I've got 20 seconds left and can't address all of them. But this leaves us with a new tool, an incentive overlay tool that can be then used in other places, either in a similar way or in a different way, a different incentive, a different thing that you get back for what you be giving. And that's going to be a lasting value. Thank you, Mr. Noble. All right. And Elizabeth. Forgive me if I start coughing, I'm going to step away and that'll be it. It's just the way it is. I mean, Elizabeth is 50th from Washington in Globeville. I am here neither supporting nor opposing this, having been in a immersed participant in the public process. It's been described it was very, very rigorous, did have a great deal of involvement, did come on the in within the framework of the neighborhood planning process. It's been incremental. There's a couple of things I want to speak to. The reason I'm neither for nor against it is because I'm for the vigilance that I think has got to continue and get very specific to bring about through implementation on a much shorter timeline. The enrichments and the empowerments, which are words I prefer rather than benefits directly to people in real time. I am a big be here now person. If I was, I was relieved at the setbacks that came so that we could keep this guy. I also said, look at the reflective buildings downtown that preserve the sky. Even in conversation with you on the buildings. I think we need to be vigilant with design. But more than that, we need to declare that we want to have employers that come in to transit oriented development areas that are committed to hiring in specific zip codes like 80216. When I hear multi-generational families say, we have been here for many generations and we cannot afford to stay here, I cannot make a transit oriented development responsible for that. But I can say what are the generations of education, workforce development and the creation of a level playing field doing to remedy that? And how are we breaking that cycle? We have an individual in Mr. Feinstein whose family has been here for generations prior to the formation of the city, who I have known to do some remarkable things to help folks in not not help, help, but to to to try to imagine and envision things that create some parity. And there are contradictions in the mass of resources that individuals have available. At the same time, I hear people that are have been here for generations and say, we need to stop these things. We need to not have this type of affordable because this type of affordable isn't accessible to us. And I'm saying, how can we break that cycle? There's something wrong. And why does it break such that the black and the brown are constantly us

that are saying that they are the ones that are the multi-generational people that cannot access all of the benefits. It's institutional racism through neglect. And we have to recognize that I am a person who needs work, live situation. I don't see that in this development and I'd just like to end on that. Me personally and I'm speaking personally, I have not been able to get across the threshold to have something for myself to afford. And I was Elizabeth at the work live. Ms.. Elizabeth Elevator. Thank you. Your time is up. Thank you. All right, Keith Prior. Very well, said Keith Pryor, 2418 champ, a street fifth generation Coloradan, been in the Five Points neighborhood for 24 years. You know, you've heard obviously everyone needs to do better. And I'd like to commend Ms.. Black, because she's trying to get density in a very district that is pushing back immensely in your district for this type of development that is so desperately needed throughout the entire city. Mr. BROOKS, you're awesome. Thank you for all your hard work in ushering this through all of the public processes that have gone on. I've attended I have a property that's adjacent to this zone district at 3361 Lawrence Street, and I'm in for it. I'm very much in favor of it. Is it far enough now? Can it do more? Yes. Five points. Fine. District nine has the most affordable housing in the city. What are your rest of your districts doing for affordable housing? We're actually going forward and pushing the envelope further by having this piece on your desk for approval tonight to increase our affordable housing.

Even though we have the most in the city, we want more. And so you need to go back to your communities and say, well, why can't we be like District nine? Why can't we start picking up our pieces and actually start doing our part? Having density because without the density and getting rid of the corridors of crap, five storey buildings along Federal Boulevard, along Alameda, along Evans would really go far to solve our housing crisis because what it comes down to is supply and demand. You can have only so many houses currently built. If you look at East Wash Park in the number of houses that were decimated there, Cherry Creek, North Hilltop. All of those were affordable housing. Those neighborhoods went through gentrification, but not a single person says the word gentrification for those neighborhoods, even though they were demolished and decimated. Here you're looking at Rhino, which is an industrial zone. For the most part, there are some single family residential homes on the outskirts. And you're actually increasing the density. You're actually creating housing stock that was not there to help solve these problems. But yet we have these situations all over the city where we have low density uses that aren't solving our problems. And so this particular piece of legislation addresses a lot of the concerns that you've heard from people talking about displacement, talking abou

t the lack of design that's in our city that's currently getting built, and how everyone is really, really lamenting how ugly our city starting to look. This is all in this bill. So everything that these people had said, they're actually saying, well, this is taking a step. Is it a step far enough? No. Can it go further? Yes. But you have to take that step. This step allows you to go back to your constituents and sit there and say this may be a tool that we can use. It's a tool in the toolbox. You need to start somewhere. Please support this. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Pryor. Okay. I said it was three more folks. We have one last person. Armando Payan. I mean, they need those, which is great. Yes. Yes. And I'd like to think that you can vote. I am the president of that. We didn't get a vote, a full board vote in supporting this bill. But however, I did did participate on the committees and have the wonderful opportunity to be a part of that process. But what I like to talk about here and like to focus in on is the community benefits agreement, which Mayor Hancock already has one in place through the National Western Stock Citizens Advisory Committee. From my perspective, I think what is needed here is that community benefits agreement needs to go further, further than the affordable housing. And I'll give you an example. What happened was that I met with the president of Renault, Jamie Local, and I asked him, Can you help us out with garden plates, elementary school? Her response was, no, it wasn't part of their their goals, which is fine, you know. But let me tell you about Garden Place Elementary School real quick. He grew to 16 is the most polluted zip code in America. These kids go to school to get to die. The high level of benzene. And I can share this report with counsel council here. But my point is, we need to focus in on that community agreement so we can get those fees, get those services to those public institutions, the rec centers, get environmental policy out there to help combat the eight or to 16, turn that label that stigmatism around to make it one of the best and brightest in the country . And I'd like to leave with what I think, what I think and what I believe. What we need here in City County, Denver, in the state of Colorado, is we need smart students. We need smart schools. We need smart communities, smart neighborhoods. And with that, I'll leave you all to this rally together and put something together. And let's focus in on building things on a positive note instead of being negative. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Mr. Page. And thank you, everyone who's able to stay and pay for parking, come through security and sit in these hard benches. Really appreciate it. Okay. Questions by members of council. We'll start off with Dr. Sussman. Turn your might go. Turn this on. Thanks, everybody, for staying a long time and for being so passionate about what you care about and for giving us your questions and concerns. Abe, I have s

ome questions coming at you. Right? Coming at you. It seems like there was some misunderstanding about the Army plans for this facility. 80% is the highest right rate. So right now in the citywide linkage fee system, if you're building units in lieu of paying the fee, the requirement is that they be affordable to residents at 80% AMI or lower. Which makes the payment in lieu of as high a higher. But they could build affordable units at 20%. Am I right? Yes. And in that case, there would likely be other programs available to help them put together that deal that that goes the extra mile. So 80% isn't a isn't the number. It can be anywhere 80% or less right now, 20% of AMI, I think about it and am I for a single person is about 40 to \$43000. So 20% of an am I would be a home that would cost somewhere between eight and \$9,000 a year. Right. For 20%. For 20%. Ami Laura,

if you're nearby, you may come closer just for the specific questions about AMI. So you're asking if. If there's a. Home like. My what the rent would. Or what the if you were doing a for sale is kind of what I'm thinking of if it's if your income is about \$43,000, 20% of that is about eight or \$9,000. Right. Okay. So you're asking about the for sale price at 80% AMI at 20%. AMI, it might not been clear. The minimum sales price. Then the minimum. Value. Right? So the maximum sales price for a home that's attainable to a resident earning 80%. Ami. Do you have a general ballpark there? Yeah, but he's giving me 20%. He's giving me 80%. You want it at 20, 20%, AMI? Okay. So I have 30% and I can do the calculation. Okay, do 30. 30 is fine. 30%. Ami for a one person household, that household would be earning \$17,650. Right. And the price of what would be affordable, let's assume it's a one bedroom for that one person household. The price that would be affordable for a renter would be \$472 a month. Okay. Thank you very much. I just wanted to make that clear to folks that it's not 80% AMI for every single facility. It could be much lower as you go through. The second thing that I heard that I hadn't heard at committee, so it made me it made me a little curious is you said that we had not decided on how long the of how long they would be affordable. And I listened carefully to Mr. Marshall's testimony, and he said that it was 20, 20 years affordable. Is that a constant for all of the affordable houses, or is it variable by location, size, everything? Can you tell me a little bit more about that? I didn't realize that the affordability was not going to be permanent. So the affordability length is outlined in the rules and regulations for the linkage fee and a minimum of 20 years. Certainly anything above that is encouraged, but the minimum is 20 years. Who sets it? Who sets rules and regulations for the linkage fee, which is approved by OED and CPD? Okay. That's a that was interesting information that I didn't realize before, but we have at least 20 years and a potential for permanency. If the

OED made that. Made the decision. So certainly any developer building underneath the overlay as well as the linkage fee could select to build that longer than 20 years. As far as what that minimum threshold is set at, our next stage in implementation is to look at our rules and regulations so I can take that feedback back to our team about what that 20 years looks like. Okay. I appreciate that very much. Thank you, Mr. President. All right. Thank you, Dr. Sussman. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah, just on that. I mean, there was nothing in the incentive that prevented us from making that permanent, affordable housing. I mean, that is the whole reason behind the incentive is it's elective. Councilman, is that. Correct? Is that a is that a question talk for. Laura or is there anything preventing us from having put in a permanent or a longer term requirement than the 20 years in the incentive portion? I'll start and then turn it over to Laura. So the first part of the answer is, I think no, it would have been possible to set the requirement differently. We went, however, with the existing citywide rules and regulations for the current system in operation and as to why one might not want to require permanent affordability. Laura Are you willing to take that on? Well, I guess I'll just take back the feedback that we've heard tonight and from council about the desire to see longer than 20 year affordability for this overlay to our next step in the process, which is the rulemaking. This ordinance does explicitly allow us to promulgate rules for the incentive overlay. So I will take that feedback back. So, you know, as the as the sponsor of the bill, what I'll say is what we did was we mirrored the linkage fee with advice from our legal team that since we just passed this in 2016, we can mirror exactly the rules and regulations from the link tree. That does not mean that we can't ever change it or anything, but we wanted to keep that consistency. Except for on the actual fee. I mean we deviated specifically on the fee, did we not. Yeah. But then we didn't on unit size makeup or or a term. Yeah. Unit size make. A decision, was it not? So all of those are proposed currently to be consistent with the rules for the linkage fee. Yeah. And so when you hear people talk about how this doesn't go far enough, I think that's pretty much what they're talking about. We're not hitting deeper armies. We're not mandating deeper armies. We're not doing longer terms. We're not. You know. So so let let me address comment. Let let me address that. Number one, this is in the rules and regulations. So what we're voting on tonight is the ordinance. As a matter of fact, we'll get into this a little later. There are several issues regarding rules and regulations that we need to adjust, and we can do that within the next month or two months if that is the will of council to talk about this. It's a larger conversation for us. We had several issues. We've been working on this for two yea

rs and there are several issues that you may feel, but it's a larger conversation. It's a citywide conversation. And so I just want folks on council, you know, as you start having these issues of certain things that you want to attack to say, can we begin to address this as you look at rules and

regulation over the next two months? Yeah. And actually, that's actually the real genius of this, is the ability to use the sort of carve outs that are being created in other ways, in other places. You know, so this is sort of weird. It is a citywide thing, but it's this is also sort of simultaneously a very specific 30th and black rhino solution. And so, I mean, I don't feel like we've had necessarily a citywide conversation, but I do think that we can use these tools in other locales. And I think that was by design, was it not? Yeah. Yeah. So I have a question for Joel first. Sorry, and I'll just start. You know, you expressed the history going back to 2015 and stated that density was a condition for I mean, there was a during the community conversations, there was a density condition for required affordability. Was that required affordability? 80%. I thought you said the affordability requirement was based on the existing H0 at the time, which would have been a 60 to 120%. Am I? So when you say above because you said above the the current requirements, do you mean that it was 121% or do you actually mean lower it by being above at 59 or below? Thank you. I really appreciate the opportunity to. To. Respond and go a little deeper. The the community consensus that was reached and captured in the 38th and Blake Hite amendments basically came down to what's embodied here as the base heights and the incentive heights and saying to get these incentive heights that the community is comfortable with. There were great SketchUp models showing views from different directions and discussions about, okay, those that density is okay. But we're seeing in this industrial area the the move out of artists and others that require affordable commercial space and affordable housing. And we want to push back on that as hard as we can. There are a lot of frustrations with Joe that were attempted to be addressed in version two and then further addressed with the linkage fee, for instance, the ability to buy out that under the H0, almost every development that that would fit the fairly narrow parameters of the H0 bought out. But we wanted the affordability built and when the affordability was built using the money raised with the H0, it wasn't necessarily built in the community where the development happened. So what Watts expressed in the Hite amendment is we want to see the affordability built here and in exchange for the taller heights, we want to see a lot more of it. When that got calibrated in the past year, it got calibrated to this five times what the what the linkage fee is. So I don't think the community discussions, you know, around the table with a couple hundred pe

ople there got into exact I am army levels those. Sorts of things but we saw these. Frustrations with the previous tools. It doesn't require it to get built here. So this does that. It doesn't require as much as we'd like to see. So if you take the incentive, you do more and it. Does for sale, for rent. Housing, as well as commercial space. So this really nails a lot of a lot of things. It's probably not going to be perfect. It's probably going to have to be tweaked down the down the line. But it's a huge step forward. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. So do you have two questions for AIM? One is and sorry this didn't strike me earlier in multiple presentations we had on the mass reduction, but the master. Production, is it? It's based on the gross floor area of the ground floor or the zone lot? The zone lot. Okay. So and it is it is a it is a combined mass reduction. So I did the math and I stacked up all those different percentages. So if you built a two story base on your zone lot and then you did a 20% carve out all the way up, you would conform. Correct. The 13 to 16 storey portion of the building would need to have further mass reduction because the requirement there is 30%. So. But no, but but you could. So that's where I'm getting. Can you extrapolate that on the mass, the gross mass of the building, the. Mass reduction that's required has to happen within each of the required increments of the building. So you don't get credit for that for doing more lower. Okay. Okay. That's that's what I wanted to know. Okay. Now, that's sort of still my problem with the mass reduction is it's sort of weird like that. And then I will actually let some other colleagues. But I well, actually, you know, this is important for everyone to understand on the on the am I so questions for Laura why not make the incentive right now? We already said does anyone have the figures on what percentage of service workers live in households that are that are at a 80%? Am I? I have the race figures that I'm going to offer during my comments. Okay, I'll wait for that. We've got the minimum for the cost for a 30%. What is the minimum cost for a home? An 80% single person household? Sure. So an 80% and my one bedroom household would sell for \$176,000. Well, that \$176,328 to be very specific. So. On the on your slides, you had a. A minimum on your bass residential slide. The one unit that had to be provided in the base was at 122. So a. Developer. But we have talked in the past that it takes \$250,000 to build a housing unit. I mean, so is a developer losing from 250 or gaining from. Well, and I'm confusing myself. Never mind. Councilman, can I jump to some others? We got a lot in the queue to come back to you. Yeah. Councilman. Councilwoman Canete. Thank

you, Mr. President. My first couple of questions are for Laura, please. Laura, I wanted to see if you could share what are some typical occupations of people earning in. Because we keep talking about this 80% of am I like it's a g

eneric number and we're talking about families and households. So let's just get a picture of who we're talking about. Sure. So just as an example, for a two person household on the Army, for 80% is \$53,700. It could be like a painter and a child. Right. So that might include a kindergarten teacher, a school counselor or a chiropractor. As a couple examples of occupations that might be at that level. Great. Thank you. And then we were preparing the housing study. We looked at the number of folks who were cost burdened. And so can you share with me, are there folks right now earning? So let's use the full range. We got 47,000 for a family of one up to 50 something for a family of three parent. Two kids, two adults, one kid. Are there folks struggling with housing at that level in Denver right now, according to our research? Sure. So our housing plan in draft form right now outlines the number of families who are cost burdened. So that means they're paying more than 30% of their income towards housing costs. More than 85,000 households across the city are currently cost burdened. And what about we also looked at severely cost burden, which means this family is spending more than half their income on housing. Are there some of those in this category? About 45,000 of those earning below 80% of the area. Median income are severely cost burdened, meaning they're paying more than 50% of their income. Okay, that's really helpful. I wanted to ask a little bit about the research that you and Councilman Brooks. You can answer this question as well. So I feel like we heard loud and clear from community that there was a desire to have developers participating in the solution of affordable housing. And so, you know, for ten years we had folks saying it couldn't be done. And I will admit, I didn't take the bull by the horns. So my colleague did. I didn't. But during that time, we. So you guys decided to take this bull by the horns and start to look at this. You did some looking at other cities. And I guess, you know, if you were to be able to on paper say, here's an ideal thing, I want 50% affordability and I wanted at 30% to be. What did we learn from other cities research in terms of, you know, when these things worked and when they didn't? I'm just curious if you can connect because other folks have tried some of this. So enlighten us. Yes. So they're basically two cities right now who are really taking advantage of this. And it's Seattle. And also we learned a lot in Brooklyn, but Portland is also trying something. And they just did a 20% mandate on affordable housing. And, you know, again, all of these are new policies. And I think starting to get the responses from these, it's a bit premature, but supply is drying up. On that, meaning that they're starting to feel like that is a bit too much ownership. Right. It's too much for one of the things we did. And Laura, you can talk about this as we did in a complete analysis of what this area c

ould take financially. Economic analysis, same thing we did on the linkage fee. And we did find that this five times the amount was about the right amount for it to break even and make money still on the project and get a project done. There's a lot of responses from individuals saying, let's do 20%, let's do 30%. Well, if you make the requirement too onerous, like we're seeing a little bit in Portland right now, you don't get the project. And so we had to get that balance just right. And Laura, I don't know if you want to go into the analysis that we did from Seattle. Sure. Well, I can at least speak to the feasibility analysis that was conducted as part of the proposal that you see in front of you tonight. Many of the folks in this room who have spoken to that proposal did participate in that. So I want to thank them for that participation and that input throughout this process. But we use David Rosen Associates to conduct a feasibility analysis for this particular proposal. We used ten different scenarios in office and other commercial prototypes, as well as residential prototypes, to test the specific scenarios that you saw here today from five stories to 12 stories, from five stories to 16 stories. We found that seven out of ten of the prototypes that we tested came out feasible, even with the requirements that you see in front of you, which represents more than 80% of the land area in this overlay. So, Mr. President. If I may, just one more question and then I'll go back in the queue in case if my other stuff doesn't get answered. Ryan Tobin, can you come forward? So. I know that you're on the development side of the Denver Housing Authority, but I'm hoping you can pinch hit here. When we build a unit at 80% of median income. The rents, I think you said. What did you say our rent was 800. \$900. Sorry. Okay. So. So there's that amount. The rent. Are the rents at this level? Eligible for vouchers? As in, could a person with a voucher go to a unit priced at this level and be able to afford it? Is that within the maximum rents that you all use vouchers on? Sure. So a

voucher is based on fair market rent. That's what's happening here. So these projects are valued at that fair market rent. So a voucher would apply. So many of our units in Denver are not at a fair market rent, so we get 20 \$500 units downtown. A resident can't go there and use a voucher because their rents are too high. That's right. But these rents are within the range where you could use a voucher. That's right. So is it possible that we could that residents could layer a voucher into these units and then be at what what are your typical voucher holders incomes in the Denver Housing Authority? A voucher holder would make below 30%. Am I. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Kinney. Councilman, New Europe. We asked Brad Buchanan to come up plus. I just want to talk a little bit about the vision for Rondo and what your wha

t you see. How's Rondo going to look like in the next 20 years? What effect will this incentive ordinance have on that? I think there's two pieces to that. There's. What it's going to look like and what it's going to feel like and what they're they've been, you know, to a great extent, getting the what it's going to look like part. Right. And I think the projects that are on the boards right now are some world class architecture that we're going to see over the next few years. The design overlay helps to ensure that everyone does that, not just the folks who care most for that and not just for the developers who choose to maybe spend a little more on design. This ensures that what might have been C plus projects can be a B plus or a minus projects. So there's that piece. But in terms of what it feels like, well, if we don't ensure that the population that the residents in in Reno, the artists that are in Reno are still able to afford to live there, then we've lost the heart and soul of what what created Rhino in the first place. And I believe this these amendments are a step towards ensuring that. Okay, so the density in haste doesn't bother you at all about the future of Rhino there in terms of gentrification or affordability. So to to, I think our plans and and to me personally, I would say putting height and density around our transit stations is exactly what our plan says we should be doing. And in doing it in a way where we have this much community discussion and input and and effect in the result is exactly how we should be looking at not not everywhere in our city. This this solution isn't right for every stationary in the city, because our station areas all have different personalities, different neighborhoods with different desires. But this is the right solution for for this station area. And the overlay will cover a majority of rider. Yes. Okay. So it's more than just the transit station is the really the rhino itself is whole character. Right. Correct. Okay. Thank you. As we look at the question, please. Similar question, Jamie, what do you what do you think it's going to look like in terms of uses? You know, we've given examples of commercial and residential work. What do you think Rhino, big, big or rhino is going to look like in terms of of that whole development along there as well as affect on the neighborhoods? Well, I think that based upon this and a lot of other things we are trying to do. I think I see a vibrant, mixed use, fully functional district activated, safe street level pedestrians, bikes, people of all types being able to live and work there. I definitely see that we'll have artists spaces, community spaces. You know, I often talk when I'm asked about gentrification and what we're doing and what we want right now to be. I, I use the same phrase over and over and that I want there to be a place and a space for everybody who wants to be there . The homeless population, the artists, people of all age ranges, famili

es. And that's the type of place that we're trying to build. Since you're so good in managing and so involved with running. What do you think that split of users is going to be between commercial, residential and retail? What do you think it's going to end up looking like? Oh, you asked the tough questions. I mean, I think, you know, density and a vibrant residential population is what supports commercial and artists and other community uses. So I think. In terms of percentages. Hard question to answer, but I think that we need the density of people living there and working there. And I think what that also does is that help support a lot of great community benefits and assets that Reno can offer to the neighborhoods that we're a part of that are around us. So be a great benefit to the neighborhoods as well. If we do it right. Yes. And if we continue to provide additional programs and services. Absolutely. Right. Last question, Mr. President. Thank you, Laura. I got the old lady hand out of the scenario of the residential and commercial that we're going from, you know, 8 to 16 floors and, you know, just trying to calculate the number of units and just looking at that. And, you know, I was just calculated as saying that 85% of that square footage is usable and using 1200 square feet for a safer unit, there'd be about 340 units in that, according to my calculator there. Pull your calculator out. I just want to make sure I have the right number. So there's 480,000 square

feet. I used 85% and divided by 1200 square feet as I got 340 units. Okay. And so the I don't just want to compare the I do to the incentive plan and I like the incentive plan. I didn't like the punitive nature of the idea. But I also would have required, what, 34 affordable units, right? 10%. Correct. Now, on the illustration that you've given you and you said that this incentive plan will be 24, so be tuned less about 30% less in affordable units. I can certainly do some additional calculations, I think. I don't have the sheet that you might have in front of you, but I. I'm okay. I'm reading. And but but the buy out, you know, for the affordable housing was but say 25,000 per unit there, that's about 850,000 versus the buy out for this, which is you can't avoid the linkage fee rate, but the buyer would be 1.6 million. You know if you wanted to buy a. So there's much more money in terms of the buyout provision through the incentive plan you have less units is my my valuation is that you have less units, less affordable units, but there'll be more money and that money is going to go into affordable housing construction in the city. Right. So let me maybe just clarify on the residential developer who builds 480,000 square feet would have to provide those units. Sounds like that example is 24 units on site. I can certainly do some additional math to understand exactly what that number might be. But the commercial. Right. The residential developer is required to b

uild the units on site or within the overlay area, but there is the option for the commercial developer to pay the fee. Okay. So so he would be buying in the bay out there is much more expensive than I mean in my calculation I would think. Just from the numbers I see, because as you do, 25,000 per year. So sure, I can spend just a couple more minutes me back. I'm just I'm just trying to understand it. You know, I see less affordable units, but I also see more bailout money, which is going to. And that money goes into affordable housing construction. Right? Yes. So the uses of the fund are consistent with actually the property tax side of our dedicated fund, which is a little bit more flexible than the linkage fee side. Because if you remember from last fall, we had to conduct a extensive Nexis study to determine the linkage fee. So the uses of this are flexible, but it is development, preservation and programs generally. But one other thing I wanted to just note, and I can do some calculations and come back, the the percentage of units in a residential development will be largely dependent on the size of the units that are built. Since the issue was structured around a percentage of units, you came out with a specific number based on the overall market rate development at 10%. Since this approach, like the linkage fee is structured around square footage, it will always calculate the same number of required units. Whether those units are 300 square feet or 1500 square feet, it will always result in the same number of units. So that's one differences. Depending on the size of the market rate units in the development, the percentage might fluctuate from seven 8% all the way up to ten, 11, 12%, depending on the size of the Mercury units . I'm sorry, just last question, just to clarify, you only quite understand, like the H0 buyout, that money went into affordable housing construction, right? So the Iho buyout fund was a closed loop fund where the requirement to pay a buyout came to the city. Right. And it also went out to pay rebates for developers who did build for round. They were right there were correct for sale or rental, affordable housing. There were a couple of instances where we used it for developers as well. The buyout for this plan, where where will that money go? Exactly the same as the H0 will be ended up going toward affordable housing. Somehow it will end up going towards affordable housing, but the uses are specific in the ordinance you have in front of you. So the advantage of the buyout here, it is still the money will go toward affordable housing, right? Correct. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman. New Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. Would you mind coming up to the mike? I'm looking at the map that shows the geography. It's got the green and the blue on the map. You've got two different maps that show the green and the blue. And I'm trying to understand the total amount of acreage that we're looking at withi

n this entire area that makes up the 30th and black overlay zone. So in. Your. Staff report that includes the applications or proposals for the two MAP amendments which have the acreages of each. And I'm just to take a look at that here the. Math Amendment that's part of this public hearing is covers properties with an area of about 250 acres. And the subsequent map amendment that you'll consider as the last item on the agenda today includes. Uh. Hang on one moment. I believe it's for a slightly smaller area of about 200 acres. So together it's more than 400 acres. Okay. So as part of this conversation. Was there ever any discussion about open space? There certainly was. Is there a reason why it's not included? Yes. So there was discussion, particularly on the design

overlay side of the discussion, about whether a minimum amount of open space as part of private development should be required. I think in the overall discussion, other items were prioritized more highly than that, although I will note that some of the requirements that are in the design overlay effectively do produce some open space. For example, the requirement that residential units at the street level be set back, create some space, and then also there's an incentive for open space built into the design overlay because that incremental mass reduction that Councilman Espinosa was just asking about, there is an alternative to provide that as what's defined as private open space in the code now, which basically is open space that's on private property that has to be publicly accessible. It has to have minimum dimensions. It has to be facing the street, it has to be at street level. So we would expect to get some of that kind of open space through that incentive. But the conversation focused more on requirements for things other than open space like the mass reduction. Thank you. I'd like to move on to a couple other questions on the length of time of the affordability. I wanted to ask Mark Marshall from ULC, if you wouldn't mind, coming forward. You own some land within this boundary. Can you tell me if any of that land was purchased with any of the City Todd Fund that you all were a catalyst in helping to secure the property or maintain it until it's developed on? Yes, that's correct. We use the Todd Deep Fund to purchase the land. We repaid the Todd Fund about a year and a half ago. So we've refinanced and paid back the Todd Fund, which is a Fund. That is a recycling fund. Okay. And you all are part of the discussion about a community land trust. And we'll be getting a briefing on that, I think, this week in our committee. But it's my understanding that you will see exists to look at permanent affordability. I mean, that is why you guys exist as an entity in helping to acquire sites that can then be utilized for affordable housing. That's correct. Oh. At our Blake site with Medici, we have a 99 year lease to ensure affordability in perpetuity at this particular site.

Okay. That was going to be my next question. So I'm glad to hear that. So even though the requirement is 20 years, your 99 year lease, how does that play into the 20 year requirement? Because we own the ground lease on it. We've written into our contract requirements for the developer. If this developer decides to sell off this property after ten, 20 years, we have requirements within our contract that allow us to have some say in what happens in this in this development going into the future. So we ensure that this remains a community benefit in over that 99 years, which has a 99 year option after the end of the first 99 years. So does that get filed as a covenant or is it just. It is in the contract. It's in the contract. Okay. All right. Thank you for that, Covenant. I have a couple other questions for different folks. So I wanted to talk about parking requirements. So if you're within a half mile, you don't have to do any parking, is that correct? That is correct. No vehicular parking requirement. Bicycle parking requirements would still apply. Okay. So how can we understand where that came from? That came from the community conversation around supporting the transit and also, as Council President Burks mentioned and others. It also relates to affordability in terms of potentially lowering construction costs for buildings that otherwise would have had to spend a considerable amount providing affordable housing or providing parking spaces. They have the opportunity to not do that and design projects that appeal primarily to users of the transit that could be offered at lower prices. So did we have anybody on the committee that was from the lending community? Because sometimes the lenders require parking, even though the city zoning code might say, let me. Let me just say just a couple of words real quick that may help with this. Although we say minimum parking requirements, it is the best practice. We've done this at Arapahoe Square as well. We're not saying maximum. We didn't get rid of the maximum. So you can still build parking and most developers will build parking because they can't get, as you were alluding to, the lending. But we've done this. I don't even know if I've said Arapahoe Square. I don't even know if there are any other areas that we've done this in wealth. Downtown has not had minimum parking requirements for a very long time. Of course, you do still see production of quite a bit of new parking. At Cherry Creek as I was as Chair Creek as a 1 to 1 ratio, and they're building 1.7 to 1. So it's market dictating parking? Yeah. Well, part of the reason I'm raising this is because some of the new development that's gone in in the Reno area and specifically some of that that's along the Arkansas corridor, has parking all lined up on both sides of that street. And I'm not sure that it's because the units, the development did not include enough parking. But, you know, this is one of those catch 22. You know, on one hand

, we'd like people to get out of their cars, but we don't have a transit system that provides adequate connectivity to encourage them to not need a car. Right. And until we get there, people are going to own their damn cars. And then what we're doing is we're exacerbating or parking in traffic challenges where we're creating more density, but yet we're not requiring enough parking. And so I'm really concerned, just seeing what I have seen driving through this area just on the Arkansas court corridor. So so I'm just raising that as a concern. Let me move on to my next question, and I know you've got other folks in the queue. I'd like to know if the Salvation Army and the taxi site are within the boundaries. Looking at the map, I can't quite tell. It looks like part of taxi is, but I'm not sure that's all of it. I believe all of taxi is within the boundaries, as is the Salvation Army site. Okay. Because I'm seeing a little parcel that is outside along where that all is between the blue and the green. And I wasn't sure if that was the Salvation Army site or not. It's all in there. It is within the boundaries. Okay. And to the north of the taxi site, is that not where their new development is going in? The housing part. So if it is, then it looks like the only part of the taxi side is in is that. Not all of it is. In all of it too. Okay. I will defer my other questions. If you could put me back in the queue. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Councilwoman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. Abe. Hi. Just some clarification. So. Currently. What is what is there in all these properties? Is it industrial? Is it housing? There's been a lot of conversation about people being displaced. If we start seeing development, there are people going to be displaced. Yeah. I'm really glad you raised that point, Councilman Black. The area that's proposed for the incentive overlay, which allows the greater heights around the station area, is primarily industrial and land use. Now, most of the residents who are in the area actually live in nearly brand new mixed use projects because this is not previously been a neighborhood, the area that's within the overlay. It's immediately adjacent to a lower scale historic neighborhood but doesn't actually apply to that neighborhood or allow greater development in that adjacent existing neighborhood. So to follow up on the comments. The guy with the beard. You know, there's a lot of bald guy. Beard was. Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Frank Lock and Frank Frink. He had a guy. He had a beard, and he was born. His point was, we're creating new housing, so it's good to know we're not displacing people and any housing we create is a good thing. So that was a very good point that he made. My other question just to clarify is. This is not a development plan. We don't have developers coming in who have plans. That's a question, do we? We do. Have a number of conceptual plans that are in review right now in the development

services side of our office for projects that plan to take advantage of the incentive height. None of them are within immediate sight of approval. But I can say that, you know, if all of those projects were to move forward in their general conceptual framework that we see now, it would be around a thousand units of market rate residential and likely close to 100 affordable units alongside that. And again, how many acres were you answering, Councilwoman Ortega? About how many acres is the whole area? It's a little less than 500 acres total, I think. And so do you have any idea of the projects that are under review? How many acres that would. I don't know. But I do know that they represent a relatively small proportion of the land area. So I think that even after that round of development, there could be another and then another that essentially the even though the area is very hot and there's a lot of development activity, that it will be a long time before the area is built out and we see the zoning maximized, if it ever is. I was going to comment, but I'm not allowed to. I'm not going to. Thanks. All right. Thank you, Councilman Black, for restraining yourself, Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, good. Good decision to stay there. That was that was great. So it appears to me doing the math on slide 17, where we went from a five story to a 12 story, 180,000 square feet. It looks to me like we're ending up with about 10% affordable. Is that reasonable to use that as a ballpark with what we might expect to get. As a general ballpark? Most of the scenarios we've looked at would probably result in just under 10%. But I think it's important to remember that since the requirements are all based on a square footage formula, it can be a little frustrating to try to translate it into a percentage because it's not based on a percentage. It uses a formula that can be better applied to a variety of land uses because it applies to commercial as well. Sure. Thank you. Laura, a couple of questions for you. What are the conditions, the economic conditions? Leading to affordable construction at this point. I mean, the tax situations and so on. How do we envision that over the next couple of years? And are you referring to tax reform? More generally. Just. Yeah, all that stuff. Sure. So we've had some changes at the federal level, too, particularly the corporate tax rate and it going down to the twenties from the thirties. And we expect that will have some impact on the tax credit pricing for one of the biggest tools that we have

to produce low and moderate income housing, which is the low income housing tax credits. And so both 9% low income housing tax credits and 4% low income housing tax credits. Have investors who are motivated to invest in those changes to the corporate tax rate certainly might affect what kind of pricing we see for those different low income housing tax credits moving forward. So we're evaluating what that looks like.

ks like from the cities get financing. So at this point, can you say whether it's more favorable for those four and 9% credits or not as favorable or we don't know yet. It's likely to be less favorable. Less. We will see how the market adjusts to this new corporate tax. Okay. And sorry to ask you to repeat, but can you give me the your numbers on housing burden? Oh, yes. So it's about 85,000 households earning below 80% of the area, median income who are currently cost burdened and a little under 45,000 of those same households who are severely cost burdened. So cost burden being paying more than 30% of their income towards housing costs and severely high cost burden being paying more than 50% of their income towards housing costs. Thank you. Let me see if everything else was answered. Yeah. The rest of the comments. Thank you. Laura. Hey, thanks. Thank you. Councilman Cashman, Councilman Flynn, you up? Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Is there someone here who can address the 38th Street underpass? Because some of the community members who expressed support conditioned it on having concrete plans for improving that awful Underpass. Oh. You want to take it on a trip? I can. I can. Take it on unless. We have somebody from public works here. And do you want to say anything? I can just I can just take it on real quick and just let you know. There is there's no one here from. Okay, from. From public hurts. Cause I think I need a car rental. Public works. But what I want to tell you, this has been a big issue in folks just specifically in the whole neighborhood, wanted it on the bond. It was not ready. The scope of work was not ready yet. I saw that in the staff report. Yeah but we are currently under a scope right now. Should be having how much it's going to cost. Mhm. So is there a conceptual plan to widen it, to light it up. There in the middle of that. They are. Yeah. Okay. And Abe, can you. And also, is Keith. Pryor still here? Yeah. I like to get a community view on this also. But how does this proposal address. The concerns in the community for. Addressing displacement, does it? Encourage displacement? Does it discourage it? Does it mitigate. It? How does it address it? So I need to understand that. You know, I'd be interested in Keith's perspective from from the neighborhood side. The way that we would see it is that this incentive overlay specifically enables greater development potential, which sets the stage for more housing, which is certainly necessary in the city. And as a few speakers mentioned, under general market conditions, the more housing that's provided at any house range, the more pressure it takes off of the housing market and in general. And then by also greatly upping the requirements for the affordable units that are set aside as part of new development, we get more affordable units. All of that is happening in an area, as Councilwoman Black mentioned, that is really not currently developed. So it's not happening within. Reside

ntially at least. Right. It's developed with industrial, so it's not displacing residents. And what we'd ideally see is that some of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods call, for example, would be able to qualify for some of the affordable units or will move into some of the market rate units that will open up housing in the neighborhood, which will take pressure off of it and open up that neighborhood as well. Okay. Just to elaborate on that a little bit, the in the incentive overlay addresses the incentive to provide additional affordable units. Does the design overlay, which is broader and covers covers more area, does that have any impact in CPD's view on on displacement? I would say it. Doesn't have a specific impact on displacement, but it is designed to ensure that as the area redeveloped in this higher intensity development happens, that it remains pedestrian friendly and very active at the street level and so can perform as a neighborhood center for all types of people. Mr. Prior, do you have anything to add to that? Um. Abe did a really great job. You know, it is critical. I mean, as John Hayden said earlier, displacement generally occurs for a couple of main reasons. You know, either you don't have the services that you need in which to stay in your community or yes, there, there, there's just a lack of housing. And so because of the lack of housing, your prices go up. And that causes you to, you know, evaluate. I think that there's a lot of things that it's a very complicated situation, you know, in talking about displacement, because, again, as Abe has said and I think, you know, Ms.. Black pointed out that this is an industrial area that's transforming. And you have single family homes and historic homes that are on the

edges. And so, obviously, you know, you're displacing some industrial, light industrial, some vacant industrial buildings that maybe artists had had. So, you know, there's going to be that. But I think that this plan obviously addresses that and tries to keep that available for their spaces to exist. You know, but what it really comes down to is you've already put the main piece, which is light rail. You've created the actual investment in this community by putting a light rail stop here. And so you've increased the service. And so I think one of the things that really is lost in talking about displacement and gentrification is are you really penalizing people of lower income by denying them services? Do you not want them to have light rail? Do you not want them to have investment in their community which allows them to walk safely with a sidewalk that doesn't exist in a lot of parts of this area to a convenience or to a dentist, to a grocery store, to a convenience store, to a place of opportunity of employment. So now they're not reverse commuting or if they, like Jamie had mentioned earlier, to wear or I'm sorry, one of the business owners has said that their employees moved out of the area b

ecause they can no longer afford to work in right now. Okay. Let me let me bring you back. Let me bring you back to Central. Let me bring it back to the central question, which is this this incentive overlay will mitigate, in your view, will mitigate displacement immensely. It will slow it down. Slow it down. Because I did look at the I did look at the the partial maps. And there are some single family homes still in the incentive area, in coal, on the edges of coal and on on the Allegheny Street. And I did look at the ownerships, and some of them are some of them are still owner occupied. They're not rentals, but there are few and far between, I guess I would say. But you think that's this will mitigate? I think it will mitigate it hugely because you you're adding a significant supply to the housing stock, which will will basically stabilize the area for further price increase. President, I had I want to bring up a couple other community members. Is Vanessa Quintana still here? Oh, she's right. You were over there before. And Mark Marshall, what is the impact on affordability and displacement, in your view, under the current under the current zoning that we have, if we did not pass this? What would happen, in your view, under the current zone? And as for Mark, you also under the current zoning, what would happen with displacement and affordability if we did not adopt this? Would it accelerate? Would it slow down? Would we would we not see it or would we see it more? So no one is taking into account all the factors that goes into it goes into this. No one is taking into account property taxes. No one is taking into account the increased cost of living with all of this development. When you bring these these developments in looking at the natural grocers, how is that going to contribute to these people? All right. When you consider all of the development here, you are raising the cost of living for the people there. They keep on talking about the increased supply of housing for who, but it's not for us. What about the homeowners in the area? Who's going to care about the property when they increase the property taxes for them? Who's caring about the increase? The cost of living? Of transportation. No one's talking about the cost of transportation for RTD. Let me know about this. Who could offset who could afford the bus pass now? Would that with a for a low income household for someone who is on a fixed income, no one is talking about this increases accessibility to transit. Okay. Could we talk about affordability of transit? Can we talk about affordability with these property taxes? Well, we clearly there's a clearly a gap of understanding on what it is to live in poverty. I suggest you all and they all take a do a field trip in the hood, in the neighborhood, and go ahead and try to live on my mom's income or somebody else's income. And you tell me how affordable it is for transit. Like they keep on saying try to buy groceries with that inc

ome. Try to go ahead and pay the rent. Try to go ahead and have a good a try to live the American dream with that. So are you saying that for. Both for renting and homeownership? Are you saying that this this collection of ordinances would accelerate and make that worse? Yeah, that was the end of my speech. I couldn't get to that. I'm glad I gave you the opportunity. Mm hmm. Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Kind of your thoughts on this. And I think it lifted. Mike. Thank you. Under the current market forces, I think the affordability displacement would dramatically increase if continue displacement if not for this bill. If we do not pass, we do under the current markets. If things take the same market conditions, conditions as they are now would continue. And it's pretty well documented the amount of displacement that's happening in this coal neighborhood. Five points neighborhood, gas neighborhood. It's very well documented the amount of displacement that has happened and it would continue to happen probably at a higher rate as than there is right now. I

don't see a slowing down right now and in development in these areas. I'm very familiar with your site at the 30th and Blake Station. Yes. And without this ordinance, what would your project look like versus with this with this package? Without this ordinance, what we were we had two previous tax credit applications that were denied at our site. We have gotten the third when passed. Without this ordinance, we would probably what we were trying to do was trying to pencil out a development that would allow us to get higher density, but that wasn't happening because of construction cost. On going up from a Type five stick on top of a platform. Construction up to concrete, steel construction Type one construction being the most expensive, affordable rents don't support that type of construction. We would probably be at a development site that is still five stories on a platform, on a parking platform structure and getting probably still trying to maximize the affordability, but. Okay, but a lower density site. All right. Thank you. Thank you. Laura. One other thing I wanted to comment on your last question about the effect of gentrification and displacement in this this particular area at the station. We've opened up conversations, we've initiated a plan. And some of the development community that's here tonight attended a meeting that we had a few weeks ago. We got financed by a JPMorgan Morgan Grant to look at a community impact study of what all of the development that's happening now that affect on the community. We decided we wanted to take a little bit more of an opportunistic viewpoint of it and say instead of having an impact study, how about we look at an equitable development plan? So we've opened up conversations in the development community has been very receptive. What we're trying to do is allow the residents who've been in this community and who've lived there to also participate in

this prosperity that's happening and be a part of it. And I heard a misquote of somebody, but I think it's appropriate, the term that they misquoted and they said gentrifying in place. We like to have the people who live in this neighborhood be able to rise with the neighborhood. And we are taking a look at the jobs that are being brought in with all the new developments. And we're looking at the commercial space that's being developed. We're trying to partner that with the community groups. We're looking at skills, individual skills, business resources across the community and trying to marry those two things together to make take best advantage of this 10% of commercial space that's been being developed. So we're looking at a plan, hopefully that's going to help to reduce some of the the displacement that's happening in the neighborhood and allow residents to participate in that. Thank you, Mr. Marshall. I very much admire what you, Elsie, has been able to do in the community. Laura, I have one last question, Mr. President, for Laura. 80% am-I is the maximum. How did we pick 80%? I was intrigued when you said elementary school teacher, \$53,000 a year. My daughter teaches elementary school. She's been teaching for ten years. She gets about 38,000. How do how is 80% picked? So the number for 80% is outlined in the linkage fee rules and regulations, and 80% was originally selected as part of the development of the linkage fee because that was the highest allowable use of the linkage fee resources for investment. And it was an appropriate amount to set the numbers that the units would be affordable at as well. I think that's almost present. Okay. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. I think Councilman Flynn's last question got to my question that I've been having this whole process just waiting was how to re arrive at that percentage. Go ahead and just just continue on down the line. I have other questions, but I'll just keep listening. Okay. So back in the shoot. Councilman knew. Are you are you in the queue again? Okay, company. Go ahead. Mr. Dwight, can you come up? You're developer and runner, correct? Yes, sir. The what would prevent you from, you know, buying out in this kind of incentive plan? I keep thinking about the age where all the developers bought out. They just didn't produce the affordable housing we thought, and we got the money going into affordable housing built somewhere else. BURWOOD What would prevent you from buying out on this kind of plan, if not for a commercial building, not residential? Well, we're just doing residential, so I'm not as in tuned with the commercial side. So we don't have that option. Okay. Well, I was just I was just doing a little calculation on just like one 1200 square foot apartment, you know, that that, you know, one. Well, he's part of a 1200 dollars a month. You know, these people are like, you know, 14,400 a year versus \$20 a square foot for a commercial. You know, th

ey'll be like \$24,000 a year. So that's \$10,000 more, is there? Maybe I'm asking. Maybe I'd be the I should be asking Laura this question. So. Sure. Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you

very much. Laura, what's what what is going to what is going to prevent the developer from on the commercial side from buying out? And are we going to be in the same situation with Asia, where we're not going to be producing affordable housing units because it's really more financially attractive to to buy out. So as as John said, residential developers don't have the option to buy out. They must provide units. Commercial developers have the option to pay units or build or the option to pay the fee or build the units. We don't necessarily expect as many commercial developments to build the units because they're building commercial development. So there aren't inherently residential units in their development. Certainly we do have the option for them to build units and they can be off site with a partner developer within the overlay area. So that's something that is possible and certainly something that we can work with developers to figure out. Do you have some goals on how many affordable units you want to produce in Rondo? Do you have a say? If we're going to produce 50% residential development and Rondo, I mean, how many units will that be? Is there a goal that you'll be monitoring or are you going to be evaluating this as it goes along? Is part of the rules and regulations going to be a semi annual or annual evaluation of what's happening? Sure. That's a suggestion I can take back to the team. For what the ongoing evaluation of the implementation of this overlay looks like. The residential units will be, as we've discussed here, roughly six, 7% to 10% of the overall residential units will be affordable based on what we've outlined here. The commercial developments that pay into the linkage fee will be invested consistent with our comprehensive, affordable housing plan. So we'll be evaluated in terms of the city wide goals outlined in that plan. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Back up to the list. Councilman Espinosa. And I. Because you ll see was talking about it. I think it's important to get an answer on this sort of on record. What is the surrounding community, the sort of quote unquote surrounding community as used and then in sort of defined or intended in the incentive overlay? So that term surrounding community is used to refer to the negotiation for a community benefits agreement as specified in the ordinance that the use that's part of the agreement must serve the surrounding community. I think the that could be interpreted dynamically, but I would say that it certainly means that it's the community where there is. It's the adjacent neighborhoods that demonstrate the need for a specific use that would not be provided by the market otherwise would be eligible to be included in the development and of course the the actual com

munity serving use that's part of the agreement occurs within the overlay, but a developer could use demonstrated need in the surrounding neighborhoods to justify that inclusion. Is there any reason why we wouldn't at least make a fairly clear definition that that cannot be a single developer or single development or a block of development, you know, that you couldn't just build a whole bunch of highrises and essentially say, that's my surrounding community. And so that it's not it's clearly not self-serving. I think. Yeah. And especially as we review the the rules and regulations, there's an opportunity to clarify that. But that the example that you gave would certainly not be the intent to build a large development and then say that you are only meeting the needs of that development with your agreement. It's about the wider community. But there isn't a current prohibition because there is no definition. Right. It doesn't specifically say you can't do that. Right. So that's more a message to OED. Not one building or one project. And then the other question, looking at the math, which I'll expound upon in my comments, prompts this question Do these rules favor small, inexpensive units to build and sell or build in rent? I mean, and I can go into my math, but it's not a question. So. Did you do the math and does it seem to work out that way? Yeah. I'll let Laura jump in if she'd like as well. But because the, you know, the square footage of small units is less than that, you know, using the formula then may generate a requirement for fewer units, but those units are all going to be essentially comparable to the to the market rate units. And so I think in the end, the intent is that it balances out. Do you have any more to add, Laura? Okay, great. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I've got just a few more quick questions. The first one is for Abe. What is the length of time for the community benefits agreement? Is there was that defined? It is not specifically defined. The intent is to to mirror generally the way that agreements around affordable housing are done. And so that would mean looking at a at a minimum of around 20 years. But I think that that's something that could be evaluated on a case by case basis for an agreement, because something an agreement for a specific kind of use might make sense to commit in a longer term, an agreement for another use in a in a shorter term. The key to be looking at is that the agreement, however long it is and is providing subsidized rent. In a comparable way to the fee that would have been paid if the agreement weren't in the path that was

taken. So I think a great example of something like that is the commercial program on the taxi site where I believe they're offering a discounted rental rate to the nonprofit that is involved in running that. And so will this include looking at entrepreneurial opportunities? So you've got a nonprofit that wants to have a coffee shop and they

want to, you know, use it as a training program, hire people from the community. Is that an example of something that, you know, might be considered? And I know that means that. If the developer is looking to put in their own coffee shop in, that's not going to sell. Right. But, you know, that's an example of something where you're creating some greater value and sustainability to some of our local nonprofits by looking at social enterprises as part of how we do this. I'll let Jeff Romaine if if he jumps out of his seat, it means I'm saying the wrong thing. What I would say is you're right. You know, that's a tricky one, the coffee shop, because you wouldn't want a developer just saying, oh, I put in a coffee shop and the community loves that. And therefore, you know, I shouldn't have to pay an incentive fee. But if they're really making an agreement about a coffee shop that has a workforce development program that's specifically aimed at the surrounding community, I would say that potentially is an opportunity for the agreement. Okay. I see him nodding his head. Okay. He didn't jump. All right. That's good. Let me move on to my next question. Brad, would you mind coming forward? I want to get back to this parking conversation just for a minute. I want to know if CPD has studied what percentage of of tenants that have gone into our new buildings that are building parking or were not requiring, you know, particularly near TOD sites where we're reducing the parking requirements. Have you looked at that? And if not, is that something that CPD is willing to study? Until we have that transit system that closes the loop on the first mile. Last mile. I'm concerned that people are still going to use their cars, you know, whether they go into a micro unit or whether they go into, you know, a unit in in this area. Until we close that gap, we're I think we're going to be dealing with this challenge. So is this something that you all have studied or are willing to study? Well, this is what I know for sure. The projects citywide and particularly the projects specifically around 38th and Lake Station area and are over part. They are they are building to finance requirements. They are building to appraisal requirements, and we're building too much parking. If you. Look for. Parking according to our requirements. I'm way over our requirements and in I believe over the actual need. Arkansas court for example today and you drive that and I've driven that many, many times I know what you're talking about right now. The vast majority of that is construction, parking, not resident parking. Those projects have got plenty of parking for their units. Now, I think there is another issue that we should look into, and that is are the apartments in that those cases apartments charging additional money for their parking. So that, I think, will be very interesting to see how many of those parking spaces are actually occupied. I've seen that with for sale projects befo

re where they're providing the amount of required parking or in excess of that, but they're selling them as an extra line of revenue. So that that's that's a piece that we don't have control over. But we are we are absolutely building more parking than these projects need. And I don't think we're going to see that anytime soon. We are having conversations now about parking maximums, not in this area, but in another area of the area where, you know, to keep to try to keep the market in check so that we don't have the opposite of the problem. You're you're suggesting. So let me let me move on to another question, and I just want to be clear in my mind as this bill moves through this process. Assuming the votes are here tonight to move this overlay forward, does this presume then that each development no longer has to come before city council because we're essentially up zoning and for . The Development Review Design review. They simply deal with CPD and no longer come before council. Yeah. This this is a legislative rezoning, so you're correct. And use that term correctly. And are there specific rules on words legislative. But this is a legislative rezoning that's happening as this body has done many times. The largest one in 2010 will be remapped the entire city. But so this is a legislative rezoning and they would not come before this body unless they were asking for an up zoning beyond what this this amendment map amendment would accomplish. In the 2010 rezoning did essentially up zoned some of our areas within the city in terms of creating the opportunity for mixed use zoning that didn't that didn't apply before under the old zoning. Primarily areas of change in and around transit stations. And this area was up, zoned, up, zoned then to meet the then current plan for this area. But this area in particular has seen substantial velocity and investment like nowhere else we've seen in the city. And that's why this has moved. So this you

know, it has basically implemented its nine year old plan inside nine years. That's not a common occurrence. So we're now trying to capture some of this value, some of this velocity, while there's still substantial development to be done there. So my last question for you, Brad. As as we look at the opportunity to address the impact to neighborhoods that are experiencing displacement. And I believe that public investment does attract more people to an area that has a result of displacement. So have you all discussed and explored it? CPD and I'll ask the same to Jeff Tweedy about the city trying to get a waiver to create preference opportunities for people who have been displaced and want to stay in their neighborhood, who want to come back, or. I'm not familiar with that specific tool being discussed, but Laura's as nodding yes, so I'm going to have to answer that. But I will say this, that in the Denver right conversation, our umbrella for the four plans, the reality that we we very clearly understand that public i

nvestment does can cause places to improve and progress and a negative impact can be mitigation. We are talking about, you know, understanding that both of these responsibilities come simultaneously through the Denver process. I'll let Laura speak to the specific. Are you done with me? Yes, thank you, Laura. And I know you've dealt with this issue. You know, we've done some research on it as well. And I know it requires a a HUD approval, but is this something the city is looking at, sort of overarching LA with neighborhoods that are experiencing rapid displacement to. We have included reference. Yeah. Sorry to cut you off. We have included as part of our five year draft housing plan, the exploration of a resident preference policy. This is a tool that some other cities like Portland in San Francisco are using to provide an opportunity in new housing developments for residents who have experience or at risk of displacement. We have also included this as a priority for our 2018 work. Thank you. I have no further questions. All right. Thank you. I'm going to tell. Someone one quick question. Brett, could you come out one last time? I just want to make sure I understood what Deb is questioning about of zoning. You know, on the map, we've got the heights at five and eight stories on the map. And with the incentive allowing go to 12 and 16, when tonight we're not changing the zoning to 12 and 16. Right. It's the same heights that is now was just an incentive to do more. Right. I'm going to be because I want to make sure we're very accurate in general. Yes, but. Yes. In general. Yes, but so so. Absolutely. Yes. In terms of the the zoning the underlying zoning will reflect the numbers on that map in the plan, which is like the previous vision in in all the plans that predated the plan amendment about the maximum height in the area. And then the overlay enables the colors, which is the increased height. Then the second part of your question may have had to do. With, I mean, if we leave that so we are tonight we are changing it with the overlay to this increase heights instead of five is two and a 12 and from eight is going to 12 or 16, right? That's right. But they'll still have the zoning. For example, you might have IMX eight zoning like eight storey zoning and the overlay would actually allow you to build 12. But you're working with the incentive requirements on floors nine, ten and 12 to get there. Okay. So the zoning will change to the higher limit, but you don't have to pay to go. Still have to pay to get up that high. Right. Thank you. Okay. A couple of quick rapid fire questions, because I think we've we've beat this a little bit. Laura, let me ask you real quick. Angelina Torres asked about a gentrification study specifically on GSE. Is it possible for OED? Obviously, we've done a gentrification study, but. You know, we haven't really zeroed in on high targeting neighborhoods. We talked about this a little bit on the comprehensive, comprehensive

housing plan that's going to come to council. Can we do something to study the impact on that for globally responsible? Specifically. I want to make sure I understand your question. What is the impact that development has had on housing prices in Greece? That's certainly something that I can take back to the team. Great. Okay. Why don't you stay up there? Jamie, look how many others have talked about funds being used locally, localized funds that are coming from the commercial development for the buy out. Can we. In rules. There's some reason we can't do that in ordinance because it. It handcuffs us, but in rules. Can we put. That the as as affordable units become available. Those resources can be directed to those affordable units in the 30th and Blake Station area. So that's certainly something that I can take back to the team as well. As you can see in the ordinance that the funds have to be used for housing purposes and they have to be used in a way that's consistent with the comprehensive housing plan. But as far as considering the location near where the funds were generated, that's something I'll take back to the team as part of the rulemaking process. Okay. You know, I think that's a. You know, I don't know who this should go to.

This should go to the team. Someone just talked about it. Oh, that was Councilman New. An annual evaluation. I think that is a best practice, seeing as you know, folks, every time we bring up a show on each side, say, man , this was an issue. An annual evaluation, I think, is is incredibly important. I think that's something that I hope we can add that to the list. And also what Councilman Espinosa talked about defining the area is something that's good. Okay. Public hearing for Council Bill 1617. Madam Secretary, make sure I'm right. 16, 17, 14 and 19 is now closed. Comments by members of Council. And I will. I'll go first. Well, two years. Two years of working on this, 250 people over 30 meetings, outreach meetings, a plan that was passed unanimously. And because of a growing, growing crisis in this city, you see some anger. Because we didn't see any anger at the plan in September in 2016. We voted on it. We didn't I didn't we haven't received one letter of opposition, not one. I don't know any project that I have. There's concerns you've listed them. And so this has been a long process. And I've I got to tell you, I want to thank our staff. This the staff at this city are they don't get the appreciation they deserve. They get called all kind of crazy names. We do, too. Or I do. But I'm out there. I'm a public official. You all hats off. So, Brett, thank you for taking this on. There was an individual in here who said that, you know, this was a gentrification, you know, tyranny, you know, masquerading around here. There are not any large city city planners who would take on something like this. Let me tell you, because we've talked to him. There's only a couple. So thank you. A barge. Thank you for this last ye

ar and a half has been really tough and just really appreciate your leadership. Andrew as well. We still got a public hearing to talk about you. But thank you for your leadership, Laura. You've just been amazing to sit with the community. We really appreciate you. And I just want to thank everyone from the coal, the rhino, you know, Curtis Park, Globeville, Alice wants everyone who was involved in this. Thank you. Because you've all ask tough questions. I think people think about, you know, legislation like this and like just make it happen. Doesn't work this way. It's a lot of collaboration and a lot of give and take. So usually I just talk extemporaneously on this issue. But after two years, I had to gather my thoughts as a leader in this city. The question of how to fix our housing crisis is what keeps me up at night. I'm unable to fully celebrate Denver's countless economic successes without sitting with the countless stories I've heard about those being pushed out on the margins and beyond. And I'm able to benefit from Denver's current boom. Like leaders in the city and others like it, I'm antagonized by this reality. Nationally, no city has adequately addressed this concern. And even though we recently established Denver's first dedicated fund for affordable housing, we all know we must do more. I recently read The New Urban Crisis by Florida. If you haven't read it, read it. It's everything we talked about tonight. And in it, he discusses income and inequality in our urban housing crisis. He makes a point that is of interest to today's discussion. It's worth considering. He points out that, ironically, the same economy that caused these divisions in our city will be the same economy that fixes them to close Denver's economic gaps. We don't need a new economy. We need to adjust the one that we have and make it work better for all of Denver's residents. One with more victors and fewer victims. This is a thought behind these hide amendments beginning to capture value that developers receive from increased density in a way that provides much needed community benefits like workforce housing, artspace and neighborhood retail. The proven economic rationale of supply and demand in cities tells us that height restrictions limit supplies and with increasing demand, we will see soaring costs for greater displacement. This plan puts density where it belongs near high capacity public transit, following healthy national principles around transit oriented development. To find a balance and inclusion for all. Florida says ultimately and this is so important, our only way forward for our economy and society is more, not less, urbanism. The plan promotes more housing density, increased affordability, safer pedestrian activity, less congestion from single occupancy vehicles. But most importantly, the clustering of diverse people. And it uses our economic engine to do it in a balanced and inclusive way. This is the deepest challenge when it comes to our housi

ng crisis, when all new development and taller buildings are perceived as bad for a neighborhood. But I think this goes deeper than just NIMBYism or holding on to an old way of thinking in a new economy. It speaks to the fear of change. The changes that come with Denver's growth come with our own set of pains and excited. And it's critical for you all to know that I feel this pain and carry these stories on the margins with me every day. My my kids go to Casa Nicole and they come home every day talking about someone who's been displaced out of the neighborhood. The irony is

that zero development would lead to higher housing costs. Great displacement. Like most of life's toughest challenges. The answer lies somewhere between the two extremes in the tension in that liminal space, somewhere between soaring skyscrapers and soaring housing costs. Lies the answer. And is the space where we most will be most teachable and truly profound transformation must take place. So this is where we find ourselves tonight. And I'll say this again to close Denver economic gaps, we don't need a new economy. We need to adjust the one we have and make it work better for Denver and the residents here. One with more victors and less victims. The plan. This plan before you tonight is small, but it's important. Piece of a larger plan to do just that. Councilwoman, can each. Well, that's not fair. I'll change my mind about where my order is. That was very eloquent, Mr. President. Sorry. So I, I first just want to thank folks for the important dialog. It seems to me that there is a real trend in our debates about housing, which is one they're never about just the bill in front of us. And to the opponents and the supporters of whatever ordinance or issue is before us tend to agree on some really important fundamentals. So I think that that's a really interesting thing. It's hard to govern right in that environment, but it is also really healthy to have that kind of honesty. And I think that the pressure that the community is bringing, particularly the opponents, is really appropriate and necessary for the city, frankly. I want to start by just talking a little bit about the WHO, since one of the main themes I heard from folks who were concerned was about the the income levels here. So I just was doing some research while we were talking. And, you know, if you look at the income of 45000 to \$50000, there are about 11,000 households of color in Denver that hit just that \$5,000 income range. So we're talking about more than 3000 black headed families, more than almost 4000 Hispanic head of household families, and more than 3000 mixed race families. And so there are a significant number of families of diverse racial backgrounds who are in this very income band. And I think that's important because I think, you know, it's important that we're having a conversation about race in this chambers, and it's not always well designed for this debate the way we do this about really importa

nt topics. But I do think that that this range of incomes and we heard about the fact that there is severe cost burden. And so I also think homeownership. Right. Is another piece of this. And so I just want to talk for a minute about the disparity in homeownership. 40% homeownership among black families, 47% homeownership among Hispanic families and 70% homeownership among white families. To the extent that this ordinance will create affordable for sale units, they aren't going to be affordable to the poorest income families. It's absolutely true. By design, homeownership is for folks who earn a little bit more. But the biggest factor in the wealth gap between families of color and white families is homeownership. And so that is the families that we care about. The families that I heard speakers caring about families of color are a piece of this income band that this housing affects. And I think is just we got to talk about that. Now, how do we try to get this housing into the hands of those families? That's a really important question that we need to be challenged on. Laura talked about the work on resident preference. I hope counsels your partner in that because we want to be a partner in that. The other thing is many cities have a much stronger pipeline of pre-qualified folks that are centralized rather than allowing each owner to do their own recruitment. And so we should think more about going in that direction. There's pros and there's cons, but it does mean that you can maybe get some of these housing units to more of the folks that you're concerned about. All right. So second thing I want to talk about and respond to is this question about so why? You know, I talked a little bit about the who, why, why use this policy to get to 80% of my families? Why not use it for 30% of. And my families are really, really deeply low income. The short story is typically you need public subsidy to get to that really low income. And the thing that I like about this policy is it doesn't cost a dollar of public money. What it does is it uses the development community and it leverages you can use whatever word they'll call it an action because there are developers who don't support this who aren't here tonight. They're going to call it a, you know, a black male who knows what they're going to call it, but. It leverages their money and it puts it directly into affordable housing without our money being required. Now, what does that do? It allows us to free up our public money for some of these other things. And I just want to just really quickly. So. Less than 30% of our housing funds. So 20 to 30% of our housing funds in our new plan will go to folks earning from 30% of AMI to 80% of AMI. I would suggest with a policy like this on the books now this is only one neighborhood and I get that. But it is the case for spending less of those public dollars on the 80. And a lot more in the 3250, for example. And you'll notice that that's only a very small porti

on of our housing funds. 40 to 50% of our housing funds in the new plan are prioritized to very low income families. So I can't vote on this ordinance and this policy in isolation without thinking about the public money. And so every unit produced in this program without a public dollar is a in my opinion, an additional unit that we can then have those public dollars really prioritize. And I think the community should hold us really accountable to that. And I will say also, we should hold the community really accountable to that. I continue to go to public meetings where I see neighborhood opposition to housing for folks earning \$20,000 a year for folks who are homeless. And so for everyone who's here tonight telling us to lower these arms, goes to a community meeting and speaks up for that housing. There is a project right now on the edge of Reno, where I've already been invited to a kind of association that wants to kill it because it's for homeless people and they don't want any more homeless people housed in their neighborhood. So that's happening. And I would love for the folks who are here posing to come and be a part of that dialog too, because we get beat up to build it and we do it anyway and we'll keep doing it, but we sure need community to. So I think the accountability I hope it goes both ways. Last thing I wanted to touch on is the to do list, because I think there's been some important things for my colleague, Councilman Brooks, about the income set aside. You know, I actually that concern was new to me. I did not hear it before today. I just wanted to remind folks, a lifetime ago in the inclusionary housing ordinance, we included this language. About the special revenue fund. With consideration being given to create housing from funds that were generated from areas identified in this article as high needs zones in areas proximate to those same high need areas. We have language that we've written in the past, so we probably could have put it in the ordinance. I didn't know about it to suggest it. Sorry, I didn't hear that concern sooner, but we could certainly look at that language in the rules. We've done it before. We should be able to do it again. Secondly, when that money comes in, we can and should be using a chunk of it for lower. So this program, right. So if you build the units, they might get built at 80%. But for all those commercial folks who are going to buy out because they're not going to build housing in the middle of their shopping center or their business office building, they're not they're not going to add a housing unit. And if they're going to pay the fee. That's the opportunity to use this program to get at lower EMIs. There's no reason this program can't be delivering on that through the use of those funds. The last thing is I wanted to mention the the idea of the community benefits. We focused a lot on the housing, but I did hear those of you who raised concern about the community serving businesses. I proba

bly would have pushed for a little more specificity in the ordinance on this piece. I absolutely hope I've shared some draft language with folks that didn't quite make the cut, but I think the rules and regs should say, I, you know, God bless the Red Cross, that that kind of scale of nonprofit with hundreds of millions of dollars in budget is not the kind of nonprofit that should be going into these spaces and getting these incentive funds. The rules should set a limit for nonprofits with a maximum, you know, annual income of X or artists. I mean, this is not for the Mendelssohn Gallery, for example. So there should be serious do we should just say it's for you know, it's for folks with with an annual income of less than X and or serving in underserved. And I again, there's language out there. That language is there. I heard you community and I think that should be on the to do list. And lastly, I echo the conversation that occurred about putting the lengthening of the affordability period into a that's that's on the to do list overall for the housing plan to look at that 20 year minimum. And you know it should be it needs to be longer and that should, you know, apply if and when we do it, it should apply to everything this as well as the other programs. So with that, I just want to end by saying I will be supporting this tonight for all the reasons I've kind of laid out. And I've I've sponsored many housing ordinances in this council. It is such a pleasure to be passing something that I did not have. To co-sponsor or did not get to co-sponsor. It did not. I mean, my colleague, Councilman Brooks, when folks said no to me, I just took them at their word and I didn't take this up. And he did not accept no for an answer and the staff didn't accept no for an answer and reopen something that had been considered closed multiple times. And that is important. It's important this is not complete work, but it is important work. And, you know, I can count on one hands the number of times we in this chambers have passed a policy that asks more of the development community on equity. And this is the third time, it's only the third time that we've done that. And so it's real that we're saying to development community, you are responsible for developing and and contributing to equity. And so for that, I just I want to really congratulate my my

colleague and the council president, Councilman Brooks, for his leadership. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Canete. Councilman Espinosa. I agree three times is not enough on that. I believe to Lauren's last comment, I believe you can have a proximity rule for the incentive fee, but the base linkage fee remains subject to the linkage fee limitations, but you'll find that out. So the thing that I was trying to question, I figured it's just easier for me to just state. So here's the math \$176,328. Is the sales price mean? The sales price is the highest minimum sales price at this very moment, but it will cos

t north of \$250,000 to build that unit. And you could probably sell it for at least \$340,000. So a developer would lose \$75,000 on the house cost to build and \$170,000 from the sales price at market rate. So the choice is really, do you want to build an 80% unit and lose \$75,000 or pay the linkage fee and make \$57,000 while the linkage fee is hefty on the incentive portion. The math only gets more favorable to opt out the linkage fee in the example. Residents 100% residential project that was shown tonight is 900,000. The total hit to build 1010 units is \$750,000. So a developer saves \$150,000 on upfront costs, which is meaningful because you don't have to carry that through the project. Alternatively, if they paid that \$900,000 to opt out of the base and the for it x linkage fee combined, they will profit an additional \$570,000 over providing affordable housing. So they will make a half a million dollars more by not providing the affordable housing. Mind you, if the cost to build those units or the sales price are higher, either one. In both cases, it makes it even more it makes even more sense to pay the higher linkage fee and not provide the 80% army units. The rules, as they exist right now seem more geared to increasing funds over the minute meager leakage fee that we passed two years ago than an actual generation of affordable and mixed income housing in private, unsubsidized developments within the TOD. I'll be honest, when we smartly approved heights to afford a fort mean to support affordable housing and density previously at the TOD the massive public fence around this massive public infrastructure projects. My expectations were far higher than what I just laid out right now. So that was my sort of where I was going with the math. Now my actual comments. So. I agree. Brad, you mentioned this is like the 2010 legislative re zone. And in that we did not have any real provisions for it to address any sort of gentrification and displacement issues. In fact, we did the exact same things to fuel to really spur and help development community sort of go gangbusters in in this economy. And this was an opportunity we still have other toddies where we can use this tool. So I like it as a tool. But again, you heard it already and you're going to hear it some more that we're not there with this as is. So I agree. They're great tools and that was your very first statement. And so 100% behind that. So but I need the supporters of this to think about this. The constant droning about keeping your artists makes one thing very clear Gentrification is alive and well with these land use decisions in Reno. For a long time, this was a deeply affordable area, a heterogeneous community of wild diversity sprinkled with artists and collectives and all manner of businesses, precisely because it was a truly affordable area. The fact that this canary in the coal mine is is the fact that the canary in the coal mine is used to prevent the further displacem

ent of artists. You know, I don't even know what I was writing there. Sorry. You know that it's sort of a canary in coal mine argument that we're doing this to preserve our artists community. That should be an indication. Those artists were not having a hard time existing down there until all of this is happening. And so the fact that we're using that to further the displacement of artists and almost. Are mean and speaking specifically only to the artist community, despite the fact that there were a whole host of other communities down there. Smacks of of. And this is going to be mean I but I lost my mind my location I'll highlight smacks of a callous entitlement. This community for decades was far more than artists, and there is no reason it cannot be in the future. But the mechanism of this ask shines a light on the failings of this proposal. But the failings not. Actually, I got my words wrong. The mechanism of this act. Does not shine. Yeah, but the meanness of this act shines a light. Not on the failings of this proposal. Not on the failings of this proposal, but on the failings of this Council. I am sorry that once again we have failed to dig deep. The silver lining is that the structural changes that the city has made to accommodate this proposal creates an opening to do better. I hope that now that CPD has taken these steps to pursue land value capture that they focus on, TOD is not where the community is asking for development rights, but where communities are asking for redevelopment to address displacement for all, not just a select segment of the community. I have had a number of meetings with Brad and my constituents on this challenge. I

hope that now addressing displacement where it is out of control now becomes a priority over developer requests to give us additional development rights. The two question to the question, does this go far enough? Which many, many people said no. It does not a resounding no, it does not go far enough. I will be supporting both overlays tonight because it is marginally better than the status quo. But I am under no illusion that this as is is a significant is not a significant step. I mean, that I am under no illusion that this is a significant step towards an affordable community. It is just not deep enough. We should be asking for more. And you're going to see it more on the next public hearing, which is creating work kits in a way opportunity by because the only time incentives work is when there's a low base and a high incentive. And when we raise the base with that, you know, that hurts the ability to do land value capture. These tools are here. You guys made them and they could work on all existing entitlement. And to get to this point without raising the base. So I'll talk more about that later. Thank you. All right, Councilman Lopez, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate everybody that's worked really hard on this. And I know that, Councilman, you've been working two years on this. R

ight. And I know you've worked hard. There's a lot of folks that have helped figure this out. Now, I want to be very clear. There's a difference in terms of rules. You know, as you know Brad folks are CPG. A lot of folks in the city we said we keep saying we want more tools. How far can we go as a city? Uh, to collect some wins for affordable housing. What can we legally do? And that's what staff is tasked to do, and they do it. However, the question of how far can we go? Is a political one. Something that a community push is, something that elected, elected and appointed officials can do. And that's a question we have to ask ourselves. So is this absolutely great work by our staff? Absolutely. Good work by council members in trying to address the solution or bringing a tool to the table? Yes. Does it go far enough? No. And I would love. To support this because of that new tool. I'm happy to see that there's a new tool. But there's. Something that just keeps eating at me. And I'm glad somebody came up to the microphone to challenge other districts to create affordable units. I'm glad, because it shouldn't just be in some areas in the city. It should be everywhere. Should be on Colorado. It should be on Hamden. It should be spread out throughout our city. And you look at a map and you see how Denver how segregated Denver is. That's because of economic redlining. And that hasn't stopped. And we are also not reversing that trend. Why? Let me tell you why. In the last ten years since I've been on council, my ten year old girl was giving you props, by the way, Brad. We've had Altos, Alameda on Alameda. Somebody said we want it on the Alameda and federal get ready with their pin because I'm going to load you up 94 units. Considerado. That's number two 100 units on 10th and bring that's a little sal another 100. PALOMA three. Another 100 on Morrison Road. Project number five 581 units at Mariposa. Westwood crossing opening now on Alameda. I made a 98 units that I set and sold 42 on federal and Alameda. Delicatessen 197 units. One of the hardest lifts that we ever had. 197 units on Morrison Road. Del Norte. This project on Avondale. A lot of units on that one right by quirky right aren't. Prime real estate for Colfax in Irving. The Jodi Apartments. Have city investment, public investment, political investment on Sheridan in ten at a light rail station at Royal Village. Opening up shortly on 12th and Perry West End Flats on Colfax. Housing for homeless individuals. Little push back, but with open arms, the west side said Yes, let's house. We're not counting Sun Valley. That's going to be coming online with hundreds of units of affordability and public housing or even potentially the Salvation Army. And the discussions of locating on Alameda. So yes, district three in the West Side has come to the plate. We've done it in a recession. So it brings to the question comes to me why and these and these the kicker is is that they're at 60%. And some of them a

re nonprofit and some of our partnerships with private sector. And if we can do this. We can produce 1592 units. At 60% throughout the West Side. And we can build. Why can't we do it in Reno? Excuse me. Five points. Why can't we do it? In areas that are popping that are here and it's not necessarily. And and then and so that that for me it's a question of political will. It can be done. The staff showed us this is a tool. All this work has brought this into the light. Now. Why are we going further? Why don't we just say, okay, we'll do 60%, 100% in the West Side, but we don't want to do it over here. We'll keep it 80. What neighborhood is immune to 60% asthma or lower? Tell me which one is. I don't think there should be any. And so, you know, I as you know, as much like I said, I really would like to support this because I like the tool. I like the new tool in the toolbox. I want to take a swing at that hammer to. But I also have to say that. It could be a. Heavier hammer

swing. And I don't want to think about this in terms of a vacuum. But, you know, we also I mean, my colleague, Councilman Ortega, brought up the issues of parking. Look, I think I would love to get to a time where we don't have to be so dependent on a car. I love being able to be in New York and not have to depend on a car and see families taking the train. But that's New York. In Denver, it's a little different. In Denver, it's a privilege not to have a car and to be able to get around to take your kids to school at a good school in the neighborhood where you live. For me. I have to take my daughter out to choose. I'm forced to choose to drive all the way down to Coons Mill or possibly to take my daughter before I get a school that hasn't been experiment on. Right. So. It is an absolute privilege. Depending on your zip code and we need to break down those barriers in terms of where we can build 60%. Am I a lower? For me, 80%. Is this not affordable and not knowing how many units. We're dealing with and not knowing the breakup of those units, are they going to be two bedrooms for families or are they going to be one bedroom for an artist? Because it's not just artists that are suffering in the city, it's families. The crisis is with families. The crisis is with folks like my my sister, who's a single mother working for the public sector and barely being able to scrape by. Too proud to take public benefits because she actually works in the same department. They do it. But wanting to survive in this city. On the brink of having to move. Those are the kind of families we should be aiming for. Those are the kind of families that are struggling in this city. And does does this address all of those families? Absolutely not. But it should. At the end of the day. You know, I I do believe it's political will. Somebody said that this is a bold move. 80% is a bold move. 80% is not a bold move. 60% is a bold move. 30% is a bold. Being able to say every crane in this city that's building a u

nit, whether it's for housing or for rent, should have a requirement. A 20% requirement. That's what I heard in Brooklyn. That's a bold move. And it doesn't just require us as a city, but it requires our friends across the park. And it requires us like we get this every day, we get a briefing on what's going on at the state and if the cities opposing the bills are not. I would love to see us supporting a bill that talks about rent control. It talks about being able to regulate that rental market because until we have those other tools, this one is just one tool in our toolbox. Yeah. So I, you know, I. I really want to get there. But I don't think I can tonight. That's not the that's not to say that a lot of good work hasn't been done. I just, you know. I guess I don't want to be offered a tip. I want to be offered a salary in this kind of situation. Not necessarily a tip. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. The U.S. development actually mediche is 65 units, 30 to 60%. Am I a little bit more information? Anyway, Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. I will. I want to first thank everyone from government for coming down, for fighting through this, for sitting in those chairs for so long. Thank you so much for being engaged. It was especially a treat for me tonight to see Darrell Watson and Keith Pryor signed up to talk because it felt a little bit like a proud reunion for me. So thank you both for all of your commitment to this city for so many years and continuing to be here at 11:00 at night. You two are just rock stars in my book. I something we there's a lot to talk about. A lot of my colleagues have done a great and eloquent, eloquent job of talking about that. I'm going to touch on something a little bit different in here is something that I think is really significant for us and really important, and that is making the river a primary street . That is huge for a city that has turned our back on the South Platte River for decades and decades and decades. To see that in here is just incredible, to really recognize that that is our front door, not where you put all the utilities, not where you put the trash cans with. That is our primary street. And to treat it like that is an incredible transformative piece of this that didn't get a lot of talk, but I wanted to say was was recognized and appreciated. I want to thank our council president for bringing this forward and for leading on this. We see rezonings come through in this area. We would see them come through if we vote this down tonight, like some of my colleagues seem to be inclined towards, that will not stop rezoning applications of the property in this area. But when we see them, when they come through one at a time, we don't see the river as a primary street. We don't see any inclusion of affordable housing beyond what is required in our housing ordinance. And we don't see design standards as part of that by doing this legislatively, by looking at this entire area. Maybe it's not perfec

t, but this was pushed way farther than what we would have seen and what we might see if this doesn't pass. We have a lot of work to do as a city on all of these issues, and I don't think anyone thinks that this is the solution. But the solution starts with a step and this is a huge step towards what we can expect to see instead of these one off rezonings where we don't get any of that. And

so for that leadership, I am thrilled to see this come forward and set the table for the future of our city. And so I will be happy to support this tonight. And thank you. Council President Brooks. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Councilman, new. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I do love the like the incentive nature of this plan, you know, so much better than having a penalty for a developer. But to incentivize improvement and growth, I think is very attractive. And it seems as a practice with council around the top East Asians, we have increased density in heights and very consistently wherever around the city. And and I keep I keep looking at this map in the book here and I can't tell where that circle is around the top. And but I think it's probably covering most of Rondo. And in terms of heights, at least as I look at the the map is further toward the increase. Heights is much more prevalent toward Brighton Road and toward the railroad's north rather than toward the neighborhoods to the south. So so I think it may not have as a greater impact as we think. I just hope that that there will be able to deliver and make sure that that doesn't happen and there will be a very good future relationship with all those neighborhoods. Displacement. Gentrification is coming. It's continuing. Right now, it's going to come and and it'll be very interesting to see how the city responds to protecting our low income families is so important. And we every every meeting we talk about is what are those tools to help those low income families? And so those neighborhoods close to Toronto will be a challenge. And I think if this plan, if Rodo can deliver this plan and produce the vision they want and make that the continuity between the neighborhoods and the business areas very cohesive and supportive. And I think it'll be a successful place up. I'll be voting for this tonight. And and I look forward to seeing the evaluations that occur on this and hopefully affordable housing will be produced. I'm a little skeptical that we'll see units, but I just hope we won't be like they were where developers buy out and would actually produce affordable housing. So. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. Councilman new councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Boy, I'm. Feeling like. My colleagues on both sides of this issue. As I recall, I was of lone no vote when the Arapahoe Square rezoning came up because there was a zero affordability component. This. To hear that we've got projects in the pipeline in this neighborhood for a thousand units and we're looking for somewhere around 90 affo

rdable units out of that. It's better than zero. It's not a lot better than zero. It's not a game changer. You know that there's a development being talked about in my district that that is looking at 60%. Am I? But there's a buyout in that contract. And 150 units. I mean, we're here in 85,000. Cost burdened households. The private market is not going to get us out of this. The the economic system under which we exist has no innate social conscience. I believe. That this. Is probably what we can expect when we leave it to the private market, these types of tools and that level of give. I think for me it just points out to as a city, we need to get way more serious than this. And I'm not talking about just council or the administration. I'm talking about the 700,000 other people who live here. And we're going to need to dig deep and get creative and come up with funding streams to deal with the preservation aspect of keeping people in their homes and making things affordable. You know, I'm not a great mathematician, but if if we're talking about that 10% number and we have 85,000 households that need affordable housing, we need to build if we're going to do it by building at 850,000 new units. And I don't advise that as as my friend Councilman Espinosa said, this is better than the landscape there today. You know, the whatever number of affordable units we get on on this land is better, but we need to come up with a bunch of new tools to to supplement this. And so, as with my colleague, I will be supporting these overlays. But it's a minuscule ask. And as was the linkage fee itself. You know, when we have a study that says we can justify I think it was seven bucks or something like that and we come up with a buck 70. And I have developers around the area telling me, God, you guys are letting us off the hook. So easy. So getting way far afield. We need to do way more. If this is all we do, then we're in a world of hurt and we're not doing right by anybody. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Castro and Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, this is this is really tough. And Councilman Cashman, you took some of the words out of my mouth about the fact that we have a long way to go. We've got immediate needs for people in our neighborhoods who are. Who are being pushed out of this city because they cannot afford to live in this city. And I don't know anybody who doesn't know someone who's got a kid or a relative or a friend who just can no longer afford to live in this city. And we all need to be part of the solution. I appreciate the fact that this this is an approach that asks the developers to play a role. But in doing that, we've got to give them more to be able to participate. In the 2010 rezoning, we gave more zoning density to these areas and as we have continued to up zone, we

should be getting affordability out of these developments. But we just keep giving and giving. And you go to other cities around this country, you do

n't see this happening. I know that the Telluride ruling plays a big part in this, but, you know, we are spending investment dollars in so much of the infrastructure that typically developers have to pay for. I mean, you look at the Fox Street corridor for an example. I mean, that's one where they think the city is making some headway in trying to get the developers who will be building in that area to be part of that traffic nightmare solution that exists today before that development even comes in there, as well as some of the drainage problems. And, you know, we need to be doing this with all of our development where, you know, the city is not expected to just foot the tab for so many of the the infrastructure improvements that then make the development, you know, want to come. That should be part of what we're looking at. We're talking about 450 acres and somewhere in the ballpark of 100 units. 450 acres. Right. That's what I heard. I mean. That's. Okay. Well, thank you for that correction, because that's that's a big deal. But. We have so much more to do in this city. And I would love to see, you know, somebody in this area, look at a site for the tiny homes. We need to be looking at changing the zoning to allow a multiple use of different housing solutions. There's no one bullet that's going to solve the problem for all of our housing needs. You know, I believe that looking at micro-housing was one part of the solution, but not the answer. You know, so we need all the tools in our toolbox. I argued against getting rid of our show because that was creating some affordable for sale units. And the people who are in those homes I know are grateful because they would not be homeowners if it were not for that program. So. I would love to see a preference policy, not that we're going to look at it, but for us to have a preference policy in place that ensures people who are being displaced actually have a place in their community that they can go to. Because we're making. That. Outreach to HUD, to to get those exceptions to be able to keep people in this city that want to stay. You know, we have I just met with the folks from Game Plan today and on the open space issue, they're saying we've got so much building going on in this city. We don't have enough open space. We talk about it as part of these developments. And unless you're more than an acre and, you know, a lot of these sites are going to be, you know, smaller, smaller developments, even though it's a total of 450 acres, we're going to be challenged with where do these people recreate? Right. I mean, you can't expect they're all going to go to a rooftop garden, right? So it's some of these issues that I think are critically important, where this is, where public policy matters and looking at how we prioritize our needs and how we prioritize people over projects. And people over money. We're going to be losing our workforce in this city. You know, they're they're they're going to the e

dges of our metro area because they can't afford to live here. And when they get there, they're going to find jobs in their area. And we're going to be challenged to find our workforce, particularly in the service industry. You know, I think we're going to face this idea. Gaylord is going to open long before our, you know, great hall expansion occurs. And I think we're going to be challenged to find the workforce to fill all those service industry jobs for those concessions. So these are some of the challenges. And this is, again, where I think, you know, there's a nexus between affordable housing and quality jobs that pay a livable wage. But, you know, I'm not sure where I'm going to land on this. I'm trying to be open. I appreciate the efforts that have been put forth to ask the development community to play a role in being part of the solution. But we we together with the development community, we the city, we, the people who live in this city need to wrap our arms around this in a much bigger way that ensures that we're not a city just for people who can afford to live here, because that's what we've become. We've lost our socioeconomic diversity in this city, and we'll see that when we see the 2010 census, the 2020 census come out. So I'm just, you know. Expressing some frustrations and concerns about how as a city, we've not been as intentional and focused on some of the things that we should be prioritizing. While as we have grown as a city, you know, we have developers that have an interest in the city. We don't have to give dollars to developers to build in this city who want to be here. There was a time when we had to do that, right, when when there wasn't an interest in people wanting to be in our in our core city. But that's not the case today. Everybody wants to be in Denver. So this is where I think we need to do a better job of prioritizing and working together and rolling up our sleeves. And I know many of you feel like this is what you've done on this project. I mean, I'm still waiting for you to tell us what's going on with the 48th and race project. There's been no dialog with the community who's been waiting for

units. This is a project or a site. The city helped the choir and there's no communication back to any of us about where where that's at. This is an example of where, you know, some of us thought maybe we would have had a project in the ground by now. And I don't know where that's at. I'd love to chat with you and hear what kind of progress has been made on on that site. So I'm going to stop there. I am getting the sign here. But anyway. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Council members, I just want to remind you that this is we're voting on Council Bill 16. This is the incentive overlay. Then vote on 17 and then we'll then take on the affordable housing contracts. Okay. Madam Secretary, do I have a second here? We have a gentleman here and. Okay. Madam Secretary. Raquel. Black eye. Clark. All rig

ht, Espinosa. Hi, Flynn. All right. Herndon. Cashman. Can eat. Lopez. No. New Ortega. Pass. Sussman I. Or Ortega. I. Mr. President. I please close the voting, announce results. 11 eyes, one nay. 11 eyes, one nay counts. Bill 16 talking about the over can you remember we we're voting on there revision or design overlay has passed will now go on to 17 and we'll put that on its. Do we need to put that on the floor, Secretary? Yes, sir. Thanks, Vince. Thank you, Councilman. You. All right? Yeah, you can do it. We now have a council bill. One of five. Councilman Espinosa, will you put us on the floor for publication? Yes, I move that council bill 18 105 be ordered published. All right. It has been moved and seconded. Comments. Councilman Flynn. Thanks, Mr. President. I called this out for a vote. When this came into committee and it was discussed that the we were using general fund contingency and then each year a general fund appropriation for the management and oversight of the 2017 Geo Bond program. I voted no in committee because I believe that the costs of the bond projects ought to be borne by the bond proceeds, as has traditionally been done. I know there are other areas where we do use general fund to administer certain other programs, but it's been traditional to administer bond programs out of the bond proceeds. And so I wanted to vote no. That's why I called it out. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Councilwoman Connection. Thank you, Mr. President. I am I did not vote to advance this bill from committee because I shared some of the concerns that Councilman Flynn has. You know, the mayor just this briefly in the mayor council meeting and his his point was that he decided to propose using the general fund because he did not want to pay interest, literally borrow money to pay for staff and to pay interest on it. I think that is a compelling argument for why not to put personnel in the bond if you have a strong enough general fund to do that. I think my challenge is that we're not doing it consistently. There are other programs where we have dollars that are set aside specifically for capital construction, and we do require those funds to pay for their personnel. Some of them are borrowed money, some of them are not, some of them are sales tax or other sources. In the case of the housing fund, it's a property tax portion of a mill. So so in those in all those cases, it's not the case that we're borrowing the money, but we are taking the money from money set aside for capital and we're using it for staffing. I think this is just generally speaking not an ideal practice. So I actually am not so much in disagreement with taking the funds out of the general fund for the bond as I am the fact that we're not doing that for other programs. So I think that, you know, having thought about it some more since committee, I am going to support this going forward. But when we say, for example, where's more money for housing, 60% of the administrative

costs for housing are coming from the housing fund that was intended to build units. Right, 40% or general fund. I think I have those numbers about right, but I might be off by a point or two, but more than half the administrative dollars for the housing fund, paying for staff, paying for important oversight. You need people to implement programs. You need people to make sure the money is being spent properly so we could free up money for capital construction and for units or the same for other funds. We have human services, similar thing. We're dealing with safety net programs and some of the administrative staff is coming from the fund intended to provide emergency services. So I think it's important for us to just like we do with other programs, there is the cost of doing business. You need city staff to run programs, you need them to do oversight and you separate that out from the money you need to build projects and to invest in programs and you don't steal from one to pay for the other. So so I hope that we continue that conversation. I will certainly be more vigilant about it in the next budget. And I think that we will have a chance to read about this for the bond in the next budget cycle, because my understanding is and the staff should jump up screaming to the microphone if I'm wrong. But my understanding is this is a one year decision on source of funds, and nothing precludes us from moving this program back into the bond program for

all of this overhead in the future. So again, if I'm misstating that, I hope someone will disagree, but I have decided to go ahead and support it for today based on the good logic that it's not ideal to borrow money to pay for staff. But we need to do better in protecting other programs and not getting overhead dollars out of those program dollars. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Can each. Anyone from finance want to address that or it's a good. Okay. I think we're good. All right, Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. I just wanted to explain that I do like to agree with Councilman Flynn's position and will be voting no. You know, I would love to have four and a half million dollars to expand our sidewalk pro bono program by two more regions. Or the one thing that I've been demanding but it's a different bucket is money to address gentrification concerns and displacement and staff to do that. And so once again, we find money to do these sorts of things, but we can't find money for things that the constituents are truly requesting. Thanks. All right. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I have a question for someone from the finance department if they could identify themselves and come forward. Laura. Laura Perry is on her way. Hi, Laura. Can you tell me if. This particular budget request includes any of the additional office space that is going to be needed for the staff that will be hired on to help administer the bond projects. Yes. So that is it. I'm just I'm so sorry. Laura Perry, capi

tal planning program director in the Department of Finance. So we every time we add a position, if there is space required to support that buildout, we typically look to our real estate capital fund that we have established to support the build out of space. So that cost is included in this 4.5 million. Yes. Okay. So the fact that we're going to be looking at additional space at the Denver Post building, which is some of the most expensive office space, concerns me. And I've expressed that to our folks from the real estate office. We've got other properties in the city. We've got a building sitting at Alameda and. I don't know. Jason Street, somewhere over there that we purchased for the Solution Center that never move forward. And I challenge that we should not be spending the most expensive, spending these dollars on the most expensive office space. And so for that reason alone, I will be voting no tonight. I mean, I don't have a problem with us, you know, spending money for staff to administer these programs. But the fact that we will not see the contract and I'm assuming this presumes that this is the okay by approving this tonight or will there be a separate contract on the expansion that is proposed for the Denver Post site? So let me clarify. There are no dollars in this 4.5 million for the expansion at Denver Post building. Those funds, I believe, from a separate source that are not related to this particular appropriation request. But that will be an additional cost to the bond. Project, if you will, that will come out of you're saying that'll come out of real estate. There is a general fund appropriation for real estate for that particular transaction. Okay. Well, when I asked the question earlier, if that those costs were included in this 4.5, you answered yes. So you're clarifying now. Clarifying now that in generalities, any time we add personnel, we always look to add resources to support any space requirements to support those, whether it's an existing appropriation or adding new through the annual budget process. And in this regard, these funds are strictly for staff in professional services for implementation of the bond. And we will be seeing something separate brought to us looking for the build out of space. I can certainly confer with our real estate division and get back to you on that. Okay. So for that reason, because it's not absolutely clear, I think I'm still going to vote no tonight. I mean. I'd like to know where that money is coming from that covers that cost. And so until we know that. So. So Councilwoman Gaby, I wanna ask you if you know this from the mayor's office is that's a separate I'm assuming that that is a separate allocation. Gabby Correct. Mayor's office. Yes, that's correct. Well, we plan to bring a separate lease for space forward at a different time to city council. Okay. Okay. Well, the fact that we're spending \$10 million for a for a lease at the Denver Post building, I don't know what this is going

to add to the cost to look at more space in that building. You know, I know we have access to the auditorium for any of our agencies, which is great. But again, I think we should be as efficient with taxpayer dollars as possible. And this is an opportunity where we could be looking at other space and not just presume that we should be utilizing some of the most expensive office space. Thank you. Yep. I hear you, Councilman. All right, Councilman Cashman, you're up. Thank you, Mr. President. Laura, please remind me how we paid for similar management services in the better Denver Bond and the 27 issue. Sure. So in 2007, actually, all the positions started out in the general fund. And as we saw the economic and market conditions change and we saw departments

having to take major reductions in budget cuts. We actually utilized and looked at all the projects in Better Denver to determine if there were any savings within Better Denver that could accommodate the charging of staff. And so at that point in time, the decision was made to actually charge staff time to better Denver bond around the 2728 timeframe to be able to allow for us to sustain employees and also allow for us to meet budgeted targets within the city. So if the general fund had been healthier, you'd have left the costs in the general fund, which is what you're speculating. The general fund would have borne some costs. The project managers at the time were working on multiple projects. Some were in the bond, some were not. And so legally, they're only able to charge their time for a bond project that they directly work on. And so their other work continued to be borne by the general fund. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Councilman Casper. And seeing no other. Thank you, Laura. See no other comments, Madam Secretary. Raquel Flynn. Oh. Herndon, I. Cashman's. Kinney. Lopez. I knew Ortega. No. Sussman. My black eye. Clark, I. Espinosa. Mr. President. I put salsa voting in after results. Nine eyes. Three days. Nine eyes, three nays. 105. Has his order published? Okay. Do we miss somebody? One, two, three, four, five. No, no. Councilman Gilmore is not here. Okay, so we're going to go ahead to 105 and I think we are, councilman. No, I'm sorry. We just did 105. Let's go to 91. Go ahead, Councilman Nu, ask your question. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. We have a couple of birthdays this week. Thursday, March 8th is Councilwoman Black's birthday. So happy birthday, Councilwoman. And Saturday, March 10th is our council president Brooke's birthday. So if you're watching on TV, council president, happy birthday. Tonight, we have no presentations and there are no communications. We do have one proclamation this evening. Councilman Lopez, will you please read Proclamation two, four, one. Thank you, Mr. President. Proclamation 241 Series of 2018 in support of National Native HIV AIDS Awareness Day and National Women and Girls. H i. V AIDS Awareness Day. Whereas more than 1.2 Ame

ricans are living with HIV and more than 50,000 become and become infected with HIV every year. One in four are between the ages of 13 and 24. Female youth accounted for nearly 2000 of all youth living with HIV. And. Whereas, according to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment at the end of 2015, more than 13,000 people were reported to be living with HIV in the state of Colorado. And. Whereas, HIV and AIDS has affected the city and county of Denver more than any other area in the state of Colorado reporting the most persons living with the disease, most HIV or AIDS related deaths, and 36% of HIV infections in 2015. Excuse me. And. WHEREAS, the continued spread of HIV in the American Indian and Alaska Native communities poses a significant risk to the public health and well-being of these communities. They've had the third highest rate of new HIV infections in Colorado from 2011 to 2015. And. WHEREAS, when compared to other ethnic groups, American Indians and Alaskan natives are ranked fifth in estimated rates rates of HIV diagnoses and have poorer survival rates after an HIV diagnosis. HIV infection was the ninth leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native youth, aged 25 to 34 in 2014. And. WHEREAS, American Indian and Alaska Natives also have one of the lowest awareness rates. One in five who live with HIV are unaware of their status, causing them to go without treatment and may unknowingly pass the disease onto others. And. WHEREAS, approximately one in four people living with HIV in the US are women, cases disproportionately affect African-American and Latino women, who represent 29% of all women in the U.S., but account for 78% of HIV cases among women. And. Whereas, the city and county of Denver recognizes the continue to work to bring HIV and AIDS awareness by groups such as Cafe Cultura Children's Hospital in Immunodeficiency Program Services, de la Raza, Sisters of Color, United for Education, Ergo. Yosemite Prep Prado. Mariposa at the Althea Center. Sorry. That threw me off right there. Embracing wholeness and arts. Addictions. Research and treatment services. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council, the city and county of Denver, Section one. The Denver City Council proclaims March ten, 2018, to be known as National Women and Girls, HIV AIDS Awareness Day and March 20th as National Native HIV AIDS Awareness Day. Section two at the Clerk of the City and County of Denver shall test and affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and that copies be transmitted to Café Cultura, Denver, N.D., and Family and Resource Center and Sisters of Color. United for Education. Thank you. Councilman Lopez, your motion to adopt. Thank you, Mr. President. I moved that proclamation to 41 series of 2018 be adopted. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I I think it was five years ago where we first had this proclamation,

and it was imperative that we read this, and it was imperative because we have to get the word out in our communities. It's not although this proclamation is geared and specifically towards national native HIV, HIV AIDS Awareness Day and National Women and girls, HIV AIDS Awareness Day. It is really a message for everybody. Right. It does not discriminate. And the more education that we have in our community, the best that we can actually prepare for it, educate our communities, understand how to prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS, and know that there is testing. There's free testing. A lot of folks, just the first the just the walking in the clinic is scary enough. Being able to ask the questions is scary enough, making that easy in our community, making it a conversation that people can have in the community in so many different languages, but especially especially in the native and indigenous community. Right. And so I you know, I can go on and on. We all you know, we've made some progress in the country. We made some progress in the world. But it's just not. It's not enough. And that's why we have to make sure that we have proclamations like this, that the message is spread throughout our communities and to really honor the people that do this on a day to day basis. Right. Those folks who are in our community, in the grassroots. And there's going to be some individuals that can speak a lot better than I can on this. And I do want to bring them up after we have our. I mean, I support this absolutely whole heartedly. Happy to sponsor this. I know we have some co-sponsors on this that that you'll see. I know. Maybe speak up and ask my colleagues to support this with me. And let's brings these speakers up. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Councilman Flynn figures for president. I would like Secretary to have my name as a sponsor. I didn't get back in time last week to put my name on this, but I would like it on. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. And thank you, Councilman Lopez, for bringing this forward. Madam Secretary, roll call. LOPEZ All right. New assessment. Black Eye. Espinosa, I. Flynn. I. Gilmore. Herndon. Cashman. Can each. Mr. President. Please close the voting and announce the results? Sorry. Whoops. Sorry. And you know I mean this president when. 11 Eyes. 11 eyes proclamation to 41 has been adopted. Guzman-Lopez. Is there someone you would like to invite up to receive the proclamation? Yes, absolutely. So there's Joy Lynch and Brenda Negrete, then the Youth Council members of a café called Dura and anybody. So if you want to come up. Introduce yourselves and your words. And then. Just the council. If you want to ask anybody up to come up, you're welcome as well to. Yet they shared Joy Lynch in a snap to cheat in a nurse that not Ginny Stein has klipsch need ascertained Beth login into Hello, my name is Joy. I'm 17 years old and I'm currently a senior at East High School. What what really stood out to me in this situ

ation was the is just native women as a native woman. You know, I come from a tribe that's mostly matriarchal. So I understand the importance of my being the importance of being a woman. And, you know, just to protect yourself spiritually, mentally and physically, you know, that's what really stuck out to me. And just the idea that, you know, we need this awareness. This isn't our conversation that happens in our communities a lot. This isn't a conversation that I have a lot, you know. So just having the National Native HIV Awareness Day, as well as the National Women and Girls HIV AIDS Awareness Day, is such a relief. And I'm so grateful to have this opportunity to speak in front of you. And I'm so grateful that you guys were here to support this proclamation as you head. Hi. I'm Brendan Margaret. I'm a senior at early college Ramada, and I wrote a little something just to show my feelings towards the situation and how important it is to have these acknowledgments of these concerns in our communities and to be spoken about. So. I mean, de la la salud de la muerte. Spinning the pendulum between my fingers and feeling my face turning bright red while the boy in the back of the classroom continues to speak about how nice my breasts look with my new bra. Yet not understanding the original use of my breasts rather than being here for the older men in the corner of the streets to ogle over my hormones hovering in the air while the teacher at the front of the room says, Young women never have sex, never understand these concepts, and if they do, they will be an outcast . But she failed to tell me that the truth powers in my body. Her true powers with my emotions and energies seeing to know about your body and to love it is one of the most beautiful things that could happen. How am I supposed to know about my body when you sweep it under the table like dirt floating around in the air and sweeping a low, hushed voice to settle the dust, as you have tried to settle my calls for help. How are we supposed to keep silent when 77% of Latino women go through workplace sexual harassment? Native women are three times more likely to be sexually abused in their lifetimes when more than one in four trans women are living with HIV. When the HIV diagnosis among African-American women fell

20%, but it's still at the highest compared to other races and ethnicities. They keep our knowledge and ways away from us, slowly depriving of our self-love and care in order to keep the hierarchy up and keep us down. But as we hold our hands together, bloody and torn, hearing the whispers of our ancestors, we slowly remember. Once we acknowledge these ways, we will use the dirt swept under the table and plant a bright red flower so pure that even we will get the recognition one day. Thank you so much. Councilman Lopez, did you want to jump back in for a second? Yeah, I forgot to introduce. This is my college buddy, Manny. He's going to give me a scolding, but I forgot to bri

ng out our crews as the director of Cafe called to the to the microphone. And I just wanted to say something. Those two young women want the ones about to graduate in. Graduate, right. So what are you gonna do? What college are you going to go? I don't know. We got you on the record. You're going to get you're going to go to college, right? All right. That's on the record. Anyway, I just wanted to keep it. That was beautiful. And if, Mr. President, we can have our crews come. Q Thank you, Paul. So as Paul has mentioned, we've done this several times and it's always a good thing to come here and bring this awareness. We have an event this coming Friday. It's called Rise Up. It's a free. Event, free food, free HIV STI. And Hep C testing. We're partnering with Sisters, of course, United for Education. As was mentioned, Chip, the Children's Hospital Immunodeficiency Program, as well as Servicios de la Raza, a bunch of other organizations. And so last year we, I think, tested close to 60 to 65 people. And we actually. Had one person who was tested positive and was able to get the kind of services that they needed and support and that direction. So in actually the first year that we had this event, a young man, 18 years old, found out he was HIV positive. So it was good for him to be able to have that knowledge and be able to get the resources that he needs. So I would encourage you on this Friday. 6:30 p.m. at the. Althea Center, we're going to have a singer. Rapper from California named Jessica Calderon, indigenous hip hop artist, as well as Native Maxim magazine, doing a fashion show. And so I encourage people to attend. So thank you very much. And we will call you all on the next city that we go to. Thanks so much. All right. So, you know, other comments from members of council, we're going to move on to presentations and no presentations. There are no communication. There happens to be one proclamation. And this is a big proclamation. You heard the bagpipes earlier today. Saturday is a big day for Denver. And so I will be reading Proclamation 254 congratulating Denver, St Patrick's Day Parade. And let me put some green on because these folks are going to get upset at me. All right. Here we go. Okay. Committee on the occasion of the 56th Annual Parade and March 17, 2018. WHEREAS Denver. Has one of the largest cultural. It's weird to wear a hat and in this building. Denver has one of the largest cultural parades in the United States and the largest St Patrick's Day parade west of the Mississippi. A lot of folks did not know that, whereas this year's theme tribute to the Irish Heritage honors the 56th annual anniversary of the parade. Whereas Denver St Patrick's Day Parade exemplifies a peaceful celebration, along with a community of diverse citizens who gather together with a glance at the Celtic past and look to the future while enjoying Irish culture fanfare, pipe and drum bands, Irish step dancing and honor

ing all divisions of our military to delight over 300,000 spectators. Whereas, congratulations and thanks to all volunteers of the Denver St Patrick's Day Parade Committee, including many who have passed on but are still remembered for their endless hours and never ending commitment and makes this celebration possible. And. Whereas, we hope the Colorado Sun and the Maha Air lifts the spirits of all who march or attend the 56th Annual Parade. Saturday, March 17, 2018. There were actually be 9000 people marching in the parade Kimberley that 9000 who who hoped for warm wind at our backs. And we celebrate the Irish culture in the great state of Colorado. Now, therefore, viable claim by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Council there hereby congratulate the Denver St Patrick's Day Parade Committee. A volunteer organization. Volunteer organization can do all of this, this incredible on a well-organized, peaceful and spirited gathering at the 56th annual event in Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest, and a fix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation that the copy be transmitted to the Denver Saint Patrick's Day Parade Committee President Teresa. Miller Grano. I'm sorry. All right. I move the proclamation to 54, be adopted. It's been moved. And second, it. I do have some comments. This is. Since I've been representing city council. You know, my predecessor was Julie Monteiro, who got a chance to represent this for a lot of years, 12 years. Her predecessor was over there, Councilwoman Ortega. And this is always just an incredible, historic

event. And what I like to say more than anything is that the folks who help organize this event. Ah, like everyone is Irish this day. It's like a welcome to the family and it no matter what you look like, where you come from, you are allowed to just celebrate and engage. And that is so important, especially today, especially today when we exclude so many people and events and things like that. This is one of the most inclusive events that we have in the city and county of Denver. And I'm always amazed how many people come. 300,000 people. 300,000 people will be here at this event. I know we've been talking about the Olympics and it brings 500,000 people, but. 300,000 people will be. Here on Saturday in my little district. And so I don't only want to thank the organizers, but I want to thank all the people involved. I know we have the police department that will, you know, be on guard and making sure everything is going well. There's never any big issues. It's always a peaceful event. And so we're really looking forward to it. But there are three people in my house who are specifically looking forward to it, and it's Kenya, Kenya and Makai, my kids, and they love dressing in all green and having a great day at this parade. So I want to let everyone know in the city and county of Denver to make sure you attend this. I hope my coun

cil members will be out here having a good time. And I want to wish congratulations to everybody who worked so hard on this event. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Mr. President. I didn't want you to think that I missed that subtle dig there about not being comfortable wearing a hat up here. Since some of us have become very accustomed to wearing hats, especially at the beginning of the college football season. That being said, my family, my kids at school just celebrated Cultural Night at their school. And so they were going through talking to me and their mother about where do you come from? What makes you who you are? And I am I am 100% mutt. But the biggest part of that puzzle is Irish. And so this has always been something that I've been very proud of. The only moment I ever had any pause from the moment I met my now wife and when I married her was when I realized that she is a thoroughbred and my kids would not. That wouldn't be the biggest thing for them, even though it was the biggest thing for me. But every year I get to show off that despite the fact that they didn't get the biggest piece Irish. We get the biggest celebration for the Irish thing. And I, I just want to say thank you to all of you because it is no small feat to put on an event like this. Every single year we get a little taste of that because we had a first time little tiny parade in my district for Halloween this year, and it was a lot of work. And it is nowhere it's not even in the same the same playing field. So thank you so much for doing this for all of us. Whether people are are mostly Irish or claim to be mostly Irish or a little bit Irish, are not any Irish and claim to be all Irish for one day of the year. It's a really important thing for us celebrating culture and heritage and having a lot of fun and having a signature event for our city. So thank you so much for everything that you do, and thank you for bringing this proclamation forward. Thank you.

Councilman O Clarke. Okay. Uh, Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Flynn is a long standing Irish name. O'Flynn means ruddy complexion. We show blood in the face quite easily. It's a family trait. And I've had the pleasure of visiting. Can I have water? Mr. President, I had the pleasure of visiting Ireland twice with. Once with my dad and my brothers and once with my children. And I'm told that it's time that I have to go back, because the Blarney Stone, which I've kissed twice, is running low on the gift of gab, and Flynn's are required to return periodically to recharge it. So I'm going to start planning a trip back there. My dad is Irish, but on my mom's side a 100% German. So together we gang up on the Brits. Right. But I want to thank the parade committee for all the hard work they've done. It's one of the first events that I took my children to 37 years ago when I moved to Denver to the St Patrick's Day parade. And we made it an annual event when they were growing up. And I know that it's hard work and I

thank you for it. And I just want to leave you with a saying that was hanging on my dad's wall when we went back after he passed away earlier this year, we cleaned out his house and he had a wall hanging in the kitchen and it said, Bless your little Irish heart and every other Irish part. Thank you for all your work. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, I thought you were going to break in the song there for a little bit. POGUE Mahone. I don't know what that means. Okay. It's been moved in. Second it. Madam Secretary, Roll Call Clerk Hi. Espinosa Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. Herndon. Hi. Cashman. Carnage. Lopez All right, new Ortega. I accept it's not going to show up. We're still rebooting my computer. Okay. Assessment. Mr. President. I. 12 vice. 12 eyes proclamation 254 has been adopted. All right. I. Who would like to come up here to speak? Madam President. Yes, thank you. Council President O Brookes. My name is Theresa milano, and that's fine. And I just want to

point out that some of our board members are wearing a special outfit. Now, it's not as special as Councilman Clark's green shirt, but we are wearing the Irish Diaspora Kilt, which the Irish diaspora represents all of the people of Ireland, as well as all of its descendants around the world. And the kilt is the colors of Ireland, and the central stripes have the colors of the Irish flag. And so I want to introduce to you just a few of the board members that help to manage, guide and inspire 200 volunteers. First of all, Mr. Frank Halligan. Patty Richardson and more, as is bensky. And we also have with us Queen Coleen Jennifer Richards. Would you please stand? And one of her court members, Molly Warmington. So we would like on behalf of all O and J leisure, would you please stand? He's also wearing a traditional Irish kilt as well. And because our theme is a tribute to Irish heritage, we want to wear these outfits. You'll see us around town this week. We want to remember the people that came from Ireland and help build Colorado. They are statesmen. They are landowners, lawyers, builders. They are just incredible people. And yes, there's a few saloon owners. But we honor their contribution to the great state of Colorado. And we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for this proclamation. Thank you, Madam President. Saturday. That concludes our announcements. Presentations there, no presentation and no communications. We do have one proclamation. Councilman Lopez, please read Proclamation 303. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm proud to read a proclamation. Three or three series of 2018 has to be three or three. This is old school Denver. This is proclaiming our solidarity with March for Our Lives efforts and with the survivors of gun violence at home and across the nation. Whereas on the afternoon of the 14th of February 2018, a mass shooting occurred at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, and 17 teachers and students lost their opportunity to ever live, laugh or love again. And.

WHEREAS, the victims of Stoneman Douglas High School. Were the most recent among the 406 496 victims of mass shootings in the past ten years. And with Parkland being the most recent school shooting. And. Whereas, here in Colorado, we intimately understand the painful and devastating the impact of mass shootings and gun violence in our communities. And. Whereas on March 14th. School communities across this country, including tens of thousands of students right here in Denver and throughout Colorado, walked out of classrooms to send one message. Enough. And. WHEREAS, we are proud to see students leaning decisively in this country to protect themselves and their educators. As well as to honor the voices of our students and school communities. The collective strength of their voices will prevail. In the streets and in the voting booth. Demanding that all lives are defended. And. Whereas, 300 738 communities around the globe, including the Mile High City of Denver, will host a march for our Life, March for Our Lives events. In Civic Center Park. Saturday, March 24th, 2018. From 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.. To advocate that student and educator lives and safety become a priority and that we end gun violence in our schools and in our communities. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. Section one that the Council of the City and County of Denver stands in solidarity with the stands in solidarity with the survivors of the Stoneman Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida. The survivors of gun violence here in our own communities and with all students who are demonstrating tremendous courage to seek and enact change throughout the country. Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall a test and effect the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy of this proclamation be transmitted to Representatives. Four March for Our Lives Denver. And to the students and faculty of Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Your motion to adopt. Thank you, Mr. President. I move that proclamation three or three series of 2018 be adopted. It has been moved and seconded. Comments. Members Accounts. Guzman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. It is with great pride. That I read this proclamation here tonight. I was contacted by students. They said that simply said, Can you please pass the proclamation? We said yes. Normally it takes a while kind to have a process, but this is something that is near and dear to our hearts. This is something that. We believe in. This is something that so many students. From. I mean, I think almost. Almost every school that I can think of in my neighborhood. Walked out for. And you know, we've seen walkouts for political demonstrations and walkouts for expression. So many different times for so many different causes. But this is the first time I've seen it like this. And we have to. Listen to our children. I've heard people s

ay that, well, they're not old enough to vote. Why they walk in and they should be in class. Social studies is best taught on the picket line, ladies and gentlemen. And we have to have the backs of

our students, whether they're in elementary school or middle school or high school. I want to make it loud and clear in these chambers and in this city that to be a constituent, to be. To have a voice in this city. You don't just have to be a voter. As a matter of fact, I mean, we don't encourage it. But you don't have to vote and you still have a voice. We still represent you. To be to be quite honest, you could be someone that goes to the polls every year, that goes to every single caucus and has have been for decades. Or you can be a kindergartner. At Castro Elementary and in my district. And you have the same voice. And then when those voices are saying, help us, please enact legislation or do something, please help us elevate our voices so people can can hear our plea. And that's to keep our schools safe. You know, I didn't put this I didn't put this passage in this proclamation because we have a process that we respect to move it to committee. And every time there's something that we ask of another or another government entity, we do bring it to committee. But however, I'm going to do it right here on the podium. Because it's my free speech. We want the federal government to act. Congress needs to act. This president needs to act. Enough with the lip service and let's start acting. Let's start taking. If we loved our kids just as much as we love our guns in this country, things would happen. And I've seen I saw a child that had just the cutest kid I've ever seen. I. Well next to my daughter. Don't tell her that I said that. Had this little sign that said. Literally very simply written. Bear hugs, not arms. He's walking up and down, happy as can be. Dumped out by Carpenter Middle School. Powerful message. I couldn't be prouder to read this proclamation into the record. And to ask my colleagues to support this proclamation moving forward. I urge people to attend these kind of rallies, these kind of actions. People need to see our action in mass, our demonstration in mass, and this does that. So I understand we have guests who are here today who are survivors. We have students here today. We want to hear from you. I know you have an opportunity to come to the podium to receive this proclamation. But I just wanted to. So my colleagues support this. Thank you for the time, Mr. President. Thank you for the consideration to file this proclamation late. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you, Councilman Love. First for bringing it forward. This is incredibly important, Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Councilman Lopez, for bringing it forward. I'd like to ask the secretary to add my name to the proclamation. You know, in all the discussion, especially over the past year or so, about these ongoing mass shootings in our schools, a light bul

b suddenly went on for me that thinking of all of the kids who have been born since Columbine and that this is all they know. You know, when I was a kid, it was back in the days when we were afraid that Russia was going to drop a nuke. So we hid under our desk and that never happened. And pretty soon in the middle of our air raid drills, we'd be making jokes under our desks, and then we'd go back and play and everything was fine. But I was sitting at a family dinner recently talking with my grandkids who are 13 and 11. And my granddaughter, the 13 year old is. Asher is a powerful young woman, and she started crying because she said she gets afraid. It's not every day, but she gets afraid that someone's coming into her school and she was crying because she was worried about her cousins who are eight and four, and that someone might go into their school. And so it just brought home to me the difference in my experience. I look at I look at the numbers and I think logically, as has been said, we have more work to do and there's more work we will do. But I think of the numbers and the policies, and it just put me in touch with with the fear that our young people live with every day. So I'll echo Councilman Lopez's urging that our state leaders and our federal leaders join us in doing more to protect our children. And thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, thank you, Councilman Castro and Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. I'm going to give you the names at the Senate. And it was seven Senator Owen Hill, Senator Vicki Marbles and Senator Jerry Sonnenberg. That those three people, of all the representatives at the state House is is who prevented it from going from a vote for Denver representatives to opine on that? And so that is the politics of our country, politics of our state, politics at every scale. So I just want you to remember those names because they're the ones that are not letting your representatives speak to this issue at the state level. Thanks. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to ask the council secretary to add my name. And I just wanted to make one comment. I can remember after the shooting in Aurora, my grandson, I can't remember, gosh, this has been a number of years now, but he was afraid to go to the movies. And, you know, when we see our kids afraid to go to school for the same reasons, this is not the norm we should be accepting in the United States. You see, in other countries, they have taken care of this issue where gun violence is not prevalent and it's not the norm. And we need to get to a place where everybody

in our community feels safe. So, Councilman Lopez, thank you for bringing this forward to our youth, for your work in helping to bring this forward and the work that youth across our city have done in mobilizing the the walk out to make this message loud and clear that enough is enough. We hear you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. There's a number of democrat

ic kind of engagement democracy events on Saturday, so I will not be able to be at the march with you in person, but wanted you to know that I will be there in spirit. And I think for any of us who can't be there in person to express that will be important so that the voice is louder and more unified. So thank you for bringing this forward and good luck on Saturday. Raising your voices. Thank you. Councilwoman, can each see no other comments? My, my first work out of college, I was working with young people and man below high school, and it's it's the best work that I've ever done, because those young people taught me about life, leadership. And, you know, Bishop, there's a reason Jesus chose disciples and they're all in high school. And one of the reasons is they don't have a mortgage, they don't have a job to to report to. They don't care. They're going to live their passion, their truth every day. And I think this is a special time in our history where we need to be following these young people. And so I'm 100% supportive of this. Councilman Lopez, thank you for bringing this forward. I'll be supportive. I'll be marching. I was I was with the principal who was helping diocese to call students organize. We got principals helping them organize to march out of school because they see the leadership and the passion and the intelligence from these young folks. And so we as city council stand with you all. Thank you so much for what you all have done and getting us to to get to this level as adults. Right. We're following you. So thank you, Madam Secretary. Raquel Lopez. I knew Ortega Sussman Black. Clark. All right. Espinosa. Flynn, i. Herndon. Cashman. Each. Mr. President. I. Police also very nice results. 1212 ise proclamation 303 has been adopted. Councilman lopez, anybody want to bring up to speak? Yes, I do want to bring up some of the students. Mr. Anderson. And if you want to also introduce. Two of the speakers. Thank you. Mr. President. City Council words. I'm speechless that you were the first city in our state to publicly give your support towards this initiative and standing with so many thousands of young people that are going to march on Saturday and letting them know that you hear them and enough is enough. We have with us today somebody who has survived one of these school shootings here in our state. And so I just want to make sure that we all know in this chamber that we have victims right here in Colorado that have went through this same situation. And Martin Luther King always had a dream that we would reach the mountaintop. But members and and people in the audience, we haven't reached it. But us as young people are going to continue his dream. Thank you. I wanted to thank you all the city and Council of Denver. Every single council member that stands before me sits before me for doing this. Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Ortega, your comments earlier about the senators who did not pass. We look at them as examples,

but we don't have to worry as a young people and as a movement, because if they don't want to listen to us in office, they. Don't have to because they. Won't be in office. We will vote them out and we will not change. We will work civically and we will make sure. That our kids, our siblings, our family, our friends never have to worry about never coming home again. And I wanted to thank you, because as a young person, seeing my parents, my grandparents who have worked hard, who have tried and have been unsuccessful, it is daunting as an 18 year old to come before you and be working on this mission. But you give us hope. You drive the passion that we have because we see that our voices are being heard. And we know that we will not stop until we never have to worry about students never coming home, about teachers never coming home from their jobs, from their livelihoods ever again. So I wanted to thank you, all of you, from the bottom of my heart. Council members. I'd just like to say that we've we've been saying among ourselves and in the public for a while that this isn't just a march and that this is a movement. And at the heart of that movement. Isn't just about reforming our gun laws. It's about ensuring the safety of our students and ensuring the well-being of the public. And I just got to say, from from the bottom of my heart to here, you all stand in solidarity with us that that just pulls. In my heart. I just want to say thank you so much. And absolutely, you know, this is a youth led movement. But that doesn't mean it's youth exclusive. And just as my colleague Andre has said here, where we fully intend to make sure that, you know, we may have grown up in the school shooting generation, but we want to make sure that we're the last ones that have to do that and we're going to get there with your help. And just thank you all so much from the bottom of my heart. I just wanted to express my thanks really quickly to Councilman Lopez

for bringing this issue and helping us accelerate this issue and also to. Councilman Espinosa, it was great to have you in the Senate and testifying for these legislation that unfortunately did not pass but should have. And I just wanted to thank each and every one of you for your support and for supporting our cause. And I want you all to know that we will keep working because your support makes it so. Thank you. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Thanks again, Councilman Lopez. We're going to read the resolutions, Madam Secretary. Please read them. Okay. Thank you, Councilman. No motion or vote is required. This will be postponed until next Monday, April 16th. Madame. It looks like we don't have anything else to do. One more item. One more item. I mean, on this one. Right? Yes. Put the next item up on the screen. And this is item number 292. Councilwoman Ortega, go ahead and off your comment on council will to 92. Thank you, Madam President. First, I want to thank the folks from National Western Center for their wo

rk in understanding the importance of local or targeted hire, ensuring that there are opportunities for people throughout the city of Denver who have not. Had the opportunity to take advantage of some of the jobs and in this case, apprenticeship opportunities so they can increase their earning ability and be able to choose where they want to live in the city, as opposed to not being able to afford to live in the city if they don't make enough money. And so the National Western Center has committed to a targeted outreach on this phase. My hope and I know Councilwoman Kenney has been working on this. Councilwoman Gilmore, I believe, has him coming to committee on Wednesday to talk about their local or targeted hire program. But it is really important that we get to a place where we actually have goals set because we have nothing to measure against otherwise. And when you have goals, then you set a very clear parameter for the folks coming in and bidding on the work to know what the expectations are in terms of the percentage of people that they will be hiring from throughout our city, that we want to ensure, get to take advantage of the apprenticeship jobs and the ability to take advantage of a career path job. And so I just call that out to say this is important. Some of us will continue to work in the direction of ensuring that we have goals attached to the work, not only with National Western, but as we move forward with the build out of DIA in all of our big bond projects. So thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman. And that concludes the items to be called out. All other bills for introduction are ordered published. We're now ready for the block vote on resolutions and bills on final consideration. Council remembers. Remember, this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote I. Otherwise, this is your last chance to call out an item for a separate vote. Councilman knew where you put the resolutions for adoption and the bills on final consideration for final passage on the floor. Thank you. I move, the resolutions be adopted and bills on final consideration be placed upon final consideration and do pass and block. These are 2008 series. The refers to resolutions 62 317 203 214, three, ten and three of the bills for final consideration. 237 to 92 and 301. Thank you, Councilman. Did we get them all? Council Madam Secretary? Yes, Madam President. Okay. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary, roll call. Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. I Cashman can eat. Lopez. I knew Ortega. I Madam President, I eat ice. Okay. Thank you very much. The resolutions have been adopted and bills have been placed upon final consideration. Do pass. Tonight, there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 170, changing the zoning classification for 935 West 11th Avenue and Lincoln Park. the materials collected through the city's Denver's recycling program and under bills. For introduction, Councilwoman Kennedy just called out her labor

of love for a comment council bill 337 pertaining to the platform open space and Detention Basin in the GSA area under bills for consideration. We have nothing under pending. We have nothing called out. Madam Secretary, please bring up 418. Go ahead, Councilman Cashman, for your comment. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to be sure the public understood exactly what we were doing here a couple of years ago. For the first time, this council started having a 30 minute public comment session before the first regularly scheduled meeting of each month a few months ago, because that proved to be such a success. We added a second monthly meeting, so we now welcome the public to a 30 minute session before the first and third regularly scheduled meetings of each month. There were some details that were missed along the way and it was not formally added to our council rules. So that's what we are doing with Resolution for 18 tonight. Hope to see you all coming to see us and letting us know your thoughts on any matters of city business before the first and third meetings each month. Thank you, Mr. President. I need to call out Council Bill 391 for a vote for the purpose of an abstention. Great. Um, Madam Secretary, can you pull up 391? I'm

going to go through the. I'm going to do a quick recap of all the bills. Under resolutions, we have nothing called out on a bills for introduction. We have nothing called out on our bills for final consideration. Nothing called out. We do have something under pending. Councilwoman Sussman has called out a postponement of Council Bill zero for 12 series of 2018 changes on classification for 4400 North Fox Street in Globeville. So let's let's do 391 first. And Councilwoman actually, Councilman Cashman, when you put 391 on the floor. Yes, Mr. President, I move that council resolution 391 be adopted. Okay. Actually, it's 391 a. Is that a resolution? Yes, it is. Okay, great. Yes, it is on the floor now. Go ahead and make your comment. Councilwoman. I sit on the board of a nonprofit organization that is partnering with Northeast Denver housing. And therefore, I will be abstaining from this vote. All right. Very well. It has been moved. I need a second durt. Yes, Dr. Sussman. It's been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary. Rocco. Ortega abstain. Sussman Black Clarke Espinosa. Flynn I. Gilmore I. Cashman I. Carnage I. Lopez I. Knew, Mr. President. I. I. Pluto's voting announce results. Sorry one's missing. We do have one hanging fire. Thank you. 11 eyes. One abstention. 11 eyes, one abstention. Three. No one has been adopted. Okay, um, let's see. Councilwoman Sussman, do you want to go head on and make your. Excuse me. Okay. Okay. We are because of the committee order taking these bills out of order and we're going to do 5/71. So can you please put 570 on the floor? Move the accounts council, five seven. To be placed upon final consideration and to pass. It has been. Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Public hearing 570 is now

open. Andrew. You're on. Good evening. My name is Andrew Johnson. I'm with the Department of Finance here to give you the staff report on a new Metropolitan District Service Plan. Council Bill 570 series of 2018 is for an ordinance to approve a service plan for a new metropolitan district titled Boulevard at Lowry Metropolitan District. The service plan is being submitted for City Council approval on behalf of C K Lowry, one LLC, pursuant to the requirements of the Special District Act, Sections 32, Dash one, Dash 201 and more particularly 32. Dash one. Dash two a 4.5. The initial project and future inclusion area to be affected by the proposed metropolitan district consists of about 5.39 acres, generally located near First and Quebec avenues. Together, the areas are referred to as the service area. The district will not provide duplicative public services or improvements that are already being provided by other municipal organizations. The new Metropolitan District will be responsible for coordinating the financing, acquisition, construction, completion operation and maintenance of all public infrastructure and services within and without the service area, including without limitation all streets, safety, water, sewer, storm, drainage, transportation and park and recreation facilities. The district will have the power to raise revenues pursuant to the authorities granted by the special the Special District Act, including the imposition of up to 30 mills plus rates, fees, tolls and charges. The total estimated cost of the public improvements necessary to serve the initial development are approximately 15 million. In order for the district to have the fiscal wherewithal to provide the funding for the upfront costs and the public improve as needed in the service area, the district shall have the ability to issue debt and impose a mill levy for a term not to exceed 40 years. The proceeds of the debt issuance will provide funding for the upfront infrastructure costs. The district will also have the ability to oppose up to ten of the 30 mills authorized to raise revenue for operations and maintenance of the district improvements. The site is intended to support only commercial uses, including a Lucky's grocery store offices, retail and restaurant land uses. The district will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of public enhancements on the commercial site, including lighting planters and a parking garage to serve the businesses, as well as have additional parking for the Selectman Library, which is adjacent to the site. The site is part of the final Lowry Air Force Base redevelopment, commonly known as Boulevard one. Approval of the service plan establishes the following. There is sufficient existing and projected need for the organized service in the area. Existing service in the area is inadequate for the president and projected needs. The district is capable of economically providing sufficient service to the area within the proposed boundaries

. The land and proposed development to be included does and will have the financial ability to discharge the proposed indebtedness on a reasonable basis. The facility and service standards will be compatible with the facility and service standards of the city. City staff does recommend approval of this service plan. Tonight, we also have here the applicant and other folks supporting the creation of this district for your questions and answers. All right. Thank you. All right. We have.

Looks like we have five speakers this evening. Please come to the front. I think you're all up to the front. Bruce O'Donnell, your first. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm Bruce O'Donnell, 386 Emerson Street in Denver. And I and members of the districts and development team are here and available to answer any questions you may have and to provide additional details. And we request that you please approve the service plan this evening. Thank you. All right. All right. Michael Fischetti. Did I pronounce that right? Persecuted. Persecuted. Michael Persichetti with RBC Capital. I'm here to answer any questions. 2828 Logan Street. All right. Thank you, sir. Matt Dalton. Amy Matt Dalton I live with 37. I married and I'm with the firm of Spencer Fein and I'm. Here as counsel to the proponents and able to answer. Any questions. You have. Excellent. Robert Koontz. Yes, sir. I'm Robert Coons with cum laude of Alvin S.K. Lowery, LLC. And I'm here to answer any questions you might. Have about the project. Great. Thank you, Chairman Sekou. My name is Terrence Sekou. Founder, organizer for the Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense, servicing poor, working, poor, homeless youth and senior citizens throughout city and county of Denver. These metropolitan districts. A very, very serious composition of the folks who are doing this speaks to the code of conduct and the manner in which this thing is going to happen. And while I support the creation of this district. I will employ the folks that are organizing this thing in our part of this thing to make sure that whatever you're doing out there with the comes of housing, which we need to know, is it affordable or is it price where regular folks can't afford it? It on my watch? Is am I on this? How much money do you have to be in this? How much money you go excluded in this as you go about all this development and raising new taxes and all of that? Where do we fit in at that? Do we fit in where it comes to getting contracts to do this thing? Are we going to even be allowed to hold a sign? I'm talking about black people. Because when I go to all these metropolitan digs, you see all this construction stuff. Black people. Absolutely. There's brown this white. There's women. No black people. They, like, disappeared, like the Indians. And now we have museum pieces and relics and even historical designs again. This is where the Negroes used to be. Kind of like how you're treating the Indians on reservations in the four corners. See? Th

ese unintended consequences that are divided by serious questions, like ask them how much housing you're going to do, what's the price of is going to be rent? Is it going to be homeownership? How do you have a program for poor people to come up in this? Is there black contractors? Duane is going to be a part of this. Are we going to let this slide back? And slowly but surely, the black population disappears. And then. Yeah. Now, where is it? Scattered to the winds. No more political base, but. But to operate and have even the possibility of exercising power because you split it up into a million pieces. And you keep that. And the people who are doing this are okay with that. Look at what's there. You see any diversity, any of this? Do you know what's going to happen? Elliot. You do it every time. You know what I hear? Well, you know, they call you right into the da da da da da da da da da. Yeah, I'm with you on that. But was the gate everything you said and you're talking out of both sides of your neck, but you still you voted for things that you never thought, but you've got a way of explaining it cause it looked good on television. So you can try to fool the voters, but you can fool some of the people some of the time. But you can't fool everybody all the time. Mr. Speaker. Stay on task with the metropolitan district. So with this metropolitan district as you go. And thank you very much for keeping on task. I appreciate that. So this metropolitan district. Has to be seriously examined in terms of intent, not what they say. Asking about the track record. Well, even do they include black folk in this, including poor people in this, where they add in you and your and your operating folks in your broke, in your poor, you've got an experience of being broke. No. And your voice is never in the room when decisions are made. It sort of goes on and on and on. At all. So after 65 years. Being born and raised in this city and actually being a busboy at the Lowry Officers Club when I was 16 years old, waiting on a white officer. Because they wouldn't allow black officers to come into the club massacre. So here we go, transforming that legacy into something new and different that is fundamentally representative of 21st century mores. We need to be included and we're counting on you all to make sure that we're doing that by being the oversight board for this mess. We want you vote. You let it go and let it do what it do. And you waiting for folks to come in and to ask for help. But too today. So when we talk about celebrating the fire thing, we brought the women in there, the first responders to the city. Well, you are first responders. You're on line. And when they get through you, is that young quarterback, said Jack. And we keep falling backward and backward and backward and backward and backward and backward and backward. While you sit there and you cheer. For how the West is one at the exclusion extermination of others

other than white. Keep on pushing, ke

ep on doing what you're doing. Martin Luther King said there's a more arc in the universe. I guarantee you God is watching and they're not going. All right. This concludes the public hearing for I actually I'm sorry. Questions by members of council. Councilman Marty. I have a couple of questions. The first one is for Andrew, if you would mind, coming forward. Does the city have a policy on the size of a metro district? So somebody came in with one acre. Would we? Improvement district. Is there a limit on the size? We do have a criteria that we set out back in 2004 when we had a lots of green space. It was shortly after. If you think about all the land around Panya Boulevard that was annexed and we did have a criteria of about 160 acres was the size that we chose that we would do nothing smaller than 160 acres. But as all the large plazas have been filled up, we have routinely looked at smaller and smaller infill sites for metropolitan districts to be utilized. So do we have a limit on the on the lower end? If it if it makes sense that it's fulfilling, we look at it more holistically and look to it to like do the visioning. But no, we don't have a girlfriend. Okay. And I don't know if you're the one that should answer the next question. So I heard that they're looking to do a grocery. But what what else is intended to be included within this development besides grocery stores? Is that intended to take up the majority of the five acres, 5.39 acres. So Robert Koonce with the development entity. And so this will be a mixed use block with multi stories. Primarily retail and restaurants on the ground floor and offices and other commercial uses on the upper two and three stories. And there is no housing. And there's no housing on this block. Okay. Do does the developer propose to use tax increment financing? Is that something that you're looking at down the road or. So this is a site that's in the Lowry redevelopment area. So it is in the Lowry tax increment finance area already. It is already in a tax increment area. So there is tax increment money that has been used to help get the site ready. Okay. So that's already been utilized? Yes. But the tax increment finance area has expired. And so all the original taxing revenues are returning now to the original taxing entities. Okay. Great. Thank you. I have no further questions. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilman Espinosa. So the 25 year period for new projects is it is no longer possible to introduce a new project. So the new projects. When the Lowry Redevelopment Project was originally a vision, there were a lot of projects that were brought forward. That list of projects has been completed and there are the tax increment finance area has been closed and so there are no more. I was retired early ahead of schedule. So I'm sure this you've already talked about this in in committee and I'm sorry to go over this, but I'm looking at this. And aside from sort of one little segment of of undergroun

d sewer, it looks like pretty much all the infrastructure is there in the surrounding streets and the grid has been laid out and whatnot. And it seems like the improvements are largely focused on on private property, you know? You know, we had just gotten done talking about the stadium and I expect a parking structure to be in the stadium because that's a function that the that we've already put public investment into. What is what's the impetus here? What is what makes this block different than any other private block in this city that requires there? That's I mean, that's a good question. And when you look at the Lowry redevelopment as a whole, it's that's how you got to look at the tax increment on this one, because it was an old Air Force base and then it was it by the utilization of the tax increment financing tool, we used the incremental property taxes to help redo replan, plan this, revision it and actually implement certain pieces of public infrastructure to bring that vision to fruition, whether it be some of the parks or the roads to actually get that was the use of the tax increment. If there was, there is \$3.5 million of tax increment going towards this particular project and it is to help create the parking, which is is part of the support for the library because the library doesn't have enough parking right now. So when you look at like all the visioning and all the things that are going on across. LOWRY This is just that final piece of it. So there is going to be a shared parking arrangement with the library across the street. Yes. Okay. All right. Thank you. You're welcome. All right. Thank you for those questions. Members of council. This concludes the public hearing for 570 comments of members of council and some assessment. This is so it's so interesting to me because it's one of the last of a very long project. I started on the Lowry Project in 1992, two years before the airbase closed. And if you can imagine, you know, thousands of acres and more in the middle of the city and what a hubbub it caused at the time . And this was an area, the boulevard, one that we didn't even expect to have the Air Force surplus. And so it came at the very end. It was the Finance Center. This particular plan for the Project for Boulevard One was

done with a large committee of residents of Lowry and neighbors. And it was well discussed. And certainly the part about having a commercial area that was across the street from the Lowry Town Center was important to the design. And, um, and here we are with a metropolitan district, and certainly we're very happy about the sharing with the shuttle's replacement library. And of course, we are the bond is going to increase the size of the library. And so the need for the parking is even more than we had expected. Very glad to have the grocery store. And very sort of wistful about this being the last project of Lowry's. Since I've been working on it for quite a while, but it certainly has been a very su

ccessful operation thanks to hundreds of people in the community and everybody working on LOWRY. So I urge my fellow council members to vote for this. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Dr. Sussman. Seeing no other comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. SUSSMAN My black eye. CLARK All right. Espinosa. Flynn, I. Gilmore. Herndon. I can. I can eat. Lopez. I knew. Ortega Mr. President. I propose bringing us the results. 13 Ice 13 Ice Council Bill. 570 passes. Congratulations. All right. Councilman Lopez, will you please put Councilor Bell for 24 on the floor? Thank you. You're welcome. Nothing further. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega. Madam Secretary, will you please put the next item on our screen? 710 and Councilman Herndon, we put Council Resolution 710 on the floor. Yes, Mr. President, I move that council resolution series of 2018 0710 be adopted. It has been moved. And can I get a second? As we moved in, seconded questions by members of council and 710. This was also you, Councilwoman Ortega. I need to abstain on this. I served on the board of a nonprofit that receives funding from the continuum of care that provides services for people that live in one of the housing developments that serve folks who are formerly homeless. So I will be abstaining on this vote tonight. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. See no other questions. Are there any comments? Seeing no comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Ortega abstain. Sussman I Black Brooks II. Espinosa, I. Flynn. I. Yo, ma, i. Her, didn't I? Cashman I can. Lopez I knew, Mr. President. I Madam Secretary, please close the voting, announce the results. While eyes one abstention. 12 eyes one abstention. Council Resolution 710 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. And Councilman Cashman, go ahead with your comment on Council Bill 680. 12 hours. Council Bill 979 has passed. All right. We have one more tonight. Councilman Lopez, will you please vote council bill nine, seven, six on the floor. Yeah, I move that 976 series of 2018 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 976 is now open. May we have the staff report? Good evening. Laura Morales, Parks and Recreation. So just here to introduce the naming of the park at Asbury and taken in District seven. It is an unnamed park at the moment and even though it is a designated park. So it is exciting for this to come through today. So this has gone through the formal process and I will be handing it over for the formal presentation for Anita in a minute. But first, they did go through all of the signatures. They got 300 plus signatures, number of letters of support, as well as a unanimous vote from our Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. They already did a very emotional public hearing. And you can see the turnout tonight even during a Broncos game. Nice, nice job. So we are excited to have this move forward. Our director of executive director has recommen

ded this as well. So this one last comment before I turn it over is that they did go through for this park design, a community design process in 2017. So we'll be getting some upgrades and that construction will start in 2019. So it is a good timing for a park naming to happen. So with that, I will turn it over to Commander Martinez and to Anita Banuelos. Hello. My name is Anita Banuelos. I'm a counselor to councilman president. Councilman Clark. I'm a Denver native. Born and raised. I grew up in Denver and still live in southwest Denver at Mar Park. I would like to first say a few words before going into the naming presentation of Asbury Park. It has been my pleasure and honor to work on the naming of the park in southwest Denver. I would like to first thank Commander Martinez. He has been such an important part. You will hear later. Hear why? I would also like to thank the residents who signed the petition, primarily Commander Martinez's family members, as well as the registered neighborhood associations Belford ATH Ma Park and College View, who all supported the naming of aspiring te home park. It is moments like this that truly emphasize the importance of community. In this presentation, you will hear why La Lomita was chosen and the beautiful history that makes our city what it is today. We cannot forget the decades and generations of families who settled here and share their stories. They are the thread of what Denver is and what

continues to be today. It is my pleasure tonight to share this long overdue recognition of a long family history. Currently, the park's one function is reducing flooding, clear water, improving air quality, cooler local temperatures. Increase habitat. Connection to nature. A local learning laboratory. The park is going to be remodeled. Just as Laura mentioned, some of the things that we have done is in partnership with South Platte River, funded by Denver Parks and Rec, Public Works and Water Management. The area currently right now has a detention pond right in the middle of both of the partials. And so with the upgrades, it will be more emphasize of the design to connect residents to the park. The current conditions of the park. If you look at it now in the slides, it is does have a lot of trees, but it's not very friendly to the conditions as it is now. And a lot of family members and residents in the area do not visit the park as much. Potential park elements in the future, the rock playing soccer fields, a walking path. We did go out to the elementary schools and asked the children what they would like to see in their neighborhood park. So the construction of the park actually popped up the name. Just to let you know, when Councilman Clark took office, he will like to get a list of all the parks in his district, and three parks are without any names. So this one is the first park that we are going through, the whole naming process. The other two parks are in Belford. Some of the other options was Goat Hill,

Domingo Abeyta Park and TODO El Mundo every todo el mundo everybody's world. Both for the park name option was 28, 21 and 21 for from an outdoor park in Gold Hill, which is kind of ironic that seven votes actually made La Lomita the park name. We did ask for young students at the local elementary schools to actually vote for this, even though they are unable to sign the petition. And I'm going to pass that over to Commander Martinez. And he can go over more of the history. Good evening. I'm Jeff Martinez and I'm honored to be here. Thank you for taking the time to allow us to speak. So you're probably wondering, how did I end up getting involved in this? Well, working closely with a lot of the council. I'm here, councilman clerk's office with Anita Banuelos. She called and told me that they were going to rename the park. I said, my family grew up there. That's where our family roots are from. We call that goat hill. We had a family restaurant that was there. She said, Really? Tell me more. So we went on and and we talked a little bit about the family. So I told her about that area. That was an area that was very poor. There were people there that didn't have water. Most people didn't have water at the time that most of my family moved in there. Evans Avenue, which we know now, is a very busy street, was nothing more than a dirt road with two big ditches on both sides. And the family restaurant that was put there was put there right in Goat Hill. So that's kind of how I got involved in this and tell you a little bit about this. So in the 1960s, again, my family lives there. Well, they're actually there in the forties and fifties. But in the sixties there was a building that was there, and my uncle and aunt owned the building. It was several different things. It was first called Evans Heights Grocery. It was a small grocery store that served the people that were there. Everybody would go there and there was a lot of business. Well, one Brentwood shopping center open, a place called Save a Nickel came along and a little bit bigger company, a little bit bigger grocery store. So people started going to save a nickel, put the family business out of out of business. So they tried a furniture business for a while there that did okay, but not too well. And then the family, because there were six. That's my family up there. That's my grandma and Grandpa Domingo and my two year Obeida. And there are six daughters and three sons. My mother was one of the daughters, Betty Abeyta, and they all would get together and they would make a lot of us Mexican-American Spanish food, more or less New Mexico style food. And they were great cooks. So they thought, why don't we try this as a restaurant? So a couple of the family members first opened this up and they called it La Lomita. La Lomita means the little hill. So the goat hill set up on a little bit of a hill. So it was called the La Lomita. So they tried the restaurant had changed hands a few times as the years

went on. My parents being one of them, aunts and uncles, other aunts and uncles also owning that and operating that. So it was a great place for people to gather. There was a jukebox where the music was always playing. People came in. They were homemade tortillas made by hand. There were lines sometimes out the door with people waiting to get in, to listen to the music, eat the good food, and it was there. It's just a great place for the family or all the families that lived in that general area. This is an actual picture of that building called a la Lomita. There's a house that's right next door there. That building still stands. It's a house that my and uncle that own this property lived in. But this is an actual picture of it when it was a cafe, the La Lomita Restaurant. These are some

more pictures. These pictures are all pictures that were taken in that area during the forties through sixties, the one with the glass windows on the front with the family sitting around. That building still exists. That's right next to where the Lomita restaurant was. So a lot of love, a lot of family, a lot of things that happened there. Our families have grown. And most of our my aunts and uncles have passed away. We have one actual family descendant, my Aunt Maggie, that is still alive. She's the last of the immediate family. And then we have my we call her my Aunt Arlene. She is truly my cousin, but she is my aunt. She's growing up as my aunt. She's going to speak later. But our family has passed away, our mothers and fathers, except my father is still here with us. 87 year old native of Denver. So we are doing our best to preserve a small part of our family, a family that was always gentle. They were kind. They have a lot of integrity, but they were a lo. They were a family that not a lot of people know about, but they are what Denver was founded on. And we believe that it is time that we have some mark of our family. We didn't think it would be right to just name it Abeyta Park because that put a little bit too much of a name of our family. But the building that a very family owned and operated La Lomita, we think is very important. And we would love if you would honor as with naming the park it as guarantee. Joan La Lomita Park, thank you. So as part of the petition process, you have to collect 300 signatures and we collected 316 signatures from Val Verde all the way to Platt Park Overland. And we did go to some of our registered neighborhood organizations to ask for signatures. And we did also get some letter of support on the west side of District seven. Like I mentioned earlier, Val Verde, Armagh Park, Ruby Hill, Guardsman, and College View. And during that whole process, we did not get any negative feedback or any opposition. Thank you very much. All right. We do have excuse me, five individuals signed up to speak this evening. And so if you're signed up to speak for this, if you come up to this front bench, so when I call on you, you can step up to

the podium and start your remarks and your time will start. For this hearing, you are limited to 3 minutes. So first up, we have Arlene McIntosh. The first one. Yeah. Good evening, council members. My name is Arlene McIntosh, and I'm a Denver native. I'm married. I'm married to Early McIntosh. I am the granddaughter of Domingo and Donatella Obata. I was raised by my grandparents. I called them all my daddy. I was one of the family. I am retired. I owned a business. Arlene's Trophies, for. 27 years. And my daughter Sonya still has the shop. And the president of the Denver 600 500 bowling club. And I'm the only. Hispanic female in the Denver Bowling Hall of Fame. We moved to the Hill in 1944. My Aunt Minnie and Uncle Joe. Romero had purchased 20 acres from Evans to Asbury. And Tyrone to Leo. They brought an old. Army barrack and moved it onto the property on Asbury, right where the park is. We did not have a floor, water or electricity. We had an outhouse and a montgomery ward. Catalog that we used for. Daddy put in the floor. There were seven of us. Lived in three rooms. Daddy, Momma, Uncle Porky, my mom, Yvonne, Margie, Betty and myself and my Aunt Minnie and Joe owned the grocery store. It was called Evans Heights Grocery Store in 1942 to 1955 and around 1955. My Aunt Lillian, Walter. Lopez, Sara and Carlos Lopez and Anna and Willie. Hernandez were the first owners of the La Lolita Café. Then later, my uncle Felix and Clarinda Beda, my Aunt Betty and Chuck Martinez and Betty and Becky Candelaria. They were cousins. We're also owners. I worked as a. Cashier and a waitress. We would be very honored to have the park called La Lomita. Thank you. Thank you very much. Next up, David Roybal. So. David Rebel 742 West Ninth Avenue. Thank you, Councilman Clark, for the whole process naming this park and everyone as part of that. And our parks are places of gathering of culture and peace. And to see all the history that goes behind that, you want to make sure that's known. And and I just hope that I just hope that the park, you know, serves all the people well in that area and the other naming of your parks and is very good process to look forward to the naming of the next parks. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Gil Levinsky. Since 1960. Must be getting hard of hearing. My name is Gail Martinez. I reside in Lakewood now. But I grew up there at the level of meet them. My parents were one of the owners at one time. We were little kids. And we actually lived in the basement. At the academy. So it was. Quite an experience. Living there and growing up in my family and. I've said on a. Lot of different. Councils in Denver, public school. Councils and different. Westwood Neighborhood. Association president and I admire you all for what you're doing. I know it's a lot of. Work and a lot. Of time, but as. Far as the park goes, a one point I wanted to make. Was that I think that the name The Limit that not only depicts. The. People that grew up around there, the resta

urant. That. So many people. Came. Around and enjoyed for so long. But the fact that the name La La Meta also is a good name for the community that is living in the area at this time because it is a very. Large Hispanic Mexican community right now. And I think I think the name fits it perfectly. So that's basically all I wanted to say. And again, thank you all for your time. Thank you. Next up, Jesse Paris. Jesse Paris can the city council at large 2019 that starts a movement. Community Positive Action Community Committee. Network for Change and the Abraham Asilo. We approve this name change. It's good to see that you are getting community involvement. The community has been involved in this whole process. The people in this neighborhood have been involved in this whole process so we can do nothing but approve the wishes of the people. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Sekou. German Psycho Blackstar exit movement. Self-defense. Proud to represent poor working. Poor homeless people and senior citizens and students. There's not much more I can add other than to say Congratulations, you guys, for stepping up and and putting your stamp on this. And because I feel very confident that this is going to be not only a safe park, but a sacred park, because we've got the police now in charge of that. So we know this is going to be the safest park in the city to go to. I look forward to being there and having a good time. And if I'm still a little bit too long, I'll just wake me up and don't give me no ticket. Thank you. That does conclude our speakers. Are there any questions for members of council? And I'll just start by saying that everybody who's here to support this got up and spoke. So if you are here to support the renaming of this park, please, if you could stand up and show everybody on the council. Thank you very much. Are there any other questions? All right. Seeing none of the public hearing for council Bill 976 is closed. Comments by members of council. And I'll just start. You know, when I realized that there were three parks in District seven that had no name, I was baffled. I said, Wait, what is what is going on here? And started digging into them. And, you know, just earlier today at our budget conversation, we talked about the cost of your neighborhood and about often this part of Denver feeling a little bit left behind, a little bit like the city has moved on and hasn't done the same things. And to see this park that has such a rich history and so many people who immediately are attached to it and identified to it, and to go through this process with this amazing family, the proud setting is a little less formal than ours. And so I think only two people signed up to speak at that public hearing. But every time they're just about to close it, somebody else from the family would stand up, be like, okay, I've got a story and just come up to the microphone. And just it was such a joy to sit and listen to this rich history that this that this fami

ly that has built this part of South Denver for decades. To hear that and to be able to be a part of that. I was just struck by the fact that this area, this park does have a name. We've just never officially taken the steps to put a sign in it. But this is La Lomita Park. And on top of that, I just am continually blown away by this family that to recognize these deep roots and decades of building Denver and not just in this part of Denver, this family now is spread out and look at all the great things that this family is doing for our community. You are Denver. You are our city. And to say, you know what? To recognize our family. Don't use a name. Let's call it by the name that we call the place. And often we're up here and we often name parks after people and that is an appropriate thing to do. But I just think it's a testament to on one of the slides, it said, you know, the humble roots of these humble people, you're amazing. You are just amazing individuals. It is a great honor for me to represent those of you who live in my district, to represent the land that is your family's history and heritage to the city, and to be able to sit up here in my capacity and be able to cast a vote to say, this has a name, let's let's officially put it on there, let's put a sign and let's have a party is just a really amazing opportunity for me. It's one of those moments that's very special for me, and I thank all of you for allowing me to be a very small part of it, for sharing your family's history with me and with us, and for all of the quiet moments that nobody will ever know where your family for the last. 80 years has built this city and continues to build this city. You are Denver and thank you for everything. I want to give a special shout out to Anita from my office from all of her hard work on this. Just awesome. And Commander Martinez, just for I mean, absolutely. Being a rock star across everything and helping with this. And then everybody who came down, paid for parking, went through security, sat around through a long meeting to stick with us. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. And there are some other people would like to say stuff, so I'm gonna stop now. Councilman Lopez. Well, I just wanted to say congratulations, I think. You know, and any time that you're able to get a park that has not been named formally and to make it reflect the history of the neighborhood, evolve folks in that process and tell the story, I think it's a good thing.

It's a great thing. That's how the sense of Chavous Park was named. That's how weird culture was. Now we're called Park is now named Ruth Training Park. So it's just a reflection of who we are as a city and as a community. And now when people say, Hey, you want to meet up along La Lomita, I say, Yeah, sure. I'll see you at La Lomita. I say, I'll be there. I like the ring. Has a nice little it has a nice little ring to it. It's almost like a East L.A. Taco thing. And La Lomita, they don't m

ee that, right? I like it. I dig it. All right. Congratulations. Thank you, gentlemen. Lopez Councilman Flynn. Thanks for president. I was sitting here during the presentation just struck by how your family's story is so similar to so many families who will be able to recognize themselves in your heritage and enjoy this park. And Jeff especially reminded me of my family. So similar to yours, a huge Irish family. Hardscrabble. I think we use the Sears catalog. My my not the Montgomery Ward the of that when they had the outhouses but how they built themselves into the community. Now, this was back in New Jersey, but they were all mostly railroad and foundry workers. But one branch, my grandfather especially ran a dining car on the Lehigh Valley Railroad and grew that into a hotel business. And then his son, my uncle, who's now passed away, had a one of the best catering spots in Phillipsburg, New Jersey, right across the river from eastern Pennsylvania. And it's still going strong. But the way you talked about your family just struck a chord in my family's history that I said we have to honor these sorts of things in our city. We have to memorialize and make permanent the place, the places that meant so much to the people who built this city. And so, Jeff, and to the whole family, the abate of high five, some debaters who sing and who sang in my church choir for many years. Jerome and Louise and. And Tyrone. It's just such a pleasure to recognize the like. As others have said, not the family name, but the institution they built that so many people will recognize. And maybe that story gets passed down to new people in the neighborhood as well, and they'll be able to feel as rooted as you have become in that neighborhood. So thank you very much. It's my pleasure to to support this wholeheartedly. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank and congratulate you and Anita for your efforts in you know, this this process is not easy. It's it's it's lengthy. It involves going out and getting the signatures. It's a lot of work. And, you know, so for you all, first of all, to bring that to the community and to say, hey, we have a park that is unnamed and we want some help from the community to name it. And then for you all to step up and say, we've got the name. We went through this process naming a park. Up in North Denver. After former councilman Sal Carpio and. I got a. Phone call from his family about a month ago saying we're going to have a picnic in the park. It was actually scheduled for yesterday and they invited me to come and about a half an hour before we were scheduled to have the picnic. They they moved it to one of the daughter's homes because they thought it was too cold for one of the little babies. But I can envision your family going and having picnics in this park. Great. Because it's. It's now part of. Part of the history that you share with future generations who are going to c

ome to that park and say, who is this named after? And being able to have those markers at these parks, I think is really important so that it's not just a name, but it's information. I mean, unlike when you go up to our mountain parks or, you know, any number of places where you see more than just the name, you see the history of who, who the contributions came from that that left that legacy. The other important thing is. Our parks are now dedicated. So it means somebody can't come and rip up your park. The names not going to be changed. It's going to have a long term presence there for future generations in your family and other families that live in the neighborhood to enjoy it. So congratulations on all your hard work. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Or taken. I forgot to thank the Parks Department. Laura, thank you for having a process for the community to go through this and for helping us navigate it and for all of the work to do for of dedicating parks that's happened in the last five or six years. So thank you very much. Well, let's not delay any more. Let's make it official. Madam Secretary, roll call. Brooks. A black eye. Espinosa. Hi, Flynn. Hi, Gilmore. I Cashman. I can reach Lopez. I knew Ortega. I Susman. I Mr. President, I. Madam Secretary, please close voting and announce the results. 1212 hours council bill 976 has passed and the park is named. All right. Congratulations. Thank you. Seeing no other business before this body. Madam Secretary, congratulations on your first meeting. All right. We do have one other proclamation this evening, Councilman Lopez. It looks like it's yours again. Will you please read Proclamation 115, six? Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Proclamation 1156 Series of 2018 and Recognition of Francisco, Cisco Gallardo and his work Reducing Gang Violence in Denver. Whereas Francisco,

Cisco, Gado and his two siblings were raised in North Denver by a single mother after their parents divorced when he was three years old. And. WHEREAS, as a young adolescent, Sisqo found himself spending the majority of his time with his friends. The small radio clique rapidly escalated into a violent life of deadly rivalries between Denver neighborhoods. Which saw him losing friends to death in prison. And. Whereas, at age 18, he was facing 48 years in prison, ultimately sentenced to a community corrections program where he decided to regain control of his life. And help others avoid the path that he was on. Through a philosophy of Kaltura Gouda translation is culture cures. And. Whereas, Cisco built on this philosophy creating a model of how gang members can change their lives by redefining three words respect. Power and pride, redefining the philosophy and models into actions by founding and publishing two positive, viral youth oriented magazines and founding the nonprofit organization Warrior Warriors. The Aslan, which dealt with Chicano issues in the political sphere and where Siskel is currently the program director of the

Gang Rescue and Support Project Grasp a Gang Intervention and leadership nonprofit that works with Denver area youth involved in the gang activities or in danger of joining a gang. And where Cisco's presence, leadership and life's work to heal his community from generational trauma by diverting thousands of individuals from joining while helping active members leave gang activity has efforts have been recognized locally, nationally and internationally, as he has been invited to dozens of speaking engagements about his experiences and rode out of gang life to personal success . Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Council of the City and County of Denver recognizes the importance of reducing gang violence in Denver and how both active and former gang members can play an active role in eliminating gang violence in our communities. Empowering those that want to turn their life around by becoming a positive influence. Section two at the Clerk of the city and county of Denver. Solid test and affects the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and that a copy be transmitted to Francisco Cisco. I thank you, Councilman Lopez. Your motion to adopt. Mr. president, I move that proclamation 1156 series of 2018 be adopted. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of council. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. It is. Long overdue and with great pride that I read this proclamation in this council chambers to honor a mentor. A friend. A brother. In an era in our community an unsung hero. And Cisco got out of the. I met Cisco when I was on the Aurora campus. And I was completely intimidated by this guy, man. Big dude goatee. Glasses and loud. His voice was loud and I thought he was screaming at us when I first met him. But he wasn't that just his voice? And he spoke about empowerment. He spoke about culture. He spoke about identity and how that was important to us. As a community. He spoke about community work, community organizing. And he. Spoken to himself as being a Chicano and being of an indigenous man. As a. As a. As a badge of pride. And that for me was a big turning point in my life. And personally, my story, I could say, is not unique. Because a lot of people can say that about Cisco Guy. You know, Siskel and is right here in front of us. And I'm going to address you, Siskel, personally. My daughter. Doesn't know. About what color she doesn't know is that she's not allowed to wear. She's not allowed to wear or she's not she's allowed to wear any color that she wants to. In any neighborhood that she walks in. She's allowed to wear a Denver Broncos shirt if she wanted. In my neighborhood. She's allowed to wear her home colors. She's allowed to wear whatever shoes she can that she chooses to wear. Without being threatened for her life. She's allowed to walk in whatever neighborhood. In this city without being. Feared for for at least. Being killed

because of her tennis shoes or her jacket. I had to explain to her what it was like as a young man growing up in the West Side. And getting jumped because you wore the wrong color on the wrong day. She doesn't know that. I had to explain about watching coming back from homecoming at West High School in 1996 because a young man shot in front of North High School. Point blank in the chest. And our pep rally turned into the saddest pep rally we've ever had in our school campus. Cisco going out of all. You are. One of the reasons why she doesn't have to live in that kind of fair man. And I want to say thank you. You know, I know for some families it's still hard and still it's hard to say goodbye for them. But I know I write this proclamation and we pass this proclamation, Cisco, because you don't celebrate yourself and we all know of your work. You're a humble man and you've been doing this work quietly in this city at the we our standing. You and your compadres with grasp and your your. And the other folks who are who are who play the same role in healing our

community. You stand at that red tape and that yellow tape and those police lines when we're fast asleep and not even realizing what happened that night and only hear about it on the news the next morning. You prevent the retaliations? Your work is work that we are all grateful for. And then we know that there will be, unfortunately, times where. You know, we'll have those same kind of conversations that we did before, but we know that at least we have a great leader in our community, in our midst that has it's worked and continue to work. And I wanted to give you a thanks and make sure that we honor you and other folks on the city council to say the same thing in a way that and that the city does. And that's true. The city council does, and that's true by form of a proclamation. So I wanted to say thank you, Cisco, from the bottom of my heart as my hermano and knowing that a lot of money, there's a lot of families, a lot of mothers are sleeping in peace, knowing that their kids are home safe in their homes, doing their homework because of you. Thank you.

Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you, Mr. President. It's with great humility. I follow that story because my experience with you is a different aspect, which is about you getting involved civically. And so I don't know if you remember this, but seven years ago, probably shortly after I got elected, I think the new chief allowed us all and the council to give him an appointment, I think it was to interview commanders. And I felt like it was important to have a voice from someone who might have had more challenging experiences with the police or come from a background that might be different than the shoes that I walk in and that the shoes of maybe the people I knew. And so I asked around and I said, who should I appoint to this? Who would never get appointed to something like this ordinarily? And your name came u

p twice from folks who said, here's someone who at that point was already working a little bit with the police department, but also had had experiences in the community where there had been breakdowns in trust. And I think both perspectives were really important in choosing those commanders. And so I remember getting a very interesting nod from the first person from the police department when I gave them your name. But there was respect. They were surprised. Just like I had asked. I said, I want to appoint someone. No one will, you know, not the usual suspect. But there was a respect in there. Nod like that. That's a really good choice. He's going to bring a really interesting perspective. And all the reports were about how constructive and how helpful you were to that process. And if I'm not mistaken, I don't think it was in the proclamation, but I think you later went on to serve on the Citizen's Oversight Board as well. Another important role, again, working with our police department and our safety departments is important, but also understanding the challenges that sometimes happen and the need for community trust. So I want to thank you for the ways that you've been involved beyond just your work at grasp and beyond just your work with gang prevention. I think we were all touched when you gave the blessing to our new chief. And I think just the visibility in saying, I believe in this city, I'm going to invest my time in committees and meetings, and there's a lot of demands to do that kind of involvement. And I just want to say thank you for stepping up and going beyond even just this calling that you have on the streets, but also to being engaged inside the building, because that to me is is really where change happens. It's bringing the outside streets into the institution. And you've done that. And so I want to thank you and I want to thank Councilman Lopez for bringing this forward. Thank you, Councilwoman, to Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I don't know how I missed this, but I want to make sure that my name is added to the proclamation. And I just want to share some personal experiences in having worked with Francisco. Cisco, as we all know you over the years, when I served as the District nine Council person, we worked very closely on a number of gang related issues in both the North Side and the West Side. And this was a time when I believe it was under President Bush. They wanted to create the weed and seed program. And a lot of people in our community did not want the program because they felt like we had not had this great working relationship between the police and community. And a lot of families felt like this would give even more power to the police department to harass our youth . And I remember standing up at a large public meeting saying, I, for one, am tired of seeing our kids laid to rest and being put, you know, locked up. We need to do something that brings our community together and really

works towards, you know, building that bridge between police and community. And Francisco was one of those people involved in the trenches. And we had numerous community meetings that brought community together. I mean, I can remember in the Baker neighborhood, people couldn't sit out on their front porch because of the gang warfare that was going on. We actually had a

woman who was killed inside her home. She lived across the street from one of the gang members, and she was home with her five year old daughter. And her daughter had to run to a business half a block away to get her aunt to tell her that something happened to her mother and she died. But, you know, it was the the work that was done with organizations like Grasp, bringing community together and really working, rolling up our sleeves, working side by side, utilizing the resources that the weed and seed program brought to the table to hire community people, to do programs in our neighborhoods, and to give youth some viable options of things to do and to. Ensure that they weren't being only attracted to the the I don't know what's the word I'm looking for, not companionship, but the belonging, that sense of of, you know, having a place where you were welcome and recognized, but being able to do that with some some options. The curfew program was one that you were very much involved with that also ensured that our kids were not on the streets late at night, so that they had you know, they were being brought in and picked up by their parents. They were they were brought to some of our recreation centers so that they couldn't be out getting in trouble and being some of those statistics that were horrific during that summer of 92, when when we saw Flint Martinez, the young man that Councilman Lopez talked about, who happened to be a neighbor of my family's, he lived across the street from us. And to learn that it was somebody that close to home. And, you know, for parents and siblings who experience this every day and and colleagues of some of these folks, it it was very real. And to recognize how far we have come in building those bridges with community and our police department doesn't mean to say everything's perfect. We still have work to do, but we have come a long way in in building those bridges across this city, in ensuring that we're giving viable options to our young people. So, Francisco, I want to thank you for all of your work for being in the trenches. I can remember taking kids on a camping trip. This was one of the very first overnight camping trips in the mountains that the city actually approved. I can't think of the campsite a by chief host, a lodge that now has the ropes course and all kinds of other things that invites youth up there. But the Department of Military Affairs with the state of Colorado was was very involved in providing tents. And we raised the money for the food and for kids. And in the neighborhoods this hit for most of them, this had been their first

time ever in the mountains. They could see them from here, but most of them had never been in the mountains. And it was such a incredible experience for them. And so, you know, it took people like Francisco just being there and being one of those constant players that just said, I'm going to roll up my sleeves because I'm committed to making a difference for these kids in our community. And you have done that year after year after year. And thank you. God bless you for all your work. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilman Brooks. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Lopez, for bring this forward Sysco. Appreciate you. Appreciate your leadership in this city and in there has been way too many vigils that we both have been on. But I just appreciate your spirit. You know, in a in a city that's experienced in violence and when there's no answer at a vigil, you bring this amazing sense of healing. And that's special. And that's because you're called to this work you've been called out of. That violence and into healing. And I think what's so powerful about that is you invite other young people to that same path. And so I just want to thank you for that. And I also want to thank you for I think it's easy to stay in your own neighborhood. What you're comfortable with, I think, is really hard to cross over in other different neighborhoods. And I've seen you in several neighborhoods at different vigils, which is really hard for some from folks that identify with certain neighborhoods. And so I just appreciate you crossing over, man. And and now today we honor you, brother. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. And thank you, Councilman Lopez, for bringing this word. Madam Secretary, roll call Lopez. Hi, Brooks Espinosa. Hi, Susan. Hi, Gilmore. Herndon. Hi, Cashman. Hi, Carnage. I knew Ortega. Hi, Mr. President. Hi. Madam Secretary, please close voting in the results. 11 Eyes. 11 Eyes Proclamation 1156 has been adopted. Councilman Lopez. Is there somebody you'd like to bring up? Yeah, I'd like to bring up my brothers. Francisco, Cisco got out of the. If you want to come to the microphone and whoever else you want to bring up with you. Well, I just want to say thank you to each and every one of you. I brought my mom up here. Even though I might have been crazy. She was trying to do our best to keep me in check when I was younger. And, you know, I. But she's also it's a part of me, you know, even when I was doing bad, she tried to help me. And and since I've been doing good, she still helps me. And so I just want to thank you thank you, Paul, for your words. And, you know, I'm really proud of you as well, for all the work you've done and and Debbie for your continued support,

you know, even your counseling when I was still actively gangbanging. And I remember that as well, you know, way in those days. And and I really appreciate you and and the leadership, you know, that you provided and a mentor for me to just watching you do your thin

g and and proving that Chicanos are Chicanos can do anything, you know. And that's what I really wanted to, you know, say to you, I really appreciate you. And and and same with, you know, the rest of the council. Council and Brooks, too, for your work in the East Side and other parts of our neighborhoods, you know, each and each and every one of you, you know, gangs is one of those things that doesn't really care where you are, doesn't care if you have a green card or not. It doesn't care if your family has money or not. It's one of those things of what will you give up for? Popularity, you know, comes down to risk and benefit. And when you feel you don't have anything, there's a big benefit for being in gangs, you know? And and I just I realize, you know, when I was facing all that time in prison and going through all those hard times, you know. There. I knew that there was hope because I had people in the community, you know like just for the record to talk about need to Gonzalez and and Ron Picasso he was works for parks and rec for many years retired from there Jerry is where I worked at Uslan Recreation Center and I grew up in northwest Denver. And I always talk about how the communities, the people in my community, they didn't let me fall. I tried to do my best to ruin my life, but they wouldn't let me. And so I've been trying to repay back that ever since. So, you know, also through the work of other people within the city, you know, they helped me and I tried to repay that back with all these, you know, trying to do with years of service. But, you know, that's all I want to say. So I to give my mom a chance if she wants to say no, this is kind of sad, but you never know. Thank you to everybody. And. For helping my son. I love him. I'm the want to love him no matter. What you do. And he's doing good. So I feel proud. Think this is thing? Yes. Thank you. Waiting for technology to catch up. Oops. There's the motion. Can I get a second? Thank you. It has been moved and seconded the public hearing for Council Bill. One, one, two, three is open. May we have the staff report? Well, certainly. My name is Andrew Johnson. I'm here with the Department of Finance and Specialty and Special Districts here to give you the staff report on Council Bill 18 1123. This is for an ordinance approving an amended and restated service plan for an existing metropolitan district called Denver International Business Center. Metropolitan District number one. The amended service plan is being submitted for City Council approval on behalf of LC full and wider pursuant to the requirements of the Special District Act and City Rules and regulations. The purpose for this amended and restated service plan is to conform the service plan to be more consistent with service plans recently approved by the city, including adjusting the debt limitation to allow for continued development. The district supports a commercial only development as residential construction is prohibited

due to a zoning overlay currently imposed on the property by Denver International Airport. The district was organized in 1994 after city approval of the service plan on August 29th, 1994. The service plan was subsequently amended by the city on December 16th, 2000. To the district's activities shall continue to be subject to the review of the city, as provided by this amended and restated service plan. State or local law. Entered of governmental agreements. Or where the district's activities deviate in a material manner from this amended and restated service plan. The primary purpose of the District will be to finance and construct public improvements and to operate and maintain the public improvements that are not accepted by for ownership or maintenance by the city or any other entity . The District's public improvements will be for the use and benefit of the anticipated taxpayers of the district. This amended and restated service plan amends and replaces the original service plan. As of the approval date of this amended and restated service plans. All provisions of the original service plan are to be applied only from August 29th, 1994, to the approval date of the amended and restated service plan. The service plans contain the District's purpose, powers, requirements and financing plan. The District shall be responsible for compliance with the city's municipal code rules, regulations and policy and all other applicable law . The District shall ensure that the District's public improvements are designed and constructed in accordance with the standards and specifications of the city and any other governmental entities having jurisdiction. The current and proposed commercial only development will have a positive economic impact on the area, including employment and business cultivation. The district currently has approximately 205,000 square feet of commercial space. 31,000 square feet of retail space. 980 hotel rooms with a combined appraised value of \$90 million per the Denver

City County assessor. It is estimated the continued development in the district will add 2.5 million square feet of commercial space, 130,000 square feet of retail space, 1700 hotel rooms and 900,000 square feet of light office space for an estimated future appraised value of \$670 million. The total estimated costs of the future public improvements necessary to serve the continuing contemplated development is approximately \$110,200,000. In order to have the fiscal wherewithal to provide the funding for the upfront costs of the public improvements needed, the Metropolitan District shall have the ability to raise up to 500 million in debt and impose a debt service mill levy. The district will have the power to raise revenues pursuant to the authorities granted by the Special District Act, including the imposition of up to 60 mills plus rates, fees, tolls and charges for debt and district operations and maintenance. Approval of the amended and restated service plan

Ian establishes the following. There continues to be sufficient existing and projected need for organized service in the area. The existing service in the area is inadequate for present and projected needs. The district is capable of economically providing continued service to the area within the proposed boundaries. The land and the proposed development to be included, does and will continue to have the financial ability to discharge the proposed indebtedness on a reasonable basis. The facility and service standards are currently and will continue to be compatible with the facility and service standards of the city. City staff recommends approval of the amended and restated service plan. The applicant, their representatives and city staff are here tonight to answer any questions you might have. Thank you. Thank you very much. We have three individuals signed up to speak this evening. If you signed up to speak on this item, I would ask that you please come up to this front row so that we can get through everybody. When I call your name, please step right up to the podium as your time will begin to elapse. So first up on this item, we have Rick Wells. Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. My name is Rick Wells. I'm with the applicant, L.C. Ful and Wider Inc. Excuse me. And we are the developer for the International Business Center Metropolitan District. And the good news is there's a lot going on in this part of Denver. I mean, this is a part of Denver that is continuing to grow. It's one of the few parts of Denver where there is existing open land that's yet to be developed, that can be brought forth and have new, new businesses and new development occur. Unfortunately, we are we're at the point with our existing district where we have reached the debt limits. The debt limits were set very low on the original district back in 1994 because of the policy back then, it was only around \$16 million. We've already got just about that amount out in debt right now, and we need to start to build some more roads. We have more businesses, flight safety as an existing business out there that wants to add 30,000 square feet and 80 new employees. We have new commercial businesses, retail office, a lot of opportunities coming out there. And unfortunately, our district has run out of the capacity to issue debt, to build those, to build the infrastructure, the roads, the water, the sewer extensions necessary to serve those businesses. The good news is this is just a commercial only district. There is no residential. So it's not people paying property taxes on their houses. It is businesses that understand how property taxes work. They understand how metro districts work. They understand the need to get these the infrastructure built so that there is more tax base out there. So it's a functioning, well-financed district right now that just needs to expand its business. So we're excited to be here before you today asking for your approval

of this amended and restated agreement so that we can continue to do business out there and continue to expand our work. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Marianne Mcgeady. Thank you. Maryanne McGinty McGinty Becker for 57th Avenue. I was the attorney originally with the applicant when the service plan was approved back in 1994. So excited to be before you here again on such a successful project. I'm here to answer any questions you might have about the district, its history, or the application before you today. Thank you very much. And last up, Jesse Paris. Jesse Paris. Black Star Action Moment for Self-defense. Denver Homicide Law and Community Action for Change. And Also at large. Kennedy for Council at Large 2019. I'm never neither for or against this. I just wanted to bring some context to this whole thing. So I heard one of the speakers mentioned something about businesses knowing how metro districts work. A lot of people in the city and county don't even know anything about these metropolitan districts, and up until recently that knowledge was not given to the local Arnaud's. This literally just seems like business as usual. You just want to keep expanding with no resolution, resolutions, sites. Who is going to occupy these businesses? Who is going to run these businesses? Who are these people going to employ? It

seems like you are like the guy said in the very beginning, Andrew, anticipated taxpayers. So there's no people that you have no clue who these people are coming to the city, spending with these businesses and setting up shop in our city without majority of the population of the city knowing what a metropolitan district is. I just think there should be more transparency concerning this airport and what is going on in this airport. That's all. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions from members of council? Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to ask Andrew Johnson a quick question. So, Andrew, in 1994, the estimated the estimate of the approximate assessed value of build out was 126 million. Right. And the district debt issuance was 16.5 million. So the fact that we're now looking at 619 million as the. The new value of the assessed build out and 500 million for the debt issuance. Can you just clarify that? That is primarily because of the. Amendments to the IGA, allowing the city to do build out on approximately 1500 acres of land at the airport that will now allow some of that to occur. Or is this within the the 56th, an impending location that is different from the 1500 acres? If you could just clarify that? I think that would help. Sure, I'm happy to clarify it. It is out near the airport. And interestingly enough, you know, it gets up. There's a lot of conversation oftentimes about the 1500 acres that is on the airport. But this is not part of that 1500 acres at the Denver International Airport. This is an area of existing hotels that are just the current uses, ar

e a lot of hotels and office buildings that are near 72nd and tower on the west side of tower and just above that 61st and penny light rail station. So it is it's some existing commercial development. And then they need to I would say there probably like a third to a half done with their development in the ground and they need to finish out the balance of it, which is why we're looking to expand the debt authorization today. Okay. Thank you for that clarification. That was very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega, Councilwoman Gilmore. Thank you, President Clark. I had a quick question for Rick Wells. Rick, could you because Andrew kind of read about the the metro district. Could you four for the public who might be viewing this? What are the roads that through this metro district you're going to be responsible for building out? Sure. Yeah, I'd be glad to answer that. So we've got currently most of the development is right along Tower Road around 72nd on the west side of Tower. And what we're planning to do with a bond issuance that we hope to get out as a result of being able to change our metro district is to build 64th Avenue from Tower Road going to the West. And if you know the area, 64th Avenue is the intersection that also, when you go to the east is going to be serving the Gaylord Hotels. So with that opening in December, we really expect a lot more traffic in that area, a lot more activity, and that's what we're seeing in terms of commercial development. So we're going to be building 64th, sort of complete that intersection at 64th and tower and then we're as in conjunction with the district to the south. You asked about the Penn Station district. That is a separate district, but the two districts will be working together to build some infrastructure from 61st up to 64th to serve sewer needs in that DiBiase district. Because of the geography or the topography out there, we have to have sewer lift stations. We have to access the sewer lift station and Penn Station. So by connecting all these pieces, by connecting 64th, by connecting Telluride, we're also going to finish on Yampa Street, which is a north south street, just one block to the west of Tower Road. And that gives us the ability to connect all those hotels up there along Tower Road on the west side of Tower Road without getting on Tower all the way to the 61st and Panya commuter rail station. And our hope is someday after we get through a successful test with some autonomous vehicles that will soon be running around out there, that we're able to expand that service all the way up to serve those hotels and get those connected without getting on tower, without getting in a car all the way to the 61st and ten year rail stops. So those are some of the big ideas that we've got going right now out there. Okay, great. Thank you. Thank you, President Clark. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Councilman Espinosa. I. Do you have an elevator speech? So. So for anybod

y who's sort of confused about metro districts and the role they serve in building public infrastructure, just a quick one, a high level, sure. Or not as much weeds as you can get on the elevator and go to the top floor of the city council tonight. So metropolitan districts, their primary purpose is for public improvements and to lay the groundwork and finance the groundwork for public infrastructure. That public infrastructure's typically roads, sewers, wet, dry utilities even do get into like open spaces and things of that nature. But the they do that raising of revenue through the ability to impose a tax or special rate fees, tolls and charge within the boundaries of that

metropolitan district. So it's a special area that has a special tax and they do special public improvements for that area. But those have greater benefit than just that area, correct? It oftentimes it does. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for council bill 1123 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilwoman Ga. Thank you, president. Clerk. The the refinancing of this metro district will as as you've heard tonight, help us build out infrastructure that's so important. And I just want to reiterate that there will from 64th Avenue up to 72nd. There will be no residential housing in this area. So the area that we're talking about is only commercial. I know that that's a great concern, especially to folks who might have additional mills tied to their single family mortgage, because, as you know, property values rise. They have a greater tax burden. And so but within the section that we're talking about, there will be no housing that we're talking about. And so all commercial and retail, which they are most likely very well versed in how metro districts work and coming into an undeveloped area. We need these infrastructure improvements in a way to finance them. And so this is our mechanism to do that. And I will be voting in support of this, and I would ask my colleagues to also join me. Thank you, President. Clerk. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Just seeing no other comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Gilmore. I. Black. I. Broke. I. I. Glen Cashman. Carnage. Lopez. I knew. Ortega. I. Assessment. Mr. President. I. I'm secretary. Please close voting. Announce the results. 12 hours. 12 hours. Council Bill one one, two, three has passed. Councilman Espinosa, were you put to council bill 113, four on the floor? All right. Madam Secretary, please. Cause voting in those results 12 hours. 12 hours, countable. 1 to 2, two has passed. So, Councilman Lopez, now, where you put the council bill 1407 on the floor. As Council President, I moved that Council Bill 1407 series of 2018 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. And so now, Councilwoman Sussman, this is the bill I believe that you want to amend. Do you have an amendment ready? And we have our legal and legi

slative staff ready to make sure that we get the language correct. So here goes. You're ready. To work. I move that the ordinance be changed in section 20 7-1 84 F from large slash phased to large or phased. And I would propose that the motion just says that we replace wherever it's large backslash phased development, that we add the or conjunctive rather than just in that subsection so that we can catch all of the of the. Yes. Thanks. Well, what she said. So to clarify, we have a motion to amend Council Bill 18, Dash 14 zero seven, currently on the floor to change, slash to or in all instances throughout. Is that an appropriate motion on the floor? It's large backslash, phased project and we will change it to large or phased project. Large backslash to large or. Okay. So that is the motion on the floor, but I don't have a second yet for that. Can I comment first? We have to get it seconded. No, we got the second. Now we can move on to comments. Councilman Ortega was in the queue first. Councilman Espinosa, is that okay or is the sponsor do you do you want to take the first shot? It's technically a forward slash. I stand corrected. Okay. So let the record show. Forward slash in the amendment. I've never felt more. Oh. Okay. So are we good? Are we covered? Legal on the amendment on the floor, or do we need to restate it one more time? You're. You're good. We're good. Okay. Council Zone. Councilman Espinosa. That's all. Councilwoman Ortega, did you have a comment on the amendment? I have a question on it. So I'm going to ask staff and then I'm going to ask somebody representing the development team, if it's your interpretation that this doesn't do anything different than the current language that is already that was originally filed. So I'd like your opinion and then somebody from the development team. So I would say that when we said large forward slash phased project that what we meant was large or phased project, that we see them as the same. Okay. Somebody from the development team, if you could either come forward or give us a head nod. Mr. Foster. We would concur that that would probably be a consistent reading. Thank you. I see no other comments. We're going to vote first on the amended and then we'll vote on the bill as amended. Correct? I'm getting everything right, Madam Secretary. All right. So, Madam Secretary, roll call on the amendment. Black eye, Brooks. Espinosa, I. Flynn I. Gilmore, I. Cashman. I can reach Lopez. Right. New Ortega assessment. Hi, Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please call the voting and announce the results. 11 Eyes. 11 Eyes Council Bill 1407 has been amended. Now we are going to vote on the amended 1407, which is on the floor. Are there any questions or comments on that before we jump into the vote? Seeing none. Oh. Councilman Ortega. Yeah. I want to get the question answered about railroads since we're on this particular. Oh, that's. I believe that was the next public hearing. Yep. Okay. Councilman Espinosa.

So just to clarify, I am in support of the code changes as amended, but I am open to future dialog about how to make the policy better. Thanks. All right. Seeing no other comments, Madam Secretary. Raquel. Black eye. Brooks. Espinosa. I Flynn. I Gilmore. I Cashman. I can reach Lopez. I knew Ortega. I. Susman, i. Mr. President, I am. I'm secretary. Please close voting. Announce the results. 1111 I is council bill 1407 as amended has passed our rate. With that, we're going to move on. Councilman Lopez, will you please put council vote one, 2 to 5 on the. 11 eyes, Lebanese 11 eyes. Adoption of council resolution 1287 will be postponed until after the public hearing on Council Bill 1225 this evening. Madam Secretary, if you can, please, with the next item on our screens and Councilman Lopez, will you put Resolution 1409 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President, I move that council bill 1409 series of 2018 be adopted. It has been moved and seconded questions or comments by members of Council. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. We're asking for a no vote so that the risk management can bring this back with the proper amount. You'll notice on the screen it says the contract is for \$3 million. But when we finally got the contract late on Thursday and I had a chance to read all the contracts this weekend, we were actually giving them \$5 million. So it was too late to redo in time to refile for this meeting. And so the agency has asked us to kill it and bring it back with the \$3 million amount. The error, Mr. President, came in, I was told during the the RFP went out and they decided to divide the business among other providers. And so they reduced the originally intended amount from 5 million to 3 million. But in transferring the amount from the RFP to the contract, they didn't change the the 5 million to the three. It's always a good idea to proofread. So we asked for a no vote on this. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Seeing no other questions or comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black? No. Brooks. Espinosa. No. Flynn. No. Gilmore. No. Cashman. No. Kimmich. No. No. No new Ortega. SUSMAN No, Mr. President. No. Madam Secretary, please close voting. Announce the results. 11 days. 11 days. Council Bill 1409 has been defeated. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. And, Councilman Flynn, go ahead with your question. Or is this the one that. in the people who have been waiting a really long time for their chance at the microphone here. So we are going to get right into it. Councilman Herndon, will you please put Council Bill 1387 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move that council bill 1387 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved. And can I get a second? Two, it has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Councilor Bill 1387 is open. May we have the staff report? Councilman, can I. Oh, I'm sorry. Before we jump into the staff report, I apologize. Councilman Brooks, you have something that you need to do

before the staff report. So if you can hold off for just saying, go ahead. Councilman Brooks. Yep. Then can we ask everybody to take their conversations outside so we can conduct our meeting, please? Yep. Gentlemen, if you could please take conversations outside. We're still conducting our business. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. President. I wanted to alert the council members that this is a city council initiated rezoning, so I'll be abstaining from from this and just give you a quick high level. This is three organizations coming together, the GSA coalition. This is brother's redevelopment and also Colorado Land Trust coming together to actually add 80 youth in this community of swans here. And so we knock the doors in this community and did the community outreach. But because we did not do the entire community to do a legislative rezoning, to put it to use on all the properties, we focused specifically on these properties because there is an investment by Seedat for \$2 million to maintain affordability and avoid displacement in this neighborhood. So I will be abstaining. But by the council of our of our Legislative Council over there, you all can ask me questions at any time during this so you can take it away. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. And I apologize for attempting to skip you on that. Thank you for the reminder. All right. Go ahead. So thank you. So, Jeffery, continue playing in development. I'll try to be as concise as possible. So this is a rezoning request for three properties in Elyria, Swansea Council District nine. Once again, Elyria, Swansea. And we'll talk a little bit about the geography of the requests. A little funky. But it's essentially three properties that straddle both sides of 17 Elyria, Swansea, that are asking for the same thing and really have the same current conditions relative to land use and zoning. So all told, the three properties, so there's two that are contiguous to each other and north of I-70, and then there's one that is at the northwest corner of 44th and Milwaukee on total about a half an acre or 0.5 acres. And so the proposal is to rezone from ESU RD, which is a single unit zoned district to you, to you see, which would allow two units

on the property and the applicant again as Councilman Brooks. And the purpose is to accommodate development of one additional dwelling units on each of the three properties. So the current zoning again, eastside. So it's the same for all three properties. And really the surrounding zoning is the same for all three properties as well. Eastside. Again, that's single unit. And so real quick, ESD has a wide variety of standards, but it only does allow single unit residential and does not allow an accessory dwelling unit or another dwelling unit in any form. Minimum lot size is 6000 square feet. And so existing land use is single unit residential on all three properties, as are most of the surrounding properties. When you go a block or two fu

rther out, the land use mix changes. And so the requested zone districts just to highlight really quick what the difference is between ESD and Utah see is one that in the UTI you C zone district the duplex building form is allowed, which means essentially that you can get two dwelling units as opposed to one in UTI. You see you can also get an accessory dwelling unit that is allowed, but it must be accessory to a single unit residential and thus the lot size is a bit smaller than than ESD with about 500 square feet smaller. And so some images of the subject properties will start with the two on Fillmore. And so this neighborhood is predominately 1940s, one story single unit residential, as you'll see on the images here and sees the two subject properties on Fillmore. And then looking north on film, your subject properties would be on the left. Looking south on Fillmore toward I-70. And so on to images of 4401 Milwaukee. So this is the one south of I-70, northwest corner of 44th and Milwaukee, same era of development and really the same built environment generally. So 1940s development, single storey, mostly single storey, single unit residential. And you see several detached accessory structures throughout this neighborhood. And so this is the subject property on 44th in Milwaukee. And this is also the sort of problem you see. There's a detached garage coming off of 44. So it's the same property, though. And looking north and Milwaukee to be toward I-70. And looking south in Milwaukee, you see the conditions are pretty uniform in this block. And so the process to date has been our normal rezoning process. I will note planning board recommended approval of the request unanimously on November 14th. And so these are the registered neighborhood organizations that were part of the notification process. We did receive three letters of support, two of which came from the two highlighted registered neighborhood organizations, and then one is from the Elyria Swansea Coalition Organizing for Health and Housing Justice. So three total letters of support for the rezoning for all three properties, I should say. And so these are the criteria staff use to evaluate rezoning requests. I'll go through them briefly. First is consistency with adopted plans. So we do, of course, have the citywide plans, the Denver Conference Plan and Blueprint. Denver and the neighborhood specific plan is the Elyria Swansea Neighborhoods Plan that was adopted in 2015. So certainly more detail in your packet. But in terms of the conference of plan citywide policies, and I know we're updating this now, but this is what's on the books as of tonight. There's a number of policies that staff cites in the staff report, but in general, staff finds the request consistent with several strategies related mostly to encouraging a variety of housing types and housing opportunities in areas that are appropriate for the slight increase in density. Regarding Blueprint Denver So all three properties a

gain, same conditions. All three have an area of stability designation that does call for some change while preserving neighborhood character and some redevelopment at appropriate locations. And all three also have the single family duplex feature land use classification, which does identify both single family duplex and actually small apartment buildings as sort of the universe of possibilities under that land use. And so staff does find the request consistent with both of those designations of stability and single family duplex, but also a number of other blueprint policies, again related to encouraging a variety of housing types and opportunities and supporting investment at a location, as you'll see here, that's been identified through the Elyria Swansea plan as an appropriate location to accommodate some increase in residential density in an area where services and infrastructure already exist. So last adopted plan that staff looked at for the analysis was the Elyria Swansea plan. That's from 2015, and that does provide pretty specific guidance for these properties. All three of them sort of mirror the blueprint classification of single family duplex, which again does allow for a variety of housing types, single family duplex, obviously accessory dwelling units, small apartment buildings. Each of the three do share that land use designation. And so there are several policies staff cited. Again, I've got a couple quick slides here, but staff does find the request consistent with several Elyria Swansea neighborhoods plan policies. Certainly the map we just looked at, but also a

number of policies in the area Swansea planning related to. It goes further than blueprint Denver in terms of promoting a diversity of housing types and choices and it actually goes further in promoting the idea of accessory dwelling units. I want to go to the next slide here and so that all three properties are in what the Elyria Swansea plan identifies as a traditional residential area. And embedded within that definition, there's support for an additional dwelling unit in the form of an accessory dwelling unit. And I guess one of the last points, and certainly last but not least, is a plan policy to look at generally increasing the supply of housing units in this particular community in general, but specifically related to the I-70 expansion project and the housing units that were lost as part of that looking to regain those. So staff does find the request consistent with those policies. And so criteria number two essentially just says that the regulations will be consistent across all three properties. That will be true for all three. They'll share the same zoning regarding further furthering public health, safety and welfare. Staff does find the request consistent with that criteria, primarily because it would implement adopted plans by supporting a range of housing opportunities and specifically related to housing units lost during the I-70 expa

nision project. And so justifying circumstances is pretty easy to find because the clearest Swansea Neighborhoods plan was adopted in 2015. That in itself is a justifying circumstance and you can certainly cite other changes in the neighborhood relative to I-70 and other changes. With that criteria, last criteria, staff does find the request consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zone District requested to go to because of the location relative to street designations and the streets. And I'm sorry the lot pattern and configuration in the area. So that concludes my presentation. Staff does recommend approval and I know there are folks here. They've been waiting patiently from the applicant team, but I'm happy to answer any questions as well. Thank you very much. We do have nine individuals signed up to speak this evening and we will be providing it's a three minute time limit. But if there is interpretation, then it is 6 minutes to allow time for that. So first up is Jeff Martinez. Good evening, Council President and members of Council. Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. I'm Jeff Martinez, president of Brothers Redevelopment and Brother's Redevelopment on behalf of the Gas Affordable Housing Collaborative. In October 20th, in October of 2017, acquired three homes in the area, including those at 4401 Milwaukee Street and at 4675 Fillmore. In the hopes that we could rehab those homes and make them available to residents of Globeville, Elyria, Swansea as part of forthcoming an emerging neighborhood land trust. Unfortunately, the homes we acquired at the time were in tough condition, and the rehab plan was eventually modified into a plan that would essentially redevelop these sites into new housing and for new housing for residents of the neighborhood, and certainly avail that. Affordability for more families who live in Elyria, Swansea, a neighborhood. Our new plans for the site now call for construction of a duplex at both 4401 Milwaukee and 4675 Fillmore. Our proposal initially seems to conform both for use in design to existing neighborhood plans and to considerations for future plans that are city council we hope will approve in the next few years. Thanks to the grant we receive from our Department of Transportation, Brothers was awarded a \$2 million grant from CDOT on behalf of the collaborative. We believe that these sites can be the first of several sites that we can rehab and or redevelop in the Elyria, Swansea, a neighborhood over time and over the next few years and make available to these families facing displacement as a result of the expansion of the Central 70 project. So we look forward to your support for this project, and certainly we would encourage it as the developer. Of those two parcels. Thank you. Thank you. Next up. No, let me go. Good evening, Council. My name is Nolan McCallum with the GST Coalition. I just want to say thank you in particular to Councilman Brooks for sponsoring this, taking the time

to walk the streets and talk to neighbors both on Milwaukee and Fillmore. Meeting with the Gonzalez family, who is actually doing the ADA, which is separate from the land trust efforts. But we package them together and I'm actually representing them tonight because they are on their way back to Denver but were on vacation, couldn't make it tonight. So they send their regards, but they've been at every other step of the way and the way that happened about actually a year ago we went they expressed interest in having redoing their garage to be in 82. We went and met with CPD and started talking about this long process that they need to go through. And when we started rezoning the duplexes, we worked with Councilman Brooks and said, well, let's put these in a package together so that we can move it forward. We're going to wait a little bit for the Blueprint Denver process to maybe allow to use. But after waiting a little bit, we thought, well, let's

just go ahead and rezoning so this family can go ahead and have their edu. The reason that they are interested in having an EDU is because they have two older sons that they that are currently sleeping in the living room, that they would like to have their own space. And that's their reasoning for having the edu they recently bought their home in the last year. They were renting it for over 20 years before that, and the properties on Fillmore happened to be right next to each other. Just want to say thank you. Many of you have met with us and talk with us on our quest to get a community land trust. These will be the first properties that are put into the community interest and we're extremely, extremely excited about that, that we will have permanently affordable and neighborhood led, owned and stewarded land in the Swanson neighborhood. So we're very, very excited about the beginning of this adventure. We really want to thank Brothers Redevelopment and the Colorado Planning Land Trust for stepping up to the plate with us to figure this out. I don't know how we we wouldn't be doing any of this without them. And they've been amazing to work with. Sometimes it's hard to work with community, but we hope that maybe the thing like the hearing before us doesn't happen if we're working together a long time as community and developers together doing what the community is looking for and needs. That's it. Thank you so much. Thank you. Next up, Jesse Pearce. Good evening, members of council. My name is Jesse Paris. I'm here representing for Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense. Denver, home of Cell Lao and Positive Action Commitment for Social Change. And I'm also an at large candidate for Denver this year and may well. Um. This rezoning. We are, we are in favor of, um, due to the fact that there is a lack of affordability of housing in the city and county of Denver. I just hope that this development does not continue the rapid gentrification that is going on in all areas of the city, specific

ally, specifically in a various Swansea and other brown and black communities in the city. I have two questions. I want to know what is the am I level for this proposed redevelopment? And also I want to know how many units are going to be built. And what levels and rates. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Virginia Calderone. We want to know. I mean, obviously, Tina Calderon. And good afternoon. My name is Keenan Calderon. You'll be with Larry on this one, Singapore, and read all of that into your show on use. I have lived in the area of Swansea for about 28 years. Keep look at them being here for years. The project is more important to us. And I'm here because I too want to support this project that is very important to us. Queremos Boire a la familia skincare that will signal that. We want to support those families who are now without a home. For go up or their most lucrative for their service. So la familia Podemos. Yeah you that are those. Families. Because now instead of only serving one family, we are now able to help two families. Carol. I reckon ultimately most of us get asked if they have me, Senor Brooks, what kind of support you feel? I would like to recognize and greatly thank Councilmember Brooks, because he has helped us very faithfully. You see, no way to see the por por las personas. The Brother's Development. Jeff Martinez tambien can assist. Jane Harrison The Colorado Community Land Trust can assign estoppel. I would also like to thank those brothers redevelopment, jeff martinez and also Jane from Colorado Community Land Trust for their support. Nosotros estamos saki Como, Ontario. Vamos S.A. Edith Animals. Elgin. Nathaniel Siqueira M.S.. Mission. We are all here as volunteers and we want to continue serving for several more years and be able to fulfill, fulfill our mission. Which is democracy. Thank you very much. Thank you. Next up, Jane Harrington. Good evening. Um, my name is Jane Herrington. I'm with the Colorado Community Land Trust. We are a third of the three partners in the collaborative toward getting Globeville, Swansea, Elyria, their own land trust. Well, our job is to incubate those homes in and hold them in our land trust until they're ready to take them over. Although I'm falling in love with the people in the homes, it might be a bit of a battle when the time comes. They don't want to let loose of them. Um. This is a very simple rezoning request to make better use and follow the plan for the neighborhood. Make better use of these sites. So we could put duplex on house two households from the east neighborhood instead of just one for site it. So I urge your approval of this rezoning increase. I think the little side benefit of an accessory unit growing in a home next to one of the homes going in the land. Trust might spread through the community a little bit more as they see the changes and trust grows and affordable housing can happen there. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Maria Elena Jimenez. When I notice. Good afte

rnoon. Correction, we never did Mariella. Another loan documents. Well, let me correct that. My name is Marilyn. 90 minutes. Okay. So about the LA Coalition. Yes. Yes. Thumbs up agenda. El

Cambio sonification. I am a part of the GST Coalition and I am also supporting the change of zone. Berk, a mosque called La Falta de Bebe and this guy in me that I I gas hassle to Reynolds familiarize Donatella didn't espacio attraction to java but uploaded as little na who not addiction. In our community. We have a lack of housing and we also have people with homes with enough land in their backyards to have an additional dwelling unit. And Tom says the animals, as their body, as personas, think. That is what I say. And I said. Well, yes, I thought, but I was familiar with their not well-established their unique focus. If that's their view, though adult operation de las casas no pueden comprar casa in malaria or in otro lugares. Many of these families who do have that extra space to build the additional dwelling unit would probably use it and are interested in using it for whether it be a grandmother or your sons. If your sons get married and they would like their own their own space but are not are they're not able to afford their own housing right now. It's not Christmas or you're going to split on that. But it is the opportunity that gives but also throws. Randy Vamos higher than ever is the cuatro familias and those cousins those in color longer. Yeah. Part of almost are you that. I'm not familiar, but I could. But I say it will not. So we would be able to have instead of two families, have four families in these spaces and one of them would be able to have that additional dwelling unit in their backyard. Gracia Sanders Broken Skull Rules for Colonel Savaii Citadel yesterday. Nosotros is the apple. Django Tanto cola, cumbia sonification. IGF forest that created nosotros también. Yeah. Gave it a year and I've been working. Thank wants to use. I've asked some fabulous experts you know to stop the Obama app or the realm of War Room Banquet. The Alarcon Moon Grant. The Espacio Laura. And I would like to thank our council member Brookes for always visiting us and being so helpful. I would like to thank Jeff as well. It's hard to get people to believe in us. And I would like to thank Jane for her fabulous ideas. And always being here for us. Graciously went unnoticed. Thank you and have a good night. Thank you. Next up, Alma Urbano. Hello. My name is Alma Barno. I'm also a resident of Swansea for 12 years and my mom is one of the members of the Jazz Coalition as well. I'm also here representing Project Voice as a partner organization of the Gas Coalition. I'm here to completely support the rezoning of this three residence. Also because it's a first baby step to support a. Community as it fights to provide safe, affordable housing for their neighbors in distress. I would also like to thank Councilman Briggs for supporting this change in zoning, and that would be

it. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Raimunda Korean. When I notice that. Those numbers. Are on every week, the whole idea is 104 approximate people maintain. Use it. And good evening to everyone. My name is Raymond Garrison. I have been I have lived in the neighborhood for 20 years. So party is effectively a sisodia day the years. Up and it'll come before that last. One need to us on. Then the opposition would lose. That's if you have those stories. And I am part of the board for Jesus. And I would also like to thank Council Member Brookes for all of your support and all of you as well. That's yes. Thank you. Thank you. And next up, Angelina tourists. But I notice that the Los Angeles notorious slave factory La mesa directly, but as a sort of the Diaz. Good evening, everyone. My name is Angelina Torres. I am. I'm part of the board for Jesus as well. This thumbs up window. El Cambio, the sonification. But I guess if I said my topless. We. I am also supporting the change of zone so we can create duplex. The easiest to sell to sell as DELBANCO. And be able to use that line in the community land trust. Get well and set out to save lives. Atolls atoll as soon as they ingresos by the end of the year. These will be accessible to those that are of lower income or below am-I. Was is a cyclist. But I guess Elizabeth and El Corazon coming up with an idea that the special counsel, Hal Bruce, is. And I would like to thank all of the council members. I hope to touch your heart so you can help us as well. And I would also like to thank council member Elvis Brooks. Thank you. Thank you. All right. That does conclude our speakers. Are there any questions from members of council? Councilman Ortega. I just I just have one question, and this is probably for the planning department. So when we create adus, are we encouraging people to split their lots or the expectation is they remain under the same ownership on the same zone lot? Yeah, there's no I wouldn't say it at all. Encourages the splitting of lots. I think it points to keeping the zone law as is. Okay. All right. That's that's helpful. That was my only question. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 1387 is closed. Are there comments by members of council? Councilman Ortega. So I think Councilman Berkshire abstaining on this, correct? Yes, ma'am. Okay. So I just want to speak in support of this application. I know that several of us were engaged in the conversation with CDOT around trying to make sure that the \$2 million, which was part of the housing mitigation from the I-70 project would

in fact go to the community and assist them in being able to, you know, kind of be part of their own destiny in terms of identifying the need in the neighborhood and working toward solving that problem. And this project tonight, this rezoning and these two, three properties is a big step in that direction. I want to thank brothers redev

elopment and the Lowry Community Land Trust for the work and the mentoring you're doing with the GSA coalition to help build them and grow them to some point in time in the future being self-sustaining. But the work that you all are doing in the community is very important to helping make sure that we not only maintain affordability, but keep people in the neighborhood that want to stay there. So I will be supporting this tonight. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Ortega.

Councilman Espinosa. I'm sorry. When this first came. When I first saw this, I was sort of wondering why we weren't doing a legislative rezoning of more to you. But then I sort of thought about it, and I liked the idea that it was individual zoning, and maybe if that was the desire, we'd see more of that because that's more consistent to me with the way our local neighborhoods sort of evolved, right? So that we didn't just create this windfall opportunity of redevelopment. Not that. That would happen. But we see so much other development and why wouldn't it? So the one thing that sort of I wish I sort of asked in my questioning the question because my own sense about affordable housing is it's going to be modest in size and scale, unlike a lot of development that's in northwest Denver, which is sort of maximizing the build out of your property and oops, sorry. And so if you're what worries me is I mean, I sort of wish we were doing a waiver here. Right. To capture a third unit, if you were still within the form in the mass and scale of what was allowed so that we could actually get more affordable housing in a manner that's consistent. But that's.

Contradictory to whatever I've just said in prior rezonings and other things, right? Which is the sort of abuse of form. But that is the thing that I that we've lost in that was part of the prior rezoning discussion, which is the destruction of modest homes for large expensive homes. And whenever we have an opportunity to build modest homes, I sort of wish we'd do more of them. But there is no plan support for that. So I'm just riffing. I do appreciate Councilman Brooks for bringing this forward and making sure that these things happen, everything that the community has done to actually make this day happen. Right. Because you guys started the fight for money. This made you've brought voice to this need and you never back down. I mean, I know when I started running five years ago, that's when I first met Maria and Nola on her doorstep, knocking doors. Didn't know that I would see you guys so often fighting the same fight and struggling, you know, to. But we're still only another step in the way. We still haven't created that one threshold that somebody gets cross. But you're a hell of a lot closer. And so congratulations. I will be supporting this rezoning. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to thank. You, Councilman Brooks, for bringing this forward. And res

t assured, I know that you are accusing yourself from the vote, but. This is going to pass, at least on my end. I plan on supporting this. Hats off. Thank you. Mothers, fathers redevelopment. Thank you all. I know. How long you've been working so hard to have some. Kind of development. That is something like this. Right? This is a good. Opportunity to use as an example, if it can. Can be a victory in. Work in Swansea and Elyria, then it can in other. Areas. Right. It's going to be a good, good test. E gracious, I thought this was their let's get around and throw a rose there, said Senora. An organization is a company that Ianto, my son at the up at Appleyard Aston. But I can I, I don't know if Damian then I haven't addressed that as you that get a totally separate econ status I once was real Nunez I say as Anyos sister to this web source was when I said it was European. So it's another yellow one at futuro. So crisis house days but also so that are largely so a hamper. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. I will just say thank you so much for coming down, for sitting here, staying so late to do this. It's unfortunate that you got the second one of the night, but thank you for coming here. Thank you for coming to speak as part of our public hearing. I think this is a great this is great on a lot of fronts. And I won't repeat what everybody else has said. But the best part is that it matches the legal criteria by which we have to judge this. So I get to vote yes in support of this. So with that, Madam Secretary, roll call. My first thing. BROOKS Abstain. BLACK Hi. Espinosa Hi. Flynn All right. Gilmore I. Herndon, i. Cashmere. I can h. Lopez I. Knew ortega. I. Assessment i. Hi. Mr. President. I am secretary. Please cause voting in those results. 12 Eyes. One abstention. 12 eyes. One abstention. Council Bill 1387 has passed. Councilman Brooks. Now that this has passed, did you want to make a comment? Yeah, I had to give a shout out because this is one of the most

impressive organizations that I've seen to date. This community came together, I mean, real grassroots organizing right here. And then the largest community benefits agreements that we've seen from. See that over \$28 million, \$2 million directly for housing. And so I just want to thank everybody here for making this a reality and made it really easy to support. So good work. And this is just the beginning. Thank you. Thank you very much. I'll do a quick recap. Under resolutions, Councilman Ortega has called out Resolution eight, Dash 1528 for a vote under bills for introduction. Councilwoman Kennedy has called out Council Bill 1421 for a comment under Bill's for final consideration. No items have been called out and under pending. No items have been called out. Looks like we didn't miss anything. So, Madam Secretary, please put the first item on our screens. And Councilwoman Black. Will you please put Council Resolution 1528 on the floor? I move that council resolution. 18 dash 1528 be adopted. I

t has been. Move. And seconded questions or comments by members of Council Council one Ortega. Thank you, Mr. President. I am on the board of a nonprofit that partners with Northeast Denver housing in administering the trauma program, which is our rental assistance program. So I will be abstaining from tonight's vote. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. See no other comments or questions, Madam Secretary, roll call. Oh, Councilwoman candidate, did you want to get in there before we. Thank you. Mr. President, I had debated calling this out just for a comment, but since it's called out for a vote, I just think this is a really important program to highlight. So we in the city have had several rental assistance programs in the past, all with federal funding and all for the lowest income families. And the rules to qualify were so restrictive that it was very difficult for folks to use. And so when we created the Permanent Housing Fund in 2016, the council talked a lot with the department about the importance of creating a more nimble rental assistance program that could really help people when they were experiencing, for example, a rent increase where they would have to move, but they needed a little time or maybe they had one time emergencies. And so I just want to say that this program has now helped just over a thousand people. I believe in the time it's been in effect, and it has been extraordinarily impactful. We thought for some families we need it for five and six months. It turned out many only needed one or two months to get through a crisis and be able to stabilize. Whether that was stabilizing where they were or stabilizing until they could get a new place. And so, you know, these are kind of routine contracts, but one of the things we always hear in our community is people do not know about the programs that we have in place. So I just wanted to take a minute to talk about if you need help with rental assistance in Denver, you can call three one, one and three one. One will get you to the right person to apply for a temporary rental assistance. And this is not just for the poorest families in our city. It includes moderate income folks, you know, up to, you know, folks that may be preschool teachers or working in retail or working in kitchens. So it is for regular folks who are struggling with their rent. We we know about how difficult the housing crisis is. We just heard testimony during our public comments about it. So I'm excited to support this bill and just make sure that we keep talking about it with our residents so they know that it's out there. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman, can each. Councilman Brooks? Yep. I'm just putting another point, a fine point on my colleague, Councilman Canete and Councilman Kenny's. Thank you for explaining the details of it. But I want to be very explicit and say that we are hearing all over Denver that folks want help now. They want help when they're in their housing crisis. And this e

xact bill does that. This helps people in and in some of the mosques. And I appreciate you, Councilman Kenneth, for saying a thousand folks. You know, it's affecting people. When people begin calling your office and tell you how it has allowed them to stay in their homes and stay competitive in their jobs as well. And so I just want to I want to thank the council for approving this. I want to thank the administration for allowing us to be nimble and help for these folks that are struggling from month to month to stay in their homes and be competitive in our city because people want to be in our city. And so thank you so much, members of council, for making this a priority. Thank you, Councilman Brooks. Councilman Lopez. I just wanted to call out a. A bill when you get the chance. Okay. My computer is rebooting. While we get through this one and then I'll circle back. Okay. All right. So see no other comments or questions on this one. Madam Secretary. Roll call. Ortega abstain. Black Eye. Brooks, I. Espinosa, I. Flynn, I. Gilmore. I. Herndon, i. Cashman. I can each. Lopez. I knew Susman. I Mr. President. I am secretary. Please close the voting and note the results. 12 Eyes, one abstention. 12 eyes, one abstention. Council Resolution

1528 has been adopted. Guzman-Lopez okay, if we go to Councilwoman Kennedy for a comment and then I'll come to you for the bill you want. Council is reconvened. We have three hearings this evening. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. If you are here to answer questions only when your name is called, please come to the podium, state your name and note that you are available for questions of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes and there is no yielding of time on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down speakers, mostly on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane, profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from personal or individual attacks. Councilman Cashman, will you please put Council Bill 1477 on the floor? Yes, Mr. President. I move the council bill 18 Dash 1477 to be placed upon final consideration, and. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 1477 is open. May we have the staff report? Thank you, Mr. President. And Council Scott Robinson with Community Planning and Development. This is a request to rezone 1709 and 1717 Washington Street from gr05 to C and as far as property is located in Council District ten in the North Capitol Hill neighborhood, also known as the uptown area, it's at the northwest corner of 17th Avenue and Washington Street. It's about 12,500 square feet, and it's currently a parking lot. The request is to rezone, as I said, from zero five, which is general urban neighborhood context, residential office

, five story maximum height to CMC five, which is Urban Center Neighborhood Context Main Street zoning. Again, with a five storey maximum height request is to reason the property to position it for redevelopment. You can see the surrounding zoning in this map to the north and east is the same grade five across 17th Avenue to the south is CMS five, the requested zone district. And then across the alley to the west is see me eight and see annex eight. So eight stories zoning across the alley to the west. You can see the mix of uses in the North Capitol Hill neighborhood are pretty varied. There's single unit residential, multi-unit, residential office, retail, mixed use and quite a few parking lots around the area. The subject property is on the bottom right photo and then you can see some of the other surrounding properties in the other photos there. This one to Planning Board on December 5th, 2018 received a unanimous recommendation of approval. There was no public comment at that meeting and went to the Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on December 11th, 2018. In your packet, you should have seven letters of support from surrounding property owners and business owners, as well as a letter of support from the Uptown on the Hill Register Neighborhood Organization and a letter stating They're not taking your position from the Capitol Hill. United Neighbors are now. In order to approve a rezoning, the city must find that these five criteria have been met. The first criterion is consistency with adopted plans. There are three plans that apply to this property. The first is Comprehensive Plan 2000, as described in the staff report. Staff has found the proposed rezoning is consistent with these four strategies from campaign 2000, mostly relating to infill development, mixed use development and creating areas for neighborhood serving retail, which would be consistent with the proposed CMS five zone district. The second plan is the blueprint. Denver from 2000 to the concept land use designation for this property is urban residential, which calls for primarily residential at higher density, but with complementary commercial uses scattered throughout. It's in an area of change, which is an area where the city is determined. We want to channel additional growth. And 17th Avenue is a mixed use arterial, which calls for higher intensity, mixed uses development along it, which means it's an appropriate place for those complementary commercial uses in the urban residential area. And Washington Street is a residential collector, again, calling for somewhat higher density, more intense development. So staff finds it's consistent with the recommendations of Blueprint Denver. The third plan is the Uptown Neighborhood Plan from 1986. The plan calls for encouraging mixed use and housing development encouraging compatible development with the surrounding character concentrating retail uses along 17th Avenue between Sherman Street and Clarkson Street

, which includes this property and saying users along 17th Avenue should be pedestrian oriented, which seems five Main Street zoning. Zoning is intended to create pedestrian oriented, pedestrian friendly development, so staff finds the proposed rezoning consistent with the adopted plans in the first criterion. That the second criterion is uniformity of district regulations. Staff finds the proposed rezoning, which would result in the uniform application of the CMC five zone district. The third

criterion is to further the public health, safety and general welfare of the city. Staff finds the proposed rezoning would do so by implementing the city's adopted plans and facilitating the redevelopment of the parcel in a pedestrian friendly manner and serving the community. The fourth criterion is justifying circumstances. Staff finds the proposed rezoning justified by the changing and changing conditions in the area. There's been quite a bit of development and redevelopment in the uptown area over the last few years, an increase in the residential population, creating an increased need for community serving retail that would be allowed under the proposed CMS five zone district. And the fifth criterion is consistency with neighborhood context, zone, district purpose and intent. Staff finds the proposed rezoning would facilitate development consistent with the description of the urban center neighborhood context and the purpose and intent of the CMS five zone district, which is intended to apply primarily along collective arterial streets where a building scale of 2 to 5 storeys is desired. As I mentioned, 17th Avenue is an arterial, Washington street is a collector. The current zoning already allows five stories. There's CMS five zoning across the street on 17th. So this is an area where the CMC five zoning is appropriate and staff therefore finds all five criteria are met and recommends approval. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much. We have three individuals signed up to speak this evening, so if you're signed up to speak on this item, I'd ask that you come up to this first bench so that you can step right up to the microphone when I call your name as your time will start to elapse. First up, we have Bill Ferguson. Good evening. I'm the owner of this property and thank you for considering this rezoning request. I've owned the Avenue Grill Restaurant across the street for the last 33 years. 32 or three years. And the De Avenue Grill Building is currently zoned CMC five and of just for an odd reason. What's commonly known as the Avenue parking lot across the street is zoned gr05. So the request is to maintain the Main Street character of 17th Avenue to allow the a greater sense in meet the want needs of the neighborhood, which is a very pedestrian friendly, very community friendly neighborhood. And to allow retail on the ground floor of what is now commonly known as the Avenue Grill parking lot. So I believe that if we consider t

he dynamics of my neighborhood, that we would all agree that the pedestrian friendly Main Street nature of 17th Avenue in Washington would definitely accommodate retail on the ground floor of the what is now a05 designation to accommodate a CMC fine. So I appreciate your time this evening and I'd encourage you please to consider this rezoning request. And if you have any. Questions, I'm available to answer any of your questions. Thank you very. Much. Thank you. Next, Bruce O'Donnell. Thank you. Council President of members of Council. I am Bruce O'Donnell, 386 Emmerson Street, Denver, Colorado. And I'm the owner's representative on this application. And as has kind of been explained, the current road zoning only allows residential and office uses and actually prohibits the activated ground floor pedestrian oriented uses that's available in the Main Street zoning . And so the purpose of this zoning is really just to achieve that. We are keeping it the five stories. We have five story zoning today and we're not asking for a height increase with the going to the CMC five. And as was stated, we've had unanimous approval at Planning Board and part of the discussion there was that it's hard to have a main street if only one side of it has main street zoning. And so it makes perfect sense to see that both sides of 17th Avenue have Main Street zoning on this block. As was stated, we worked with both Chan and Uptown on the Hill and have support from Uptown and Chan didn't think it was a significant enough change to even take a position. And then we also in your packets there are letters of support from neighboring property owners. So with that, I want to formally request the City Council vote to approve Council Bill 18 dash 1477, rezoning 1709 and 717 Washington from zero five to CMC five. And Mr. Ferguson and I are both available to answer any questions. Should you have any? Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Jesse Pierce. Good evening, members of council. My name is Jesse Paris. I'm representing for Denver Homeless Outlaw Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense and Positive Acts of Commitment for Social Change. And I'm also an at large candidate for 2019. We are against this. This neighborhood has been rapidly gentrified. I see it every day. I was born and raised in this neighborhood and I don't even feel safe or like I belong in this neighborhood. And to see that you guys are sitting up here accepting this rezoning for a property that clearly has been gentrified, the whole neighborhood has been gentrified, and you just want to make these yuppies more happy. We're not standing for this. We need a attainable, affordable housing right now. This bottom level could be used for that. It cannot. It could be used for that instead of this commercial use. But it already meets all the criteria. So we already know you're going to go through with this. So I just ask

you not to go through with it, but already know you're going to go through with it. Thank you. T

hank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions from members of council? Councilman Ortega Thank you, Mr. President. CRUZ Would you mind coming to the microphone, please? I'm just curious. It sounds like a pretty minor change. Realizing that the code has to be changed in order to. Just codify what the current. Character of the site is of the property. How long did it take you to get through the zoning application process? Oh, boy. I'd have to double check that. I think we probably did the pre-op back in maybe even April or May, so probably in the 9 to 10 month. Okay. Range. All right. Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for Accountable 1477 is closed. Are there any comments by members of council company? Yes, sir. Looking forward to seeing the redevelopment of this property. 17th Avenue should become a quiet, quiet street. Boy was so much a development with housing development and some of the best restaurants being created too. So I'm really proud to support this and I encourage my colleagues to support this. And I know Mr. Ferguson will create a great project there that the neighborhood will be proud of. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Councilman. Now seeing no other comments. I'll just add thank you to staff for putting together the staff report for us. I think this clearly meets the criteria. And because of that, I will be voting to support Secretary Roll Call on Council Bill 1477. New Black II. Brooks II. Espinosa. I Flint. I Gilmore. I heard it. Hi. Cashman. Hi, Kenny Lopez. Hi, Ortega. Hi. Hi, Mr. President. I am secretary. Please close voting announce results. 13. 813 IES Council Bill 1477 has passed. Councilman Cashman, will you please put Council Bill 1539 on the floor? I move that council will series 19 zero one to be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. The public hearing for Council Bill 19 0128 is open. May we have the staff report? Teresa Lucero with community planning and development. This is another rezoning. It is 4999 Jasmine Street, and the request is to reason from a Chapter 59 PD number 223 to urban edge mixed use three stories. So it is in Council District five in the Montclair neighborhood. This just gives you an idea of the location of the property. It is about a quarter of an acre, 11,700 square feet. It is an existing three story office building. Again, the proposal is to rezone from an old code PD to urban edge mixed use three stories and the request is to move the remove the beauty standards so existing zoning surrounding the site is urban edge single unit to the north and east well north of the R three, which is a Chapter 59 multi-unit zoned district. And then to the south is the urban edge. Mixed use two story. So land use, it's an existing office building. There is multi-unit to the north, commercial to the south and west and then multi-unit to the to the west and

south west. It's kind of gives you an idea of the area that there is a six story residence, multi-unit residential directly across 10th Avenue and then commercial on the lower left directly west of the property, and then single family upper right, directly across Jasmine Street. And then another two storey building and two storey multi-unit residential directly south of the property. So the urban edge context is that blend between suburban and urban, primarily single and two unit residential, small scale multi-unit commercial embedded in our in the residential areas. And it's intended to promote pedestrian scale, diverse areas that enhance the convenience of walking, shopping and public gathering. So informational notice on this application went out in September of 2018. The planning board was posted properly for their public hearing on February 6th of this year, and they unanimously supported this rezoning. And then Luti committee passed this forward and public hearing is tonight and it has been properly posted. We do have a few R and O's in the area. No R.A. has commented on this application. We do have one letter of opposition from a resident of the multi-unit across the street. And the concern there is parking issues in the neighborhood. So you know, the criteria, the plans that apply our current plan 2000 and Blueprint Denver there is no small area plan. Staff believes this conforms with several strategies and current plan, speaking to the re-use of existing buildings, expanding the diversity of business in the area, and infill development that's in character with the neighborhood. And on the Blueprint Denver map, this is in an area of stability and a neighborhood center concept, land use. These are small shopping areas embedded in neighborhoods that mix the services in the neighborhood. And Jasmine Street, as far as street type, is an undesignated local street providing local access and as well as 10th Avenue is a non-designated local street staff believes this does conform with our adopted plans that by using a standard zone district where it is consistent and uniform in our application of zone districts, by implementing our plans and allowing some re-use of an existing structure, we're furthering the

public health, safety and welfare and justifying circumstances, our changed conditions and the rezoning of a former Chapter 59. There is some new multi-unit to the southwest of the site. There's new multi-unit at ninth and Colorado, just a few blocks to the east, there was a redevelopment of Rose Hospital campus. There's some redevelopment on Colfax Avenue. So there is some recent changes in the area. And staff believes this is consistent with the zone district purpose and intent. The proposed zoning is consistent with the urban edge context and the intent of the three AA to promote those safe, active, diverse, pedestrian scale neighborhood shopping areas. So with that, staff recommends approval. Thank you very much. We have two individuals

signed up to speak on this. So if you signed up to speak on this one, if you want to come up to the front bench. And first up is Paul Wilkinson. Yes. Hello, my name is Paul Wilkinson. I am the owner of the building. My law firm occupies the building and I am here to answer any questions that anyone might have. Thank you very much. And our next speaker is Jesse Pearce. He's just in Paris representing for Deborah Holmes of Low Black Star. It's a moment for self defense and positive commitment for social change. And I'm an at large candidate for the May 2019 election. I'm on top of the ballot, and I reside in Albert Brooks District, a District nine. I was at the city subcommittee meeting for this. Already know you're going to approve this. There's nothing I can say that's going to change your mind on this. So I'm just going to let you do what you do. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions from members of Council on this item? All right. Seeing no questions. A public hearing for Collinsville 128 is closed. Are there comments from members of council council on assessment? Yes. This is actually the the neighborhoods didn't have any particular feeling one way or the other, because we're just moving this from Chapter 59 to what is. No, it's not a question. It's just a comment, a moving of chapter from a PD to a what it would normally have been assigned as it is, and it has there is no intention of changing the use of it. It is going to continue to be an office building. So just wanted to mention that. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Seeing no other comments, I'll just say thank you to staff for all your work on this. I think this clearly meets the criteria and I'll be voting to support it this evening. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 128. SUSSMAN Hi. Black I froze. I. Espinosa I slid. I. Gilmore I heard it, I. Cashman All right. Lopez. Hi. Ortega. Like Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close voting and note the results. 12 hours, 12 hours. Comfortable 19 0128 has passed. On Monday, April eight, eighth, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 246 regarding the service plan for Denver International Business Center, Metropolitan District Number one. 11 eyes, one nay council bill 302 has passed as amended. Councilwoman Sussman, now, will you please put Council Bill 303 on the floor? Sure. I move the council bill 19, dash 0303 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Councilman Thank you. Councilman Sussman. Councilman Cashman, would you like to formally offer your amendment to Council Bill 303? Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Council Bill 19, Dash 303 be amended in the following particulars on page two Line one Strike April ten, 2019, and replace with April 23rd, 2019, and on page two line to strike number 20190013 and replace with number 20190013a. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. It has been moved and seconded. Comments. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. I wo

n't repeat my lengthy remarks, but as I stated before, the purpose of this amendment is to allow for inserting a sentence on page 27 under the vision introduction. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Madam Secretary. Roll call on the amendment. Black. Hi. Brooks. Hi. Espinosa. I. Flynn I. Gillmor, i. Herndon, I. Cashman I can. Lopez All right. New assessment. I. Mr. president. I. I'm secretary, please. Because voting announced results. 12 hours. 12 hours counts of all 303 has been amended. Councilwoman Sussman, we need a motion to pass as amended, please. Certainly. I move that council bill 19 dash 0303 be placed upon final consideration and do pass as amended. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Comments by members of Council on three or three calls from Sussman. Oh, thank you very much. I really enjoyed the discussion about Blueprint and having all the people that were on the task force with me come here tonight. I mean, it was just amazing. Joel Noble and Kimball, of course. Kimball Kringle. But Margie Valdez hadn't seen her in a while. Gabriel Gillham. Perry BURNETT. Paul Andretti. John Desmond. Caitlyn Quander. It was well, I don't want to miss anybody. Stuart Tucker was here, but he didn't get to talk. Jeff Walker. Heather Noyes. Angel. I mean, it was like old home week having you all here. I mean, we did this for three years, meeting regularly and got to know these folks pretty well. The amount of work that went into this on the part of the staff, it was just incredible. But also the volunteers, as so many

volunteers that just gave up their time to do this. And and certainly the the recounting of our task force meetings was really very authentic, where people would, you know, they would we didn't always agree with each other, but we certainly found a way to craft what I think is a lovely plan for land use. And I will be voting for this tonight. And I want to thank all those who are on the task force for everything they did and for how much they taught me. It was what and how much the staff taught me to. It was, I really think I should have a few hours of college credit for it, but. But nobody gave me a test, so. But it was wonderful. Thank you for the experience. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I want to thank the staff. I am. I don't know about other council members, probably all of us, but I personally sent you dozens of edits to the various plans, and I appreciate that almost all of them were made. The few that weren't. You explain to me why. And I followed along with those sticky notes. It is a new standard. Someone suggested it's a very high one, but I was able to track where and why changes were made through the versions and so it was a really extraordinary process. I feel the need to chime in, not because there's a lot to be said about the plans, but because I feel like it's important to speak to those constituents who asked me to vote for DeLay and why I'm not able to do that toni

ght. I read everything I got, and in almost universally, the requests for DeLay were based solely on timing and not based on specific language in the plan or something that they were concerned about or articulated that they would like to be different. So I would say, okay, so what is it you would like to be different? What do you think a new council or a new mayor would add or take away? What would change? And in the converse, I did not get that detail in. In comparison, those who wrote me or communicated their support listed out very specific things in the plan that they thought were urgent and needing to move forward. I don't ever mean folks who've heard me talk before know that I don't count out pros and cons. So we had more pro speakers tonight. If the con speakers gave and persuasive to me that there were specific things either missing or wrong, that we would do differently, that would have been important. And to me and it wouldn't have mattered if there were three of them and a hundred of the others I want to share . There's just two exceptions. And that was, you know, the folks from Washington Park West Wash Park did identify a couple of things about concerns that they didn't want to take on more missing middle and concerns about the adus. And I guess that I would say that this is where I point to the good news and the bad news. And this is to Councilman Flynn's point, the plan is not self-executing. And so it's good that it's not. If it were self-executing, we would have taken 13 years and everything we would have done in the beginning would have been moot. So you have to do this in phases. You have to start with 30,000 feet and of course, 30,000 feet never has as much certainty as 10,000 square feet, you know, 10,000 feet. So I. I and I. I just want to highlight this was well covered by others, but for me, what I can't wait on is the vast majority of communities that are seeking more access to ADOS. I believe there's a way for the implementation conversation to handle areas without alleys differently, and I believe there is that, you know , an ability to to handle some of those other pieces. But I've been asked for that since I took office. And so to delay that simply because other folks asked for delays that we gave them does not, to me make a compelling case. Secondly, the equity pieces I used to be an organizer and I used to. Work. Really hard in like year long planning processes to get a sentence on affordable housing, one sentence so that I could then come back and lobby the council to implement that one sentence when some rezoning happened later. I can't believe the level of integration of equity in this plan and I will be there holding you very responsible to all the implementation. As the staff already knows, I ask for an FTE count and how many folks will be moving over to implementation. You know, I want to get right on the large redevelopment question. So I think that that to me can't wait. I can't look at constituents who

are saying to me, don't let the big zoning happen. Don't let that big redevelopment happen without equity as they were here, stewing just was that just last week on 40th, two weeks ago, two weeks ago, they were just here saying, don't let this keep happening. And this plan says you now have the legal authority to do something different in the zoning process, which is a big deal. We always get really strict rules about the zoning process. Now it says no big rezonings. Without that, I can't in good conscience not move that forward immediately so that the implementation can begin. And, you know, if there's a wholesale change in this council in the mayor, there will be, you know, decades of area plans to alter each piece of this. I believe that I heard enough public support from diverse enough individuals, both based on racial backgrounds, neighborhoods we had far northeast

here all the way to to, you know, Cap Hill and other, you know, very different neighborhoods. Heather Noise you there are some folks here who are not easy folks to talk about development and change not to pick a new poor Heather but we have some intense these are not easy folks who came up here saying they have high standards for this city and I've seen them oppose things as well. So that tells me that I think no matter who's up here, we probably have the support we need. But for me, I want to put on the record, I, I will be supporting this tonight based on those reasons. And I want to thank each and every one of the individuals who spoke today and who were involved over the past years. You did far more work than I did. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennedy to Councilman Espinosa. You know, first, I want to acknowledge the incredible effort that went into the documents under consideration tonight. The effort was both necessary and worthwhile. I particularly want to thank David Jaspers for thoughtfully considering and appropriately incorporating any and everything District one introduced in shaping the final outcome. Thank you. I also want to acknowledge the work of CPD because as far as a plan at this altitude, 40, 30,000 feet can this plan articulates a bold consideration of many of the concerns I have expressed from this dais over the course of this. My first and only term as a district representative. I know District One has had among the most robust input on these plans. And their vision and and their vision and desires are well incorporated into these documents and have made them far better. I am going to ask that you understand that my comments are not a rejection of what has been done, but what is needed to advance it. What I feel this plan is missing is the how the how is the key an element and is the source of much of my consternation or much consternation by many, myself included . While there are many related invalid concerns, many of which were shared tonight, my vote tonight is about what is missing. The how I recognize the how is the role of other tools other th

an comprehensive planning documents. But for many communities for many years this plan blueprint Denver will vote is most. I edited and I edited it and I still screwed up this sentence. I don't even know what I was trying to say, but for many communities for many years, this plan blueprint Denver is most directly responsible for accommodating growth and will be the only gaining. That's what I'm getting at. This will be the only guiding document for those communities for years, especially in northwest Denver where three fourths. Of our neighborhood. Statistical neighborhoods do not have small area plans and never had. Therein lies the problem for me. Much of the displacement and gentrification in our communities isn't just a condition of market conditions, but how those forces interact with our land use policy and the tools available to our communities to shape those policies. And just as this plan clearly acknowledges and documents, not all communities are equal, or as the plan reads. Neighborhoods with more resources often are able to have stronger voices in negotiations. Equity includes a community's ability to comprehend plans, a community's expertise to use and challenge plans, and the time and financial resources needed to ensure that the quality of life they aspire to have can become reality. For example, last Monday night, we approved the rezoning in northwest Denver at the corner of 32nd is shown in Highland with the guidance of Blueprint Denver within the guidance of Blueprint Denver. The existing one was in direct conflict with the neighborhood's desires, leaving the neighborhood to negotiate with Denver Housing Authority, the developer to get a win win outcome. In this case, the community had the resources and expertise to negotiate a desirable outcome for the residents most impacted by that rezoning. The adoption of this plan blueprint Denver will have a direct impact on rezonings and in my neighborhoods for years to come in communities with means and communities without. And that's true for all of Denver. Why this matters is that this plan, more than anything else, maps a way to capture substantial increase in population, allowing for significant density to permeate most, if not all, communities. The justification is supposed to be driven by the six vision elements, but most fall outside the scope of city reviewers is staff struggled to keep track of customized zoning that typically had hard coded requirements. How are they expected to define something as subjective as these vision elements in real time? That's where the discrepancy between the haves and the have nots will continue to play out. Fueled by the capacity goals in these plans, trying to capture density, God help those underserved communities that are the next Jefferson Park. See if the development community cares if they won't run roughshod over you. The ones that do are the exception, not the rule. With the implementation plan listing timeframes in years and most neighbo

rhoods as far as a decade, in some neighborhoods as far as a decade out from neighborhood planning, there is too much vulnerability built into this document. Blueprint Denver should have

language identifying items for immediate implementation. It should have had concurrent text amendments to the zoning code to add safeguards to vulnerable communities, particularly the former areas of stability. It should have. It should mandate the use of customized zoning or overlays created after the plan. This plan's adoption as a requirement on all map amendments, a.k.a. rezonings and communities that without adopted neighborhood plans, or if the adopted neighborhood plan is less than 12 years old or older than 12 years old, they should say. Given these concerns and the items I mentioned which are lacking, I cannot support this adoption and the unintended consequences it will have on our communities without means. Density. Without the tools to address the totality of the plan. Vision elements transform today's vulnerable will transform today's vulnerable but desirable low income communities into low hanging fruit. For profit motivated speculators to build disposable fees, simple unit or market rate towers and get out. Paving the way without concurrent regulatory guardrails is an environmentally irresponsible intergender and intergenerationally unjust for all Denver rights. I wish we could take a few weeks to author text amendments to blueprint Denver and the zoning code to mandate CPD led customized zoning for vulnerable neighborhoods, or those statistical neighborhoods that have never had plans and now have mapped high density place types without prior direction. These would be critical to advance the objectives of this plan, lacking this important safeguard against unintended consequences. I will be voting no for this document as is. I do again genuinely appreciate all the hours of the committed and committed and committed hard work of those involved residents, stakeholders, and most importantly, David, Sara and your colleagues to get this far in this process and craft what is, in all honesty, a remarkable, truly remarkable plan. So I'm sorry I won't be voting in favor, but it is a wonderful document nonetheless. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Councilwoman Brooks. Well, I will. And I want to say, you know, I was looking at Karen Champagne's shirt. It says Denver. And I got so tired of looking at that thing in the DMV when folks will be outreach into our office in Hay and we would be inviting people to come to meetings in three people would show up and we would send emails and emails out to our entire lists and 17 neighborhoods in District nine. Three years ago. And two years ago. And not a ton of engagement. And so, you know, for the individuals who have emailed me and called me and asked for a delay, I think we got to do better as a community. You know, yes. There's always things that we can do from the government side to improve our outreach. And I think

community should push us to improve that outreach. But I attended the meetings. I sent the emails with no replies back. I met with community activists and organizers and ANA leaders and nonprofit leaders and asked them to be a part of this to no avail, and still pushed CBD and make sure that there was equitable outreach. Make sure that. That we were doing. Going to hard to reach communities and pushing the envelope. And I think part of the reason is we're under a lot of pressure here in Denver. There are a lot of pressing issues. And if there was a drainage project in I-70 project, I could get 100 people in the room. But if we're talking about who we're going to be in the next 20 years, I only give five people in the room. And so there's some challenges and there's enough to go around. But I needed to acknowledge that as a leader in the community and say we all need to do better around that. The other thing I want to say is, boy, you know, I've been doing some projects for eight years and have never been able to look at the legal criteria that says, hey, because your community suffered redlining and they did not lend to African-Americans in this community, we can now do equity. We had to we had to make that up. I couldn't say that in front of our attorney. Now, today, we can, as a part of what we want to see in inclusive building, inclusive cities in this community. And so I'm going to be supporting that on removing not just barriers of race, but gender as well in this city is is incredible. I hear this more than anything else. There's three things why I'm voting for this. Well, actually, I'm voting for this because it meets the criteria and all that kind of stuff. But these specific issues have come from the community, both from activists, organizers, nonprofit, are know community equity. We want that to be a number one issue. Intersectionality. Stop just thinking about zoning. Think about parks. Think about transportation. Think about economics. The intersectionality of what happens in our city is in this plan and it's powerful. And that was touched on tonight. But I want to just be specific and explicit and say intersectionality and what we do is very important. And then the growth. Growth is such a big topic. We're talking about it all the time. We're afraid of it. We don't know what to do with it. And my the thing that I've been encouraging folks is this is an excellent way to see what to do with growth and growth. And it's about harnessing it in the right specific areas of the city. And I think we've done a

really good job of that. So I'll be supporting this. Government doesn't stop for elections. And I just want to say that explicitly, we don't stop for elections. There are over 10,000 employees who are not elected and work their butt off every day. And I just want to say, hats off to you all. I'm sorry you're caught up in all of this craziness. It'll be over, hopefully in 15 days or whatever. But thank you for working so hard in the

midst of all of this as staff folks. And I know you've been through a lot through the community, but we see you and we appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Brooks, Councilman New York, for sure. Yeah. I want to say thank you again for the quality. The work you've done is so low. I enjoy so much to hear all my colleagues and I hear the people in the audience an implementation. Implementation that's so key. There's the quality of a plan, the way we all feel about it. When you can say, let's do it, let's go ahead and implement. So I just want to thank you again for setting it up to such a high level of quality that now we're ready to say, let's go do it. So I just want to encourage the mayor. I know the mayor probably loves this plan as much as everybody here. And as we go through the planning and for the budget process, we'll be thinking about resources for next year. But but also we need to be thinking about just like we did for for this planning process, we need to be thinking about the next 20 years of the financial resources. We need to implement this plan as well as address all those key issues we've got. We've got huge issues. We've mentioned affordable housing, transportation, homeless problems that we're going to require a lot of resources that fit into this plan, like I said. So I just would encourage the mayor to to take this plan and be ready to implement it and do what he can to bring us all together to see how well we can develop this city. Thank you, Mr.. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr.. President. Yeah, for me, three things come to mind that haven't ever been said in any plans I've read. He's never said equity. I mean, it seems like a duh. It must have been, but it was never held out as a value before. And it still isn't in the plan until we adopt this it for the first time in any plan in the history of Denver. It talks about that on all of our streets. The safety of pedestrians and pedestrian movement is paramount. And for me, I'm a fan of ADOS now. I don't read Blueprint saying that there's going to be a use in every yard it holds up to use as a value to be considered on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis. And that's going to be an important discussion. So I think to delay this endangers the well-being of our citizens. So I'm very much looking forward to moving this forward. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to add a few comments in here. I do understand, you know, to not feel and see the pressure in Denver is to really not see and feel the pressure people in Denver and what they're facing. And I think it's critical that we don't dismiss that, but we realize that that is. A true. Issue. And as Denver is growing by leaps and bounds, we have to address it. But we cannot do it in a way that is irresponsible. And I say irresponsible because a lot of the things that we're facing don't just happen through zoning. I mean, you c

annot fair. Well, things have to match up. When I first took office, we were in the midst of a recession. Nobody was building. We are just we were about to embark on the 2010 rezoning the whole city. And here I was, brand new city councilman. I didn't know. I got to admit, I didn't know very much about zoning, but I learned quick and we made the right moves. We made the right moves for the time because during that time, so much pressure was on West Colfax and in some of these areas. And we actually down zoned we down zoned from R two to R one with eight to use. We did eight to use before. It was cool. Only two were built, but we did to use before it was cool. And now you see where the dividing line is and you see all the developments going. No, it's it's it's right there along 12th in Villa Park in the West Side. However, we because of lack of of being able to have something a little bit more descriptive and customized, we now have people who live in very tiny homes on big old lots and new folks coming in can't afford to actually live there because it's a small house for 500,000. It straddles old red line. If you go north of Colfax, everybody's property values are hunky dory. If you go south of Colfax, you think it's two different cities. That's redlining, ladies and gentlemen. That's not neighborhood boundaries. These are all red lines. So as much as we really like and love our neighborhood boundaries, we've got to think beyond that. We got to think fluid. We got to look. We got to redefine neighborhoods in our own minds and how we how we approach this with the plan and how we use this plan in the future. It is a guide, right? It isn't the end all, be all. It is going to take political will from the next council and a heck of a lot of leadership to get us to where we need to be. I say that because and this is not to slam anybody out at the staff at

Denver. I did an amazing job of keeping us abreast of everything, of every step that we were making. And the first step. The first meeting I remember the first meeting I was like, Wait a second, where are we having these meetings and where are we not having these meetings? You skip West End Zone. No, no, no. We got it covered in quadrant so I can't think of the city and quadrants the west side. We should be having a meeting here at Gorky Park Gonzales Library. That turned out to be one of the most fruitful meetings for this whole process. And the majority was done in Spanish. This will help us guide what Denver's growth will look like, how we manage it. And we all I talked about the role of government in leadership. You have to push your representatives to make sure that they understand that what your definition of the role of government is and that it's okay to wander into the forest there. I. Wasn't really aware of where we were headed in the district until and understanding this plan and understanding our future until some friends came over from bigger city and we went to go watch the Raiders Bronc

os game and they said, Oh, you live downtown. And I live on seventh and I live like on like seven. KNOX So no, I don't live no downtown. Yes, you do. It's right there. You live downtown in our city. You live downtown. And I thought to myself, you know what? I kind of do live downtown compared to Flynn land over here. So I live downtown because that is total. I mean get Pinehurst that area that the good Costco that one that's the suburbs we are downtown compared to that and when we looked and we we had these conversations in our community, in our neighborhoods with this plan and these maps. Why the heck do we only have single family homes right here, right here by the light rail? Can we pick it up a notch? And if we don't do something about it, the free market will come and they're going to make a patchwork quilt out of our neighborhoods. So if we don't lead, we don't have a plan and we will have a plan to fail. And so we cannot afford to fail. And I'm sorry to go off here, but. We have to have a plan and this plan can be amended. This plan can be revisited. It is nimble, it is fluid. It can be changed and it should be, but it cannot be successful if you don't have a budget to fully fund our staff so that you have planners that are going to be working on these neighborhood plans and implementing these neighborhood plans. We can't just say, Hey, Sarah, come over here. Hey, we can't split people in two. You saw this, Chester, when you were on staff. It was so hard. Steve, each other. Come, Chester, Steve and Chester. But you know how amazing that Westwood neighborhood plan was? For the first time in a plan, we use the word Mexican with pride to describe Westwood. We actually called out Little Saigon and talked about cultural centers, and that's the kind of work it's going to take. But you have to have a fully functional, budgeted staff that matches the resources of what's in front of it or the resources to match the, the, the. The, the. The staff and the desire. You have to have leadership from our council and you have to start thinking about community benefits. Every step we make, we have to ask ourselves, how does this benefit the community and what can we use from these developments to help come back to the neighborhood? How can we use this these developments to help come back and benefit the community? So that's where I'm headed. I am supportive of this because I do believe in a plan and not a plan to fail. The last thing I have to say about timing, I understand it. But you cannot I cannot go back to Westwood. I know the West Side, to all those folks that organized and spent years on this in their own communities, taken, taken time off of their jobs, real jobs, cleaning our buildings, building our city, teaching our kids just so they can come and volunteer and be part of this. To say, oh, wait, it wasn't implemented. It it reflects yes, a lot of our staff time, but a lot of people in the community that chimed in. And with that I will

I will support this moving forward. Thank you. Guzman-Lopez Councilwoman Gilmore. Thank you, President Clark. I will be very brief. Thank you, Sara and David, for all of your work. We had a great participation in far northeast. I think it maybe had a little bit to do that we had a neighborhood plan that we were really excited about. But the engagement, the outreach and how we are honoring the thousands of hours of work of not only city staff, but registered neighborhood organizations, businesses, nonprofits in the area. And, you know, I agree with Councilman Cashman. I have not read equity in very many city plans. And I know that there's an urgency to it. If this passes tonight, jump right in and start implementation. But I think it's really important to call a pause for just a brief moment, because we don't want to recreate the same systemic root issues that got us into this situation before. And so I have to call out and give kudos to community planning and development staff because the work that you're committing to do around implicit bias training, looking at, you know, systems of institutionalized racism, that's big stuff. That's a big, big deal, especially to a

predominantly African-American and Latino community that I represent. And by you engaging them and us tonight, having two strong community leaders, Angela further and Pam Joiner here to testify their support of this plan. That's another very, very big deal because they know their stuff. They've lived in the community for many years. And I just want to acknowledge that and that, you know, coming going forward, I would like to see that evaluation, that checklist tool so that we can continue to have that transparency within the neighborhoods so that they can see how you're evaluating the plans and how decisions are being made. And KIMBALL And Joel, thank you as well to your work. And I look forward to supporting this plan tonight. Thank you. President Clark. Thank you. Comes from Gilmore Councilman Herndon. Thank, Mr. President. You know, I remember that first meeting years ago when I had an infant and now I have a very rambunctious nearly four year old. I cannot say thank you enough for everyone. I as as Mary Beth talked about, to be in a room with just just thoughtful, innovative, brilliant people for years was just truly remarkable to go out to the community members and hear those sentiments. How there is. There is. When I hear the comments about we, people were unaware you just weren't paying attention because I don't know what more we could have done to connect with the community. Because if you look at the maps, we touched every neighborhood. We reached out in multiple ways, several different facets. And so just cannot say thank you enough for that. And to see this final product is truly remarkable. And we know the work is not done. And I want you all to continue to hold us accountable to make sure that the city is moving forward with the implementation, with the vision that the c

ommunity created. But I'm very excited about the future and I'm excited to vote on this. So let's get this done. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Herndon. With that, I will just close by saying, you know, a plan that that took as long as it took to get here. I guess it's appropriate that we're taking this long during a council meeting to get to a vote. Crossman Herndon was talking about remembering that first meeting. I was just trying to remember the beginning of this meeting. I will not rehash what everyone said up here. I just really want to say thank you. Thank you to staff. Thank you so much for the hours and hours of work in the community, the hours and hours of work with my constituents. Thank you to all the task force members and all of your unpaid hours and commitment to this city and to this process. It is this this plan is what it is because of all of you. So thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Roll call on Blueprint Denver as amended. Black. All right. Brooks. Espinosa. No. Flynn. No. Gilmore. I. Herndon. High Cashman. I can teach Lopez. My new. Assessment. Hi. Mr. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please post voting in those results. I said. Ten eyes to. Net, ten eyes, two nays. Counsel Bill 303 has passed as amended on Monday, April 29. Or we can confirm that. On Monday, April 29th, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 344, designating 4150 East Shangri-La Drive Cleveland as a structure for preservation, saying no other business before this body. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman. And then one last announcement this past Wednesday, May 8th, was Councilwoman Neches birthday. So happy belated birthday. We're going to move on from announcements. There are no presentations and there are no communications. But we do have one proclamation this evening. Councilman Lopez, will you please read Proclamation 473? Thank you, Mr. President. Proclamation number 473 series of 2019 recognizing May 19th as hepatitis testing day and July 28th as World Hepatitis Day. Whereas May 19th is National Hepatitis Testing Day and July 28 as World Hepatitis Testing Day, HEP Hep C is recognized as the most common blood borne viral infection in the United States. And. WHEREAS, mortality due to hep C is increasing in Colorado partnership, particularly among people born between 1945 and 1965 with over 19,000 hepatitis C related deaths occur annually in the United States. And. WHEREAS, Hepatitis B accounts for almost 14,000 annual deaths in the United States, there are currently about five I'm sorry, 15,436 people in Colorado living with chronic unresolved hepatitis B infection, and fewer than one third of people with chronic hepatitis B are aware of their infection. And. Whereas, Hepatitis B and C cause an estimated 61% of liver cancer. Hepatocellular carcinoma. HTC and the United States and the opioid epidemic is feeling an increase in HPV and HCV positive cases, whereas hepatitis C has infected an estimat

ed 50,975 Coloradans. As many as 2.7 million American residents and more than 130 million people worldwide, and is a leading cause of cirrhosis, liver cancer and liver transplants in the United States. And. Whereas, hepatitis C can be prevented, testing can identify existing infections, and early diagnosis and treatment can save lives, money and resources. And. Whereas, Liver Health

Connection is available as a statewide resource for education testing, linkage to care, patient navigation helpline and other support services. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one at the city, the Denver City Council agrees that preventing and treating viral hepatitis as an important public health initiative that will improve the quality of life for Denver residents affected by the virus. Section two The Denver City Council proclaims May 19th as hepatitis testing day and recognizes July 28 as World Hepatitis Day. Section three, the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall attest and affects the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy be transmitted to Nancy for executive director of the Liver Health Connection. Thank you, Councilman Lopez. Your motion to adopt. I move that proclamation 473 series of 2019 be adopted. Has been moved and seconded comments by members of council and Councilman Lopez. Thank you, Mr. President. Every year I have the honor to bring this forward. I think we've carried it since 2009, perhaps every every year. And it's absolutely critical that this that this proclamation come across our desk and in these chambers, because hep-C is absent, there's a cure and it's preventable. And the more people that we get out, particularly the high risk populations to understand Hep C and especially our young people and especially folks that get tested, it's absolutely critical we can prevent these deaths. There's been a lot of research, a lot of resources and just, frankly, a lot of good education. I have seen, you know, I think it was Councilman Garcia at the time represented Council District One who carried this. And in his absence, he wasn't able to. And I took it on and and I took it on because it's dear to me, my grandfather, whose picture I have right here along with my grandmother, my my daughter , my grandfather was born in Ault, Colorado, northern Colorado. My family's from and went to go serve in World War Two. He was a beet worker and really and he went to go server and he served our country in Germany and came back injured and spent his time in Fort fought against Fort Carson. But he he had a blood transfusion after his injury. His Jeep had rolled over an explosive. And the folks who were in the energy besides him were killed. And he rolled over on his knee and crushed his is his his knee had an injury. They gave him a transfusion. We didn't know that that was the cause of his cirrhosis until he had it. And my grandfather has not been with. He played t

he role. My father has not been here since 2000. My second was his birthday. And I wish that we had the advances and the technology to be able to treat it. Early on, my grandfather would still be here with me and I would really appreciate his advice. Nowadays, they just don't make them like that anymore. And it's sad that my grandfather only got to see 72 years of life. There are a lot of people and we're losing our war to generation. There are a lot of baby boomers. There are a lot of folks who need to be tested. Everybody needs to be tested. We all should be tested for things like this. So we know and once we know that early detection, we can treat it and we can save lives because there's somebody's grandson that needs his grandfather or grandmother or mother. Right. And it's absolutely critical that we make this is the part of our everyday awareness. I thank you, Nancy. And I used to be the Hep C connection. So thank you all for carrying this. It's been an honor to carry this for you. This is my last time I'm carrying this proclamation. And I and with the same amount of energy that I carried the first time around, I'm going to ask people to please get tested. Please educate others about hep C and other viral infections like this. With that, I know that on. Let me see. May 19th. Are we in the web? Sorry. May 17th. C testing is going to take place free. Hep C testing is going to take place in the web building from 830 to 330. So we'll make sure that more information is passed on. I'll be on my website. Mr. President, I'll have Nancy come up and explain the rest of that. But thank you for allowing me to carry this proclamation one last time. Thank you. Councilman Lopez. Thanks for bringing this forward. Madam Secretary, roll call. LOPEZ My. Black eye. Flynn All right. Gilmore, I. Herndon. I. Cashman. Kenny. I knew Ortega. My assessment. Right. Mr. President. All right. Madam Secretary, please. Because voting announced results 1111. Nice. 11 Proclamation 473 has been adopted. Councilman Lopez. Is there somebody you'd like to bring up to accept the proclamation? Yes. None other than Miss Nancy Steinfurth, if you want to come up. Thank you, everyone, for your support of the resolution tonight. And thank you especially to Councilman Lopez, who's been our champion for many years. We're going to miss you. I would like to encourage everyone to join us at our event on May 17th. So because the Web building isn't open on Sunday, we're a Sunday. We're doing this event on Friday from 830 to 330. We're offering free testing for hepatitis C to anyone who's interested. So members of the public, people who work in the building, audience members, anyone who's watching television. We would love to have you come down and get tested. It's free. It is a simple, simple finger prick. We give results in 20 minutes

and then we provide information on what the next steps are in the process. Because like a lot of viruses, this isn't a one step and you're done. You then have

to have other testing. One of the great achievements of the medical field is that there is now a cure. There's actually a few cures for hepatitis C. It is in as short a timeframe as eight weeks with one pill a day and no side effects. And so that's a remarkable thing to be able to say. We can cure this, we can eradicate it, but you can't do it until everyone is tested. You had a risk factor. Some of those risk factors are getting a tattoo in an unsafe setting. People don't think about that that often. But if you are sharing works because you're doing it in a basement, well, that's kind of risky. So that is one of the criteria. World War. In addition to World War Two veterans, Vietnam veterans, about 10% of them have hepatitis C, and that's because they hadn't even identified the disease until 1989. And so anyone who had a blood transfusion, plasma transfusion in the field, trans transfusion, MASH unit care, that was a risk factor. And so that represents 10%. Over the last couple of years, the VA has treated 100,000 veterans for their hepatitis C infection, and they are committed to treating everyone who is a veteran. And so that's a great opportunity. In Colorado, the Department of Corrections is also treating everyone in the Department of Corrections that has hepatitis C. Unfortunately, it was as a result of a lawsuit. But hey, we'll take a win wherever we can get it. Colorado Department of Corrections will also treat everyone. And so all of these great opportunities are coming together and we hope everyone in the audience takes advantage of it. If you can't make it to the web building, we're also testing at Pride Fest, which is in June and then will be testing at Skyline Park on Friday, July 26. So it's not the 28th, but we figured the largest number of people would be there. We could get people walking up and down the mall, people out for lunch, break, etc.. And that's thanks to Councilwoman Ortega. So thank you very much for sponsoring that. I appreciate all of your support over the years. And thank you again. Thank you. All right. That concludes our proclamations this evening. We're moving on to bills for introduction. Madam Secretary, will you please read the bills for introduction. Council is reconvened. We have three public hearings this evening. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. If you are here to answer questions only when your name is called, please come to the podium. State your name and note that you are available for questions of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yielding up time on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal att

acks. Council Members. We have a technical problem with the screen back there, and so it will not be able to show the staff reports this evening so you can pull them up in your system or the two screens behind us will still show them. But unfortunately the screen in front of us is not working to show the staff reports this evening. Councilman Espinosa, will you please put Council Bill 406 on the floor? I move the council bill 40406 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and second in the required public hearing for council bill 406 is open. May we have the staff report. I'm Alice, Stevie. And this is the proposed map amendment for 1901 South Navajo Street and 1900 South Osage Street. So we are in Council District seven in the college view South Platte neighborhood, and the subject property is just under one and a half acres. It's located between Osage and Navajo on the south side of Jewell Avenue. There proposed rezoning from IMAX three to IMAX five is intended to facilitate redevelopment of the site. The current zoning is IMX three, which is the same zoning as the properties to the west, south and east, and then the zoning to the north is OSA. The land use map shows vacant along Osage in office along Navajo and Ruby Hill Park is directly the north and then the area immediately surrounding the property to the east, south and west is a mix of industrial and vacant, with a few instances of office or commercial and then transitioning to residential a few blocks farther to the west. So the bottom right image shows the subject property facing south from Jewell Avenue. The image above that shows the maintenance building in Ruby Hill Park, and then the image on the bottom left is an industrial building south of the subject property. Planning Board recommended approval of this map amendment and staff received a position, statement and support from the Ruby Hill neighborhoods. R.A., as well as two additional letters of support from neighbors, citing the need for higher density development surrounding the park to leverage the recent investment in Ruby Hill Park. So now for the review

criteria, we have two plans to consider at this location. And the proposed MAP amendment is consistent with comprehensive plan 2040. It will enable mixed use development at an infill location where infrastructure is already in place. The requested I am x five zone district increases the allowed density, thereby increasing the number of residents or employees who can live, work and play in the area. In Blueprint, the future neighborhood context is a special district, or more specifically, a manufacturing district. The site is identified as an area that should maintain manufacturing uses. The future place of this area is called Innovation Flex, which is a mix of research and design manufacturing, light industrial uses with urban amenities, a greater mix of uses and transit and multi-unit residential is compatible. Osage and Navajo are classified as des

ignated local streets, and Jewel AV is a residential arterial. Districts are anticipated to see around 5% of new housing growth and 15% of employment growth by 2040. The proposed MAP amendment to IMX five will focus mixed use growth adjacent to a regional park and in an Innovation Flex district, which is an intended location for this kind of growth. Therefore, this proposed rezoning is consistent with blueprint. The proposed rezoning will result in uniform application of zoned district building form, use and design regulations, and it will further public health, safety and welfare through implementation of adopted plans. And it allows increased density within close proximity of a park which has been linked to several positive health impacts. The staff report details physical changes in the area resulting from investment in Ruby Hill Park. So this rezoning would recognize the changed character of the area as it transitions from industrial and vacant land to an innovation flex industrial mixed use area abutting a major park amenity. The industrial context is characterized by larger blocks, with buildings closer to the street, ranging from 1 to 8 stories. The current zoned districts in the city sorry, the current zoned district of the property and the surrounding areas are all within the industrial context. The purpose of the IMAX IMAX districts is to accommodate a variety of industrial, commercial and residential uses and serve as a transition between mixed use areas and industrial districts. Given the existing land use pattern, the current zoning and the aspirational future character of this location, the IMAX purpose is appropriate for this location. And finally, the specific intent of the IMAX five district is for industrially dominated areas, served primarily by collector streets with a maximum building height of five stories. Given the property's location on a residential arterial and an industrial mixed use area adjacent to a regional park, the intent is appropriate for this particular area. So based on finding all right, review criteria has been met. CPD recommends approval and the applicant has submitted a form to speak as well. Thank you very much. We do have two individuals signed up to speak this evening. So if you sign up to speak on this item, I'd ask that you come up to the front row and when I call your name, you can step up to the podium. First up, we have Andre Covi on. Thank you, Councilman Clark. My name is Andre Coogan. I live in Lakewood, Colorado. Work in Denver, Colorado. As I'm sure every all the council members know, resigning can be a pretty difficult and contentious process. I'm actually pretty proud of how this entire process has been handled. Before we even closed on the property, we reached out to Councilman Clark. We reached out to the adjacent neighbors. We reached out to the neighborhood organizations to discuss this whole process with them starting, you know, about a year and a half ago. I think that, you know, as

you as you heard, we do have letters of support from the I.R.A. and from a couple of the adjacent neighbors. I am very proud of that. The one just the one point that I wanted to make was that, you know, the new 2019 blueprint, Denver makes it very clear that Denver needs to start directing its growth towards vacant lots near amenities like Ruby Hill Park and near transit stations and rail systems. There. The Evans light rail station is less than a mile from here, as is the South Platte River Trail. I feel like this is the perfect opportunity for city council to validate, you know, that stance, that blueprint Denver has taken. Thank you for your time and I'm available for any questions. Thank you. Next up, David Burton. Hello, counsel. My name is David Burton. I live in Jefferson County. I work in. Denver. I'm in Denver every day. I bought this property about a year ago and have been working with the neighborhood for about a year and a half, actually. And not only with the Ruby Hill and College your neighborhood associations, but a few of the other for. I'm currently on the board of Levitt Pavilion and I've been working with Levitt for the past four months trying to, you know, bring the Ruby Hill neighborhood. Up a little bit. This property has been underutilized and or vacant. Half of the property is vacant land and half is an underutilized building for ever. So one of the things that we would like to offer in this particular site is redevelopment and

without any displacement. I know that there's been a lot of displacement in communities throughout Denver, and this is not one of those examples. So we do requests your approval for the rezoning of this property from IMAX three to IMAX five. And if you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions for members of council? Councilman Flynn. Thank you. Just a quick question on the justifying circumstances. Frequently, I find that justifying circumstances might include some things that are only tangentially related to the parcel that we cited. But here, clearly, you mentioned investment in Ruby Hill Park. And I'm curious, what would the staff have found had Ruby Hill Park not had any investment, but just was Ruby Hill Park the way it's always been? What without it? Would there be no justifying circumstance for this? Would we not do the rezoning? Would you not have recommended it? I can't say whether, you know, that we wouldn't have just having not done that analysis. But the the justifying circumstances does also mention as kind of a supporting argument, because the investments in the park are definitely the strongest ones for this area. It does also mention, and the applicants mentioned, the proximity to the Evans Light Rail station. We didn't lean on that heavily in the staff report because we generally looked more like a quarter mile away. And this is farther than that. But this is it is less than a quarter mile from a b

us line that goes directly there. So I think it wouldn't have been as strong an argument, but I couldn't I couldn't say whether or not it would have met the criteria. Because the Evans station has been open since 2000, you know, 19 years. So it's not really a change. All right. That's all I had, Mr. President. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, Councilman Espinosa. I couldn't find the letters from the R.A. or the letter from the R.A.. Can can can somebody speak to the content of that letter and why they supported it? I'm going to unless you guys can jump in quick. I think I'm going to look for it right now. But I believe that from the R.A., it was just the position statement when we send out the notification. There's just an a like a Adobe form that they can fill out that says if it's in support or opposition and how many people voted. So I will continue to look for this and chime back in. But I think that it might have been just that. Let me ask the the architect then, or owner sorry. When you conveyed a possible rezoning to the R.A., did you opine about the intended use of the property? We talked about doing mixed use residential on the property primarily. We've talked about doing coffee shop. And really the the residents want some sort of. Amenity there by the park. I've attended about ten or 12 of their meetings. Over the past year and a half, and I've been really working with them and will continue to do so. So is there any sort of hardcoded agreement on potential amenity or actual mixed use in the development? I mean, we really haven't discussed it and we can't discuss that. We really didn't solidify anything. The reason why I'm asking this is going to be the next question to CPD, because I'm struggling with the blueprint Denver justification. But you were the architect for the project in my district at 46 I 44th and Tennyson. Is that correct? That is a 100% residential structure on a five storey mixed use zone district. Correct. Could you come up to the microphone just a moment? All right. So now my question for Steph. So my concern is, is the blueprint Denver justification talks about districts, talks about industrial, talks about transition. There's a lot of this emphasis on this not being 100% residential. Is there any prohibition to a 100% residential development on this project and on this parcel? I don't believe so. And the staff report does also talk include the language from Blueprint Denver about how multi-unit residential is also compatible in this innovation flex mapped area. Yeah. So but when you have a community that is asking of a development to have to sort of incorporate the goals and ambitions that are set forward in our recently adopted plans, why wouldn't we codify that transition in? Why are we pursuing a zone district that allows a use that doesn't necessarily get that outcome that the community is is thus asking for? Well, in this case, we're evaluating the zone district and not a specific development plan. And b

ecause the zone district is consistent with the language in the adopted plan. So that's where I'm struggling. Right. Because if we go back to the comp plan, which has the six objectives, the L vision elements, they talk to these other aspects. Right. And so are we supposed to sit in this box of. Well, I am. Zoning is the appropriate zoning district to meet the blueprint Denver map or are we supposed to. I'm sitting here, I'm opining out loud, but I would actually like a response if you could to help me and my colleagues going forward. Or should we factor in all of this other vision statements about how the other needs of the community are, in fact met that are consistent because those things came were forged together. The park plan, which applies to the property directly across the street,

the comp plan which applies to all these things and and blueprint Denver which then speaks to these districts and this mix of uses. Yeah we are saying, you know, that's great, but we're not thinking about that. You know, we just hope for the best or can we? Are you guys talking about how we're going to actually get these sorts of outcomes that the community is asking for in our development? The process we currently have is to capture that kind of community input in the plans and then ensure that rezonings that we recommend for approval are consistent with that. Okay. So to the property owner, you can see that I'm struggling historically. My time here on council has been, you know, full of developer agreements and private, you know, we've had to work outside of zoning to get outcomes. You've already articulated that the community has asked for these things. Are you prepared to at least go on record right now and say that you will provide the amenities and a non residential component on your ground floor? Yeah, I'll definitely work with the community, with the Ruby Hill Neighborhood Association and College. Here to give them. Some sort of community amenity that they can utilize, whether it's a coffee shop. Or something like that. I told them I would do that. So yeah. I'll go on record and say Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 406 is closed. We're going to go on to comments by members of council, and I'll start because this one's in my district. I just wanted to first say thank you. I'm not sure. And four years in office, I've seen anyone be as present and engaged in dialog with a community on a rezoning as, as you guys were. I mean and and not just at the Arno, but, you know, with with the Levitt Pavilion with multiple Arnaud's because it's in a place that two different Arnaud's claim as their own. And so just really appreciate seeing that level of engagement and involvement way ahead of the time, not just, hey, here we are, but in that consistent engagement and, and really being a part of the community over the past almost a year. So I really appreciate that. Thank you v

ery much for that. I know that this is something that the community is very excited about. And I mean, as we can see from tonight, with support and knowing here in opposition, this is something that everyone is really excited about. So I hope we'll see something come to fruition, not just change in zoning, but actual actually see something come out of the ground because this is something that the community's been waiting for, watching for. I know we talked, you know, Councilman Espinosa talked a little bit about that activation, but also we just had a group of in Rubio get together to talk about how do we get more eyes on the park to get some of the negative activity that's happening in the park? And one of the biggest goals, one of the biggest things they want is more people living on the park who create that, you know, community of people who. Look out the window and see stuff happening. And this also does that. And so I just want to say thank you very much. I think in addition to that. STAFF Thank you for the staff report. I think it's clear that this meets the criteria for a rezoning, and I will be voting in support of it and would hope that my colleagues would as well. Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. So I want to thank the developer for, for hearing my request in and acknowledging the willingness to have that dialog with the community. And hopefully, I mean, I hope I heard that as you committed to, to putting that in. I trust you heard me being frustrated because we don't have ways. I mean, we have the means to codify this thing and sort of make this happen, but we don't. But, you know, is this is not coloring my opinion on this rezoning application. But you. Mr.. BURTON No. You know, my history with particularly with parcels adjacent to parks and ground floor activation, whether it's the Zocalo, the River Clay or the Element 47 projects, and how important that is the future. And even though it may not make sense, day one, it will make sense eventually. And so I appreciate you being willing to make this. And why that was important is because of the reason why ultimately I will be voting in favor because yes, all the other checkboxes on the zone map are checked. Right. This is the appropriate zone district to meet all those plan objectives. My problem is, is that we should have ways to sort of compel those plan objectives other than hoping for the best. But thank you. I am hoping for the best in this situation. I'll be voting to support things. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa. Seeing no other comments. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black eye. Espinosa. Flynn All right. Gilmore I. Herndon All right. Cashman Carnage. Lopez. All right. New Ortega assessment. Mr. President. Madam Secretary, please close voting. Announce the results. 12 hours. 12 hours. Council Bill 406 has passed. Councilman Espinosa, will you please for council 547 on the. Nine days. Three Neighbors Council bill four for eight has passed. Councilman Lopez, before we jump into the ne

xt hearing, I understand that we have a special guest in the chambers. Would you like to recognize our guest? Yeah, we do. Congressman, if you want to stand, I wanted to recognize Congressman Tony Cardenas from California here to visit and was. Stopped by the. Council chambers. You never know when you have a member of Congress. And so he might have a list to hand to you to help our delegation. Well, welcome. Welcome, Congressman. He's also a former L.A. City councilman. And I think one of the is a juvenile justice and crime prevention. You know, community based gang intervention model, nationally renowned, comes from Mr. Cardenas, who implemented it in California. So thank you. Welcome to the Denver City Council. CHAMBERS That's welcome. All right, Councilwoman Gilmore, will you please be accountable for nine four on the floor? Yes, President Clark, I move that council bill 0494 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. Public hearing for council bill 494 is open. May we have the staff report? Thank you. So Jeff Hurt with training, planning and development. So I'm here to present on a council action item to for Tex Amendment number four to revise the general development plan processes and standards. So I'm going to walk through what a general development plan is briefly and then get into sort of the current practice within the city agencies to kind of address some of the deficiencies actually we've had with GDPs. And we're looking to fix as part of this process and then get into a summary of the proposed changes and then the analysis of the TEX Amendment decision making criteria. Okay. So what is a GDP? So a GDP is a coordinating multi departmental process that's been in place since the 1990s to address large development sites. These are typically applicant driven projects with a final deliverable of a high level conceptual site plan that addresses oftentimes infrastructure open space, sometimes land use issues, design issues, things like that. But it is a high level conceptual site plan. The process does require one public meeting that's an applicant led public meeting and a planning board public hearing. And the planning board actually recommends to the Development Review Committee, which is an administrative body of the Executive Directors of planning, public works and parks. Um, no, city council does not see these. So there's no City Council approval required for GDP. And that's important for a number of reasons here. And so the typical process is well over a year for getting the GDP approved. So the current zoning code process and flowchart format and a very high level is that essentially as we get these development proposals that come to the city, there's an evaluation against a number of factors as to whether or not the GDP would be the appropriate tool to use. One factor is whether or not it's over ten acres, but we do have GDP's under ten acres. So there's actually a whole host of factors looking at

whether or not we need sort of this enhanced coordinated infrastructure for these large redevelopment sites. But if the answer is no to that question of whether or not it needs a GDP, then there's certainly the option to go into other regulatory processes site plan, subdivision, for example. But if the answer is yes, then you get into the GDP process where you're preparing that high level conceptual site plan, and then we're looking to sequence in and build in the rezoning and other entitlements with the GDP. I mean, each one is really different. So some of the good outcomes from these again, these have been in place for several years now since the 1990s. The process does foster looking at shared solutions across different city agencies. For these large projects, you often have competing objectives, so fosters kind of that dialog across those objectives. It is through the GDP process, one of the few places in our zoning code where we get open space. So there is a minimum 10% set aside for open space. Talk about that and looking to carry that forward. And there also is at least an opportunity for community input on the project and awareness that development is happening in the neighborhood through this GDP process. So some of the problems with the GDP process at a high level are one. And I think the biggest issue we've identified through our assessment over the last couple of years, even further back, is that we've used the GDP tool both for planning and plan implementation, which has been problematic for a number of reasons. The GDP tool isn't really built to have a robust community dialog and engagement when you're talking about community visioning and establishing land use policy for a neighborhood with a one sort of check, the box applicant led public meeting and city council not seeing these. So the system isn't really set up well for planning, but we have used it for planning where there's been absence of a plan, but simultaneously we've used it as a plan implementation tool, which is more getting into the technical site planning exercise. So trying to do both of those things simultaneously, not particularly effective that either. And then I'll highlight some of the other issues with GDP's, which is that they either go too far or not far enough. And what I mean by that is in terms of not far enough, like I said,

it doesn't have city council approval. It's very conceptual and high level. So it doesn't actually have a lot of regulatory weight or teeth to it in its approval. Yet there's kind of an expectation or a perception from community members and others that it does. So it doesn't go far enough in the sense of giving it actual teeth to implement through subsequent development entitlements. But then it also goes too far because we're asking of the community and of the customer and of the city a lot of time and money and resources going into preparing a bunch of detailed technical studies and site plans with really limited

assurances at the end of the day in terms of like a zoning entitlement or something like that. Again, the GDP itself doesn't have a lot of weight yet. We're having folks do this before they're getting those entitlements in a lot of cases. And then also to highlight, we are getting mixed open space outcomes from that 10%. And that's one thing we're looking to address with this tax amendment. Okay. So the current practice to address some of these issues, so this is a lot of this is processes that the city has put into place over the last several years to address some of these issues while we do more a holistic fix to this GDP process. One I'll highlight when we need to gain consensus on a community planning visioning process. We're not using the GDP tool anymore. We're initiating a city led process that leads to a city council adopted plan. So no more GDPs for planning, at least in terms of current practice. And then bullet point to when we need that technical site planning exercise for coordinated infrastructure analysis. We're not using the GDP tool for that either. We're using the infrastructure master plan tool. So so part of this text amendment to codify that tool. And then third, we need assurances. So that means development agreements, other tools to achieve community benefits. We're not using the GDP tool. We're using the rezoning or the subdivision tool. Those have more regulatory weight than the GDP does. Okay. So second of three flowcharts to warn you. So the current practice that I kind of explain there in flowchart format and a lot of this is we're looking to codify with this text amendment in terms of a best practices as these developments come in the door today, we're asking the one of the first questions is, does it need a rezoning? If the answer is no, we have pretty limited ability to require a process more kind of a robust process that looks at the project. So the answer is typically, if the rezoning, if there is not a rezoning needed, there's the option for an applicant to move into another process like a site planning process under their current zoning. And that's one of the issues we're looking to address here. But if the answer is yes that the project needs a rezoning, then there is the evaluation that's being done. You know, in terms of what the City Council adopted plan guidance is for the site and whether or not we need that coordinated infrastructure. And I'll highlight a couple of scenarios here. Just highlighting kind of the current best practice we're looking to codify here in cases where there is a rezoning needed and we don't have that planning guidance, which is a good chunk of the city, we are working with developers to see the value in doing a planning process first before we're getting into the rezoning of the site planning. So that's Loreto Heights, for example, Stadium District. And then in cases where they do need a rezoning, but there is a plan in place, we're already doing a lot of this in terms of our cu

urrent practice of trying to sequence these things. And so this LDA tool codifies our ability to do this. And so the summary of the changes to the zoning code, and this is at a high level and happy to drill down on any of these topics, of course change. One is that we're replacing general development plans going forward with the large development review tool. So what that means is that the current GDP's on the books today so these there's 28 of them stay intact as is and can have minor deviations and amendments done to them. But for new projects going forward, they're more of a clean slate. We would not use the GDP tool for those. We would use the LDR tool or the infrastructure master plan tool depending on the scenario. But so topic two or change two, and this is really the big difference between the LDR and the GDP, that the LDR process is more a process framework as opposed to the GDP, which is a process and a set of plans. So the elders, a process framework that includes a menu of tools that right sizes the project to get to site development. And I'll talk in the next sort of flowchart how that would work in process. But essentially it's a documentation of the process going forward to tee up some of these conversations in this dialog and this coordination earlier in the process before plans are drawn up, before rezonings happen. So we have the opportunity to have these more robust conversations earlier in the process, a third to carry forward the community meeting that was a part of the GDP. But clarify a few things on that front. One, that it happens earlier in the process and then also to clarify the

conduct of that meeting city staff and applicant roles and to have that happen actually before an application is even submitted for an LDR and then forth to better calibrate the thresholds for when this process was required. So lowering the threshold from ten acres under the current GDP world to five acres. But important to note, there are a whole host of other factors that are built into this bill that make it a little tighter in terms of what is when an LDR would be required. And we could talk a little bit about that decision making process as well. We can drill down on that and then last to codify the infrastructure master plan tool, which is a tool recurrent. Using with a number of different sites. But this tech summit would codify that as sort of an enhanced site planning tool. Okay. So here's the sort of flowchart. And I think it's easier to understand the the text, the movement through this lens. But essentially how this new tool would work is that once we get a large development proposal submitted, there would be an evaluation done between city agencies. So this is a big change from the current state, whereas under the GDP world, the CPD manager has the sole authority to decide if the GDP is required or not. Under this new world, it would be a joint decision across parks, planning and public works. Looking at all those factors

the size, the need for coordinated infrastructure, again, we can drill down under those factors. And so all this happens at the pre-application phase of these developments. And essentially what happens is within 30 days and this is codified within 30 days of the PRE-APPLICATION meeting, the applicant, the city informs the applicant in writing if LDR is required based on those factors. If the answer is no, there's the option for the applicant to move into other regulatory processes, like a site plan, for example. If the answer is yes, a lot happens in this step right here. But if the answer is yes, there's an interagency convening that happens built into this bill where we look at infrastructure, open space, affordable housing design, stormwater, all these things that we want to get a more sort of coordinated, holistic look and look at specific, more specific projects earlier in their development process. And so part of that dialog is a preliminary determination of what the scope of the large development review is going to be. So what types of infrastructure, coordination and study do we need? And the big question that's asked at this phase is whether or not there is a city council adopted plan that addresses the site. And there's language built in to address that. I'm happy to talk about looking at as part of this preliminary stage, again, looking at, you know, what sort of community benefits are articulated in an adopted plan that we would look to address with the site. What are the tools that get us there? How do we sequence these tools? So a lot that happens in here in terms of figuring out what the process is going forward. And then sort of the next step after that is having the community information meeting and then and then the application actually can't be submitted until after the community information meeting. And then looking at the bottom of this flowchart here, just highlighting a couple scenarios of what the outcome of this process would be. It's essentially a documentation of the process going forward and the major asks from the city and the sequencing of entitlements. So it's not a tool we currently have today to kind of frontload the coordination. But the idea is, you know, some looking at, for example, one of the one of the most challenging scenarios would be when we have laser pointer here, when we have a situation where there's no adopted plan guidance addressing the site, a rezoning is needed. A scenario could be that the outcome of this LDR process is a documentation of what that planning process needs to be first before going into rezoning and site planning. This is what's happening again with Loretto Heights and Stadium District. And so this would codify the ability to have that structure. And we'll go to the other scenarios. But it's really about the sequencing and the process going forward, not about what the zoning should be or what the standards are, but just figuring out what the process is going forward. So getting in

to the open space changes. So like I said, we are carrying forward the current 10% minimum open space requirements from the GDP, but we are enhancing what qualifies to better address what's publicly accessible, usable and providing a community benefit. So I'm happy to talk about what those design standards look like and the specifics behind that. And this is the visual to scale of of what the new requirements look like. So importantly, in a field I mentioned in the last slide, we are lowering the threshold from ten acres to meet that 10% to five acres. And that's what this looks like to scale in a couple of typical Denver blocks. And so I won't go through the examples scenarios in detail, but it is helpful to look at real projects and how this would have played out. So Loretto Heights, for example, would have been subject to this LDR process if it would have came in after this bill. And I think the outcomes would have been really similar in terms of requiring a planning

process. First is City Council adopted planning process before getting into the other entitlements. And there was South Sloan's Lake. That's an interesting example where the outcomes may have been different. If they were to come in under this new bill. And we would have asked that question of whether or not there is clear and sufficient adopted planning guidance that addresses the site and addresses what they want to do. The answer probably would have been no, and that looking at the West Colfax plan, potentially needing to amend that plan before getting to site development. So the outcome would have been probably a little different with South Sloan's Lake and would have fostered that planning process a little better. So the process for this text amendment and we did have a GP working group that was a pretty diverse group of community members, designers, developers. We did go to ANC Zoning and planning committee twice with the proposal that's before you today. And we did initiate communications to affected projects starting back in March. So many, many projects were notified of this that were in the pipeline in terms of active site plans, active rezonings. We did receive three public comments on the bill. One, supporting this is at a high level, paraphrasing them, but support for the community information meeting and the notification behind that. And then second to support that this process has for a general deference to the city council adopted planning process as the best planning process as opposed to the GDP. And then lastly, concerns about using citywide policies. So Blueprint Denver specifically in lieu of small area plan policies as part of this tool and happy to talk about those comments. And so the actual hearing process has led us to the public hearing tonight planning order to recommend approval unanimously of the bill on May 1st. And I will note that we have supplemental rules and regulations that accompany this bill to clarify certain things. We are working with a

handful of stakeholders over the next couple of weeks and in advance actually of planning, board, public hearing on the rules and regulations next week to clarify some decision points within the LDR process to provide a little more predictability. So we are working with a handful of property owners to provide that a little more clarity through the rules and regulations of what's already in the bill. So I'll go through the criteria for text amendments. And this is a citywide text amendment, so only citywide policies apply in the analysis. So in terms of campaign 2040, certainly more details cited in the staff report. But there is a number of policies in the comp plan related to coordination and collaboration across city agencies to achieve greater impact or collective impact that this bill certainly supports. And then some policies related to enhanced public spaces that this bill also does. And so related to Blueprint Denver policies, there's actually a policy in there in support explicitly of doing this very project. So it is in support of that. And then also some policies related to outdoor public spaces, which this bill again fosters. Criteria to further public health, safety and welfare of staff to find the tax amendment consistent with that criteria because it will implement adopted plan policies also will improve predictability by having this more front ended coordination and communication both for the community and the applicant and for the city as well. And then lastly, improve public welfare by promoting more public open spaces. And then last, regarding a uniformity of district regulation, staff does find the TEX amendment consistent with that criteria because it would treat projects equally across the board in terms of these procedures and standards. So staff does recommend approval of the Tex amendment and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you very much. We have five individuals signed up to speak on this item this evening. So if you can make your way up to this frontbench, I'll call you up when I say your name. Go ahead and step up to the microphone and your time will start. First up, Chernobyl. Good evening, counsel. My name is Joel Noble. I live at 2705 Stout Street. I'm here speaking in my individual capacity alone. I served on the GDP Working Group from 2014 on. It's taken quite a while to get to this point, but that GDP working group came about because of a lot of concern about how some GDPs were working out. GDP as a tool over time. Became kind of schizophrenic. Sometimes it was used as intended. As a infrastructure. Development tool. Where are the pipes going to go? Where the building is going to go, where the roads is going to go? And it was reasonable for that to be applicant led to be very technical. It was reasonable. But in areas where we had a large redevelopment opportunity in the city and not enough plan guidance, too often the tool was used to substitute for plan guidance where there was no bluep

rint. Denver of course, everywhere, but maybe nothing else. Or maybe the neighborhood plan wasn't terribly clear. It set up neighbors in opposition to the property owners in competing for what the vision would be rather than how we know our process is supposed to work. Have a city led

neighborhood plan process. Or master plan process is happening at Loreto Heights, some adopted plan. So the large development review process fixes that. CPD did the first part of the fix some time ago by directing infrastructure work to use an infrastructure master plan, an infrastructure master plan tool that can not be confused for trying to set vision. And they've been doing that a lot, but it took a long time to really understand how extensive of a fix was it going to take to make what had been. GDP a very important idea. When we have big redevelopment spaces. We have to treat them with more care. We have to treat them with more. Involvement in planning. And we have to ask for. What we want, like open space, how to preserve those things. And I think they've landed in a really good place with large development review. Essentially, this is a framework, is not a new planning document, but it's a framework to stop at the beginning and say. Where are we? Where do we need to go? And what of our existing tools are going to take us there? Do you need to amend that existing plan? Do you need a new plan like Loreto Heights? Do you have all the planning guidance you need? You can go right to infrastructure planning, but that level setting of given where we are, what are the steps that are needed is the output of this large development review document. It's a minimal, sane, inclusive approach and I encourage your support. Thank you. Next up, Jesse Paris. Jesse Paris represented for Denver Home a sellout black star. So moving for self defense and positive commitment for social change. And I was on top of the ballot for our lodge this past May 2019 election. Almost 15,000 votes with no money. We are neither for or against this. We just wanted to know exactly what this all entailed, this general development plan, because there's been multiple projects with these developments that we, the public, has not been notified all the details of these development plans. So I'm glad that we're getting to some kind of clarification in regards to this. I just wanted to know if this general development plan also included opportunity zones and exclusionary zones for housing. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Jessica Liza de. Good evening, members of Council. I'm Jessica Leeds today with Fairfield and Woods on behalf of Bbf Gateway, its principals John Fair, Brew Berkeley and 64th and Tower Partners LLC. My clients have been part of discussions with landowners of a large portion of the far northeast area and stand to be significantly impacted by the potential text amendments. I will point out that they were not specifically included in the outreach process, but I will say that we're supportive g

enerally of the replacement of the confusing and confounding GDP process. So thank goodness for clarity. However, we are not entirely comfortable because we have not been involved with the broad nature of the language. We have been working over the last few days closely with staff and with legal to try and work through those concerns. And generally, I think we have gotten to a place where there's a comfort level. So but for the record, I do staff has made it clear that they as you heard from them, then they're going to work with some stakeholders. We would be some of those stakeholders to continue in that out the process and to provide more clarity, more definition in the areas that we're where we believe the language is broader, where it's open to too broad of an interpretation. However, I do want to commit those three areas to the record. The first is the broad scope of staff discretion in determining how and when the LDR process applies, and more objective criteria in the reconciliation of the proposed text and then the gateway rules. How does all of that work together? And the last is open space and the requirements for open space. And then how does all that work together? So lots to work out. But there is one area I would implore you that cannot be reconciled with the text as you have it in front of you, just one. And that is the requirement for a public easement over private open space, and that is a public easement over private land. And that works in many cases, but it does not work in one exception, and that is multi-family housing. And the reason for that, there are two. So there are concerns that if you have an interior courtyard or there are areas that are counting towards open space, it does not work for affordable housing purposes. So the land use restriction agreements don't allow that. We also believe that there are so it would impede affordable housing and it also has Kiawah Common Interest Ownership Act implications. We ask for a simple text amendment easy fix. All you have to change is the word from ciao to May, and it would then allow us to work with staff to refine that. It only applies through the same rules and regulations you're asking us to follow. In the case of multi-family housing. I thank you. Thank you. Next up, David Smith. Hi. My name is David Smith. I live at 1770 Chestnut. I have worked in the real estate development community for a couple of different. Firms here in Denver. But I'm speaking in capacity as a private citizen. I'm in support of replacing the. GDP ban in a number of. Meetings with stakeholders, both in the business sector. And industry groups. We have the current from them. As a project under way. We've embraced the

LDP process, we've submitted required documents. We're working through staff through the process. I think it's well thought out. It's more defined. It reduces uncertainty if you're on a developer in the development sector and it streamlines. Communication between departments. Stephani

e An improvement over the GDP. We are optimistic about the process and I would encourage staff to support it. Thank you very much. Next up, Chairman Scoop. Yes. Chairman Sekou likes to ask movement of self-defense. You know, I'm sitting here and I'm looking at this. And first thing popped in my mind is, what does this got to do with poor people? What's got to do with us. If you have these issues about open space and you've got an existing camping ban that doesn't allow poor people to occupy open space without being harassed by the residents. Was this. Meet us. And as taxpayers who spent our last dime the city sales taxes, we get none of this. Where's our protection in all this? That we can occupy open space without being harassed by neighbors who don't want to see poor people in that neighborhood? Who adversely call because poor people are present and then accuse them of doing dope deals or whatever. And then we get aroused by the police just sitting in the park. It was like, What is this? Where's our protection? That and all of this? And then you got a loophole in there. If all of this don't work, then, well, we've got other ways of going about getting this thing done through other legislative processes. What is that process that would allow you to get away with all of this and go outside of this? Well, you got to know the process that was on your first grade. What is that all about? How can you get out of this once you approve it? There's a loophole in the game. What is it? It was not explained in the process of looking at this mess. So somebody explain to me, how do you get around this in other judicial processes? And who is that to appease? So we could stop the charade. For real. Cause all you've got is another layer on top of another layer on top of another layer on top of another layer. That gives poor people no say so. No power whatsoever. To determine the outcome, because when we come to the meetings, we're outnumbered is a democratic process. And most of the notifications that you give to people coming to these meetings are never given to the service providers of the port to inform us about the meeting. So we looked at the look. Now tell me I'm not. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions for members of Council on this item? Council meeting each. Thank you, Mr. President. Jeff, can I ask a question? So the comprehensive plan and blueprint were being discussed throughout the same time that this process was happening and have now been adopted. And so your slides talk a little bit about conformance, but the plans make many, many references to the importance of examining the equity aspects of large potential rezonings or upswings and thinking about displacement risks. There's a whole bunch of planned support around that and I was disappointed to see the slides really didn't make any mention of how this process thought about the equity issues and how this process might be connected to them. You and I have spent many me

etings talking about the topic, but the slides really didn't talk about it. So I'm going to give you the opportunity to fill in the blanks a little bit about other than open space, how does this process improve our ability to look at those topics? Yeah, that's fair and that's an oversight. So so the process improvement addresses a number of equity policies from the current planning blueprint, mostly with regards to so you have the citywide equity policies and the neighborhood specific equity policies. But in terms of citywide equity policies, this process enhances our ability to tee up those conversations at the front end of the development process, more so than what we have today. So the idea behind this process is to convene all of these groups at the front end, one of which would be economic development and affordable housing folks , to bring them at the table, to have discussions about what sort of policies they want to look to implement, and looking at it in comparison to open space and infrastructure and balancing all those needs. So at a high level, this process was a much better job of teeing up those issues so that we can have that infused at the front end of the process as opposed to when it's too late in the game, you know, at a rezoning or a site planning stage. So at a high level, at the citywide level, it does that. And then the process is also designed to look at specific neighborhood planning guidance where you would hope you would have that more granular addressing of the equity policies on a neighborhood level. So that's related to affordable housing, but also related to local business, you know, local business issues, fostering local businesses, things like that. This process, again, tees up the ability to have those discussions earlier in the process in terms of the overall text amendment. And it's sort of how it lined up with blueprint and comp plan. This was well underway while that was well underway. So the expectation going forward certainly is that what we're putting in place now a more sort of robust template for

analyzing each text amendment against all equity policies. This didn't get that level of analysis because of the timing, but you're absolutely correct that it was an oversight to not highlight that in the slides, but that at a high level is how we see this implementing equity policies by teeing up the conversation earlier, recognizing that it's going to be neighborhood specific, but at least enabling that conversation much better across these agencies, which doesn't really happen today necessarily. Yeah. I want to ask if you can follow up with a little more detail on that. So there's like what the policy sets as a framework, but a lot of this depends on how things operate within the city. So can you talk more about the different approach that the departments are taking with regard to making sure that housing is at the table at the same time that these other departments that historically have always been at the t

able. So Parks has always been at the table, CPD has always been at the table. But can you talk specifically about how that's happening differently? Yeah, I mean, in some of it is in the text, the memo, in the rules and regs in terms of who we do referrals to and all that stuff. But a lot of it is sort of institutionalizing interagency processes. So for example, right now we are setting up a working group of people that would meet on a recurring basis to evaluate these projects as they come in. And that group is not just Parks, Public Works and planning. It includes representatives from Dito on the affordable housing front and also the equity front. In terms of the NEST group, they're embedded in this as well as you just had a meeting this morning with them about community benefits agreements and so things like that, teeing up those conversations. So we're putting in place the staff interagency structure so that those folks are at the table on a recurring basis. And it's a regular thing where they're always at the table as opposed to just sort of leaving it to chance. If wherever you're sort of project case manager is to be proactive and do that kind of outreach. So we're. You know, some of us in, in the text amendment bill, a lot of it is in institutionalizing city practices that we're going to certainly share. Great. Can you just clarify for me made passing reference? There are some references in the text amendment and some in. The rules and regs. I read the whole text amendment. I did not read the rules and regs. So is Dito as a department. Obviously the name will change, so we'll have to go back and fix it. But is the Housing Department or whatever it will eventually be called, called out by name in one of the policy documents? Yes. Yes, it is. And the rules and regs as its current name or it's it says in parentheses or as future TV names or, you know, sort of the name can change. And so in the rules and regs, they're they're called out as a referral agency specifically. But in the text amendment itself, I mean, there's some language we did our best to put language in there related to our evaluation of community benefits that are achievable. So we did add that in in the last iteration of the bill. Thank you for being responsive to that feedback along the way. Thank you, Councilwoman Kennedy. Councilman Black. Thank you, Mr. President. I have two questions. So one that Jessica brought up about. Open space. That would be a courtyard within a development. Will that count as open space? So it depends. It could. It has to be. There's a lot of language that goes with it. But if it's contiguous and accessible to a public street via a public access easement or similar mechanism, and it's fully visible from the street and there's some graphics to support that. So it would count if it qualifies. So so the idea of a courtyard being tucked behind, you know, an L-shaped building that you would never know exists as you're walking down the street that wo

uld not qualify or is not supposed to qualify under this bill, but something that, you know, maybe as a passageway from the street that's publicly accessible and has no permanent barriers, that leads to a courtyard that you could see and know that it's there. If you're a member of the public, that would count. That's the intent. And we did our best to put specific language to require that in the bill. And so the intent is for the public to see it and to be able to use it. Correct. Okay. And then I had a question about and specifically to all GDP's. In my district, for example, they're both the light rail. Stations, and so they're in the old code. And so is there anything that would happen to trigger repealing those. And then. Creating in. The. Ah. So if someone wanted to rezone. Part of the land or all of the property. In the GDP. Would that trigger the. LDR and move us into the new code? So if if so, if these are old code GDPs, they can stay in the old code world in terms of the GDP. So the GDP amendment process and all the standards of the old code stay intact and stay locked in. It's only if they wanted to reason into the new code and it meets all the factors in terms of the size and the need for coordination and all that. Would we even flag it for whether or not an LDR would be required? So I mean, all I can say is that each case will be different, but we'll have systems in place

where we'll flag these developments to ask the question of whether or not an LDR would benefit, you know, the customer, the city and the community. And so and then we look closely at those factors to see. But one trigger, though, is if they are in the new code. So if they're zone to the new code and needed to do a major amendment to the GP, that's a potential trigger to come into the LDR process as a factor. But nothing is really a given. There's just a whole suite of factors we would look at. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman by Councilman Ortega. Hi. I have a few questions as well. Can you highlight the criteria of what would throw somebody into a large development review? I know you talked about the ten acres going to five acres, but, you know, one of the speakers talked about concern for staff discretion. So what is the very clear cut criteria that that defines what would throw somebody into this process? Yes, it's a good question. So so at a high level, we generally know this is an answering question yet, but we carried forward the GDP applicability language. So we mirrored in a lot of ways in terms of the host of factors. And so those include but are not limited to changes to the arterial or collector street grid and changes to regional stormwater systems. And then some more blanket statements that the issues with the development can't be resolved through other regulatory processes. So there's a whole host of factors in addition to that acreage metric. What we did to improve on that decision making process and tightening it up from GDPs is we

said instead of the CPD manager having the sole authority to make that determination, it's a joint decision of the DRC. That's one thing. Another thing we did to kind of tighten up that piece of it was to eliminate language where in the current GDP world that the project is phased or has multiple owners. It could be subject to a GDP, which is a really massive universe of projects, and you consider that most of them really have that of any scale. So those are a few examples of how we carried forward the GDP applicability language and tighten it up a bit. And there's certainly other factors in there. Like, for example, if an adopted plan calls for an LDR GDP. So if you have a neighborhood plan that says for this site or for this area, consider using this tool to better coordinate development and infrastructure. That could be another factor or another trigger. So I'm not setting all of them, but I think that's a good chunk of them. That's helpful. Can you speak to how issues like development that will be within a close proximity to railroad will be addressed as part of this new process? Looking at offsite infrastructure issues, I'm thinking about, you know, the development where we're going to have the football stadium parking lot, the Sun Valley neighborhood, 13th Avenue is a major, you know, arterial connector that will bring people from downtown over to that area. And I could see this one being where there's some cost sharing on improvements so that the expectation is that it's not just all, you know, general fund, public works dollars, taking care of the improvements needed. How would something like that fit in to the general development review process? So to your first question about the freight, so this process would certainly improve from the current state in terms of fostering that dialog with those stakeholders early on. So so the benefit of this process through that lens is that as opposed to the rezoning process, for example, as we are looking at a general development concept as part of this ADR process. So we have a sense of what's being proposed there and so that we can start to coordinate as needed if there is freight rail implications, for example, with the right stakeholders on that front to kind of get ahead of that as opposed to waiting maybe too late in the game. So I guess that's the quick answer to the first question. The second question is, I think also to emphasize that we're making an improvement over the current process in terms of our ability to coordinate across large sites for infrastructure analysis. And so you're referring to the Stadium District area. We're actually starting the LDR process or some version of it depending on, you know, obviously the bill tonight to address that site for those very reasons, which is the need to look at infrastructure on a bigger scale, you know, and to get a sense of what the overall development concept will be in the overall development program so that we can calibrate the in

rastructure better within that development area and including potentially adjacent areas and integrating with those like river miles and things like that. So I guess at a high level for both questions, it's an improvement over our current process in terms of our ability to not in every case. I mean, it certainly has to meet all the criteria and the factors for a large development review, but all give us much more strength to be able to coordinate all of that across larger sites. So just to take it a step further, just looking at that area of the city that is proposed to have some pretty large scale development, we know Federal Boulevard is one of the adjacent corridors that is being

proposed to have some improvements to address pedestrian safety issues. Potentially a whole rerouting of, you know, or upgrades at the Cloverleaf. Could this be an example of where there's some, I don't know, overlap in in as part of the large development review sort of urging partnering with CDOT, for example, or the city of Denver, who's also involved in work like that along the Federal Boulevard corridor. Yeah, I, I don't know specifically how that's going to play out, but I know like in that case of Stadium District that we're using this ADR process to ask that very question, which is not something we currently have today, the ability to kind of probe on that. So all I can say is that those discussions are actually happening on that site through the LCR process. So we've kind of already been using it to to get out some of those issues, recognizing there's parallel infrastructure issues going on through the Cloverleaf on Federal Boulevard and then also jumping across the river. I mean, you're looking at a site here. We're driving across the river at the stadium or at the River Mile Development. I think that this process has enabled us to look at the broader infrastructure impacts, and that includes an adjacent areas. I mean, it's a a discussion that's going to happen with each project in terms of the level of coordination with external partners outside of, you know, the the applicant, basically. But we are having those discussions right now and that specific project. So with so much proposed activity that will be going on, you know, I've asked the people from CDOT what what they're doing to look at all of the development that is being proposed and how that is guiding some of the recommendations coming out of the Powell study, which I think you're familiar with. How how are we looking at development from our side trying to influence the PEL study, for example, with development from, you know, Alameda all the way to 20th Street with huge projects along various stops along the that corridor. I'm not sure I'm familiar with that study. This is where CEDA is looking at how they're going to address future upgrades to I-25 from Alameda to 20th Street and. You know, I've encouraged that they are talking to the CPD about all the development that is be

ing planned, which is why I keep raising the issue about 38th and Fox, because it doesn't go far enough to address all that development at the far north end of the city. And so looking at that corridor as a whole, I think is really important to ensuring that we're not just creating more and more traffic congestion, which already exists pretty much, you know, sun, sunrise, sunset on that corridor. So how do we see us having greater input to see that to influence, you know, maybe how they might address some of those upgrades or improvements as as we're looking at these projects so that it's not all expected to just be on the city streets. And again, you know, I think we all want to see development that looks at how we reduce traffic demand and look at alternative modes of transportation. But we know that all this new development isn't going to happen without cars. Right. And so how we manage all of that becomes really critical to. It's just how what happens in our city and how we're trying to not overburden this particular end of town, for example, that's going to be having a huge amount of development along that I-25 corridor. Yeah. My, my quick response is, again, this would better enable the dialog and that coordination with those parallel efforts. So if there's as compared to the current state, you know, through the rezoning and state planning process, for example, those two tools aren't particularly well equipped to tee up those conversations in terms of looking at, Oh, there's an instructor study going on here, how are we going to integrate with that? Is there an opportunity here? I think the quick answer is a much better tease up that communication and that collaboration with those efforts. Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you. Councilwoman Ortega Guzman Espinosa. So I want to say I'm encouraged actually to hear that the LDR process is being used as you're looking at the stadium district because it affords the city the opportunity to sort of get some of those other concerns addressed that we were talking about in prior rezoning and get them mean in agreements with the city prior to any rezoning that was necessary, probably necessary. Likewise, my question is, I don't know if the text amendment that I have on my computer is the most recent, but if it is, I want to sort of clarify something that I'm reading here in section ten .8.1.3, the minimum amount required. This is a minimum of 10% of the net development area as defined by section 13.1 .6.4, a open space in large development rules of measurement. If I go to that. It says open space, you know, 13 164 open space in large development areas, a net development area. The required amount of open space in large developments shall be calculated as a percentage of the gross development area. It's the only place where we say that everything else seems to point towards the net development area. Is that a typo? So I don't have to put up the language here, but but the the regulat

ion is for. Is that it says the net development area shall be the gross land area within the boundaries and then tells you how to get to the net development area. So that first statement says shall be a percentage of the gross development area. Yeah. The in fumbling through the language here. But it should say that it's a definition of what the what the net development area is, which is basically the gross development area minus areas for roads, other infrastructure parks. So that tells you how to calculate what the net development area is that your open space is based on. There may be clunky wording there, but it should read. Yeah, because to me it would be more accurate to go ahead and say the requirement required amount of open space in large amounts shall be calculated as a percentage of the net development area. The net volume and area shall be this, you know, because the gross development area has a specific definition. I would love it if it were to mean a percentage of the gross development area, which would be far more substantial in some cases than the net. But yeah, it's well, it is the I mean, it is the net area. So and I think that's a that's how we do it with the GDPs currently. So the language could always be improved, but that's the idea is for it to be the gross area, the total area minus other areas that are required to be dedicated . Okay. So then for the purposes of GDP, the what is the definition of open space? So the definite well, the the definition of open space, I guess it's not a defined term in terms of it being in Article 13. I would say the best definition, if you want to call it that, is through the design standards that are in Article ten in terms of what qualifies. So in order for it to meet the requirement for large development, open space, it has to meet a number of design standards related to its public accessibility, its usability and its and you know, it has to be I think it lists some examples of what can qualify as sort a courtyard or plaza natural impervious area, things like that. So that's probably the closest thing to a definition which is basically setting forth what qualifies. Okay. The reason why I ask is it's very clear on, you know, you know, frontage towards, you know, you know, access from streets, name streets and stuff like that. But seems pretty vague to me still on the material, you know. And so hopefully we'll we'll watch this and see how it how it gets utilized. But please, I mean, I know the intent is that this does not become streets and this does you know, we specifically prohibited that. But developers I still think there's latitude here for developers to sort of take advantage of what we're calling open space . Yeah, I mean, we definitely made improvements. This project was about addressing a process, I will say, and the idea of open space is certainly a hot button issue. And we made improvements, recognizing that there's also a city wide conversation that could happen for smaller develo

gments. To that, we would get more into design and functionality and things like that. This these changes were intended to make improvements on precluding trying to preclude some of those bad outcomes. So like specifically saying an off street parking area doesn't count was not something in the GDPs and people were finding that loophole and doing like pavers on a parking lot and coming in as open space, not being able to count like a three foot long linear strip of, you know, you know, of a little bit of landscaping where we we are precluding that with this bill. So we're taking steps in the right direction, I think. But there's definitely a recognition that there could be definitely another turn at this and multiple turns to get at design and all of that stuff. But the hope is also that one of the things that this ADR process, you know, sort of could foster is looking at design standards, and design standards can address open space. So there could be an opportunity there through site specific areas, specific design standards, if that's a priority to address some of these issues about materials and things like that. Great. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Espinosa. Councilwoman Sussman. Thank you for answering all these questions. A lot of this is there's so much planning ease in the in the ordinance and in the language. See if I can simplify things. If it is decided that, then LDR is needed, will an LDR always occur before a rezoning? Yes. I think that's very important to say because GDPs didn't always happen before zoning. Right. It's correct. Right. So this is a this is a major change because people would very often the public would say, well, we don't know exactly what you're going to do when you're asking us to rezone. So the biggest difference is that if it's decided an elder is needed, it happens before a reason. Right. Yeah. It's I mean, there could be in some cases where it's staggered a bit or concurrent. But but the LDR is designed to say is designed to do just that to to mandate a sequence of entitlements and rezoning could be would typically follow the ALR if a rezoning is needed. I think that's probably one of the most important points about creating this LDR In terms of getting neighborhood input and ability to give their views. The other one is if you have a an owner of a property who's wondering if he's going to need to do an LDR and the and the decision is going to go to the Development Review Committee. Is do we

have anywhere stated that it's in the is it a consensus of the committee? Is it a majority vote of the committee? Do we know who the voters are? That still is not as predictive as it could be. Do. Is there any feeling about how that process works? Yeah. I mean, that's probably an area that's probably one example like that you know, that we could provide a little more clarity through like rules and regs or supplemental guidelines or something as an example. But I will say to that point, the, the LDR, the outcome of the or

der of the all the F does require joint signatures of those agencies. So presumably, you know, in order for them to sign it, they will have had to be brought along through the whole process in terms of saying yes, it was applicable and have had this interagency dialog leading to that outcome. But the specific decision point in the language is DRC. It does not say majority or any voting system, but that's something that we could look to, to clarify that a little more predictability for folks. You need every signature, so it has to be unanimous to it. Did I understand that. For the final. For the final yea. For the final LDR. That's correct. Okay. Okay. But not necessarily for deciding that it needs to now be crimes. Yeah. That's the way the. Is there a universe of criteria that could be listed? Probably not, because it's always hard to list what you can do. Or perhaps is there a universe of criteria of when it wouldn't happen? Okay. This do we have a universe in either of those instances to give a little bit more predictive this to. Yeah. We have a pretty long universe of when it is required or we don't have the universe when it's not required. I mean, this is good. This is good food for thought for us to provide that clarity because I mean, this is you know, those are impacts on projects. So we want to make sure we have as much predictability as possible. So that's something we could consider. Okay. Sure. Thanks for that. Appreciate it. Thank you, Councilwoman Sussman, Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Jeff, so to understand, the LDR process requires a single public meeting, and then obviously if it goes into a rezoning, there would be more involvement in that process itself. Correct. Okay. So one thing I'm kind of disappointed in my memory is that when I was first briefed that this LDA process was coming to replace the GDP, the two important points for me were that the 10% requirement for open space dropped from ten acres to five. But then there was going to be another 10% of green space. What happened to that? Yes. So I believe you're referring to the idea of Parkland City, Parkland dedication, which is what we shared with you, I believe, at the briefing. So, um, and correct me if I'm wrong as they go on this path here, but there's sort of two types of open space in this project or through this lens. There's the open space as set forth in. This bill, which is typically going to be privately owned, publicly accessible, so not a dedicated city park. What you, I think are referring to is a discussion that is still ongoing with the Parks Department and others to look at a citywide Parkland dedication requirement. And so the percentages and all of that haven't been fully calibrated yet. But that is still that is still in play now. And we're working through that. And there's actually an individual here from the Parks Department, if you wanted to kind of drill down on what that project looks like currently. But basically, this bill

allows that to happen. So what I mean by that is the 10% minimum open space is a given as part of this bill for all site development over five acres. But there's built in flexibility so that if the Parks Department proposal, through their own adopted rules and regulations or any code changes, wanted to propose and look at additional Parkland requirements. There's the ability to do that within this bill and have them sync up with each other. So essentially this LDR process, for example, tees up that question of whether or not Parkland dedication will be required for the project per the Parks and Recreation Rules and Regulations as adopted. But right now, that greenspace requirement is still in discussion. Could happen, might not happen. It's pretty far along and I think there's a lot of momentum to it. But it's not it's not final yet. So we're not voting on that tonight. Correct? Yeah. Yeah, that's correct. The other thing about open space that I found interesting in her neighborhood cooperation was proposing a more complex way to assess open space. Right now, we assess it two dimensionally based on the square footage of the property, correct? The 10% number? Yeah. It's a land area of the land. The land area. But there their point being that we're building so robustly now that there's probably a difference in what we need as far as open space. If we're talking a few 20 story buildings, then if we're talking a few five story buildings. And what was the thought in CPD about that? Yeah. So that's there's a recognition that there's a deficiency there and an issue in terms of looking more holistically at open space for all projects. So all I can say is that this bill was about again about fixing a process, but we did improve the open space requirements by lowering

the threshold and making it more applicable and making the design foster a publicly accessible, usable community benefit. But in order to look at all sites so not, you know, the ones that are smaller but maybe have more density, for example, I mean, that's something that while we would have liked to address with this bill, was a bit out of the scope in terms of looking at all projects, which I think is what the ideal state would be. They're looking at, for example, sites smaller than five acres, but also sites open space calibrated to intensities and densities and land uses and things like that. There's a whole big picture conversation, I think, that we want to have and probably will have to to address these sites more holistically. Okay. And then last question, Mr. President. Jeff. So as you know, when we passed Blueprint and we passed the comp plan, there was a statement added that in as we plan our city, addressing the need to mitigate our impact on climate change is our overarching guide. So I'm wondering what are the discussions in CPD at this point about what that means and how you might assess developments with that in mind? Oh, I know. Yeah, that's a big one. I mean, that's a that's a

huge issue for sure. And I guess my only response to that would be this process improvement will again tee up those conversations better to where it's designed to look at all of those policies holistically, that being one of them, to figure out and to kind of put our heads together across all the city agencies to figure out if there are strategies that we could implement through the LDR process related to whatever it is, green infrastructure, things like that. There's so many strategies I think, that could get at that issue, but that's sort of a core it's definitely a core policy that would be better teed up through this process, I think. And I think you're probably. Be right. But I just wanted to point out that the wording is it doesn't say that we should also look at climate change. It says it's our overarching guide. It's our number one thing to be committed or to be considered. And so I know we're starting some discussions among members as to exactly how to approach that. And I'm hoping your department is as well. Awesome. Thank you. That's all, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Jeff, I want to clarify, did you say that the Development Review Committee would include people from representation from the Housing Division of Economic Development and from MAST? Because what I read in the ordinance was that it consists of the managers, CPD manager of Public Works, the zoning administrator, the fire chief and the manager of Parks and Recreation. Are we changing that in this text amendment or is that are they ad hoc members? Yeah. So those they would not as part of this Texoma would be a part of the DRC and the DRC is already a set group. Right. And that's been codified. But what we did do is explicitly add those other agencies as referral partners as part of the frontloading of the evaluation. Okay. So they're not part of the initial decision making. Well, they will be at the table. Yeah, I guess in terms of what the code says but as one thing. But, but you know that that's the practice that we talked about how we're institutionalizing that they are part of that group that is deciding on these but the code is for the DRC is is kind of locked in. Okay. What is what. Is the public engagement process that the department is is looking at for? When you draw up the rules and regulations. For the for the community information meeting that's required. When you draw up rules and regulations for implementing the LDR. Process. And you're going to draw rules and regulations. How are you going to roll that out? How are you going to gather input from the public, from the community in general, from the landowners, from from the investors, from everybody. Yeah. So important to clarify. So the rules and regulations are supplemental to the code. So it's really only supposed to be about clarifications and like. I see the draft as. In here. Yeah, yeah. Okay. Yeah, there's a detachment to the staff report. So

we in terms of vetting that, we've taken that to a planning board twice now and there'll be the third time next week. And we've certainly shared the public review drafts, but most of what is in there is clarification of what's in the text amendment . So there hasn't been. Yeah. Okay. Should there be should more outreach or is are you figuring that going to the planning board is sufficient? Well, yeah. I mean, there's there's and like I said early in the presentation, we are actually working with some stakeholders who through this process have identified some issues with the rules and regs. So we're having some individual engagement on refinements to the rules and regs. But, um, but ultimately, you know, what is in the rules and regs is supplemental to the, to the bill, right? And being carried forward from, from what's already on the books with the GDP rules and regulations actually. So there's not a okay. But you know, where the ordinance, where the code that we're adopting tonight sets up the framework, it's sometimes the devil's in the details of the rules and

regs. That's that's why. That's why I'm asking. Yeah, that's. Okay. All right. Well, I'll. I'll follow that. Let me give you a feed arrest and ask Jennifer a question. So. Halftime. Could you expand a little bit and explain the issue that you saw with the requirement for a public access easement on private open space? I can. The requirement for public access or a public easement over private property in the case of multi-family housing, which is a very narrow section and that would include for rent and for sale in the case of a for sale product. So condominiums or townhomes, for example, provided that that space meets the contiguity and width and all of those requirements under Kiawah or the Colorado Common Interest Ownership Act. There are some requirements that you cannot burden private homeowners with public requirements. And so this would apply to a for sale. Correct. It would absolutely apply to for sale. It would apply to any for sale that met that requirement. That met that requirement. It would also. Not to a rental. It would also apply to rental. So in the case of rental or affordable housing, the concern or the primary concern there is that affordable housing, as you all know, is a very complicated issue that uses a very complicated set of financial mechanisms in order to create the framework so that it can happen in a public private partnership . Two of those more commonly known frameworks, one is Ly Tak, which is a low income housing tax credit product, and the other are some HUD loans that are subsidized with private financing or some soft financing, if you will. Both of those, it creates an issue of liability to have a public access and over private property, a required public access over the private property. And it also creates some real potential issues with the LURA or the land use restriction agreement that you have to make in order for the project to continue to b

e low income over the 30 years of the property. So they're to put it to potential seriously legal issues in the limited case of multifamily. All right. Thank you, Jeff. Good. Let me follow up on that. That is there a is there any other mechanism that the city has at its disposal that would ensure that the private open space remains open space in perpetuity other than a public access easement? Yeah. I'm not too knowledgeable, but there are. Yeah. I mean, you look at, for example, I believe through a subdivision plan with the, you know, with notations on it. And I'm not sure if through a development agreements, I'm kind of out of my league on that if that one would be possible. But there are and this in this language was drafted with the assumption that there could potentially be other tools. But we wanted to make sure that we had the ability. The intent with our is that this open space would remain public, open space as though it were a city park, even if it is publicly owned. Is that. Yeah. I mean, I know. I don't know if I'd say as if it were a city park, but because that's a different sort of definition of the space. But that is the intent is to have a mechanism in place to remains publicly accessible in perpetuity. And one last thing, just generally. Are there circumstances where an area less than five acres could nevertheless also be subject to this process. To the for the open space or. To to LDR to the. Other process? Yeah. So yeah. So just as is in the current GDP world, something less than ten acres could be subject to it. Same thing with the five acre. Threshold. And then other circumstances that you could envision where an area greater than ten acres would not be subject to LDR. It's possible. Yep. Mm hmm. Okay. Thank you for that. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, Councilman Gilmore. Thank you, President Clark. Jeff, could you talk a little bit more about the the DRC and I guess what the transparency is going to look like around how they're making decisions? Are we going to see kind of what their, you know, decision making metrics is or how are we going to have transparency around that so that if something does trigger the LDR, we understand how those decisions were made, but then as it goes through the process, my second question is how is the equity lens going to be overlaid on that process as well? Looking at different parts of the city, we sometimes get different development outcomes for a. Variety of reasons. And with CPD and Public Works and Parks and Rec and ultimately City Council going through equity training, how how is that going to, I guess, be woven into this process? Yes, that's a good question. So in terms of how to use the equity lens through the LDR process, again, so the process is designed to to bring those partners around the table and have the discussion about which equity policies could be applicable to the site at a citywide or neighborhood level. And so and then the idea is, you know, once those have been identified

and this is a hypothetical, of course, but once those once those have been identified, figure out what the right tool is to achieve said community benefits related equity, for example. And so there may be in an LDR an articulation of what those benefits are at a higher level. And, you know, so and then it will and then the LDR might say through a development agreements address X, Y, Z,

equity policies. And so that becomes a are an improved record, a document, the LDF that sets forth those parameters so that as development proceeds within the LDR area, there's that core, you know, that tie back that says, you know, whatever it says in the LDR, rezoning happens first in the infrastructure master plan. Concurrently with that, a development agreement to address said community benefits as part of that. So it's memorialized at that level, at least conceptually in terms of the equity lens. So yeah, I guess that's the answer. And then from memorializing it, I guess, how does the community have the assurance that it's actually implemented in that way? Yeah, so I mean, it's, it's a binding document that is recorded and publicly available. And so, um, so it's something that everyone would be held accountable to. Okay. And so I just again, you know, to my earlier question, just transparency around how those decisions are made so that when we're going out to a community meeting, folks can understand how we got to that place. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, that's fair. So so that's one of the I think one of the reasons why we we built in the community information meeting where we did in the overall kind of process. So going back to that flow chart, but essentially the community information meeting is repurposed from what it is in the GDP world today, which is basically a developer presenting and development concept in a in a plan. In a lot of ways, it's been repurposed more toward sharing the city's findings, for one, that the LDR was applicable. And why then also the preliminary scope to address key questions like is there an adopted plan? Are preliminary assessment that we will be sharing with the community at that meeting would be, you know, yes or no. There's an adopted plan that addresses this site. Here's the preliminary scope that we you know, we've started to develop with the applicant going forward. So that could address equity, the equity lens, for example. So the idea is to be able to share the information with the community as to how we got to where we are before anything gets finalized with, with the large development framework basically at the end. Um, so, yeah, so that's great. Thank you. Thank you, President Clark. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. Councilwoman Cannick. Thanks, Mr. President. I just wanted to briefly follow up with is it Jennifer, the attorney? Thanks so much. So I really appreciate, you know, wanting to look out for eventualities that could interfere with housing. But I guess I just wanted to ask, you know, having seen a lot of five a

nd ten acre developments, I've never seen any at that scale that have put the open space in the private responsibility of an owner of a multifamily building versus under the ownership of the MAT district or the large. This is not a standalone this wouldn't you know, to Councilman Flynn's point, this wouldn't apply to the typical one parcel development. And so can you just answer, do you have a specific project in mind that's causing this concern or is this more of a just in case? Because I just don't in my, you know, 15 years of doing affordable housing, I've not seen the scenario that you're describing because typically they can't afford to use a portion of land in that way that's publicly accessible. That's just not a realistic thing that someone can finance in a typical project. I can't speak to the condo side, but again, just is this a specific project? You have great points, great questions. The answer is more from a large scale development process. So what I think is missing here is that the LDR process, as you heard, starts first and then subdivision happens and we're talking about large parcels. So you're talking about really master development in a lot of ways or development of large parcels, large areas. And then once so you're deciding at that point open space, you're deciding park land. You're making decisions that, as you're pointing out, really should be more on a site level or down on a local level as these master developers are talking currently with developers. Right. The land's not all just sitting fallow and no one's doing anything with it. They're master planning communities, of which that includes affordable housing. But what happens is those open space requirements, which are changed now and it changes the the entire landscape of what and when it's required happen, that happens on an upfront decision. It gets shared over the parcels on all of the property. So at that point, it does make it very difficult. It also means that local, the singular or parts of that development would be applied. You would have you could feasibly. And there are actually some. I have to be very careful with the attorney client privilege. I don't have the I'm sorry. I'm not being cagey. I just don't have the authority to disclose those projects. But yes, it does have the potential to have to affect potential projects. Okay. I'm just going to move to Jeff real quickly. Thank you very much. I appreciate that, Jeff. The previous speaker just made a reference to the idea that you would, you know, distribute an affordable housing requirement across all the parcels. That is only one option available. Nothing in this ordinance would require each individual portion of a large development to meet a percentage goal. In theory and in fact, most large development areas designate a portion of their site and dedicate a larger tract of, you know, open

space for efficiency or whatever. They don't necessarily need under this policy to assure that each and every piece

of vertical development within the project fulfills a percentage open spaces that I just want to clarify. Yeah, I think you're right. I mean, there's nothing in this bill that changes the allocation and distribution of affordable housing. I mean, the open space requirements are what they are. You can you can you can. You can fulfill them in one portion of the site and require none of your vertical developers to do any of it. In theory. That's correct. As long as you meet the 10%, you can allocated whoever you want. Okay. Thank you very much. No further questions. Thank you, Councilwoman. Each. All right. Seeing no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 19 0494 is closed. We're going to move into the comment section. Are there comments by members of Council on this item? Councilman Espinosa. Yeah. You know, I also wanted to say as a I don't I don't I don't share the real concern about the potential that you're talking about simply because the master developer will apportion the open space in as appropriate, given the new process and those those parcels that will be dedicated or, you know, earmarked essentially for, you know , low income projects or housing, you know, housing developments will be we'll have to factor that in. You know, when you're when you're when you're when you sell that because it won't be on a parcel by parcel basis, it will be on the development scale. So unless you were doing some massive project, but again, it would still be there are so many ways to skin this cat. And that's what the beauty of this whole LDR process is, is it just allows it starts to close a lot of I mean, it starts to compel us to have a lot of conversations to finally get outcomes that we've been trying to get through a whole haphazard scheme of, of things. And so and it and it has some vagueness that I wish were tighter. But I think over time we'll find out whether we do need more regulatory constraints to handle those things as they come up. But it also then affords itself to be adaptable to those things as they as they come up. So just thank you all the volunteers, the staff that have been working on this for some time because it's one that's been desperately needed to be addressed and it will be, you know, future councils can look forward to seeing the results of the public process and potential rezonings that actually start to factor in some of the concerns that we've been articulating for the last four years that I've been here. Things. Thank you, Councilman Espinosa, Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you, Mr. President. I really appreciated the comment from my colleague, Councilwoman Sussman. I'm going to miss you of saying how much planner speak is in all this and how to really boil down why this matters to people. And so I just want to say that I believe that this is an important step forward in creating a more rational, clear system for proceeding with large redevelopment. And my simple way of talking about it is, is there is a

good plan and good guidance. Then this lays out the next steps. If there isn't a good plan and good guidance, then it says you have to have that first. And and I think that that's really important. And and it means the city leads it. We've had confusion, I think, in some large developments in the past where you have developer led processes sometimes creating a feeling that it's not an equitable process for the whole community. And so the number one change I expect to see come from this is where there's not plan guidance. We don't have to do what we did, you know, and thankfully the staff was amenable. But when, you know, Councilman Flynn and I talked about the Loreto Heights thing, it was we have to ask. For a process, you know, or when we talked about, you know, some of the sites, you know, they did not get a process that was city led. They had a developer led process. And so it was a situation of whether you were successful in advocating for that or you weren't. Now it's clear if it's a city led process, if there's not plan guidance or you better have a darn good excuse. And I appreciate a Councilwoman Gilmore's questions, I think this puts a lot of accountability on the administration and on the large. I'm sorry. Lldr0 Irc Irc. It puts a lot of onus on the administration to be very consistent in your decision making and very transparent in your rationales and to, wherever possible, include the council in that process. I think that where you do so, you end up with more consensus and more understanding of what the community needs are and more insight. So even though this is not our function under the charter, there is no reason we cannot be collaborative. And on projects like River Mile, where you worked closely with Councilman Brooks and Councilman Espinosa to think about those types of aspects of it. I think you had more success and we had more success as a city, so I wanted this to solve every problem we have with disconnects between affordable housing and planning. And it's probably not going to solve every problem that we have with those disconnects. But I did feel through three or four meetings that I had, both with the

planning staff, the housing staff, including some of your high up directors, that that things are moving in a good direction and that the the areas where improvement are needed are identified and new staffing is coming with new expertise. And so I do feel like this is going to put us in a better position to be more coordinated about equity and about preventing displacement before it happens. So for us to do all that will require a lot of vigilance. And so I hope that we check in on this, and I hope you keep really good data on each and every project that does or doesn't get selected and why and the size of those projects and the outcomes that open space. I think data is going to be really important for us, so I hope that's part of the work plan going forward. And then lastly, I will just say there was a lot of conversa

tion about this other piece about, you know, community benefits as a way to doing equity. And we've just we're all using pretty different terminology. And, you know, there is some standardization out there in the rest of the country. And I know I've already started talking to some of the folks on the team, but there's a difference between when we put things that are good for the community in our agreements versus when the community gets its own agreement where they're the signatories and they're the enforcers and then how we support the community or whether we're at the table with them. And so I just hope that we all will sit at the table more and clarify what we're all talking about so that when the council members, both those here tonight and those that are new, are using the terminology and you are in the community as we all are using the same language. Because I do think that this for me, large development matters because of the impacts on a community and the change that it creates. Right. But it also especially matters because it is the biggest potential negative impact in terms of displacement or ripple effects, and it's also the potential to mitigate those effects. And so for me, that's what makes it so important. And I just want to thank you. I gave a lot of feedback, even though I don't sit in over four or five meetings. And you were really thoughtful and included a lot of that feedback and a lot of the changes. So I found it to be a really collaborative process and I want to thank the staff for all of the hard work and all the community members who served on it. Thank you. I'll be really excited to take this big step forward tonight. Thank you, Councilman Canete. Seeing no other comments, I will just add and forgive me for being brief, but the hours late and we have more to do after this. Just thank you. I think this is a huge step forward in a lot of ways. Thank you for all the work that went into this and and for bringing it forward. I will be happy to support it. And I don't think I've ever seen in four years that many people, almost everybody up here grilled with questions and then nobody else commented. So you guys did a great job answering everyone's questions during the question phase. So thank you, Madam Secretary. Roll call on Council Bill 494. Black Eye. Brooks I. Espinosa Flynn. I. Gilmore. I. Herndon. I Cashman. Clinic Lopez. Sorry. That was my microphone. Ortega assessment. All right. We don't have we don't have a place to. Oh, there it is. It's just. Thank you, Mr. President. Madam Secretary, please. Because the voting announced results. 11. Nice 11 nice. Comfortable 494 has passed. Councilwoman Gilmore, would you please for accountable 447 on the floor? of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes and there is no yielding up time. On the presentation monitor on the wall you will see your time counting down. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain fro

m profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Councilman Flynn, will you please put Council Bill 584 on the floor? Yes, I will, Mr. President. Thank you. I move that council bill 19 Dash 584 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Constable 584 is open. May we have the staff report? Yes. Thank you. Good evening. I am Libby Adams. I'm an associate city planner with community planning and Development, and I'm here to present on the proposed text amendment to the Denver Revised Municipal Code regarding the partial rezoning, a former Chapter 59 planned unit developments. And so in the following slides, we'll talk about the purpose of this text amendment. I'll go through the summary of the existing regulations and what's being proposed. I'll highlight the public process and the feedback we received. I'll talk about how the review, how the proposed tax amendment meets the review criteria and then conclude with the staff recommendation . And this proposed zoning text amendment is sponsored by the Community Planning and Development Executive Director. So the purpose of the text amendment is to revise the Denver Revised Municipal Code to change who may submit an application to rezone a portion of a former Chapter 59 planned unit development. The hope is that

this will encourage property owners in the former Chapter 59 PUD to rezone into districts in the Denver zoning code by simplifying the requirements for who may submit an application. So the under the existing requirement in order for a single property to re zone out of an old code pad. All property owners within that PUD would be required to sign the application under the proposed requirement. Just the applicant who's proposing to rezone their property out of the old code would be required to sign the application. So this applies only to applications for portions of former Chapter 59 PDS that would be rezoning into a district in the Denver zoning code. The existing signatures requirement presents an unnecessary barrier that doesn't exist for other former Chapter 59 properties. So those with waivers and conditions, as well as those unplanned building groups, are all able to submit an application for an individual property. So removing it would level the playing field for all property owners that are within the former Chapter 59 code. So this is an illustration of the existing requirement. So if the property owner of the blue, the property represented in blue would want to rezone out, they would have to get signatures from all eight property owners within this PWD in order just to submit an application. Under the proposed requirement, the property owner in blue would be the only one required to sign the application in order to apply for rezoning. And this is a map of the former Chapter 59 pads that are in Denver. So the ones in kind of t

he orange, a yellow color are just one property. So those won't be affected by this text amendment. But the ones in red are multiple properties. So those would potentially be affected by this amendment. So as you can see, it does impact all areas of the city, but is concentrated those in Cherry Creek and then the far northeast. This is just a highlight of the public process. I won't go through everything it was in your staff packet, but I will highlight just a couple of things. So on January seven, this red line and the summary was posted to the Community Planning and Development website as well as an email was sent to registered neighborhood organizations and city council members. Then on January 26th, staff went before the entire Neighborhood Cooperation, Zoning and Planning Committee to present on this topic. And in that meeting, we did learn that they would that the greater agency organization would be meeting on February 9th, which is three days after the originally scheduled planning board hearing. And so in order to allow them to meet as a large organization and come to a formal vote on this matter, we decided to postpone the planning board hearing. So that's why this process started several months ago. And then we also allowed for more time for public input. So we went to the Montebello Neighborhood Improvement Association meeting on February 20th. And then we're here before you today on August 5th for the city council public hearing. We did receive three public comment emails and one motion from ANC regarding this topic. The first comment was from a private citizen and they were opposed to the text amendment. Their concern was that this would facilitate piecemeal rezoning of former Chapter 59 properties into the Denver zoning code. However, this amendment does not change the process for a rezoning, so any owner applying to rezone a former Chapter 59 PD into the Denver zoning code would have to meet all of the review criteria. And as a part of the rezoning process, community planning and development would make sure there would be no ill effects. And if there would be ill effects on the remainder, then that may be one that staff would recommend denial on. And then the second comment we received was from a registered neighborhood organization, and they were concerned that PDD amendments that were negotiated between the neighborhood and the developer would be nullified if one property were to come out . However, this text amendment will not change any established agreements. Those would still be in place. And then we received one comment from a private citizen in support of the amendment, and then the motion from ANC was in opposition. And so to the criteria for review for a proposed tax amendment are found in section 12 for 1211 of the Denver Zoning Code. And CPD finds that the proposed TEX amendment is consistent with many of the goals, strategies and policies found in comprehensive plan 2040, as well as Blueprint 2019 to highlight a few.

The comprehensive plan calls for improved, equitable access to city resources and city meetings, and to adopt strategies to ensure city plans and processes incorporate equity as well as promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. So this text amendment promotes equity by putting property owners in the former Chapter 59 Code RPD on a level playing field with all other property owners that are still in old code districts by allowing them to individually apply for rezoning. And then it promotes infill development by eliminating a barrier that currently

inhibits the development of former Chapter 59 Pwds and then Blueprint Denver 2019 specifically encourages incentivizing property owners in the former Chapter 59 code to rezone to the Denver Zoning Code. And this text amendment does just that. It's one way it simplifies the requirements for applications, making it easier for property owners to come in to the new code. And then staff also finds that the Tech Summit furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the city by providing all property owners within the old code an equal opportunity to apply for rezoning. So the requirement for consent from all property owners within a former Chapter 59 PD to apply for a rezoning does not exist for other former Chapter 59 properties. In addition, under the proposed amendment, properties would be subject to the rezoning process and the Denver Zoning Code, which requires a more frequent and extensive notification process to property owners and registered neighborhood organizations than that of the former Chapter 59 Code. And then finally CPD finds the text amendment will result in regulations that are uniform in each district. More specifically, the amendment will result in uniform application requirements for all properties in the former Chapter 59 code proposing to rezone into the Denver zoning code. So staff has reviewed the proposed tax amendment for compliance based on the review criteria and has found the amendment satisfies each of the three review criteria. So staff recommends the Denver City Council approve the partial rezonings of former Chapter 59 planned unit development text amendment to the Denver Revised Municipal Code. And that concludes staff presentation. Thank you very much. We have seven individuals signed up to speak this evening. If you signed up to speak on this item, I'd ask that you come up to this front bench so that you're ready. When I call your name to step up to the microphone and your time will start. First up, we have Merrill Carter. And again, I'd ask if you've signed up to come up here because you're going to lose some time if you're not ready to jump up. So I'm concerned with the fact that we the city, is giving state money to these corporations. I'm not. I've been an addiction counselor here. And I'm sorry, sir, but this is for the rezoning for chapter 59. I'm sorry. If you'd like to sign up for a courtesy hearing abou

t those items, check in with our council secretary. But that's not what this hearing is for. Okay. Thank you. Next up, Michael Anderson. They could kill two members of her. Allow me to speak to you. Address you this evening. I'm going to read for some notes that I took in my purpose for being here as support of the Core and Geo Geo. Again, unfortunately, that's not this hearing. I think you signed up for the wrong one. We have to this evening so we can check in with the council secretary. She'll get you signed up for the right hearing. Thank you very much. Next up, Chairman. Thank you. My name's is Sekou. I represent the Black Sox Movement for Self-defense. Couple of questions. I can see was in opposition to this change. And. I heard nothing in the staff report about that letter of opposition in terms of why they are opposed to this, since it's such a good idea and they represent. When it comes to getting community input, they're much better at doing that and getting more people involved than the people who were given the report. It would seem to me that something of this nature. You would expect for their meetings to reflect that in terms of the number of people who actually attended the meeting. That's not in the report. So we don't know whether it was one person at the meeting or at Montebello. We don't know what was a community engagement with that Arnaud to get people to that meeting. And so I'm kind of lost there because after 15 years, that is some justice just gonna slip in here with this one here. And my last concern is this when we're talking about property owners and we're talking about people who actually own multiple unit dwellings as property owners in these areas that we wanted to do the zoning zoning change. It was my understanding that when I pay rent with I own the property or not, then I'm doing the things that the property owners are required to do that don't do that. I do that. So how come I'm not included in this as being a resident who has approved this thing? My boys ain't even are, but I'm paying for all of this. So what's going on here with this sale? Is this class legislation for just the rich and we don't matter. And then you asked for our opinion. But then you don't. And then we're paying for all of this because as a renter, I'm paying taxes, too, and I'm paying property taxes. Taxes on the property. But you don't talk to me about none of this. And you want to pass this mess for real. This shouldn't even be considered out of the sense of equity and justice to the people who are paying taxes. This is crazy. But this is what we do down here, because you dismissed the people who matter the most and recruit the people who don't matter to most. Property owners don't even live in the city county of Denver. So you talk to me and you tell me I'm lying about this mess. I'm sorry, but your time is up. Next up, Jesse Paris. Jesse Pierce, represented for Denver Homicide, a low black star action movement for self-defense and posit

ive action commitment for social change. And I was on top of the battle for our lives this past May 2019 election by almost 15,000 votes with no money. We are neither for or against this. I wanted to know exactly who is going to benefit is going to benefit the property owners. We know this. So it's going to make it easier for them to do a rezoning. So if they want to do a upscaling of their property, they will not have to notify their immediate neighbors surrounding business owners of this to get their application approved. Is that correct? Is that what I'm understanding? So I have that question. Is that whether. It's going to happen? This is just your comments in national section. How would this factor in with potential tiny home villages and encampments? Would a property owners be able to change the rezoning to allow for these things to even be possible or to use or any other attainable housing that our property owners might want to do if they actually cared about our housing crisis? That's my question. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Amy, former. Oh. Amy disappeared? Nope. Okay. We'll get her moved over to the other one, Brian Conley. Evening Council. I'm Brian Connolly. As some of you know, I'm a land use planner and land use lawyer with the firm of Otten, Johnson, Robinson, Neff and Ragan. Eddie, I am not here this evening on behalf of one single client, but on behalf of several of our clients who have been in the position of being in properties that are under former Chapter 59 pads, but that have sought rezonings out of those pads. And so therefore we are here fully in support of this amendment, which is very much a common sense amendment. I think there are three underlying reasons that we would encourage your support. The first is that this amendment would allow a conversation to begin when a landowner desires to rezone out of a former Chapter 59 district, as Ms.. Adams presented very well. Any landowner who wants to even start that conversation has to first get the signatures of every person who owns property within the party to even file an application . So it allows the conversation to begin. It allows your professional staff to review those applications, and it allows those conversations to come forward to you. The second reason we support this is that this or this amendment would be consistent and make Denver consistent with every other jurisdiction in the state of Colorado in which we've worked. There is no other jurisdiction in the state that requires every landowner within a party to consent to a rezoning of it. It allows parcel by parcel rezonings. And the third reason that we are supportive of this amendment is that many landowners who find themselves with amputees, who require the support of all the other owners, find themselves in a position of being assaulted by those other owners. For amendments, we've been in the position where you have maybe one holdout landowner who does not want to consent to a piece of the amendment, b

ut will only do so on the condition that he or she is paid a certain amount of money to consent to the amendment . And so that prevents several, at least in our experience, has presented several meritorious projects from moving forward, everything from grocery stores in communities that are underserved with grocery stores to affordable housing projects, projects that would involve the creation of new public space. So for all those reasons, we think this is very much a common sense amendment. We thank your staff for bringing this forward. It's something that for a long time we observed was an issue. And so we would very much respectfully request your support of this amendment. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there questions for members of council? Comes from black. Thank you, Mr. President. Libby, I have a question for you, first of all. Great presentation. Thank you. While we don't always get that. So my question was about PBGC plan building groups. And I feel like I heard you say that this applies to PBDEs. Is that true? So you as like an individual property owner in a PBGC, you could apply to rezone to a new district, but you would still remain in the planned building group. So this doesn't change the plan. To get out of the plan to building group, you would still have to have all of the required signatures. Okay. And is CPD working on perhaps changing that? Annalise It's sort of like you might have an answer to that. I happen to have a lot of those in my district. In there currently that's not on the work program on what we're committing to, but it's something that we might evaluate further. PB Jesus and parties are quite different in nature because a PBJ is essentially a site specific development plan that has more detailed elements such as drainage and landscaping and parking. And so there's a little bit more nuance that goes into those. So right now we're not proposing any changes, but we can follow up with you more on that. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Black. Councilwoman CdeBaca. Thank you, Mr. President. Can you tell us. Or. Describe a real example. Of one of these pads and perhaps how it didn't allow us to do something beneficial to. The community? Certainly. So in Council District 11, the far northeast, there is pad 319. Let me see if I

can pull it up here. Um. Let's see. Here it is. So it's Green Valley Ranch, and then the park is split by Pena Boulevard. And this park does not allow for a grocery store. It specifically says no grocery stores. And I believe several years ago, there was a proposal to put a grocery store in this park and it was unable to happen because there are so many owners in this party that they would have had to get hundreds of signatures and with property owners constantly changing. They were stuck with the development that the city currently calls for. Thank you. Thank you. Councilwoman CdeBaca. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Mr. President. Libby, can you. One of the concerns I've

had is this work through the process is exactly what you spoke to about and what some of the opposition is rooted in, which is all the property owners in appear to have a common interest in some of the agreements and the waivers and conditions. And I know that your answer was, well, staff would likely not put forward a change requested by a single owner within a payday to to make a change that might alter those agreements that were made. I think the R.A. cited that. The one R.A. and I can see. Can you speak to what other safeguards are in place, if any, other than just a staff review before it comes to us? Because we would be the final wall protecting the other owners in a PD from losing some of their their rights. Yeah, certainly. So in this PD 319, for example, there are development agreements and so for roadway improvements and things like that. And so those would still remain in place if the one see the kind of the larger property at Green Valley Ranch and Pena Boulevard were to rezone out so we could have a grocery store. So there are other agreements or infrastructure master plans that would keep some of those things in place. So the rezoning would not nullify an impact. So in that sense, to go back to Councilwoman Black's question, it wouldn't, you know, if you were in a planned building group, you would still be bound, even though today I have a PBGC at my old Target village, for instance, with several other properties in it. If one of those property owners wanted to rezone out of the old B3, which is old chapter 59, then you're saying that they would still be bound by all the requirements in the plan building? Correct, yes. So they would still have to file the plan building group, but they could apply to rezone to a different to. Do another use perhaps or some. Okay. All right. Thank you. That's Thomas President. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Councilman Hines. Thank you, Mr. President. Question Are there any current pwds in the country club neighborhood? So there are two, I believe, and I think they may be single owner. Let me. One may actually just be outside the bounds. Oh, this isn't close enough, is it? On a lease may be looking here, but I think there might be one or just two. And while you're looking, the reason why I'm asking the question I think, you know, is that the the one R.A. that voted that it registered opposition other than ANC is the country club historic neighborhood. So I'm our country club neighborhood organization so I'm kind of filling time so the analyst can do a little more searching. But so I guess I'll ask another question. Why might a neighborhood that doesn't have a lot of affected, why might an R.A. take a position against if this R.A. doesn't have a lot of or can you help provide additional context as to why Country Club might have voted against? Yeah. So I think's the PDS that I'm thinking of May. If they're not in country club, they're right on the border. So it could have been that when the parties

were first established, the neighborhood had an agreement with the developer that was adjacent to their neighborhood. Okay. And so this obviously country club's in Converse Perfect ten. So I want to make sure that I understand and listen to their concerns as well. If we were to have future zoning variances, which I'm again, I think what I think you've just answered this with Councilman Flynn, but I just want to make sure I understand country club R.A. would have all the same protections as they would if this weren't a party like you. Just go this the same regular zoning process. Correct. Yeah. So they would still get the referral and they would be able to comment on the project? Correct. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Hines, are no other questions? The public hearing for Council Bill 584 is closed. Are there any comments by members of council? Well, not everybody jump in at the same time. All right. Seeing no comments. Madam Secretary. Raquel. Black Eye. CdeBaca. I. Flint High. Gilmer. I. Herndon. I. Paint. I. Can each. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I swear. I. Torres. I. 12. I didn't get to vote. I mean, I voted on here. But you. Didn't ask. Mr. President. Okay. I. Madam Secretary, please vote in the results. Now, I think we have 12. Thank you. 12 eyes. Gainesville, 584 has passed. Councilman Flynn, will you please put Council Resolution 673 on the floor? Councilman CdeBaca has called out Bill 678 for comment and 818 for a vote under Bill's for final consideration. No items have been called out and under pending. No items have been called up today. Miss anything? All right, Madam Secretary, will you please for the first item on our

screens? This is 825. Councilman Herndon, would you please put resolution 825 on the floor. And move the council resolution 19 to 0 8 to 5 be adopted? It has been moved and seconded. Comments by Members of Council Councilwoman CdeBaca. Thank you, Mr. President. I called this out because this is a lease change for a downtown establishment called Onyx. Currently it was previously known as Ebony. Do are the owners or the parties of this lease in the audience? Okay. So I'm calling it out because the a little bit of background, there were some issues that arose in 2016 and 2017 regarding some something that happened on the patio of this establishment. This establishment was bought out or the lease was transferred in 2018. And then there was an incident in July of 2019 that raised some safety concerns. The new owners were not given substantial time to remedy the issues that were raised. The owners are people of color. This is an establishment owned by the city, leased out to the club. And so I just wanted to make it clear that I don't feel that the way we went about this process with these tenants was fair. I think that for a transfer of ownership that happened in 2018 where parties were engaging in good faith and paying extra money for security of a parking lot that they were not leasing . And then to have incidents that w

ere never exclusively tied to the establishment is incredibly problematic. And so I recognize that both parties have signed this agreement, but I did want it to go on record that I do not support the way that these tenants were essentially strong armed into a lease amendment without a place for them to go. Otherwise, in a time when it's very difficult for tenants of businesses to find affordable rent in other areas near this establishment. And so I want the city to make sure that we prioritize getting a minority or woman owned business into this space when we open it up for future uses and not make the same mistake in the future. So thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilman Herndon. Is president. I saw Lisa Lumley come up, and I'm not sure if someone else this came to committee. We had a pretty thorough conversation in committee, so I didn't I wanted to give the city the opportunity if they wanted to do a quick summary about why we are here. If and if not, you know, I just want to for you all that opportunity. I think. There's actually. Is there somebody. Else from the city attorney's office. Or we to have gender if you want to come up. Thank you. Just wanted to allow the city to share what they had shared with the floor, with the Biz Committee about this and why we're here. Hi. Good evening. I'm Ginger White, executive director of Arts and Venues. And I appreciate the comment and the question. So this release was actually a lease that the city entered into. It's a long story around the master lease with Mickey Fouts and then it transferred in 2016. Actually, it's been the same same partners and business partners throughout. As far as we're concerned. The lease the lease in the ownership didn't change. That being said, we had four incidents involving firearms. The first one on June 30th. The second one on July 5th. Also on July 5th, there was an incident that someone was beaten to the point of unconsciousness. We also had another incident with a firearm on July 8th and then the fourth one on July 21st. So the amount of activity was what at with firearms on the in the neighborhood at this leased premises, an adjacent arts complex parking garage, large garage is what prompted us beginning July 10th to issue a notice of concern after that notice. Concern of concern is when we had that fourth incident and that by that point, as a city agency, we believe that we have a higher standard for public safety and what it means to be a good neighbor and felt we needed to go into at least negotiation with the tenant. And dangerous to point out, this was a mutual agreement. Both the city and the tenant have correct. They have signed the agreement. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. You, Councilman Herndon, Councilman Seelbach you back up more questions. Thank you, Mr. President. So can you clarify these incidents? Did they happen on the premises that we leased to this this tenant or did it happen, I think you said, in the adjacent public p

arking lot? So they're a little bit different per for the four incidents. Some of them were actually outside of the leased premises. There was a firearm that was shot into the leased premises. Some of them actually happened in the garage itself. So it depends on which incident we're referring to. But they all happened after 2:00 in the morning when this particular business establishment lets clients out for the evening. Were the police able to directly connect any of these incidents to the tenants of this establishment? So I don't know. Commander Sanchez is here. If he wouldn't I don't know if he would like to address that on on behalf. But we have created a nexus between, again, when the clients in the leave to when we are having these incidents happen shortly after 2:00 in the morning. Do they pay for extra security? Were they required under any previous agreements to pay for extra security for a public parking space that is not part of their lease? So in the previous

arrangement, so prior to the one that's in front of you, they were required to have off duty officers both in the premise as well as they were doing wandng and bag checks. But we were finding what's happening is that after the club let out that people were going to their vehicles and perhaps getting their firearms from their vehicles. And that's when we were having those issues. You say perhaps is that a theory or was that proven? I believe that was the case that was proven. But again, we have four different incidents. So I can't speak to the each that each individual one. Who could confirm whether that's an idea or a theory or was it proven. I would invite Commander Sanchez. If he can come up. While we wait for him. Are there any other minority owned businesses in that area under the DCP? This is the Denver Performing Arts Complex. And there are not. Thank you. Thank you, Commander Sanchez. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Good evening, everybody. So I'm sorry. Could you just introduce yourself for the folks watching on TV? Yes, sir. My name is Aaron Sanchez. Denver Police Department commander. Of District Six. Thank you. Yes, ma'am. So. Most of those cases are still in the adjudication process. So I guess. Technically they they are. An unproven theory at this point. However, since January, we've had 71 incidents, 173 calls for service. Of those, 125 of those have been 911 or non-emergency calls. So it's it hasn't been that the police are there, proactive policing. They're responding to 911 calls. 50 of those calls have occurred after 10 p.m.. So I guess in regards to the theory to the west of Onyx is Hotel Teatro and then to the to the west and to the north is the Four Seasons and then to the east is the DCP complex. So after about 10/30, maybe 11:00, the DCP crowd is gone for the evening. Just by the nature of hotel, theater and the Four Seasons is probably not a lot of calls in regards to disturbances, fights and things of that nature. Since January 1st, we've had 12 assaults, eight of

those simple assaults, three of those the aggravated assaults, those that George was just talking about, and also one sex assault, forcible. And so we heard all of these reports and we asked which ones were directly connected to this establishment. We were told that only let's see, I think it was two or four were directly complaining about that establishment and then the rest were in the general vicinity of the area, which is a downtown area, really close to a lot of different things, near a parking lot that's used for a lot of the nightclubs and different things around in that area. And so thank you for your testimony. No further questions. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilwoman. All right. So no other questions or comments, Madam Secretary. Raquel CdeBaca. No Black Eye. Flynn I. Gillmor, I. Herndon Hines. High. Cashman. I. Can EJ. Ortega Sandoval. I swear I Torres, I. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please. Because the voting announced results. 12 eyes when they're. 12 eyes one day. Council Resolution 825 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, please, for the next item on our screens. 836. And Councilman CdeBaca, you have this one called for a comment. You want to go ahead with your comment? Thank you very much. We have one individual signed up to speak this evening, Jessie Pearce. Good evening. Members of council, members of the audience, those watching at home. My name is Jesse Pearce. I'm running for I was running for city council at large. Almost 15,000 votes with no money. I'll be running again to be your next mayor in 2023. And the slogan still stands Justice for the Poor People, Our Profit. And I reside in Candy's district, county seat of Bacchus District. And I represent several organizations such as Denver Homeless Outlaw, Black Star Action War, Self-defense, Positive Action Committee for Social Change, as well as Unity Party of Colorado, Denver, and as well as Universal African People's Organization . And you can find me on Mile-High News, YouTube and Facebook minus someone regards to this. I'm in approval of it. Cashman is an awesome council person. The council hall is awesome as well, but I have nothing to say about this. Good, good job, Cashman. This should easily get passed, so I have no qualms about that. And thank you for allowing me to speak this evening. Thank you. That concludes our speakers. Are there any questions? Oh, to Shannon Stage also signed up. Sorry, I missed that one. Since we do. Have the owners too, I think there might be a problem with when. We get for. To speak. Okay, so we're getting that ironed out. Looks like they're starting to pop up now on my screen. So Shannon stage, if you want to go next and then I also have Kristi minnillo. So if someone else other than those two signed up, then please talk to our council secretary. Excuse me, councilman and Lori Tetlock, who is the owner of the home, is also there trying to get that straightened out. To. All right. Got it. So now I have all three of you. T

hree. Okay, go ahead. Okay. Good evening, council members. Sorry about that. Technical difficulties. My name is Shannon Stage and I am the preservation coordinator at Historic Denver. As many of you know, historic Denver is a preservation nonprofit here in our city that is a community

resource to owners like the tap blocks that are here tonight. We are a preservation nonprofit that advocates for Denver's unique character and historic buildings. The landmarking process is a major undertaking by homeowners. There's a lot of research involved, as well as the application and of course, the city process itself. So we want to thank the Tat LAX for wanting to designate their home and bringing it to you tonight. This significant commitment. This is a significant commitment. A historic Denver was happy to help John and Lori Tat walk through this process. They first reached out to us over a year ago and so I connected them up with the consultant. They ended up using Kristi minnillo who researched and wrote the designation application. It is exciting to see the Pete Catwalk House hopefully becoming a Denver landmark tonight, and we hope other building owners will be inspired by their commitment to preserving a small part of Denver's story. The Catwalk House clearly meets the designation criteria, as Jenny mentioned in her presentation, being influential in the development of Washington Park and this Italian Renaissance revival house is an excellent example of JJ Benedict's architectural legacy. So we urge you tonight to honor the Tat Locke's hard work and yet to get this designation before you and urge you to designate this worthy House as a Denver landmark. Thank you very much. Thank you. Next up, many Mineo. Good evening, city council members. My name is Chrissy Minnillo and as Shannon mentioned, I prepared the landmark application for the Lock House that's built between 1916 and 1917 and located in Washington Park. The property is directly associated with the early development of the area. It was designed by one of Denver's most well-known architects, J.J. Benedict, who also designed the boathouse at the south end of Smith Lake in Wash Park, as well as another house that follows on tonight's agenda. The permit for the property was filed in September 16, September 1916 by a woman named Jane Pee Pee, who was a widow , came to Denver from the East Coast with her two young boys in 1914 and was immediately involved in real estate speculation and development. She had an appreciation for the arts, specifically French literature and poetry, and she was involved in the historic art club. So it's really no surprise that she would commission Benedict to design this house, and the two must have had a decent relationship because she'd worked with him a couple of times, a couple of years before. On the design of the cabin house, which is located two properties to the south. She and her two boys lived in this home, the Pete home, until 1922 or 1923 when she moved back

to the East Coast. This house is an excellent and intact example of the Italian Renaissance revival style, which was popular in this country between 1890 and 1930. What makes this property significant from an architectural standpoint is that it appears to be the most imaginative of Benedict's known designs in this style. Yet it remains approachable and fitting of its urban neighborhood environment. It must be noted that Laurie Tetlock and her family have been caring for the property for the past 55 years and have made relatively few changes as they respect its unique characteristics and history. The property has experienced these few alterations and because of that retains integrity of location, design, setting materials, workmanship and association. I support the designation of this beautiful property as a Denver landmark. Thank you. Thank you. And next up, Laurie Tack. Yes. So I'm Laurie. Tetlock. And I live at 1168 South Gilpin. My family moved there in 1964. And I went to Washington Park Elementary School, Byers and South High School. There have been a number of changes in Washington Park, and we just seem to be losing the character all the time. And because of the unique nature of this property, it's on four city lots and people are coming in and paying incredible amounts. Of money for a vacant lot. And they would tear it down. And so that was our greatest fear. We I was married in the yard. My girls have been married in the yard. And we just are pretty excited about having an a historic property. Thank you very much. All right. That now concludes our speakers. Are there any questions for members of council on this item? All right. Seeing none of the public hearing for Council 1119 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank the chat logs for and I said this when they brought it to committee for the gift of preserving this home, as you so ably pointed out. A house on four lots in that neighborhood, as lovely as that house is, would probably be gone. And the dollars seem to be making more of those decisions. You know, I had someone teasing me before the meeting. Where was every house in District six going to end up being designated? Because we we do have an active preservation community in the watch park area. Christina Park, the University of Denver area. And we've been fortunate to have a number of great designations come before this body, but all of them added together. Even with the 176 homes in the Christina Park overlay district only begin to approach an identifiable fraction of a percent.

Most of the homes in all of our neighborhoods are going to go the way of history at one point or another. And so, again, thank you for allowing us the privilege to have yours around. A couple of quotes that I found that I thought, speak to this. The idea of preservation, especially poignantly, John Sawhill says, in the end, our society will be defined not only by what we create, but by what

we refuse to destroy. I like that. And then a quote for which I was unable to find attribution. What a country chooses to save is what a country chooses to say about itself. So, you know, I appreciate that we have the opportunity to have this piece of our history to learn from and to carry us forward. So I look forward to supporting this. I hope my colleagues will do so as well. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Seeing no other comments, I will just add that I grew up about four, maybe five blocks away from this house. This was my neighborhood. And while I did not spend 50 years in that community by my parents, did. They bought their house 50 years ago this year, 1969, for a whopping \$10,500. And last time I was on the block, because they still live there. I was doing the math and about half of the houses on the block I grew up on are not there anymore. They've been torn down. And right across the street and a little bit to the left of my parents house, they tore down one else and they built the giant house in its place. And then they bought the house next door, tore it down to build a yard. So there's actually one fewer house even on the block than there was. And it is changing. It's not the same neighborhood that I grew up in, and it's certainly not the same neighborhood that it was when they bought their house. And so to be able to have a few structures in this neighborhood that we know will be preserved and will last as it is rapidly, rapidly being torn down is really special. And so I will add my thanks for your gift to our city and to our community, and I will be happy to support this this evening. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black CdeBaca. I Lynn. I. Hinds. High Cashman. Kenny Ortega. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please go to the voting, announce results. You see? You have a nice. 11 are countable. 1119 has passed. All right. That brings us to our next bill. Councilman Hines, will you please be accountable? 1120 on the floor? Thank you, Councilwoman. All right. I don't see anybody else in the queue for announcements, so we're going to move on. There are no presentations this evening and there are no communications. We do have one proclamation, however. Councilman Flynn, will you please read Proclamation 1387? Yes, Mr. President, I will. Proclamation 19, Dash 1387, urging all in global capital to either invest in local journalism or divest its interests. Whereas all little global capital, the hedge fund that controls more than 100 local and regional newspapers, including The Denver Post, has had a devastating effect on local journalism around the nation. And. WHEREAS, since Alden Global Capital took control of MediaNews Group in 2011, its newspapers, including The Denver Post, have been gutted, their staffs slashed and many of their assets sold. And. WHEREAS, staff at the Denver Post has been reduced by 75% in those eight years and staff at newspapers. ALDEN Global Capital Controls has been reduced by

more than twice the industry's national average since 2012. And. WHEREAS, 21 U.S. senators, in a letter to Alden's leadership in May this year, condemned the hedge funds pattern of profiteering and its, quote, newspaper killing business model as, quote, bad for newspaper workers and retirees, bad for communities, bad for the public and bad for democracy. And. Whereas, researchers have noted a correlation between diminished local news coverage of public affairs and increases in some government costs, including bond rates and taxes. And. Whereas, Alden Global Capital is under investigation by the U.S. Department of Labor after investing close to \$250 million of employee pension money in Alden controlled funds. And. Whereas, a recent analysis has found a correlation between the loss of local newspapers and lower voter turnout and increased partisanship. And. WHEREAS, statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke referred to the Free Press as the Fourth Estate of the Realm because of its vital role in political advocacy in democratic societies, now therefore be proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. Section one The Denver City Council urges Alden Global Capital either to invest in the Denver Post and its other newspaper properties so that they may more expansively perform their role in the community or sell its interest in the Denver Post and its other newspaper properties to civic minded entities that will take up that duty. Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that copies be transmitted to Alden Global Capital and to the Denver Newspaper Guild. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Your motion to adopt. Mr. President, I move that proclamation 19 dash 1387 be adopted. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Flynn. Yeah, Mr. President, I want to say just a few

things. First, I want it to be made clear that in no way is it the intent of this council or this proclamation, or by me personally to in any way imply that the journalism that is being done by the Denver Post or other newspapers similarly situated, is in some way deficient. Some great journalism is being done. The problem is, as I see it and as I hope my colleagues see it, is that not enough of it is being done. You simply cannot cover a community with 25% of the staff that used to cover it. It takes a well-resourced, a well-paid and a well-trained staff to cover. The folks up here and the folks up on the other end of Civic Center and the folks in the business community on 17th Street. And in our local communities and in our neighborhoods. It takes people to do that. A newspaper is more than just a business. It's an institution. It's what Burke said. It's it's the fourth estate. It is an integral part of the civic conversation and of democracy. It isn't simply a Sears or a Woolworth's or or some other store or business that runs purely on the

bottom line . It's it's a reflection of the people and their values in the community. And so it requires a little more thinking than what just goes into the bottom line. I want to quote a constituent of mine who happens also to be a former editorial page editor of The Post, and that's Chuck Plunkett, Harvey Park resident who looked almost two years ago now, I think it was in April of 2018, very bravely put together a package of editorials, including a lead House editorial that attacked its owners, Alden Global Capital, and said, either invest in us or sell us to someone who. Will. Who will invest in those resources. And in an interview after he was forced out, after about a month after a month of censorship and of demands that he submit his product to a publisher, which he had not had to do before, he turned in his resignation. And he was interviewed in Rolling Stone magazine. And among the things he said that the erosion of quality local journalism in the short sighted service of obscene profit taking is destroying the public trust in what we do. And, Mr. President, I think that's my fear with the loss of a daily newspaper of record type journalism in Denver , is that we're destroying the public trust with all the profit taking. And believe me, there is a lot of profit to be taking because as I see it, The Denver Post is very profitable. And there's no reason, literally no reason that they have to operate on 25% of the staff that they operated on before. I say this with a great deal of caution, by the way, because, you know, we could be targeted something at some point and we will maybe, probably should at some point. But that's that's how that's how our society in a free society is structured. We need. We need a free press. We need the fourth estate. So with that, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support me in adopting this. We've been through committee as our rules require. When the council does a proclamation that takes a position on policy and issues of this type, and I asked for affirmative votes from my colleagues. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Flynn, Councilwoman Cannick. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to just thank my colleague, Councilman Flynn, for bringing this forward. I think that it's a really confusing time because you can hear a narrative out there that indicates that the media is no longer kind of a viable industry, that that really, you know, you can't really figure out the numbers anymore. But I feel like increasingly there are stories that indicate if we, as consumers of news and readers of news, are willing to pay modest subscription prices and pay for the value of the information we receive, that many newspapers are coming back. And so one of the things I don't want our proclamation to do tonight is to encourage people to stop supporting local news because we're frustrated with the ownership. It's hard. I feel very mixed about what I consider to be unreasonable subscription rates that I know are not going to p

ay reporters. But I also know that if we do not stand by our local news, then we won't be seeing it. And whether that's a contribution that you make to Colorado Public Radio or folks where you do it through, you know, contributions, whether it's through subscriptions. I think that the more we invest directly in our media rather than relying on corporate advertisers, I do think that that is a really important model. So as as much as I enthusiastically support this proclamation tonight, and I'm unhappy to see that the dollars that we invest in our local news are going to a hedge fund capitalist . I think it's critical that we keep supporting this paper as we do all the other news sources that we rely on in our local media. And I want to, you know, again, urge Alden Capital to divest. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. And thank you, Councilman Flynn, for bringing this forward, seeing no other comments. Madam Secretary, call. Flynn. I like I said I. Gillmor, i. Herndon, i. Hines, I. Cashman All right. Kenny Ortega. Sandoval. I swear, I. Torres, I. Mr. President. I. Madam Secretary, please close voting and announce the results. 1313 I as proclamation 1387 has been adopted. Desmond Flynn Was there anybody you wanted to bring up for this or just are we done

here? Yes, there is, Mr. President, given that all the reporters and writers are probably working on deadline at the moment, we do have from the Denver Newspaper Guild, we have Tony Mulligan and we have some folks supporting him here. But I wanted to call Tony up to the microphone just to say a few words about the news matters campaign and have 5 minutes to do so or up to 5 minutes. Thank you, Tony. The Guild again, thanks the Council for passing this proclamation. It's actually the second that's on the similar issue, and I appreciate what Councilman Flynn and Ken each had to say. To me, the most shocking numbers is that all the global capital, the owners of media, news group, Digital First Media, they've cut their staff at a 75% clip while the industry average is 25%. It's correct that the industry is suffering that with the evolution of online revenue is going down, but other owners are managing to maintain their staff at a much higher rate than digital first media. So we appreciate your demand that they either invest in the paper to where they can continue to serve the community, be a viable resource for the community, be informed and or sell it to a local civic minded owner. That will do so. So we thank you for your proclamation. Yeah. Could you identify and identify yourself, please? My name is Ken Valero. I'm an employee in the mailroom of the Denver Post. I just wanted to read something very briefly. I speak in full support of the Denver Newspaper Guild, representing as I represent the Denver Post mailroom employees as president of the Denver Millers Union Number eight. As with the Guild, we have had no reason three years. We have nationalities from all over the world working in the mail

room Vietnamese, which make up about 30% of our workforce Hispanics, Russians, Indians from India and Somalis. We are a genuine aging workforce. We have not had a single new full time employee hired in the mailroom in 20 years. This is a profitable company. And in addition to the profit made from the newsroom and advertising departments, a lot of that profit is produced in the mailroom. By the ad inserts we put in the newspapers and the Post-it notes we put on the front pages of the various newspapers that the post prints with the cuts and our shifts and benefits, those of us who have remained have our workload greatly increased with fewer employees working. I want to thank you for passing this resolution. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilman. All right. That concludes our proclamations this evening. Madam Secretary, will you please read the bills for introduction. Councilmember Ken Each has called out Bill 29 for comment and under pending, no items have been called up. Did I miss anything? All right, Madam Secretary, if you'd please put the first item on our screens, which is 1375. Councilmember CdeBaca, go ahead with your questions. Thank you, Mr. President. Is there anybody here who can answer questions? How are you? Very excited to see this caring for Denver dollars get kicked off. Are these part of it? Pardon me? Are these part of the caring for? This is a crime prevention and control commission funds. Is this going to go to. So our district was tossing around the potential of a cahoots pilot. Is this that or is this going toward that? This is not this is separate, although it is my understanding that the Department of Safety has applied to carry for Denver for those funds. And I think that that has been awarded just very recently. But this represents the existing co responder program. Okay. So can you explain to me what this specifically is funding in the crisis, in the co responder program? Is it? How many staff does it. Employee. So that the total number of staff is 12 clinicians, which is enough to have a co responder in every police district seven days a week? And is this adding on co responders or is this funding the current ones? Is funding the current ones? The expansion is that request through caring for Denver. And can you tell me a little bit about how we monitor our return on investment? What is the evaluation process for our co responders? Sure. That's it's kind of a tricky thing to measure because often what the co responder does is it prevents something from happening. So it's hard to monetize a counterfactual, something that that didn't happen that might have. I can give you some numbers of the number of incidents that happened in 2018 and sort of the outcomes of some of those, if that's helpful. But it's not really like a true return on investment in a percentage. Okay. Give me 2 seconds. Thank you. This is a very exciting and important part of the work being done, but. It's

really great stuff. Okay. In 2018, the Crisis Intervention Response Unit responded to 1725 incidents that had the potential to escalate. Of that 1725, 69 individuals received a citation or arrest. 286 were placed on an emergency mental health hold. 71 were connected to housing and treatment. 13 resulted in detox and 567 engaged in continued services with MH KD for various diagnoses like bipolar, depression, PTSD, schizophrenia. And so how in the future will we determine if this is a

program that we want to expand or continue funding? What are our metrics for that? So the Crime Prevention and Control Commission is looking continues to. To perform an analysis on every program. And in this particular one, I think we do need to look at different metrics and figure out how do we identify a a, you know, an actual dollar amount, like a cost return on investment. At this time, we haven't identified that. So I, I can tell you that we continue to work on it. And as as you're now on the commission, you'll be part of that work. Awesome. And quick question about the 12 that are in each district. Do we find that they're necessary in all of the districts or do we find that most of the incidences are coming in specific district? I don't have that information, but I'd be happy to work with KD on on getting that and seeing if we can't provide that, you know, some some sort of heat map that shows geographically like if there's a, if there's some imbalance. Got it. And so what exactly is warranting the amended 700 just a continuation or. Right. So for the for the past couple of years, we've actually had this contracted at \$1,000,000. But because MHC is able to build Medicaid for some portion of the services that they deliver when they're Medicaid members, they're actually seeing a return from Medicaid around 40%. So we're requesting \$700,000 to operate the co responder program in its current state for 2020. And that just kind of chews up the amount that that the city actually expends. And these are not PCC dollars. These are CPC. So these are from the pilot dollars given to KPCC to administer or what budget are we using these dollars for? So the PCC is a special revenue fund through the expanding authority is the Department of Public Health and Environment. So like that's the the budget that it sits in. Is that does that answer? Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. That's all the questions I had. Thank you, Councilmember. Councilmember Gilmore, do you also have questions on this one? No. President Clark, I just have a comment. Go ahead. Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much for this contract. It's a very important time for this to come through our city. And I'm really looking forward to following the work. And so more information that you can provide, especially for us to get out to the community so they know or if they're contacted by the police, if they could request a correspondence or request someone to accompany a police officer when they make those pho

ne calls. Sure. That would be. Really, really helpful. Sure. We're currently working on our 2019 evaluation now. So hopefully we'll have some, you know, some some updated information that we can talk about, like how did it work in 2019? Those numbers I gave you were were 2018. So so we'll be happy to share that with council, you know, as we get it. Okay, great. And then, you know, we've unfortunately had some youth violence tragedies over the past few months, but then also families that just they were in that gap where they weren't able to access mental health supports. And so I guess beyond when a co responder accompanies a police officer, will you be tracking or I'm requesting that you do track where there's a gap or where there's a gap in services so that we're really avoiding sending folks off on kind of a wild goose chase. And then they get frustrated and they can't get the services. And so then they kind of close up and try to do things internally. Sure. Absolutely. I mean, some of those conversations are already happening as we work with the Department of Safety on their, you know, initiatives on their side. But we'll be will be happy to, you know, make a make a point of of keeping an eye on that so we can report back. Perfect. Thank you. Sure. Thank you, President Park. Council is reconvened. We have two public hearings this evening. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residence and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. If you're here to answer questions only when your name is called, please come to the podium. State your name and note that you are available for questions of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes and there is no yielding up time on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks if you're standing up in the back. Our fire code does not allow standing back there of us an exit. So we do have overflow next door in 432 or it's on and you'll be able to watch and see what's going on. And if I can ask everybody else to scoot together if there's any room next to you and yeah, there will be a little bit more room after this hearing for the one that I think most people are here for. All right, Councilmember Ortega, will you please put Council Bill 1381 on the floor? Mr. President, I move that council bill 19 1381 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you very much. It has been moved. Can I get a second? Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Council Bill 1381 is now open. May we have the staff report? Thank you, Mr. President, and happy birthday. Good evening, counsel. I'm

Kyle Dalton with the Department of Community Planning and Development. I'm substituting for Ellis TV tonight.

Who prepared the materials in your record? She's out sick this evening. This is a request to rezone 2060 West Colfax Avenue from Cemex 5 to 8. It's located in Council District three in the Lincoln Park neighborhood. It is located southwest of the interchange of Interstate 25 and Colfax Avenue, north of 14th Avenue and east of the South Platte River. The request to rezone to CMCs eight is to urban center mixed use district that to allow a buildings up to eight stories and there's currently a one story warehouse on the site and the proposal is to rezone in order to facilitate redevelopment surrounding the existing structure. The current zoning ACM x five, which allows buildings up to five stories and it's adjacent to five story zoning and must in most directions except with the open space to the west where the South Platte River is located. It's currently used industrially and is in an area surrounded by office and utilities. Industrial and open space uses. Here's a shot of the property looking northeast towards downtown, generally in an industrial and mixed use context in the near near near of the photograph looking to the intensity of downtown to the northeast. Here's a taste of the site in the surrounding areas. The photo in the middle is the subject site to the above and below are surrounding buildings, showing a generally 1 to 2 story scale with some taller buildings in the area and a mix of building coverage as. The applicant has entered voluntarily into an affordable housing agreement to exceed the minimum city standards. They have committed to a minimum that 10% of all dwelling units will be offered for sale at or below 80% of the area median income, or 60% for rental units for a period of six years. And a minimum of 25% of those units will be at least two bedrooms. The process. They follow the process required by code for a rezoning planning board recommended unanimously that you approve this at a public hearing in December. There are three letters of support from different registered and neighborhood organizations, including in your packet. There's also a letter of support representing two property owned or two businesses and a property owner in your packet. And we've received no other public comments on the application. There are five review criteria. And. Analyze more detail in your staff report. I'll go quickly through the five criteria. The first is that a rezoning must be consistent with adopted plans. It's consistent with the comprehensive plan strategies, including under the Equity Vision element, where it will enable mixed use development, including an increase in allowed housing density near two stations along the light rail line. It's also consistent with the climate recommendations of comprehensive plan 2040. In particular, because it's an infill location where infrastructure is already in place. Again, it's near a couple of light rail stations. It's well connected to the city's Off Street Mobil

ity Network as well, with the proximity to the South Platte River corridor. Turning now to the city's land use and transportation plan blueprint, Denver. The future place contemplated here is the district's place. This is a special district which can be mixed use and offer a diverse range of amenities. That's the context excuse me that the blueprint Denver stipulates for the site, the future place type is innovation flex. And this is contemplated for a mix of employment and residential with buildings that orient to the streets and are pedestrian friendly. In the proposed TMX eight zone district allows a wide and diverse range of uses consistent with this recommendation, including residential office, retail and some light manufacturing uses commonly associated with craft or makerspace and design. It also implements Blueprint Denver's recommendations in terms of the growth strategy in this area of the city, the districts areas we the plan contemplates up to 15% of the city's job growth and 5% of new households. Rezoning would enable growth consistent with that strategy. I'll turn now to a couple of small area plans that also apply to the site. The first is the Decatur Federal Plan, which city council adopted in 2013. It contemplates that this area is a transit oriented character area where the highest intensity development and mix of uses is contemplated. The mapping corresponds with the urban center neighborhood context. And again, we found that the zone district is consistent with this recommendation of the plan. The plan actually also has a building heights map that recommends up to 12 storeys because this applicant is requesting eight storeys that's under the 12 storeys recommended by the plan. And so the zoned district is also consistent with that part of the plan. The last small area plan that applies is the Lama Lincoln Park Neighborhood Plan adopted by council in 2010. It shows this area's mixed use. It's an opportunity for redevelopment to provide jobs, retail and services. And again, we found that the proposed district is consistent with that recommendation. Finally, the citywide housing and inclusive Denver plan that City Council adopted includes recommendations around creating and preserving housing

options that are accessible, affordable, mixed income and mixed use, although not required for compliance with the other adopted plans. The affordable housing agreement that was signed by both the city and the property owner that I mentioned earlier is consistent with that plan direction. It's also consistent with the second and third review criteria that will result in uniform application of zone district standards. It will further the public health, safety and welfare there, justifying circumstances due to the adoption of the plans that I mentioned earlier, which identify this as a total area. There have been major planning efforts and redevelopment in the surrounding area as well that justify the change in the zoning. And then finally, th

e request to district is consistent with the neighborhood context, description, zoned district purpose and intent as specified in the code and as further detailed in your staff report. The applicant is here and is signed up to speak and I'll be happy to answer any questions later. Thank you very much. All right. We have five individuals signed up to speak on this item tonight. First up is Susan Powers. Good evening. Council president and members of the city council. My name is Susan Powers, the president of Urban Ventures, which is a development group in Denver. My home address is 1475 Dale Gainey Street. I wanted to provide a couple of pieces of information that might not come through the normal process here to explain why I'm doing this at this point. Steam on the plot is about a three acre property that we purchased about four years ago, and within it, we have two renovated buildings, one that houses the fantastic New Rises Brewery here and the steam building, which is completely leased to. Has over 400 employees. We have surface parking that meets the code at this point. When we first started the development, it was difficult for us to see this as a place for all for new office development, because it was somewhat pioneering. So we have extra parking that we have leased from the Broncos to meet the needs of the employees. We all recognize that in five, ten, 20 years, nobody is going to have a car. But unfortunately, everybody has a car still at this point, most people do. So we have, as the Broncos have announced their plans to move ahead with their redevelopment of the parking lots that they have. I started getting concerned that we would be losing that extra parking and decided that we need to take the steps to move all of our parking needs onto our site. In order to do that, we would be building an eight story structure of which four floors of it would be structured parking, and then four floors will either be office or residential. We haven't made the decision about whether it's residential or office at this point are our lease up is fairly new. We're getting a sense of kind of what the what the energy level is and the interest in in coming into it into the Sun Valley area, which is pretty strong. So it might end up being an office building, but the building would be wrapped with either office or residential. So you wouldn't see see the parking structure from the lower floors and we'll design the parking so that in the future when none of us do have our cars, we can convert that to other uses as the demand for parking goes down over the five years that we've been involved in Sun Valley neighborhood. We've developed deep relationships with members of the community and have brought businesses to stem on the plot that have also become integral partners in the neighborhood. This rezoning will allow us to bring additional jobs or housing to Sun Valley and to address the parking needs at the same time. I appreciate your support and an

y questions here to answer. Thank you very much. Next up, Jesse Pearce. Good evening. Members of council, those watching at home, those in the audience. My name is Jessica Sharp. Harris and I ran for city council at large last year, almost 15,000 votes with no money. And I'll be running again to be the next mayor of 2023. And I represented for Denver Homicide Law, Black Star Examiner for self-defense, positive action, calling for social change as well as the Unity Party of Colorado and Mile High. No. I was originally against this rezoning because like it was already stated. Sun Valley is really cultural district for the West Side and the natives have been. Displaced in this area. So I was pleased to hear that there was going to be affordable housing potentially at. This site at 80%. Amarillo, that that still kind of rolls me the wrong way. But I see that the occupant did their due diligence and went to the Arnolds in the area and asked them if they approved of this. And I didn't see any letters of opposition to this. So there's really nothing I'm going to tell you that's going to not make you pass this because it's already been set in stone. And like I said, the Arnolds haven't went against it and there's no letters of opposition. So with that being said, I have to approve this. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Jose Tito. Sorry. He gets butchered all the time. Happy birthday, by the way. Good evening, council members. My name is Joseph Ed. I recited 769 South Hudson Street. I attended a 2060 was Colfax Avenue. I race brewing company which many

of you have been able to visit. And I wanted to talk in favor of of passing this because as I'm here to speak more about the character of the applicant, Susan Powers and her team have been excellent in furthering opportunities for people of color, women and other minorities. And we are Latino on Hispanic, on Mexican, on LGBTQ, on veteran owned business that is doing really well thanks to affordable commercial real estate, real estate provided by Susan. And we welcome this change in density, because that means more business not just for us, but for the businesses within STEM on the planet and within businesses within that fine line between Lincoln and Sun Valley. Right now, that's a little bit of a desert, but thanks to the spark that has been happening in that area. We welcome this kind of density done in a proper way, just the way that Susan and her team are doing. So thank you for considering my words. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, Chairman Sekou. Yes. Good afternoon. When I was chairman, Sekou, the founder, organized the Black Star Action Movement for Self-defense. Born and raised. Denver 68 years. And voice for the oppressed, the poor. Vulnerable. This. Is consistent. With the plan. I'm like everyone who comes here to do a zoning change. All of them have been cookie cutters into a format that is working to make this have some consistency throughout the city. And I salute the council for working on

this, because this is an owner's task to do, especially when you get it at this stage of the city's development. And so I support this because to not support this, I would be a hypocrite and supporting other neighborhoods and not supporting this one. And I do have some concerns. The process that we're doing. And the modernization of these neighborhoods. A starting to distort the character of the city. We're now we're starting to look like New York. And that's not who we are. This is the wild, wild west. And we have a certain thing that happens out here with everyday folks. There's a certain integrity and honesty about the people who just tell you flat out whether we like it or not. And we like to be like, you know, we don't you don't want no games being played with this and now we're losing who we are. See, when we do these kind of things and we have buildings that go up that are not consistent to the history of who we are. I don't even know what they look like. Vertical penitentiaries. Everybody's stacked on top of each other and anal space and develops a certain mental sickness like they got in New York where people don't even talk to each other. No. And everybody is suspicious of everybody because you're cooked up into some kind of container and you're not free to breathe. See, there's something wrong with that picture. And at this stage in my life. I don't even know who we are anymore. So I don't know. So. As I get better at this thing. I am. Thank you. Next up, Jeannie Granville. Good evening. My name is Jean Granville, 2715 West told in place. I am here tonight as president of the Sun Valley Neighborhood Organization. It's called the Sun Valley Community Coalition. We did send in a neighborhood position. Statement which should. Have been passed on to you, I think, in your packets. But I would just like to take a moment to point out a few of those things as to why we're supporting this rezoning and really commend the applicant Urban Ventures and Sue Powers and her team as what we consider to be kind of a model for developers , new developers that we know will be coming into the Sun Valley area. As you're well aware, Sun Valley is embarking upon a huge transformation, and I will just. Point out a. Few of those things. A couple of which you've heard the steam on the Plate development has environmentally cleaned. Up and. Restored blighted property with sensitivity to preserve historical structures that characterized the Lower Colfax area has attracted encouraged tenants committed to hiring from the neighborhood whenever possible. Being active in and contributing to the Sun Valley neighborhood has provided affordable business opportunities for people of color. And women such as bold beans, coffee through girls, ink and rice brewing has volunteered and contributed. Attend to numerous neighborhood activities and cultural events, and as part of the neighborhood organization and other numerous local planning activities, continues to. Demonstrate co

mmitment to providing economic Opportunities that promote Sun Valley's values of diversity, inclusion, and equitable and viable economic opportunity. While we realize that this is primarily a commercial venture, the rezoning to. Allow in well, in support. Of a commercial venture, we really do commend Urban Ventures for also exploring the very much needed affordable housing that we. Know. We will be pursuing within the neighborhood. So I urge your support and thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers on this item. Are there any questions from members of council? Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. Either for my powers or Kyle. I'm just where I am. Not clear on where things are at, on whether there's going to be affordable housing or not. Oh,

there's there's an affordable housing agreement that we've signed and it's been recorded. Okay. So but if we if we choose to do office, then we would pay the fee instead of building the housing. So but we did sign the agreement. But we don't know today. We don't know today. Thank you. That's all. Mr. Press. Mr. President. Thank you. Mr. President, if I may. For my colleagues, some of the materials were not in our granicus and Zack has emailed them. So the affordable housing plan and the updated PowerPoint, which includes some of the affordable housing details, is in our email. And I know I don't always see my email in the middle of a hearing, so I wanted folks to know it was in there. Thank you, Councilmember Councilmember Hines. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to say, Miss Powers, thank you for moving this forward. And I think. Councilman, we're still in questions. We're going to get to comments and maybe I had a question come in, but I want to send it. All the way with it, too. Okay. Thank you. I will get back to you in just a second. Councilmember Ortega. If you wouldn't mind coming to the microphone. So if you were just building and you were allowed to continue to do to use the parking at the stadium, you wouldn't need to reason. Correct. You're doing this so that you can accommodate the parking onsite. Well, yeah. I mean, because. We were you have that long, Tony. Built, any building we put in there is going to take the onsite parking off of it anyway. So we would we would still need to replace the parking that we have on site somewhere. And so we would be building structures. Okay. So I was just trying to understand the primary reason why you needed to rezone. Yeah, well, and that is for the addition, the parking that is on the stadium. You're right. We need to build a structure. This will make it a higher structure. And that's the reason is, is that it's in order to bring back the spaces that are on the stadium site, onto the site. Now it has to get above five storeys. And we don't really know the timing of when the stadium is going to move forward. But this creates that stability. Right. That's exactly right. Thank you. Sure. Thank you, Councilmember. All right. S

eeing no other questions. The public hearing for Council Bill 1381 is closed, and now it's time for comments from members of council. Councilmember Torres. Thank you, Mr. President. I just I really want to thank Susan for the work that you've done thus far in Urban Ventures. Jean Granville is absolutely correct. Sun Valley is undergoing a huge transformation. This is accurate and it puts tremendous responsibility on the city and on this council to make sure that it's not done at the expense of families who have sustained that neighborhood for generations with very little attention. From what I've seen in terms of the renovation at Steam on the Platt building and the renovation of the building where race operates, I'm excited to see what comes of this particular vision. I've currently been holding my coffee and community at the Bold Beans location, which is on the first floor of Steam on the plot. It is fully occupied and it's a makerspace, which is, I think, the vision moving forward even into the commercial vision of the next building. So you have folks who are creating things, which is something that we've lost in Denver, are dedicated spaces to makers. And so I'm excited about that being a part of the Sun Valley future and vision on a continued basis. This space carries forward that in addition to community space, reflection of the Sun Valley community and respect of the river and, and the land commitment that we have there as well. So I'm really thrilled about this. I'll be supporting it. I hope my colleagues will as well. And just really appreciate all the due diligence that you've done community wide on this project. Thank you, Councilmember. Councilmember Hines. I do have a couple questions. No, I'm just kidding. So I feel like a repeating myself. Myself. But I do want to thank you. I don't have questions, but I want to thank Ms.. Powers for your hard work on this. I want to thank staff as well for your hard work. I know it's not every day that you get both all the nays turned to. Yes. So, you know, when you get Jessie Paris and chairman say you go from a no to a yes. That's pretty awesome. So. And no letters against it. So thank you very much for all your work and making sure that this is a unanimously in favor. So thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Councilmember Torres, you back up? I did because I wanted to make sure folks knew exactly what rentals at 60% AMI and for sale at 80% am. I means if it's a rental, it's 60%. And you were a single individual, you were earning up to \$39,000 a year. If you're two people, you're earning together \$44,580. If it's for sale at 80%. Ami for one person, that's somebody who's earning less than \$52,000 a year and for a couple, jointly, 59,400 a year. So we're still talking about workforce housing, folks who might be teachers, who might be cops, who might be firefighters who still need to find places to live in the city. So I just wanted to share those numbers. Thank you, Councilm

ember Councilmember Cashman. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, normally I would be pretty concerned. Without a definite yes, there's going to be affordable housing. I hear it's in the plan and an option. I have watch list power since her days with the Urban Renewal Authority many, many moons ago. And I fully believe that by looking at what's come before that, whatever is built on this piece of ground will be in line with the values we hold as a community. So I'll be glad to support this this evening. Thank you, Councilmember. All right. Seeing no other comments, Madam Secretary, roll call. Torres. I black. I CdeBaca. Flynn I. Herndon. HINES All. Right. Cashman. All right. Kenny Ortega. I seen the ball. I. Sawyer. I. Council. President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close the voting, announce the results. You have a nice. 11 eyes comfortable. 1381 has passed. Ah, right. Councilmember Ortega, will you please put Council Bill 71 on the floor? . I'll be bringing forward and another change to the rules so that these public comment sessions hopefully will become televised, which they have not been since started back in 2016. So with that, thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilmember Cashman. All right, Madam Secretary, if you please put the next item on our screens. Council member CdeBaca. I believe this one's yours. Resolution 85. Thank you, Mr. President. I have some questions on this one. Is there anybody here to answer questions on the Salvation Army? Hi. Rachel Goldberg, Denver. Human Services Dean, Animal and Denver Human Services. Awesome. I have a couple of questions about how many new beds we're going to net for this emergency transitional shelter. Is there anything new coming online or is this a renewal of the current capacity? The capacity in previous years has been five beds. In this year, we're moving it up to ten, 5 to 10. And we are. So is this one still also administered through the police departments or how do families get in this emergency. Emergency transitional shelter families can access the Salvation Army transitional housing shelter through Salvation Army directly or through our contract with the Volunteers of America and our Family Voucher program. Someone's families are in the voucher program. They can be referred to and sent to Salvation Army if they choose to. And how do we define a family? The we define the family as a parent and a child. And where will these ones be located? At the Lambert Center on Federal. Awesome. Thank you. That's all the questions I had on that one. No. Arts Council Resolution 281 has been adopted. All right, Madam Secretary, if you could please put the next item on our screens. And, Councilmember Torres, if you please put Bill to 82 on the floor. I move the council bill to 82, be ordered published. Thank you, Councilmember. It has been moved and seconded. We're going to questions and comments on this one. And I'll just start by saying, you know, again, as we enter uncharted territory and as t

here are new recommendations coming from the CDC and from our public health officials, every day, we have been trying to dove in and look at what might happen, what could happen and be prepared for those situations. One of the things that exists for us now is that even if we were to decide that it was in the best interest of public health, that this body not meet, and that is not something that we have decided as of yet or that is planned . But in any situation that might lead to that. R And to still require that we come someone come down and open that meeting, take attendance, show that there is not a quorum of us here to conduct that meeting and then close the meeting, which has happened a couple of times over the course of the last four years before we, you know, fixed some of the weeks that we don't meet, the four weeks of the year that we don't meet. We had a couple of times where so many people were out of town on, you know, family stuff that we had to do just that. And so as we're grappling with, you know, our open meeting rules with what's in the charter about how we conduct our business, this was one of the things that was identified that we can fix. It will take two readings. So we're introducing it today and we'll have it again next week. But that allows for in an emergency situation for the cancelation or suspension of a meeting without our secretary coming down here to do that often with, you know, any members who are available only to determine that there is no need for a meeting. So that's kind of the crux of this as we move forward, you know, continue to identify ways and places where we can adapt. I think there's a broader conversation that this particular issue has shown a light on that we that that we need to look at, you know, from a code we participate not in this room. And what does that look like from access to the public? Could the public participate in something that needed to move forward without being in this room? And, you know, other cities have taken action to amend their charter and allow for virtual participation or amend their open meeting rules. And I think that's something that we need to take a good look at. Doing that quickly and on the fly as we're doing it is hard and we want to make sure that we get that right because there's a lot that goes into that

beyond just the current situation that we're in. But as we work through that, if we continue to identify places that can be fixed, that do make sense and can or couched in areas like during periods of emergency that give us some increased flexibility items like this that we can continue to bring forward. You know, I also want to just thank some of our colleagues who were not here today as we continue to also heed the recommendations of our public health officials. And out of, you know, the phrase that I think we're all getting sick of hearing, but out of an abundance of caution, we have some members who are not here this evening. And I think we're going to hav

e to continue to grapple with how do we conduct business and make sure that we are able to do that. And part of that is making sure that, you know, when someone feels that they should or should not be here, that enough of us are here to continue conducting that business. But one of the members who wasn't here, you know, really has some questions about how do we not just at this meeting, but get getting updates from the administration on stuff like we were just talking about about what kind of funding is coming through, what kind of programs are there, what needs legislative action and all of this? How can we help? How can we assist? How can we work as a team? So we'll continue to look at outside of the tight confines that we're in. From a charter perspective for this meeting, are there other opportunities for us to get updates, briefings that don't require people to be in the same room outside of this meeting? And how do we navigate that? So certainly the beginning of conversations to come, but this was one part that gives us some some flexibility under certain scenarios that we may or may not face in the coming weeks. All right, Councilmember Sawyer. Thank you. I couldn't have put it better. That was a great kind of summation of the conversations that we have had over the past week. And I think it's really important, you know, for the public who hasn't been able to be a part of those conversations as readily to kind of catch people up on on what is happening. So so, you know, because this is an emergency, because we are in an emergency that none of us expected to be a part of. You know, I think it's important that both of these rules be moved forward and be adopted tonight. That said, I think that when we are no longer in an emergency, we need to go back and have some serious discussions about what these look like and how we move forward from here. Because I do think that we need to talk about things like remote participation. And if we had talked about remote participation before now, we would be able to remotely participate now, and that would be fantastic so that we wouldn't have to be here and having these conversations right now. We wouldn't have to all be in this in this room. There are precedents across the state for remote participation. It's something we could be doing. And it's a shame that the that we've got members who can't be here tonight for various reasons and who, you know and and who should be able to participate. If we had done this earlier and had these conversations previously, we they would be able to be here. So I am I am supportive of putting forth both of these rules this evening, both of these ordinances and establishing them. But I'm also suspicious of them. I think that they are they are being put in place fast. They are being put in place without the kind of full, broad spectrum discussion that we probably need to have around them. And I think that we need to make sure that we go back and have that discussion and mak

e some changes to these when we're no longer in an emergency. And I just want to make sure that that's on record. So thank you, Mr. President. Thank Councilmember Councilmember Gilmore. Thank you, President Clark. I am in full support of of this bill tonight and putting it forward. I think that we do need to have more conversation about what the tools are at our fingertips fingertips now. And I have talked with Kirsten Crawford, our city attorney, and asked her to put together a legal memo, at least identifying the top two or three next steps that we could maybe evaluate, especially with our committee structure. Could we do some sort of remote committee structure so that at least there's transparency for the public to see what's happening within city government or what those other tools may be? We don't need to speculate on what those are tonight, but if we're really looking at another eight weeks of restrictions, the public does deserve to know what is going on and have access to that. And I just want to be able to explore what our options are. Thank you, President Clark. I think Councilmember. Councilmember Hines. Thank you, Mr. President. I've just learned from one of our colleagues who isn't here tonight that the CDC has revised its guidance once again and and says that there should be no more than ten people in a room at a time, which would make our meetings difficult just to and not violate the CDC guidelines. Of course, this is a very fluid conversation since the CDC issued their other guidelines for 50 people, I think, on Friday or

Thursday. So we're moving very, very quickly. And I want to recognize Councilperson Sawyers comments about we should think about this at some point in the future when we're not having we're not basically up against a wall. But I do have a question for Ms.. Crawford. Would it be possible for us to add a placeholder for open public virtual meetings for council and not have that defined since we're changing the ordinance with this build to 82? I mean, should we amend it and add that tonight or should we wait? So I think I understand the question. Kirsten Crawford Legislative Council under three point to 3.3.2 of the Charter. There are very rigid requirements that apply to regular Monday meetings. So the only way we've been able to thread the needle to make less rigidity is to talk about the schedule. The charter used to provide the council had to meet shall meet 52 weeks. We changed the charter to make observance. We to make accommodations through ordinance for observance of holidays. We are not alone with our rigidities. There are some other large cities both in Colorado and nationwide that have some of these rigidities. I do think there is a possibility to go fairly quickly to virtual meetings when it comes to any other sort of body or council committee, for example. It's not without complications, but it can be done. It's a very large policy debate, but there we've become a little bit focused on one tool

in the toolbox, virtual participation, when I think there are many others that still need to be explored. And that's one of the conversations I've had with Councilwoman Gilmore. And those conversations are occurring throughout the city. So so we will be coming forward with more proposals to allow accommodations. Great. Thank you, Ms.. Crawford. And thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Councilmember. All right, see no other questions or comments, Madam Secretary. Roll call on accountability to wait to. Clark I. Gilmore, I. Herndon High. Cashman. High. Can each. Sawyer I Taurus I Council President. All right, Madam Secretary, please close the voting. Announce the results. Nine ice nine accountable to eight to has passed. That concludes the items to be called out this evening. All bills for introduction are ordered published. Councilmembers remember that this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote I. Otherwise, this is your last chance to call an item out for a separate vote. Councilmember Torres, will you please put the resolutions for adoption and the bills on final consideration for final passage on the floor? I move that the resolutions be adopted and bills on final consideration be placed on final consideration and do pass in the bloc for the following items. 20 Dash 220 Dash 149 20 Series 150151204036194 199 177 to 10 two 7141, one, 63 and 047. Thank you, Councilmember. It has been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black eye. Gilmore. I heard. It. Hi. Hi. Hi. Cashman. Hi. Carnage. Sawyer, I. Torres, I. Council President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please call the voting notes. The results. Nine eyes. Nine eyes. The resolutions have been adopted and the bills have been placed upon final consideration and do pass. Council will not take a recess this evening. Councilmember Torres, will you please put council bills? One of five, one of six and one of seven on the floor. Thank you very much. A quick recap of items called out under resolutions Council member state of Israel that Resolution 334 questions and comments under bills for introduction not items have been called out under bills for final consideration. Council member state of Arkansas called out Bill 115 for a vote and under pending no item seven called anything that I missed. Okay, Madam Secretary, if you please, for the first item on our screens, which should be 330, and we're going to go to Councilmember CdeBaca for your questions and comments. Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to call this contract out because I think it's really important for two reasons to make sure that the next time it comes in front of us, it's gone through a competitive bid process. This is a company that has been contracted with for many, many years and is responsible for either the diversity or lack of diversity in DPD. We know that there's an outstanding issue of diversity, and this is an organization that has a lot of power over determining what officers we get. And they have screened ou

t many candidates of color in the past and have historically not had therapists of color on staff doing the screening. And so want to make sure that it's on everybody's radar. My colleagues radar to dove a little bit deeper so that when it ends in December after this extension, we are looking at different different organizations to allow some more access so that we can ensure some more diversity in DPD. Thank you. Thank. You've got to remember and I heard comments. Did you have a question in there? Are you good? Just with the comments. And I got my questions answered via email and I'll be following up after this. So with the extension just going until December and a commitment that there will be an RFP and a competitive bid process. I feel I feel okay about going forward with this tonight. And I just wanted to do a shout out to Sensory for her amazing work in

continuing to find the resources to keep this project on track. So thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Ah, right now. Executive You please put the next item on our screens. And Councilmember CdeBaca, will you please put council bill three six, nine on the floor. I move that council bill 20 dash 0369 be ordered published. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded questions or comments by members of Council Councilmember Black. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm asking my colleagues to vote no to defeat this bill. By defeating this bill, Council will be aligning with the Career Service Board's recommendation, which is in alignment with the Finance Department's effort to stabilize the city's budget in the wake of COVID 19. Thank you, Councilmember. See no other questions or comments? Just a reminder that. Councilmember Flynn Thank you, Mr. President. Could I ask Councilmember Black to explain why the bill was filed if the Career Service Board did not recommend it? Yes, it's required every year that H.R. does a pay survey, and they are required by law to bring that to the Career Service Board with their recommendation to change the pay. And then they are required to bring it to council. And so they have to bring it to us. But in light of the current economic situation, they feel that it is not a wise thing to bring it forward this year. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. President, if I understand that they are required to bring it to the floor and they recommend that we vote it down. Okay. Thank you. And the Career Service Board voted to reject it. Thank you. I'm going to bring up Skye Stewart from the mayor's office because I think we might have the wrong bill pulled up. But let's check and see. Hi, Sky Stuart. Mayor's office. It is correct that Councilman Black is saying that we need to vote to vote down the paper on classification. But that bill is not in front of you tonight. This is for some very specific purposes. Right behind me, it's for some specific pay classifications, not the entire pay plan that's actually on the mayor council agenda tomorrow and would be filed for next week's action. So we got

we got both at which Bill was turned back by the the Christmas board. Flip flopped. That's right. It should be on the agenda next week. Next week. It's actually bill number. If you hang on 1/2, I can tell you it's actually Bill number 370. That's on the mayor council agenda tomorrow. 370. Well, Councilmember Black, does that change your opinion on asking us to vote no? Yeah, that. I'm sorry. That is totally my fault. I thought that. Okay. I'm the one who told the council secretary that. So I take full responsibility for that. All right. So this one is a year. We want to we want to vote yes on this one. And then next week, we'll have the one that was not recommended. Okay. So you are happy with that? Councilmember Black. Yes. Okay. And Councilmember Kennedy, you buzzed in. Was that before you caught that? Okay. All right. So so as a recap, wrong, Bill, we will revisit this next week with 370. The request on this one is a yes vote, seeing nobody else in the queue. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black. I see tobacco. I swim. I Gillmor. Herndon. Cashmere. I can each. Ortega. I. Sandoval. Sawyer. Torres. I. Council. President. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 1313 IES Council Bill 369 has. Been ordered published. All right. That concludes the items to be called out this evening. All the bills for introduction are ordered published. Council members remember that this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote. I think they are skeptical of this getting to the ballot and don't want to commit until we commit. But our commitment is our vote and document it tonight to get there. And that commitment has been made to me repeatedly that if we refer this, then their initiative comes down. And I want to be clear about all agree with that. And I guess I have no reason I have no reason to doubt that. It's just I recall when we put the public financing of city elections on the ballot. I believe that the that the ordinance the bill that put it on the ballot specifically stated that it would it would be on the ballot at the who was I forget the name of the committee that put it on the ballot, but it was contingent on their with on their commitment to withdraw. Democracy for the People initiative. Yes. Yes. This is an agreement that we made within the task force as well. I guess. Okay. I guess I don't I don't have any reason to doubt it. I understand that. But the other question I had was about the statement that 26% of sales taxes are paid by Denver residents, only 26%. I find that really hard to believe. Like I called the Department of Finance to ask if that's what they what they have. Where did that come from? We have 700,000, 700,000 people here in Denver. They buy cars. They buy big items. I find that I find that an unbelievable figure. What's the source for that? I wish it was a number that was put in front of us at the task force. I have not confirmed it by any means, but that was the number that was put in front of us

at the task force. And who put it in front of you? I honestly, I don't have a recollection of who that was. Okay. So I think that's highly implausible that only 26% of our total sales tax is generated by people who live in Denver. When you buy a car alone, it's \$1,000 sales tax for getting the figure right now. Councilman Flynn, thank you for your concern, though. Okay. Thank you. And maybe financial callback before roll call. All right. Sounds good. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 20684 is closed. Comments from members of Council. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Madam President. And, you know, I think a lot of talks about this, a lot of committee we've talked about this a lot tonight. And so I won't rehash what everybody said about the urgency of this, about the need for us to address this and about why it's so important and how COVID has shined an even bigger light on why it's important, because I think many people have said that better than I could. I just want to say thank you to again to the task force members who worked really hard on this as volunteers, to the city staff who worked on this, to the mayor's office and to again, to my colleagues, both who were pushing for this. And in all of those early meetings and for the ones who were pushing back on this to make it better and to get us to tonight, a huge shout out to resilient Denver, who I think pushed the city and as we heard, will continue to push us towards, I think, good things and to our awesome facilitators for really a one of a kind task force that I got to hold before. You know, I think that, you know, this is the first step that the task force has put in front of us. And as Councilwoman Canete said, you know, one of the easier things that nothing about solving the climate crisis that we face is going to be easy. But this is a case where Denver voters already will have something in front of them. And we have the opportunity to put something better that has consensus from a wide range of people who are brought together specifically to hash these issues out and come to something that everyone could live with to help us get to where we all, I think, on council know that we need to get and that's the choice before us today is to give voters a better choice this November and then it's up to them, but a better choice on building that base and really showing that we are committed to doing what we need to do as a city to solve the climate crisis. I want to say thank you to everybody. Thank you to all my colleagues who've been so engaged in those pushing for it, pushing back on it, making it better, crafting it. I really feel like this came from the task force but belongs to all of us. And I will be voting to support this tonight, and I hope you will all as well. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Councilman Sawyer. Thank you, Madam President. Well, I will also be voting to support this tonight. And I want to say thank you to

Councilman Clarke for his leadership in this. He has been the spearhead who has made this happen. So you've done an amazing job. Thank you, Councilman Clark, for all that you have done in putting together this task force and being the voice in pushing this forward and being the person who has pulled all of this together for the year that I have been on council and even before then. Your leadership in this is why we are all here doing this. So thank you for this. And thanks to the task force for all of your hard work. You guys are amazing. You have done an incredible job. And, you know, like I said, in committee, my biggest fear is in sending this to the ballot right now is that it is so incredibly important that this passed. And my biggest fear is that people are so concerned with the financial crisis that is happening right now, that they will not pass it. And that just terrifies me because it is so incredibly important that we pass this. So I will be supporting it tonight, and I hope that people will support it in November. I am so concerned that they won't, but I hope that they will. And, you know, so thank you so much again, Councilman Clark. And thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Flynn. A Thank you, Madam President. I guess I'm when I think about the task force and the recommendation that came forward on a sales tax, and that was at the Broncos, Coach Saban, who made the who went for the tie, a very unsatisfying tie. And he had that famous quote about a tie game I sat in as an observer on, I believe, all of the task force meetings. And I appreciate all the work that went into it. I witnessed a lot of it. I encourage my constituents to take part in the opinion survey. And what struck me about it is that the sales tax of all the revenue options that were on the table in the opinion survey that was up for about a month and a half. Sales tax was the only revenue raising proposal that was opposed by most of the respondents in the public survey. Other than I think there was a late last minute extra tax on meat and dairy products that somebody threw on the table. And given that, it seems to me like this is because we couldn't reach a way to make better solutions work that actually change behavior and get at what we're trying to change through this through this effort, we settled on the default the easy way out, which is sales tax, which is

regressive. I agree with Alexis Morris, one of our speakers earlier, that this is a very regressive tax, despite the promise that the revenue will be used to be spent more equitably on those communities. It's still a very regressive tax and. My fear beyond this is that this week we'll hear a proposal from a councilwoman, Connie Chung, on a sales tax for services for homelessness. And I believe that is the and that is the thing that I believe is appropriate for the sales tax to be used. I want to put my support behind th

at. And in doing that, I feel that we're asking too much from our voters right now. This will put us up at 8.81% sales tax. If both of these were to pass and my my intent is to support the homelessness sales tax. And I almost wish that Brazilian Denver's initiative would be the one to go forward. And then maybe. Work with that one, flawed as it is, I think this one is flawed as well. I think I would rather see the resilient Denver attacks go forward than this one. So I probably be the only no vote on this. That doesn't mean that I oppose the efforts that the revenue would be used for. I just think the way we're raising it, it's not the appropriate way to do it in this time. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman CdeBaca. Thank you, Madam President. It's not often that I agree with as many points as I do agree with with Councilman Flynn, but I agree with many points he raised tonight. And I think that it's it's really disappointing that we took a whole year to get to a sales tax, considering what we started out with and what is currently on the ballot. With the Resilient Denver Initiative. I thought that was more courageous, more complex, but definitely more courageous in shifting the burden to our commercial and industrial users. This is, we know, overburdening the people who will who we're trying to help and who will be faced with this competition of a sales tax for climate change and a sales tax for homelessness. I think that it's unfortunate that we're putting both of these in front of them at this time. And while in principle, I support always giving the voters the power and sending this to to the ballot. I think our voters are smart and I think our voters are frustrated about how we use tax dollars and when they see tax increases on the ballot. I don't think we've given them a reason to pass any of them. And so what what I. Fully expected to happen may well come true and we might strike both sales taxes down because we're just giving this to them at a very inopportune time without a lot of proof of our ability to manage their money wisely in the first place. And so I'll support getting this onto the ballot. But but I don't support another sales tax. I really don't. And I think that even with our analysis of the numbers that our friends from the task force shared, it shows just on an estimate, a rough estimate will be paying more as individuals. With this tax than we would with the other tax. And I think right now that's not what what our constituents want or need. But thank you for letting me share my comments and I will support to get it on the ballot. But I personally will not be voting to support it. Thank you, Councilwoman. Seen no other hands raised in the queue. I'll go ahead and provide my comments. You know, I was part of the group of council members working with Councilman Clark to do something, to do something that we were going to be able to hopefully address the immense disparities that are in our communities of color, sp

ecifically in regard to climate change and the impacts of climate change. And one of the biggest pieces that we wanted to make sure was that those dollars, whatever the funding source was, was that those dollars got back to the very communities that needed this help and support. And I just want to point out to folks who are maybe on this meeting, but on page four of the actual bill request in Section seven, we didn't talk about it in the questions, but that the funds would be expended on permitted uses, allowing for flexibility to take advantage of one time opportunities or catalytic projects. 50% of the dedicated funds would go directly to communities with a strong lens towards equity, race and social justice. And that is one of the pieces that that is so important. And that gained my support of this, among others. And I want to thank the members of the task force. It was a hall for all of you in day long Zoom meetings with breakout sessions, and the conversation was so intentional and deep to try to figure out what we could do. And I know that there are concerns about the ballot, about the time in history that we are in right now. But I want to provide the voters of Denver the opportunity to weigh in and have their say on this. And so I will be supporting this tonight. And we'll go ahead. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Wow. I see the bucket. I swear I went now. Herndon. I. Cashmere. I can eat. I. Ortega. I. Of I. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Madam President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close the voting and announce the results. One day, 11 eyes. 11 Eyes Council Bill 684 has passed. The pre adjournment announcement on Monday, August 31st, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 694, changing the zoning classification for

48, 55, 48, 56, 48, 76 and 4900. Sherman Street 48, 24. 13 Eyes Council Bill 550 has passed. We're on the homestretch here, folks. Next, public hearing is 20 dash 05776. And it's a bill for an ordinance changing the zoning classification for 1901 South Clarkson Street in Platte Park. Councilman CdeBaca, will you please put Council Bill 576 on the floor for passage? I move that council bill 576 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It's been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Council Bill 20 20576 is open now. We have the staff report, please. Yes. Go ahead, Libby. All right. I am the other Libby with community planning and development. And hopefully, can you all see my screen? Mm hmm. Okay, great. So this is 1901 South Clarkson Street. This is located in Council District seven. In the Plat Park neighborhood. And the applicant is requesting to rezone from urban single unit C one with a minimum zone lot size of 5500 square feet to urban single unit B one, which has a minimum zone lot size of 4500 square feet. The site's approximately 4690 square feet. And it's located at the intersection of Jewel Avenue and Clarkson Street, a block north of Evans Avenue. And as I just stated, the current

zoning is urban single unit C one. This does allow for the accessory dwelling unit use and the detached accessory dwelling unit building form, but it only allows the building form on a minimum zone lot size of 5500 square feet. And so as you can see, there's other you zoned district along Clarkson Street. And then as U.S., you see as you move farther east and then you SUV one to the north and the west of the site. The existing land use is a single unit home. Most of this area is single unit uses with multiple. There's several duplexes scattered throughout. And then as you can see, there's more commercial an office along the commercial corridor of South Pearl Street. The bottom right hand side is the existing home, but above it is another existing single unit home in the area across Jewel. And then there's the existing and existing duplex approx across Clarkson Street and then kind of the start of the commercial corridor on South Pearl with the restaurant. This application was complete at the beginning of April. An informational notice was sent to neighboring property owners within 200 feet of the site on April 3rd. It went to planning board on June 3rd, where it was recommended unanimously for approval. We have received several public comments. We received a comment from the Platt Park People's Association, as well as five neighboring property owners, all in opposition of the proposal. The Park Peoples Association said they are supportive of accessory dwelling units in the neighborhood, but they were concerned that this particular rezoning would lead to spot rezoning. And then out of the five emails that we received, several of them were concerned that this would actually make the neighborhood less affordable and as well as concerned with parking issues that this could cause. And then two of the comments were concerned that this could lead to commercial uses, such as a medical office on the site. But this would not open up the site for commercial uses. There are five review criteria that must be met in order for it to be approved. And I'll go through each of each one. The first is consistency with adopted plans, of which there are two. In Comprehensive Plan 2040. There are several strategies that this proposed rezoning meets. I'll just go over a couple of them. The first is it will create a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood for all individuals and families, which will lead to a more equitable, affordable and inclusive Denver. And it will also promote an environmentally resilient Denver by promoting infill development. And we're infrastructure and services are already in place. Now moving to blueprint the guidance for this area is the urban neighborhood context, which is a single and two unit residential areas with some multi-unit and mixed use embedded throughout the block. Patterns are regular and there's alley access and then a high degree of walkability. The future place type for this site is low residential, which is pred

ominantly single and two unit uses and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. The future street type for both Dual Avenue and Clarkson Street are local, which are mostly characterized by residential uses. Blueprint also goes into further detail on when it's appropriate for rezoning to go from to request a smaller lot size. And so it says that it's only appropriate when there's an established pattern of surrounding blocks of smaller lots with similar uses that would be consistent with the zone district request. So this map that's on the screen shows the sizes for the lots and the surrounding blocks. So you can see the lot. The subject site has the red box around it, and the block that it's on is about split between lots that are under 5500 square feet, which would be more consistent with the US sub one zone district and lots that are greater than 5500 square feet, which would be more consistent with us. You see one once you cross Clarkson Street to the east side and then move further east, you can see if there's a pattern of the yellow and the kind of

purple lots. And so that really does those are the larger lots that are more consistent with us, you see and see one. But when you go north, northwest and west of the site, you can see that there's a lot more of the teal color which is more consistent with the US. You be one zone district size. So based on this, staff found that there is an established pattern of smaller lots. But because there needs to be both an established pattern of smaller lots with similar uses, the applicant provided this second map. So this is they went through and found where all the accessory dwelling units are in the area. So the subject side, it has the yellow star and then you can see where all the black stars are, are where they found accessory dwelling units and most of them are on properties that are zoned sub one, but you have the smaller class sizes. So Steph did find that it meets this a you know, it is appropriate to reason or it meets this guidance and blueprint for when it's appropriate to rezone to a district with a smaller lot size. And then the growth area strategy is all other areas of the city, which is where we anticipate 10% of new jobs and 20% of new housing by 2040. Staff also finds it meets the next two criteria and that it will result in uniformity of district regulations and it will further the public health, safety and welfare, primarily through implementing city adapted plans. The newly adopted guidance and blueprint on when it's appropriate to rezone to a district with a smaller lot size serves as the justifying circumstance for this application. And finally, staff finds that this proposal is consistent with the urban neighborhood context, the residential zone district purpose and the US hub. One intent statement. So therefore staff finds that it meets all five criteria and we recommend approval of this rezoning. And that concludes staff presentation. I'm happy to answer any ques

tions and the applicant is available as well. Wonderful. Thank you. Libby, if we could ask you to take down your screen. Sharing wonderful. Tonight, counsel has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 20-057. We have one individual who has signed up to speak this evening. Barbara Poole. We've got her in the queue. And so we'll. Get her unmuted. All right. Go ahead, please, Barbara. Hello. Good evening. And thank you for allowing me to state my opinion. I live next door to 1901, so. Clarkson I'm a 1905 self Clarkson Street. And the I've been hesitant. Until now to oppose the Farthing moving forward with their request to rezone. However, there has been a new development and that they. Have moved to. Steamboat Springs Springs. Potentially. For a year, but currently they have moved away and they have three renters in their house currently. So. This turn of events means they are now proposing. To potential. Rental. Properties on their undersized lot. I do realize that Denver has been made aware that Denver has regulations that property owners need to be present to rent, that they can't. Rent. Both units. However, a quick Google search showed that there are workarounds and plenty of people know how to work around that. So that does leave the potential. And I'm not. Suggesting this is the father's immediate goal, but. It is a potential. For my close neighbors to the north. The. The ADA will essentially remove any privacy I enjoy in my backyard. The. The due to the height of the structure will look directly into my yard and then overlook. My. Fence. Our shared property line is only about 12 inches north of my home. So. This is concerning to me just because I have a young daughter that is in the yard frequently they have where they would be able to look into the back of the windows in the back of my house, the the yard in the back . And just. Essentially our. Privacy. Will be gone. And so I also believe that this would really decrease potentially really not. Significant. Whatever decrease my property value as well to have no privacy in the backyard. So and the dense dwelling. So for that reason, I oppose the rezoning. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Paul. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council. Councilwoman Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President, for the. I have a question for the Mrs. for right now. Do you. What's your zoning? Is your zoning as a rule, it's the same. As the farthing. So it's it doesn't allow accessory dwelling units or is it. I don't have the lot. So is not large enough. Okay. So you're in the same kind of situation where you have connect. Whose baby is this? What is the situation where she has see one but the lot size is too small so she wouldn't be able to have an accessory dwelling unit. Is that what I'm understanding? So I haven't looked at her lot size, but. So you can still have an accessory dwelling unit if you're under the minimum lot size, but you would have to be attached. So it's just prevents the de

tached accessory dwelling unit. If it's not 5500 square feet in the US, you see one district. But you can have it in the basement. Correct. Okay. Thank you. That clarifies my question. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. I think that clarifies my question, too. I was trying to figure out I guess I still need a little more clarification, Libby. The

form based zoning code. This is the part that to me is like speaking Greek because. I guess I need a little more clarification around the purpose of rezoning from the sea to the sea. Yeah. That have to do with the lot size and the requirement that it be attached versus the unattached 80 you. Yeah. So I believe I mean the applicant is here, but I believe he would like to do a detached accessory dwelling unit and that you have to have the minimum lot size. But you then attached you don't. Okay. Thank you. I was. So it's got to do. Can I is that is it okay if I ask just one more question, Madam President. So, Mr. Farthing, maybe could you explain or clarify is that is that your intention then to do the detached one and that's why you're rezoning? Yeah. Can everybody hear me? Yeah. All right. I got awesome. First foremost, thank you guys for giving me the opportunity and consideration for this rezoning. But that to answer your question, yes, that would be our intent was to be a detached accessory dwelling unit, just like all the other ones that are in the neighborhood. Got it. Okay. Thanks so much. No further questions. All right. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Thank you, Madam President. A couple of questions, Libby. I looked through the staff report, and I saw the letter, which was very short from EPA. They didn't say that they oppose it. They said that they're not able to support it. Maybe I'm thinking more with the marijuana social consumption where there's, you know, support non opposition and oppose. Do we just treat anything that is not support as opposition or because it didn't say we oppose this, it says we are unable to support it. So talk me through. There's something that I'm missing there. Or is that just how we treat anything other than support? No, that's a great question. That was my assumption, which could have been incorrect because yeah, you're right. They said they chose not to support. So I assumed that meant that they opposed. But you're right, I don't know how I can ask as that's a question I can bring up to our reasoning team. Okay. I just read a lot like a letter of non opposition versus a one and I didn't know if we had that distinction when it came to zoning. You had mentioned this, but just to quickly clarify and get on the record, there were two of the comments against that reference, some sort of business operation, a dental, medical that is not allowed under any of these conditions attached any of that? Correct. Correct. And then there is also in the staff report, there is, you know, a couple of pages, I think starting around page 4

6 that show a map and then people are in support. And your staff report, you only said we received the you know, the letter from three V.A. is letters in opposition to we don't count that kind of stuff. Those are just other things. How does that get quantified? Because it's in the staff report, but it wasn't in the presentation. So just curious, but. Correct. Yeah. So those were from the applicants outreach. So those were not letters that staff had received. The other ones were things that we have received, but the applicant can speak. That was from his outreach to the neighboring property owners. Okay. Okay. I think those were the questions that I had. Thank you very much. Thank you. Madam President. Thank you. Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. So I think Councilmember Clark, we are calling him that instead of President Clark. But anyway, Councilmember Clark, I was I've got similar questions. So thank you for distinguishing between the applicants letters and these letters. Were you saying that all of the comments that CPD received were in opposition? Is that. Correct? And how many comments was that? We received five. Five. Okay. And and CPD believes this is worthy of acceptance despite the letters of opposition. Is that correct? Correct. Based on the criteria, we do find that it is compliant with the criteria. And and so I think that, you know, some of the concerns were about private property rights or the lack of privacy or. I am I am I kind of digesting the the letters that you received and opposition accurately. Yeah. So there I mean, there were concerns about parking as well as that this could make the neighborhood less affordable. Sure. Okay. And and so there is a rezoning in my district, which is not related to this one, about an area that I'm I'm learning a bit because so far we have never in in my you know, in my year on council president has been pretty clear. We have unanimously accepted every area rezoning. And so I'm trying to trying to figure out how we might break that mold. And I don't really see how how we can do that, because our president has been pretty firm and pretty unanimous for all of them. And so I. I guess. There is also a concern about private property rights. Like, as in, if someone build something that goes above my fence, then that impedes my property rights. But doesn't it? I mean, I guess I could also it's that isn't relevant for the five criteria because that's both plots that the owners of each of those plots have private property rights. And and so how would we necessarily correlate that? Am I barking up the wrong tree or the right six foot fence or. Yeah. I guess I did. Do you have a specific question? I just. Know. I know. I apologize. I guess I am asking a softball question that really doesn't have an easy answer. But I mean, I guess the question is this

you don't see any place in the five criteria where private property rights of the current owner or the adjacent property owner meet or fit into

any of those criteria. Is that right? Correct. Okay. Thank you. And thank you, Madam President. Madam President. Guy. Sorry. Go ahead. I just wanted to, I guess, reiterate the fact that, you know, I know there is some opposition, but we I have done my family. I've done all kinds all the due diligence we possibly can. And and we want to make sure that all of our neighbors are happy and bring a decision together that that makes sense. Right. And I I've spoken at length with with Barbara, our next door neighbor. Next door neighbor, as well as all the surrounding neighbors. And I know that we can come to if there is any opposition or any discomfort, you know, it's something that we talk about constantly and want to make sure that everybody's happy. So, you know, we really want to reiterate the fact that that, you know, we're not trying to piss off any neighbors here and really do the right thing. But, you know, according to the city's adopted plans, you know, everything undeniably does follow the adopted plans of the building to use. And I guess my, my, my, I guess approach would be kind of two pronged, right? One, the consistency of adopted plans, but then to I mean, regardless of and EDU is even to be built on this on this lot the lot is more like a U.S. would be want than it is a see one. So we're basically rezoning it to what it should be to begin with, which was out of my control when this thing got zoned right years and years and years ago. But, you know, at the end of the day, we really just want to be a good neighbor and and do the right thing. So that's. Thank you. My little pitch. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. Mr. Farthing, as long as we have you here. Couple of questions as I'm looking again at the aerials. I noticed there's a garage that faces the side street, not the alley. Is there. Is your intention to build a detached adu in place of the garage? Yes. So that garages is built probably, what, 1905? It's not usable as a garage now it's a storage shed. And so that would be torn down and everything would be built to code and yeah, there would be a garage and then they do on top of it. Okay. And because the, the zone and the size of the lot would allow an attached adu. Why are you not doing that? Well, simply because of the size of our lot and the alley access. We want to keep as grass as possible. And I don't know. Then we got to deal with. Okay. Can we have a curb, side to side street access from door or have access in the alley? So there's that option potentially. But we we never really wanted to do that. But why? Because there is there already is a curb cut for the garage on Jewel. But but it would have to be detached because there's the curb cut on the garages, I don't know, 30 or 40 feet from where my house is. And so I don't we wouldn't want to build the house that takes up the entire lot and lose every single square footage of grass. Okay. And are you or have you actually moved to St

eamboat? Are you in Steamboat right now? I am in Steamboat, yes. Okay. So are you. And what is the plan for this? Well. You know, the plan right now is just to be here for a year. You know, with COVID and everyone working remotely, my wife and I have been talking about moving in the mountains for since we've been together for seven years. Ten years. And and so we said, all right, all right, now's the time to do it. And we have an opportunity. And so, yeah, we're up here for a year just to, I guess, see if you like it. But, you know, regardless of of our outcome in Steamboat, we still want to be able to have the opportunity to. To build the ADA and our Denver house. Yeah. Okay. Now, you just bought this house about a year and a half ago. Yep. November. And you're thinking of selling it already? No, no, no. We're never going to sell our house. Oh, you use it around and. Pardon me. That's my clock chiming on the hour. I apologize. No one going to hear that. One more. Thank you. So you're going to rent both the Adu and the house? No. No. So we would never, ever, ever do that. The adu. If if we move back to Denver. Right. And if we have the money to build the Adu. Right, then it would be a a place for me to stay when we're in Denver. Because my wife's name is Endeavor and or option to write. We move. We don't like Steamboat and move back to Denver. And our current home kicked the renters out, though, did you? And now we have a place for Asian grandparents to stay in my home office. Obviously, rental, rental opportunities and all the equitable, positive positives that their native will bring. Okay. Thank you. Libby, can I ask you a couple questions now on the the zoning that is there now, the C1. Allows them attached to you? Correct. Correct. But the lot size is too small for a detached. This is what I'm hearing, correct? Yes. And the justification for it is the the ungrammatical. I'll point out, being an old editor, it is only appropriate to allow smaller lot sizes in the existing zone district if there is an established pattern in the surrounding blocks of smaller lots with similar uses. So we have a map with one, two, three,

four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten black stars that indicate that there are 80 use of those locations. Are all of those detached or are any of them attached to use? They're they're all detached. They're all detached. Okay. Thank you. And, Libby, what is the is given the the footprint of the house? Are there any setbacks from the primary residence or the primary structure to the ADU that obviously on a smaller lot you might run into a problem like that? But do they apply in this case? And so there's no set back that I'm aware of from the structure. There could be building requirements, but it does need to be in the back 35% of the lot. So you don't know if the primary structure came close to that 35% line. Fire code would, of course, say you have to have some kind of setback. Yes. Minimum five feet, I imagine. Okay. Are

there any rules about these to use in this zone district or in any zone district that say you must be the primary resident of the property in order to have it or do. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Oh, no, you can finish your question. Or. Or can you rent both the house and the you two separate parties? So in all single unit districts that allow ADU is this is city wide where regardless of what neighborhood context you do have to, the owner needs to live on the site. Okay. Thank you. And are there any restrictions? I don't think there are. But confirm for me, can and Adu be used as a short term rental? Yes. And in all cases. Yes, it can. Okay. As long as the owner is living right. Okay. Thank you. That's all, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. Those were somewhat along the lines of my questions that Councilman Flynn was just asking. So first, I wanted to just ask Levy, when we have applicants coming in to zone their property for an EDU, what justification do you all use to verify that they are in fact an owner and occupant of the property that they own? So for that I would have to get back to we don't I wouldn't actually review the request that would be with development services would be the ones that are residential team to actually review the zoning permit to make sure that the property owner does live on site. And I'm not exactly sure what they look at, but I can find that out and get back to you. Well, since it is one of the criteria that allows an application to move forward, it seems to me somewhere in that front end application process we should be doing some of that verification. And so I guess I just question how. An application is allowed to move forward if we have an applicant that does not live on the premise. This individual is the owner. But, I mean, he just admitted he's living for a whole year in a different city, and that is one of the criteria. So I guess I would just ask who from the city attorney office is available and I want you to weigh in on this question about how we can allow an applicant to move forward that does not live on the property, given that it is one of the clear criteria that has to be met to move forward with an ADU on your property. And we have Nate Lucero here. And so we'll get. So, Nate, can you help us into the. Yeah. Can you hear me now, Councilwoman? Yes. Yes, go ahead. Great. So is the question related to whether or not. You can have an accessory dwelling unit and not be the owner of the property. So two questions. The first is what do we do to verify that you are an occupied owner making the application to do an ADU? Because that is one of the criteria. Are we allowed to move forward knowing that we have an applicant that does not live on the premise? Admittedly. So I think Libby is correct in that development services would have a process to ensure that any applicant to construct an accessory dwelling unit is the occupied owner. I'm not sure what their list o

f. Criteria is that they go through to ensure that the that the residence is owner occupied. But there must be a way that they do that. So in this case. You know, with Mr. Farthing not living at the residence, he would not be able to apply to construct the ADU. So if he were to move back to the residence and make application for the construction of an 80 you, then he could move forward with that effort. But let me ask my question differently. The fact that this applicant is not an occupied owner can be used as justification to deny the application for moving forward. Correct. Are you talking about denying the rezoning because the owner doesn't live there? Yes. It's part of the criteria that has to be met as far as them being able to move it forward. So how do we justifiably approve it when admittedly the owner is saying, I don't live there? So I'm going to be there for a whole year. But I'm making the application and. I may or may not live there at any time in the future. But, you know, I want to move forward with this application and I get that we have to deal with every single zoning on its own merits. Behind you brought up the question about, you know, this has been the practice across the city and yes, across the board. We've been talking about wanting to see more opportunities for ADAS to exist in our city because it's part of our housing solutions. Right. But at the same time, if we have a criteria that comes through the CPD office, it seems to me all of that

should be bundled into an application that is put before us, regardless of whether it's part of this arm of that arm of CPD, it should all be, you know, the same the same process move forward. Well, so what we're doing here this evening is considering the entitlement of the property and whether or not a rezoning to the US you be one zoned district is appropriate. So we're not considering any development application in that city council this evening. We're only considering whether or not it would be appropriate to rezone this property to a specific district. We're creating that entitlement with a known property owner saying, I don't live there, and that's what I'm having struggle with in terms of the the process that we're dealing with here. Now, if he lived in the property and he was making the application, that would be completely different. But he's admittedly saying, I'm not going to be there for a whole year, but I'm making this application. So that's that's my struggle with it. So I'll just have to vote as I may. It sounds like there isn't any other explanation. For addressing my question. Well, can I. Just a moment, sir. We need the city attorney to respond. Nate. Thank you, Madam President. So it's really a bifurcated question, Councilman Sandoval. One is. I'm sorry. That's okay. So. So one is the entire process, right? Like many developers that you see come before, you sometimes are just entitling the property and then they turn around and sell it to whoever is going to actuall

y construct the project. If not, all of those processes have this kind of criteria attached to it. That's the difference between this and those. Yeah. And I would respectfully disagree because all rezonings have the exact same. Criteria that you have to. Consider. All right. I'm not going to argue with you. I just don't agree. So thank you. The photos were the extent of my questions. Thank you, Councilwoman. Next up, we have Councilman Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. My question is for Mrs. Poole. So you said you have 13 inches from your window of the back of your house to your property line. Is that correct? Oh, I'm sorry. You're muted. You can't unmute yourself there. You're in there? Yes, that's correct. How did that end with setback? We have setback requirements. So how did that happen? Back in the twenties, maybe. I don't know. When these are old homes, it's. Okay. At some point it was re zoned. This is it was this way when I bought the home that got it the property line. Okay. The reason I'm asking is because one of the criteria that we have to consider is health, safety and welfare of the community. Right? So if we are looking at a rezoning and we are looking at a situation where a potential of 82 is being built and there's if you can pass a cup of sugar from one window to the other because there were no setbacks in the twenties when the properties were built, that is weird and potentially a safety issue, which is why I am asking the question. So I was just trying to mind around and I've been looking on Google Maps at the, at the at your property connections and trying to figure out, you know, where the property lines are. So can you explain to me a little bit more what what your concern is about that? Well, I think just the I think the loss of privacy and the decreased property value, those are my biggest concerns with an EDU because right now we you know our backyard. It's. It's you know, I mean they could look over the fence but I mean you know one I mean we can just enjoy it feels safer than having a renter in a unit that I mean and it's I know that that is not unique I mean that's people have that all the time, but that wasn't there when I bought the property. So it's just kind of a new. Exposure that I don't enjoy. It's my daughter and myself, and it. Just makes me feel a little more vulnerable. Then the decreased property value is something else. So, you know, I'm not sure. The impact, but I don't think it would increase. It. So those are my biggest concerns. And then. You know, if it is right now, they're, I think, three. Is that correct, Corey? Three renters. Four. So there's parking. There's, you know, so all that and then a few. And and have you talked to your next door neighbor about potentially, if they were to move, if they were to get the rezoning, if they were to move back from Steamboat, if they were to then qualify, move back into their house and qualify them for all of the criteria to apply for the ADU and be able to af

ford to build it. Given all of the financial challenges of COVID, potentially, maybe like putting up a privacy fence or some sort of, you know, have you have you maybe kicked around a potential compromise here? We haven't talked the details. It's been a very. You know, non contentious discussion with I mean, Corey's. Been very respectful and I mean, it's been but I just feel like this is my last opportunity to protect myself and my daughter. And so that's why I'm taking it tonight. I don't know how with the proximity that the structure would need to be. I mean, the privacy. Fence would. Have to be very. High, you know, so short of. Not having windows on the south side. I'm not sure how. You could avoid. You know, the losing privacy. Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. Thank you,

Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Thank you, Madam President. And Nate and Livvy, I want to be get this crystal clear here, because I think I think some things were getting inflated. There is no criteria within the rezoning that speaks at all to the residency requirement when it comes to 80 years. That requirement lives in. If I'm going to rent out both units for a city. Stapleton You know, for a city I think was developed, Stapleton did not intend to live in any of those. They built units with 80 views on zoning that was allowed. They saw that, in fact, you can buy a structure with an ADU as a rental property and never live in it. You just cannot rent the adieu unless you yourself live in the property. But that is not one of the criteria when we talk about that criteria for rezoning that does not exist anywhere in the rezoning criteria that only exists in the if I am living in it and I choose to rent the Adu that comes into play at that point. But purchasing an entitlement rezoning that does not live anywhere in those criteria is not correct. That's correct. Can I get legal to also confirm that since I know Councilwoman Ortega was talking about the legal criteria that we are required by law to test this application against that criteria of whether someone will live in that structure does not live anywhere in the rezoning criteria. Is that correct? Nate or I see your son on here as well? That's correct. Councilman Clark, thank you. Okay. So I just wanted to make sure that we were we were talking about two different things. One is, who will eventually own the property and what they will do with that? And in fact, anyone could go buy a house that has an 82 on it and they could rent that unit. They just can't rent both units. They would have to rent the house with the idea that somebody could use as their office or or whatever. But the only person who could rent that second unit is the person who lives there. And that does not live anywhere in the rezoning, which is what we have. Barbara, I have a question for you. You had mentioned that this hasn't been contentious and that you've been, you know, kind of evolving over time. I did notice as I was going through the

staff report that the applicant had submitted, you know, kind of a petition with 12 people in support that I'd asked about. I looked closer at that. And you were one of those people who signed that. And that is, in fact, true, that at that point you thought you were of you changed your mind. Not. You're not asserting that anything was fabricated incorrectly about your support at that point? No, I was hesitant, but I did sign. And but as things. Have moved forward, they've recently. Moved and it just kind of blew it up. And, you. Know, the situation. Changed. I totally understand. I just wanted to make sure that because I saw your name on there is in support and then you're here in opposition that there was no you know, this wasn't fake. You that was you were was. Not able known or whatnot. I just wanted to be crystal clear on that point as well. Thank you, manager or Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Clark. Councilman Flynn. Hey, Madam President, I spend a little bit of time listening also, but looking at that map again. And Libby, maybe you can answer this for me. The some of the stars on the map that shows some of the existing arrows, some of which are fairly frequent, fairly recent, rather. But none of those parcels appears to have been resolved. How how did all those on the north side of July along Clarkson, how did they get approved and built? Wouldn't they have needed a similar rezoning? So those are already zoned for use, as is the subject site so that most of Platte Park. And they're in their ones they're in the ones that are allowed on the larger the 5500 square foot. No they're on the ones that allowed on the smaller so used to be one which is what the applicant is a 44 flats is locus currently at the site of bus us ub1 to the north and the west. And I do want to put it I know that we've talked a lot about it to use, but because they can already do any of you, this rezoning is really more about rezoning to a district with a smaller lot size than it is about allowing an adu because it does already allow for an 82 use. Okay. And but in the with the smaller lot size, it has to be an attached. Right? So because they don't meet the minimum zoned district, lots of size of the current that it would have to be attached there. So the ones the ones that I did see on Google Street View show that there are they are detached north of dual. Correct. Yeah. So those would all probably that means so because those are all in the US U be one zoned district. They have a minimum lot size of at least 4500 square feet which is of the applicant is applying for. Okay. So they can do the the detached the ones that are in the C one. Mm hmm. They are. I saw one there that was also detached. Yeah. So that. Yep. So we would have to have at least a minimum zone size of 5500 square feet. And if you look across the street on Clarkson, a lot of those lots are around 7000 square feet and there's a lot of 60 to 50 lots in the neighborhood as well. Okay. Thank you. A

All right, Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. So. Is it possible that this was actually just an oversight in the 2010 rezoning or whatever the you know, whenever this particular plot was set up, that it was just a oops because it's it's right next to a whole bunch of other plot centers owned by one. And this one happens to be C one. Yeah. Know, I'm not exactly sure. It is interesting how the lines are. There's a lot of you know, normally you'll see there's there's more rectangular where the district boundaries are but in plot park it is kind of very zigzag on where it changes from B to C and then B one to just be. So I'm not exactly sure what. The I guess I'm asking you to say, did some of your team screw up back in 2010? So and I'm not trying to do that, but but it just seems to me like this might this might have just been a noose. And and I do I very much respect your comment about this isn't about an issue. You can put an issue on his property right now. And I think that's a really important distinction because all the letters of opposition are about the ADA. So at least as I understand it. So I think that's a I think that's an interesting and important distinction. So thank you. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Flynn, I see you lowered your hand. All right. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 0576 is closed. Comments by members of council. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Madam Chair. First, I wanted to thank Barbara for coming down and being our Sloan speaker on this. So thank you for that, for taking time for sticking with us. So 930 at night, really appreciate that. I also live in Plattsburgh and I also have a house that sits way closer to the property line than would currently be allowed under the zoning code because these homes were built before those rules. And so mine is I think I have a couple more inches than you. I think I'm 20 inches from the property line on on one side, which causes all kinds of interesting issues when you try to touch anything on your house because now your entire house is in the wrong place and you can't move a house over. It also, I think, creates a lot of we have a lot of houses. You know, the minimum lot size frontage on the block that I live in is only 25 feet. And so we're going about 25 feet, then another house, then another house. You have a lot of these issues of privacy, right? When you are only about 25 feet from width before one neighbor and the next neighbor. And it's not just around 80 use. It's also there are a lot of historic one story structures and then someone builds a two storey and it goes back further than the one story. And now you have a two story home where the third you're looking directly into somebody's backyard and attached to you. And this would certainly create that condition where an attached to you doesn't get rid of the privacy concern by being on the back. You're overlooking the alley potentially or the other garage. The extension of o

If an attached to you could be looking directly on to the backyard, which we see a lot in that park where someone has , you know, a smaller house that started here. Somebody does in addition on the back. Another addition is looking two stories into a backyard. And, you know, it's one of the not fun things. We even have a couple of cases where people put solar panels on a one story home and the next door neighbor uses their use. My right to build up two stories and blocks part of their solar, how much energy they're creating during those winter months. And as part of that, you know, this is not an, you know, a suburban zone district. This is a is an urban edge, the urban zone district where there is all of that happening. There's light rail stations and there's wood that don't have parking lots because they're walkable and there are embedded commercial districts, all of that causing conflict and turmoil. I think that what we are charged with here tonight is, is that those are issues that come with, you know, density in the kind of neighborhood that this is and has been for a hundred years. What we're charged with is, does this meet the legal criteria for rezoning? And beyond that, looking at, you know, taking into account what what do the people around think and feel? You know, I think that the three page letter to me was a non opposition letter. It was that we can't support this. It didn't say we adamantly opposed this. And the reason that they didn't support it was spot rezoning, which was a very real thing that was not allowed in Denver until a couple of years ago, when the minimum lot size for a rezoning application changed and now it is legal to put forward an application for a single lot that is 4600 square feet. That was it three years ago. And so that that is some of the language that's still around. It's something that would have prevented this from ever happening a couple years ago. But that is allowable in today. Of the five letters in opposition that were that were received by staff, two of them were about something that can never happen there. There's the medical office and the rest were about issues with a use in general. This property is already zoned for an 80 it already could build in 82. Those problems are part of that urban fabric problem, that problem that we have as our city continues to see people move into it and change. They're not necessarily problems with the change between the B and the C. We have

over the time that I've been here, had big rezonings that take something that was single family zoned district and move it all the way to five, six, eight storeys. And then we have small rezonings, which most of the time look like I can't have a air to you, and now I can answer you by adding that one on the end. This one is even smaller than that. I can't remember a change that is smaller in what it allows. The next 80 year old is allowed. It can be attached now. It has to be detached. We're not even adding the right for an 8

2 that's already there for everyone on this block and all the blocks around it, you know, in three of the four directions allow for this smaller lot size because that is the cadence. And if you look at the map, that's the cadence on this side of the block. When you get to the other side of the block, the cadence starts to be slightly smaller lots. So I think that this is tough because we all want to sit here with everybody happy and everybody saying, this is exactly what I want. I want to be clear that the set, the unit rental, the renting of two units. At the same time, which again, was was one of Barbara's main concerns. That is not allowed. That cannot be allowed. But that is not a part of our rezoning criteria. Whereas in a different place, in the same way that, hey, I'm worried you won't bow your weeds or have too many dogs on site is something that is valid to be concerned about when you live next door to people. But it's not something that is a criteria for zoning. It is not something that is controlled by zoning. It lives elsewhere and we have to be vigilant as more and more to use come online in our community. But it's not those use are not being abused in a way that they were not intended to be when we said, hey, you can't brant that out as if it was a duplex that is you have to live there if you want to rent the other thing. But the ownership can change three times in the next year. And that law, that's why that law doesn't live in the zoning because we're not zoning to one owner. We're zoning to everyone who will own that property after. We'll all be beholden to that rule, and we have to make sure that we're enforcing it at the end of the day. It comes down to does this meet the legal criteria? And I think that there's clearly, as staff has demonstrated, thank you, Libby, for all your hard work on this. It does meet the legal criteria. I will just end by saying that the Councilman Hines point earlier. I don't believe that just because we haven't had an edu that's been turned back yet that we never will. Each of these applications is based on does this application meet the legal criteria? What we are what we are tasked with doing here, and we may get someone who comes and applies for an edu that does not meet the legal criteria and not one would get turned back. But I believe that this one has been clearly demonstrated that this small change from attached to you to detached to you from see to be is something that meets the legal criteria for rezoning. And for that reason I will be voting to support it tonight, and I would encourage my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Torres. Thank you, Madam President. I really. Appreciate all the back and. Forth to clarify this, because it is more. Complex than even the one. That just came before it. And in my district and. A lot of things. That get raised in. Terms of what do we oppose and and what's before. Us right now, what I what I d

o want to. Say, because I do think the. Criteria has been. Met even elsewhere in this. Neighborhood, is that this actually brings up one of. The other needs that that Denver has, which is. Councilwoman Gilmore, you initiated, I think, a conversation around this last year. And others, but. A rental registry and really being able to make sure that we know exactly where rentals are and who's allowing them, because I even in in my district, what we wouldn't. Want were for folks, whether it's in Barnham who have the entitlement to build a to use or elsewhere throughout the district who apply for. It to then. Rent out both. Units and you. Really start to lose control of a. Lot of the neighborhood character and. Livability of. Neighborhoods. When you don't have that primary occupant there who is the property owners. So that's. Definitely one thing that. I know we've got to get a handle on for Denver as we start to create more credibility throughout the city. I think you all have. And. Q Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I'm having a difficult time with the fact that an 80 and attached 88 was already allowed here, and the rezoning is being sought so that he can do something that doesn't really apply except for this particular guidance in a blueprint about is there an established pattern on the surrounding blocks? And for that reason, under criteria too, that's one of those criteria that always boggles my mind. Uniformity of District Regulations. The proposed rezoning will result in uniform application of zone district building for museum design regulations. That's that's a tautology, right? Of course, if we rezoning to this particular district, will will apply those rules. But the question is, you can add an aide. The issue for me is you can add an

eight you already. It has to be attached because of the lot size. And for that reason, I don't believe that it actually will conform with criteria to. So I don't know. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. So two councilman talks points to the fact that the city is not auditing where owner occupied entities are going. I think is is it's a concern. And we've heard it tonight and I, I have these throughout northwest Denver. They keep popping up. And what's really challenging for me is it's the zoning code is this was this was a 2010 legislative rezoning that we are just barely even ten years later figuring out some of the issues. So Councilman Quinn's point, I have some conflicts here. So right now I continue to listen to other comments. But this one is really challenging. I think you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilwoman Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. Yeah, I am. Along the same lines of my as my colleagues. You know, frankly, I 80 years are the compromise for the neighborhoods who feel very strongly about, you know, preserving their character for the neighborhoods who like, you know, the the grass and who like the the feel of old Denver 80 years are the comprom

ise. Because we've got to add the gentle density. We have to be able to bring in the affordability somehow. All of the neighborhoods, you know, Blueprint says all of the neighborhoods have to share the burden of growth in our city. And so to use or that compromise. But I am I'm incredibly concerned about the idea that we are not as a city doing more to ensure that as we are as we are bringing ADAS into our neighborhoods. We don't have eyes on whether people are following the laws that we have set forth around those ideas, because the buck stops with us and the responsibility lies with us to ensure and we are the ones who are going to hear about it when you know those laws are broken. And that is incredibly concerning. So. Well, I understand, you know, and then there's also this sort of health and safety issue and privacy issue around, like Councilman Clark was saying, around the fact that there are the setbacks in this neighborhood like there are in some of the other neighborhoods, which potentially I don't know, I would, I guess, have to go back and look at the legislative history. But maybe that's why the these parcels were not zoned for detached dwellings in the first place. Maybe that's why they were only zoned for attached dwellings in the first place because of those privacy issues, because they're already they're already zoned for 80 use, but they're just zoned for attached to use, not detached areas. So I guess I am I have my concerns about this one in particular based on the specific facts of this case. But I think, you know, I'm torn because it is so incredibly important that we are bringing to use to to our neighborhoods. But like you said, there are 80 is already in this neighborhood. It's not like they can't have one. This is not about yes or no 80 you this is about detached versus attached to you based on the specific facts of this case. And I'm uncomfortable with what we're looking at in terms of the information we've been given tonight. So I'm going to also keep listening. Thanks so much. All right. Thank you, Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. We are a growing city. And where is the secrets out? And and people want to move to our beautiful slice of the planet. And and as we can continue to grow is going to find a place to put people and I'm not trying to say that our five legal criteria are are about finding places to put people. But but I would say that I know that my district is very vibrant and we have a lot of people who to resist change, but we also have a lot of people who live in tents. And and people are angry. They're angry that they that there are people living in tents at the end of their block and the right of way or across the street. Yet they also resist even the gentlest of additional density as in an area. And this situation, this this isn't even about whether there is an idea or not. It's that, I guess to to the point, is detached or unattached and well an attached to you could also be above a garag

e that would be on the second floor and have the same privacy concerns or the same concerns about looking over a fence. And and, in fact, we're going to hear about that very soon. So that's you know, that is so I don't know if how attached or detached really solves the privacy concern. I, I also know that I'm not that that my world has to be everyone else's world. But, you know, President excuse me, Councilmember Clark mentioned a bit about his house. I know that when I first purchased my unit in October 2011, I had a beautiful view of downtown, of course, feel the mountains, and now I have a view of a whole bunch of bedrooms. And that's not really exciting to me. I'd rather have the view of the mountains, but we also are in a growing city and and if we want to live close to the mountains, we want to live close to the national parks. And if we want to live in a city that's vibrant, that has good economy, good jobs, we have to also recognize that that so we have to make some accommodations. And if we start turning down to and we're going to get more

scrapes and there are like Congress parks, the vast majority of the homes that are built in Congress Park are built before 1940, as in the marker that, you know, the oldest identifier in the spectrum. And so if we start saying we're not going to have any use and this is just, you know, in general, there's a not specifically to the five credible, but just in general, we started saying no to eight years. We're saying yes to scrapes and we started saying no to a use. We're saying yes to destroying a historic character. And so, you know, there's some value discussion that we should have outside of this particular conversation. But in this particular conversation, I don't see how this doesn't meet the criteria. And I'm not saying that my colleagues are wrong. I'm saying that, in my opinion, this meets the legal criteria points that we have to consider. And whether the person lives there or not is certainly irritating to me. Thanks for going after Steamboat and kind of adding more wrenches into the mix. But that's not part of the legal criteria. So I can be irritated and still say yes because we are supposed to be arbiters or quasi judges right now, and I am not making decisions based on irritation. So thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Up next, we have Councilman Herndon. The thing about a president I appreciate everyone's conversation is when you originally look at this. But sometimes when you have hearings, you think it's going to go one way and it goes in a different direction. I applaud everyone's comments and thoughtful considerations on this for me. I don't want to reiterate the point of people will say so. I will tell Councilman Clarke, I really appreciate your comments. I think you're spot on. I do think the criteria has been met. And I would say I would say this to the name of Barbara. Forg

ive me. I wrote the name down. Right. My apologies. You said you were concerned because you left. Well, the reality is, since he's not there, that the timeline of this isn't even close, because as we have talked about a lot, this isn't giving him the opportunity to build the A-Team. This is just as a property owner for the rezoning, and that is it. And so I don't believe that we should look at him, not be in mayor as a reason to deny that. I think the criteria is quite clear and I'm glad that we have to do that to we will be sticking to. And I want to say for Councilman Sawyer, I thought you made a great point for making your questions earlier. The property owner now has to move back. Then they have to decide to do it. And then there's the financing issue. And then do they then they actually build. And so for my colleagues who are concerned about as a city, do we have the mechanism in place to better track this? Well, there's time if we're dealing with this particular issue that we're concerned about, this particular property, and this is probably happening elsewhere. But let's have this conversation with the administration that this is our concern. Let's move forward with that. So I do believe that this is appropriate and has met the criteria. And I will be supportive and I would ask my colleagues to do the same. And I wanted to say this too. I really want to I was felt good seeing this is that neighbors disagree, but they weren't disagreeable. And so I hope that this can happen in other conversations, because usually when neighbors disagree, it's much more contentious than this. And I wanted to applaud all the parties for being neighborly when it comes to this. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. And seen no one else in the queue to make comments, I'll share my own. This was a really robust, great conversation. I didn't know exactly what path we were going to go down and just appreciate everybody's contribution to it. And I have to appreciate Nate, because it was really helpful to hear you explain the entitlement process is through this rezoning and that really the owner occupied piece wasn't something that we through our quasi judicial role right now in this rezoning we need to really look at those five criteria for the rezoning. And I do believe that those five criteria have been met for this rezoning. And so I will be voting in favor of it as well. And with that, Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Okay. Right. Flynn now. Herndon. Hi. Hi. I. Cashman. I. Can each. I Ortega. So. Sandoval. Pass. Yeah. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Black. CdeBaca. Sandoval. I. Council President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Two days. Ten days. Ten Eyes Council Bill 576 has passed there being no further business before this body. This meeting is adjourned. She tries to clap along with. That's a cheat, but not. Just a friend from head to toe. But whiskey is one of the.

First time. You know, you have to ask. Though, she's a bit overzealous. Missing her late shows. Yes, Madam President, I move the council bill to 0-0965 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved. Thank you. The required public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 20961 is open. Maybe please have the staff report. Good evening, counsel. My name is Tina

Axelrod. I'm the running administrator for the city of Denver in the Community Planning and Development Department. And going to. Share my screen to get us to the presentation tonight. And. Right. We're here this evening. This item is for an interim zoning ordinance sponsored by Councilwoman Sandoval. And essentially this is a temporary ordinance that addresses zoning authority in direct response to the COVID public health emergency. This ordinance will only apply during the pandemic and will sunset automatically upon expiration of emergency public health orders. The crux of it is that this ordinance will allow the city to permit COVID related temporary uses anywhere in the city and not just on land zoned under the Denver zoning code. The kinds of emergency uses at particular issue right now include temporary managed campsites for our homeless population, also known as safe outdoor spaces, and the temporary expansion of outdoor patios and spaces associated with restaurants and bars in direct response to the economic implications of the COVID quarantines and public health orders. There's nothing.

Administrator has been given authority in the Denver zoning code to determine whether a proposed temporary use that isn't clearly listed or allowed in the code can nonetheless be permitted. It's been in the Denver zoning code since 2010 when the code was first adopted, but it's been used very sparingly since in those ten years, determinations have been issued to allow temporary outdoor holiday decorations, temporary telecom towers, temporary tiny home villages, which some of you are familiar with, because we just recently or within the last year or so, codified that use into the code and then the two COVID related temporary uses that are still pending or have been granted allowance under the Denver zoning code. So in this ordinance right now, we've got two zoning codes in the city of Denver. The newer one Denver zoning code, adopted in June 2010, does give a thory to the zoning administrator to recognize and permit temporary uses and activities that are otherwise clearly allowed. But our older code that still applies to sometimes referred to as former Chapter 59 does not have that same authority. So while the zoning administrator has approved numerous temporary uses on Denver's zoning code zone land, none of those uses were allowed on all codes homelands lands, in particular the temporary tiny home villages. And to a large extent, the temporary outdoor patio expansions. Even when there is an avenue to allow some of the city's unorganized owned land, for example,

the temporary outdoor patios. It was through a different path and different authority. And typically many more limitations will apply. For example, while we were able to extend the temporary outdoor patio program to all coach owned lands, it was much more restrictive than what we could allow on Denver's zoning programs. Just one example of that is that if you were on all codes down land, you can have your temporary outdoor space, but you could not take up required parking spaces. Even if no one was coming to drive to your restaurant, you could not take up those parking spaces. That's just one example. So the ordinance. Will. Work to allow the zoning administrator to make a conscious and deliberate decision every time she makes a determination under the Denver zoning code to allow an unlisted use to also allow the use on all code so land. Remember, this is in response to the COVID emergency only. And it's not. It is bookended by criteria and parameters. Essentially, the determination has to find that the unlisted use is similar to other permitted uses in the zone districts at issue, both in character and external and external impacts that the proposed use is consistent with the code and zoned district intents, and that allowing the use is necessary to preserve or advance the public health, safety and welfare. The zoning administrators are also allowed to attach conditions and limits on any unlisted use determination to mitigate potential impacts. So both the tiny home village temporary use and the the temporary outdoor patio expansion program came with conditions and limits on those uses to mitigate potential spillover effects on surrounding properties. When this authority if this authority is used under the pending ordinance, the zoning administrator would have to specify which code zone districts to allow to use and also does provide an allowance to bridge the two codes and give the zoning administrator authority to apply standards that Denver's zoning code landowners enjoy to code zone property landowners , for example, that that same limitation on whether or not you could use required parking spaces for your temporary use. With this ordinance in place, I could allow the patio expansion to take up otherwise required parking that during this pandemic is certainly not being used. Of note is that allowing temporary uses under COVID or other circumstances has no impact on the legal status of any permanent land use that's also located on the same property. This highlights some of those provisions in these next few slides that I just talk through. Section one is the general grant of authority and the bottom line allowance section to list those criteria of findings

that would need to be made. Section three further specifies the requirements for the zoning administrator to allow such use to design all code zones. Land in section four is the automatic sunset when the COVID emergency is over. But obviously the question comes up naturally. What lands are

we talking about in the city of Denver when we say all code zone lands? Here is a very simple table and story about what percentage, whether we're talking acres or total number of assessor or ownership parcels, is comprised of all codes on lands as far as acres, which does not include all the land under DIA. It's about a little over 20% of total acreage zoned in the city of Denver. We're looking at a number of parcels. We're talking about approximately 24% of all assessor parcels in the city of Denver are zoned still under the old code. And to bring that home visually. The orange in this slide on the map shows those old code zone lands that remain in the city. There's quite a sprinkling across all the city council districts, but you could see obvious concentrations along the eastern boundary and southwest boundary of the city. Tonight. In order to adapt this ordinance, Council must find that the ordinance ordinance is consistent with adopted plans, that it advances the public health, safety and well for welfare, and that it will be uniform in effect across all zone districts. This ordinance. Oops. Staff does fired is consistent with the goals and strategies from our four key comprehensive plan elements. It would advance several equitable, affordable, inclusive element goals to provide a complete range of housing options in every neighborhood of the city, helping to prevent displacement of residents and businesses during this emergency. It would also have found a strong and authentic neighborhood element goals by ensuring a mix of housing targets and supporting businesses that create vibrant centers and corridors in our city. It would also advance, connected, safe and accessible places an economically diverse and vibrant plan goals by maintaining active streets and supporting bars and restaurants and other local businesses. The ordinance is consistent with many blueprint goals aimed at created at creating affordable housing options for people experiencing homelessness. In addition to supporting local businesses. The ordinance is directly consistent with two of the three Blueprint Denver Equity Concepts. This ordinance would permit emergency shelters and campsites and outdoor patios in former Chapter 59 zone districts and provide additional opportunities for residents and businesses to stay in their neighborhoods to maintain employment and sustain their community infrastructure. It also helps maintain and expand housing and jobs diversity through the city. I like from the housing an inclusive Denver plan. This ordinance is consistent with one of the fundamental values stated in the city's housing plan to support housing as a continuum from homelessness to homeownership. Regarding consistency with the second and third criteria, staff finds that adopting this ordinance will further public health and safety and welfare by allowing temporary uses such as emergency shelters and camps in all zone districts across the entire city. So that. So that housin

g is provided for our most disadvantaged populations, and also that allowing temporary commercial uses like the outdoor patio expansions, can also maintain and support businesses during this public health emergency universe. The uniformity of district regulations will result in processes and regulations. This ordinance will result in processes and regulations for temporary uses that will be generally uniform within each zone district in which the use is granted while allowing for necessary flexibility. During this state of emergency. With all that CPD recommends that the City Council adopt this interim zoning ordinance based on findings that all review criteria have been met. At this point, I'm happy to take any questions before topic. All right. Thank you so much for your report, Tina. And council did not receive any written testimony on Council Bill 20 Dash 0961 and two night for our public hearing. We have five speakers who have signed up. And so we'll go ahead and go through our speakers and then we'll get to questions by members of council. And so our first speaker who we have signed up is Jason Hornick. Hi there. My name is Jason Armagnac and I live at 4989 Decatur Street and I am on the board of the Chafee Park Neighborhood Association. But I'm speaking tonight only for myself, and I thank you for the opportunity to do so. I'd just like to voice my support for the temporary ordinance to open up the former Chapter 59 plans for emergency uses such as safe outdoor spaces. I don't think that we should let an asterisks in the code prevent us from properly and equitably responding to a crisis. I think it's a great idea. I applaud the initiative and I hope that Council will find similar common sense solutions to other equity issues that may arise from the Chapter 59 situation, because our zoning code is only as complicated as we make it. My respect and gratitude to you all. Thank you again, and I yield back the rest of my time. All right.

Thank you, Jason. Next up, we have Tanya Wilson. All right. Go ahead, Tanya. Hello. Thank you so much. I became aware of this earlier this afternoon. So I've jotted down my thoughts and put this together as quickly as I could. But I found that the timing was very interesting. There has been very little discussion in City Council about former Chapter 59 until very recently, I would say early September, when an organization of neighbors from across Denver got together and really started digging into the group Living Proposed Text Amendment Change Number seven. But of course, it caught my attention because I saw this is chapter 59. And again, it hasn't come up very often. And I'm curious about why this is coming up just now, why it's coming up so quickly, why there hasn't been a lot of communication about this and why it's coming up so late in the agenda tonight. But that's another story. What I'm not clear on what is the problem that this is trying to solve and why it's coming up now? My understanding is that the

Central Park neighborhood and Lowry do have extended outdoor spaces today. So it doesn't seem it's focused on that, but perhaps it's just focused on. Temporary camping sites. So if that's the city issue that. They're trying to solve, it doesn't seem that the city's issue is lack of land available even in the regular zoning code. It's a lack of public interest in having these sanctioned camp and camping sites near homes, people's homes or and or their businesses. So I am not in support of this at all. There hasn't been a lot of clarity. There hasn't been a lot of promotion of this so that the constituents in Denver can even understand what this is. And it doesn't seem that there is actually a problem to solve. And the idea of having temporary emergency camping sites doesn't seem equitable. It's just temporary. And those are my thoughts with very short notice on this coming up tonight. Thank you so much for your time. All right. Thank you, Tanya. Next up, we have Adam Astrof. Oh. Denver City Council. My name's Adam Ashraf. I live at 361 LRT and I'm speaking on behalf of myself and Yimby Denver. We support this change and thank you very much for bringing this forward. You know, we're definitely going through unprecedented times both in the budget and people's lives and safe outdoor spaces, while, you know, not not necessarily not really housing, you know, are going to be a vital component of us allowing to keep all of the people in our city safe, especially over the winter, with the provision of services, restrooms, you know, waste disposal, all of the things that, you know, we need to make sure that the camps can be safe and also definitely for expanding for restaurants as well. That's that's really great. And, you know, making sure that we have one zoning code in our city. Zoning has operated in the past by creating arbitrary delineations between types of housing like single unit versus multi-unit. And those arbitrary delineations were used to enforce discrimination and to disinvest in certain neighborhoods. You know, I got to live in District nine for part of my time in Denver, and you could certainly see that there. So thank you very much. For know, making sure the entire city is going to participate in supporting, you know, our all of our communities here and making sure that we have a single zoning code. And it's great to see that it's it's so easy to adapt chapter 59 to deal with our current problems. So thank you, City Council, please vote yes. All right. Thank you, Adam. And our final speaker is Jesse Paris. Hi, Jesse. He was a councilor. Good evening, Council President Gilmore. My name is Jesse Pierce. I represent I must allow for self defense, positive action, commitment for social change and accountability. Colorado and Ohio. Primaries. And I will be the next mayor in 2023. We are in favor of. In terms of this ordinance code, which you push from. Nine states outdoor spaces spaces like no house with crisis and sweep. People like trash is

not the solution. So we support safe outdoor spaces. Like I stated during general public comment, I toured one of these demonstrations and I met them and I love to see them in all areas and districts of the city. Thank you. Thank you. Jesse. That concludes our speakers for tonight. Questions from members of council. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam President, my first question is for Tina. So, Tina, you mentioned in one of the slides in your deck, the tiny homes. And as you know, we have a current lease on the space where the existing tiny homes is at. How would this language change affect that particular location and that lease? It would it would not affect that location or place. That tiny home village is operating under permits that were issued under the Denver zoning code. And in the interim, since it was first stood up, we have actually codified and clarified that use as allowed on the face of the zoning code so they won't need to rely on a listed use determination by me. They can come in now as a buy right use. Thank you. I wanted to just get that on the record for the listening audience. The next and final question that I have is about how this might be used if we were in the middle of a natural disaster, which some of us might consider.

But how would this apply to recreation centers or other city buildings if we wanted. To. Temporarily place people in those kinds of facilities? As you know, it's not unusual in the world communities when it snows and people are stranded to stay in gymnasiums and whatnot. So can you just speak to that piece of this and how this applies? Sure. This ordinance would apply only if there's a temporary some private property. It could include city owned property, though city is subject to its own zoning code, but will only apply where a proposed use is nowhere else allowed on the basis of the code. So we do allow homeless shelters to be set up in emergencies in the zoning code. There are allowances specific specifically for temporary shelters in the face of an emergency, as well as some authority to waive some of the conditions and limits on those shelters to sort of get out of the way when you have to react quickly and stand up temporary shelters. So this ordinance wouldn't stand in the way or hurt or deter our already existing authority under zoning and other rules to set those up. But what it would do is where there's a proposed shelter or housing option that is ahead of the code and it's never been considered by the code, like those managed campsites, which are very similar to the tiny home village where we hadn't anticipated those would provide an avenue to temporarily allow such a use with whatever limits or conditions make sense and get them up quickly without necessarily having to go through an entire text amendment process, which takes months. And we can issue determinations after consultation in a matter of days or a few weeks. Thank you, Tina. I have no further questions. Madam Presid

ent. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilwoman Zoya. Madam President. Tina, I do have a question. I think one of the speakers, Asit, and it's a great question that I think a lot of the public is probably asking. So I would think it's probably just worth answering in Lourey and Stapleton, which are Chapter 59, most of which is covered by Chapter 59, there are businesses right now that are using outdoor spaces and parking lots. So how is it how is that possible if we are having this conversation right now? As I kind of hinted at during my presentation, there was a way to get some temporary outdoor patios with those old code zone lands like we see in South Stapleton and Lowry. It was just through a different door and it was a much narrower door that came with a lot more limitations on it. I can get pretty technical, but we allowed them as a instead of an unlisted temporary use, we allowed it as an unlisted assessor to use, which is a necessary use as a use that's secondary or incidental to the main use on the property. So for a restaurant, that outdoor patio is technically an accessory use. But with accessory use comes this whole host of strings attached that we couldn't unwind, even though we could allow some expansion of those outdoor patios. So for example, that outdoor patio in Lowry or South Stapleton has to be on the same zoned lot as the restaurant, whereas under Denver's zoning code, if you had a willing property owner a couple of doors down that's off your private property that you control, you can still set up your patio there as long as you meet all the other code requirements. More significantly, if you have a parking lot and you're in Lowry or Stapleton, and it's just for you, and the zoning code says you shall have a minimum of ten spaces for your restaurant use. You have to maintain those. You can't take away any of those tents to expand your patio and on the old code zoned land. So if you had ten spaces required and that's all your parking lot had and you wanted to expand your patio onto your parking lot, you were out a lot and a lot of people took advantage of that under the greater allowance and the Denver zoning code if they have a parking lot available. So it felt artificially constrained given the circumstances of the COVID emergency and the change in traffic to our businesses. And it felt unfair. People are doing it and making do, but they'll hit a wall at some point that they wouldn't otherwise hit if we were allowed to extend the Denver zoning code allowance to them. Okay. So do you have any example, a concrete example of a business? Just because I would think like if there wasn't if what we haven't heard from is a any business owner who has emailed our office and said we cannot do what we want to do because we have come up against a zoning issue that has not allowed us to do something. So I guess I'm just wondering, you know, have you can you give us an example of of a situation where where CPD has run

into a business owner who has not been able to do something because of this? Well, business, I can certainly tell you, of dozens of sites that have been taken off the board for housing options in the city because of this mismatch of codes and land businesses. You're right, we haven't bumped into them as much with the outdoor patio expansion program, which is really the only temporary use on the table now that we've spent a lot of time and energy on. But I also have to say, as part of the expanded outdoor patio program, whether it's in Lowry or downtown, under the new zoning, under

Denver's zoning code, we didn't require a permit and we're not inspecting. So. We've just tried to get out of the way and let public health and right of way and licensing deal with any potential problems. So I have to say, for all I know, I don't know what's happening out there on the ground, but. That's okay right now. Yeah. Got it. Okay. Thank you. So then in terms of the housing challenges that have clearly come up around this, are there as you look into, I guess, other potential options for housing? Are there going to be conversations with the council members or as if we were to vote in favor of this and grant you this right as the zoning administrator does, then that give you the right and ability to make decisions in our council districts without coming and having discussions with council members about what is happening on the land in our council districts. Sure. Well, I want to assure the entire city council that whether it's whether it was a temporary tiny home village three years ago or today, a managed campsite in response to a public health emergency, there will still be a community participation outrage and and plenty of communications as as people in the audience might know. But we've been soliciting from the council members ideas, thoughts, anything about land that might be available for manage campsites across the city. But out of that, there's been little that we can move forward with. But as we find sites, all the council members are brought into the conversation and if they're they pass the viability smell test from multiple city perspectives internally. But yeah, but this wouldn't stop that process from happening. It would just open up the availability of land outside the 75% that's zoned under Denver's Denver zoning code into play. And we have had many parcels of land put on to list of potential sites that hatch essentially be filtered out first thing because it was the ranch domain, including many land owned by our faith organizations in the city. Okay. Thank you. No, no more questions. All right. Thank you. Councilwoman Swire. Councilman Sandoval. 18 of these questions for you. Thanks for your presentation. So if you have a parcel and you're a property owner or a business owner and former Chapter 59, doesn't it say in that zoning that you're not allowed to have any of these accessory leases? So although I haven't received necessarily emails

from my planned unit development, which is Chapter 59 and District one, they have inquired because it explicitly says they can't do this. Is that correct? Some of the old code zoning out there is what we would call custom zoning that had a lot of traditional limits and conditions placed on them that were totally one offs. So there might well be certain prohibitions buried in the text of their applicable zoning, like a PD, for example, which is or zoning with waivers and conditions that might put out of play altogether certain temporary or accessory uses. And I can't override that. But typically for temporary uses, there's a general reference in most of the custom zoning that just looks back to former Chapter 59, the book, and says, you can do any temporary use allowed in the block. And that would allow me to link up even to these old code zone lands that have custom zoning. Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 0961 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President, and thank you for your presentation. As I was exploring this idea of sponsoring this amendment, the conversation of equity was at the forefront of my mind, and I would like to provide equity throughout the city and county of Denver. And although one of the speakers said that they have not heard about chapter former, Chapter 59, I have been a in city council not elected, but I've been in working in city council since 2012. And I have thought about Chapter 59. And when you're a council aide, you don't have the bully pulpit, you're not able to speak about it. And I've only been elected for a year and I am giving great consideration to Chapter 59. I give lots of consideration to zoning. That's why I have, instead of three planners or three council aides who do policy and constituent work. I have a full time planner in house in my office because I do give a lot of consideration to all of the zoning, because I believe that zoning impacts people in ways that we don't understand. And I'd like to create solutions to the problems that we see. So as I was thinking about this, sponsoring this bill, particularly as I said, it was due to the inequity that I see in former Chapter 59 and to build a bridge. That's the kind of work that I would like to do in Council District one and throughout the city is build bridges so that we have equity. And as it was mentioned, this is related to COVID. And I know that we've had several discussions about making this a permanent solution as we attempt to tackle Chapter 59 in our future. During our budget our budget hearings, I asked Laura Allegretti, who's the director of Community Planning and Development, if it is on their work plan to talk about Chapter 59 and bring it into the Denver zoning code. That's something that not everyone on council would be excited about to work on. But in my little brain, I'm like, Oh, I can create, I can solve problems, I can have, I can

help. And so that's what I hope that we all do in this. And I'd ask all my colleagues to vote in favor of this. It met the criteria that Tina laid out, and it helps those who cannot understand zoning in a way, and it creates equity across the board in Denver. And so that's of the utmost importance to me. So I would ask my colleagues to please support this, and that's it. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Zoya and or excuse me. Thank thank you, Councilwoman Sandoval, and your leadership in sponsoring this. Up next, we have Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to thank all the staff who worked on this. I certainly want to thank my colleague, Councilmember Sandoval. I understand that there may be concerns. This is temporary, and I look forward to seeing how this behaves in the wild, so to speak, during COVID, so that we can see if it does merit making it permanent. So thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman Hines. Seen no other comments by my colleagues. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black Eye CdeBaca. I a. Clerk. All right. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hines. I. Cashman. I can. I. Ortega. All right. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Madame President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce results. 1313 Eyes Council Bill 961 has passed. Congratulations Councilwoman Sandoval for sponsoring this hour pre adjournment announcement on Tuesday, October 20th. Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 933, approving the 1840 Grant Street Urban Redevelopment Plan, the creation of the 1840 Grant Street Urban Redevelopment Area Hi, Madam Secretary. Please close the voting and announce the results. 3913 Ayes Council Bill 965 has passed. Council members say to Barca, will you please put Council Bill 983 on the floor for passage? Yes, Madam President, I move that council bill 20 dash zero 983 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Humans have been moved and seconded by Councilman Herndon, the third public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 0983 is open now we have the staff report please. And I believe we had Fran cued up for this one. Friend you might need to unmute. I'm sorry. I. Of course, honey. You're good. You're good. Okay. Let me share my screen. 1/2. I have Marianne here, but it's the. Here we go. Can you see my screen there? Mm hmm. You know, this is like waiting for hours. And, of course, the computer froze. I had the other one. No worries. No worries. You're good. Go ahead. Okay. Good afternoon. Members of City Council. My name is from UNIFIL, and I'm going to I'm going to be sending you two more cases of ideas. This is very similar to what you heard, so I apologize. I'm going to sound like a record. We're looking at 1790 Humboldt Street and the applicant is asking to rezone from U.S. you see to U.S., you see one. The subject property is located in Port Cashman's Council District six in the university neighborhood. The subject properties locate the subject. Property is at the co

rner of East Colorado Avenue and South Humbled Street, just southwest from I-25 and the University of Denver Light Rail Station. The subject sold is 9360 square feet, and the applicant is proposing to rezone the property from U.S., U.S. to U.S. U.S. one, which allows for the Urban House and iTouch accessory dwelling unit building for its minimum standard of 5500 square feet. The property is currently in the urban single unit, seasonal district and as you can see on the map, is mostly surrounded by other properties that are also shown us, you see. But you can see that there is a little bit of us, you b to the east. The site is currently occupied by a single unit home and is surrounded by mostly by other single unit uses. This like here shows existing context with the site of the proposed rezoning on the top left and on the top right and bottom left. Some images to show the residential character of the neighborhood. Now looking at the process. Information on notice of the application was sent on June 11, 2020. Planning Board recommended approval on September 16 and of present to letters of support from the public have been received and one letter of opposition from an R.A.. The Denver zoning code has fiber five criteria. Well, which I'll go over now. The first criteria is consistency with adopted plans. There are three plans applicable to this rezoning. We have a comprehensive plan 2040 Blueprint Denver and Housing an inclusive Denver. The rezoning is consistent with several of the strategies sought in comprehensive plan 2040. This MAP amendment will promote equity by creating a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood, and it will lead to an environmentally resilient Denver by creating by promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. Now looking at Blueprint Denver the subject properties map is part of the urban neighborhood context. This context is described as containing small multi-unit, residential and mixed use areas that are typically embedded in one unit and two unit residential areas. Look, patterns are generally irregular with a mix of early access, and they have been described as having a high degree of walkability, likability and good access to transit

with less reliance on cars. If you took place. This map designates the subject property as no residential place type. Displaced types have predominantly single and two unit uses, and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. Humble Street is designated as a local street, which is mostly characterized by residential uses. Now the growth area in Denver is all other areas of the city. This area is anticipated to see 10% employment growth and 20% housing growth by 2040. Lupine also includes specific policy recommendations. Housing policy number four talks about diversifying health choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. A citywide approach to enable you to use preferred until a holistic appro

ach is in place. Individual rezonings to enable you to use in all residential areas, specifically where close to transit are appropriate. In this case, the requested rezoning is a single lot in a residential area within a few blocks from a light rail station. This rezoning 22 use district will have minimal impacts on the surrounding neighborhood and is consistent with blueprint recommendations. Adopted in 2018. Housing and inclusive. Denver was not adopted as supplemental to Denver Comprehensive Plan 2040, but was still adopted by City Council and can be relevant to the review criteria for this MAP amendment. The plan encourages expanding the development of accessory dwelling units to incentivize affordable and mixed use housing. The proposed rezoning is consistent with recommendations in a comprehensive plan. Blueprint Denver and housing in Denver because it will expand housing options and allow the development of an accessory dwelling unit. Study also finds that the proposed rezoning to U.S. U.S. one meets the next two criteria. It will result in the uniform application of some district building for use and design regulations. And the proposed official MAP Amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the city through implementation of the City Adopted Land Use Plan, which recommends the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. The proposed rezoning would also provide the benefit of an additional housing unit that is comparatively integrated into the surrounding neighborhood. Stuff does find that there is a justifying circumstance for this MAP amendment, with the newly adopted vision for accessory dwelling units in all residential areas, including Denver. And finally, criteria number five. The proposed zoning is consistent with the urban neighborhood context residential district and the USOC wants on district. Stuff does recommend approval based on finding all review criteria has been met. And that concludes stuff. Presentation. Thank you, Fran. Council has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 20 20983 and we have one individual signed up to speak this evening. We have Jesse Paris. The Council dog watching at home when I was just in Paris and I didn't experience 20, 23 and I didn't Blackstar actually did the self defense housing action plan for social change. I won't be doing any part of Colorado in my own piles. I'm going to be again. Yes, I'm. I did have some questions. The first question was how many 80 requests have been approved in District six? And if you can release the demographics, the racial demographics of the occupation, appreciate it. You got this Cashman. It's going to be a reluctant. The women will look that yes for me. But you've got to make this to get past. No problem. Thank you. And cue the music. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Madam President. Is the property owner on the line? You should be. His

name is Nate Crumby. Yeah, I think we're. All right. We should be moving Nathan to the panelists. Are you there, Nate? Nate. You might have to meet yourself. I'm here. Can you hear me? Yes. And Nate? Nate, can you tell me a little bit what what what your plans are for the property where you plan on building what the access to the idea would be? So what I plan on doing is demolishing the current garage structure and then rebuilding something that's larger just to fit the city codes for building something like that and then building a putting an apartment above the garage. And currently the access to the structure, at least from. For the garage. I'm on a corner lot, so the access to the garage is from Colorado Avenue and then access to the structure is TBD. I haven't really gone through any sort of specific planning with an architect yet. Sure. And can you tell me what, as you're sitting here today, what your thoughts are for the use of this structure? Yeah. So I live close to the university and I also live close, really close to public transportation. The thought was to rent it out and provide additional income for us and, you know, just increase the foot traffic in the area. I mean, one of the great things about this neighborhood is just how pedestrian friendly it is. And, you know, the more the merrier, in my opinion. I know that the opposition, at least the R.A., had referenced parking. You know, another perspective for us is we'll actually park our cars in the

garage once we had a larger structure because our garage isn't all that big right now. And so it would actually free up parking on the on the street and then also provide, you know, lower sort of cheaper option for somebody to live within the Denver city limits. Sure. Thank you. Hey, friend. Remind me what the parking requirements are for a place. If you give me a second, I can look it up very quick in my code. Apologize ahead. It all open in my other computer, of course. Take your time. So it here. And I would just mention for our friend Mr. Paris, while you're looking that up, that there are very few ADA requests thus far in District six. I don't have the exact number, but they are starting to come in. Slowly but surely. And while I understand the the desire for a citywide policy for neighborhoods that are a little antsy about this new land use, I like the fact that they're coming in slowly, and I expect to find that they're good neighbors. So we don't have any parking requirements in this you but we have the parking bays so not with. Let's go to space. Okay. So two to. Spaces off street. Parking and drive lot coverage in primary street setbacks to spaces. Okay, very fine. And the owner expects to have two spaces in the new garage, correct? Yes. Okay. Well, those are my only questions. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. Friend Same sort of question I had on the prior one, and that is as I look at the prope

rty and I didn't see in the staff report. Exactly. Of course, then you wouldn't until site development. The setbacks. It looks to me like the garage that's there already might not be within the required setback, which is 12 feet off the alley when there is an alley. And it looks to me like it's right on right on the alley right now. So when this is rebuilt, is there sufficient spare space between the primary residence and the the footprint that you would build on? And maybe the applicant could address that as well? And it seems to me it would have to be a new structure, would have to be 12 feet off the alley right of way. And that's one thing I wanted to note. So kind of like a new thing that we're doing now with the few applications that we're getting because we get so many is that at the time of the pre-application, we asked the applicants to have a meeting with development services. And that meeting basically we tell them this there's no need for them to hire an architect or have proper drawings, but they can have just like a drawing in a napkin. So exactly for what you're asking. So because we don't want anyone to reason and then find out they can build whatever they need. So we go process. It's required by code and it's not not everyone has to do it. But but we always side by side because then we don't want people to waste \$1,000 and the rezoning and figure out, okay. So this has been through that and we're okay on that score. I would like to take that with me, but I think so because we get it. So like I think that maybe if you can answer that need. Yeah, sure. So I have not gone through that process and if it's 12 feet, then I've just wasted \$1,000. And my understanding was that it was five feet. But but there is actually enough room to build add you know an 80 you. In our backyard. The question then is just whether or not we actually do it. But and so. Yeah. Okay. Rear setback, Ali, 12 feet on the in the staff report. All right. Thank you. That's all I have. Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Seeing no other comments or excuse me, no other questions by members of council. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 0983 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Cashman Thank you, Madam President. I am an unabashed fan of ideas. I'm glad to see them. As I said, slowly coming into the district. This is a particular particularly ideal site. It's a large site. It's on a corner. It is within walking distance of the university rail station. And I look forward to supporting this this evening. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Madam Secretary, roll call. Cashman, I think. I. Ortega, I. Sandoval. Oh. I am sorry. Sawyer. I paid for. I black. I see tobacco. I park. I. When. I. Herndon. I ask. Hi, I. Madam President. Madam Secretary, please come to voting and announce the results. Of 3913. Ised council Bill 983 has passed. Council members say tobacco, will you please put Council Bill 984 on the floor for passage? Ised co

uncil Bill 983 has passed. Council members say tobacco, will you please put Council Bill 984 on the floor for passage? Yes, Madam President, I move that council bill 20 dash 0984 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Sagen has been moved and thank you Councilman Herndon for the second the required public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 0984 is open and we have the staff report Fran. Okay. Okay. So this is another EU request. This is 2520 South Merrion Street and the applicant is requesting to rezone from ESU d x to ESU D1 IX. The property is located in Port Cashman's Council District six, again in the university neighborhood, and this property is located between Harvard Gulch and Bossert Bay Avenue along Marion Street. It's approximately 6250

square feet and it's currently in the urban edge single unit de zone district, and the applicant is proposing to rezone to urban edge single unit RD one X to allow for an accessory dwelling unit that ESU de one X requires a minimum so lot of 6000 square feet and allows for the urban house, suburban house and the touch accessory dwelling unit building sports. The property is sown East Dix and surrounding properties are stone. Yes, you do. If you see an OS a. Scientists occupied by a single unit dwelling, and it's surrounded by other single unit uses, as well as some public quasi public uses, including the Porter Adventist Hospital, only one block to the west. Here we can see get an idea of the context where the site of the proposed rezoning on the top left and on the top right and bottom left. Some images to show the residential character of the neighborhood. Now in regards to the rezoning process and informational notice of the application was sent in June 2020. Planning Board recommended approval in September 16. The City Council public hearing was properly notice in October 12, and as of present, only one letter of opposition has been received by a red registered neighborhood organization. The Denver Zoning Board has five review criteria, which I will go over. The first criterion is that the rezoning request must be consistent with adopted plans. There are three adopted plans that apply to a requested rezoning. The Comprehensive Plan 2040 Blueprint. Denver and Housing and Inclusive Denver. The proposed rezoning would allow infill development that broadens the range of housing types available in the area where infrastructure and services already exist, consistent with a strong and authentic neighborhood vision elements, as well as the environmentally resilient vision element. The rezoning request is also consistent with Blueprint Denver. The subject property is mapped as part of the urban edge neighborhood context. This context is described as containing predominantly residential uses with single and two unit low scale homes on should walkable blocks. The future places map designates the subject property as low residential place type. This place types have predominantly single and two unit uses,

and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. In Street is designated a local street, which is mostly characterized by residential uses. The growth area in Denver is all other areas of the city. This area is anticipated to grow to see a 10% employment growth and 20% housing growth by 2040. Lupine also includes specific policy recommendations. Housing policy number four focuses on diversifying housing choice through expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. Housing Policy Number five recommends removing barriers to constructing a use as these rezonings would accomplish. Housing an inclusive Denver Anchorage is expanding the development of accessory dwelling units to incentivize affordable and mixed use housing. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan Blueprint Denver and Housing in Inclusive Denver because it will expand housing options and allow the development of an accessory dwelling unit. Step also finds the proposed rezoning to ESU. D1 IX meets the next two criteria. It will result in the uniform application of some district building for use and design regulations, and the proposed official MAP Amendment furthers the public health, safety and welfare of the city through implementation of the city's adopted Land Use Plan, which recommends the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. The proposed rezoning would also provide the benefit of an additional housing that is competitively integrated into the surrounding neighborhoods. The justified circumstance for this rezoning is clear. The adopted plan sees the approval of the existing ESU DCS on the street. The city has adopted the Comprehensive Plan 2040 Blueprint Denver and Housing an inclusive Denver. As stated throughout this presentation, the proposed rezoning meets the intent of this plan. And finally, criteria number five. The proposed zoning is consistent with the urban edge neighborhood context residential district and the U.S. One Zone district does recommend approval based on finding or review criteria has been met and that the presentation. All right. Thank you, friend. We have one individual signed up to speak this evening and Jesse Paris. Go ahead, Jesse. Councilor Pearson, I'll be your next mayor in 2023. You so black star action, which was the first positive action commitment for social change. That's what's going to be part of Colorado and my news. Once again, it's going to be a lot to yes for me tonight. I used to be. Door knocking in this neighborhood. So I know it pretty well. And I was not welcomed with open arms when I was president. But out of love for. On the women's side. Yes. I just have a few questions. Is the hockey player going to run out of affordable housing to do so? And I think cash, money or an exclusive to this district. I just want to show what is the average annual income for this neighborhood? If some of these answers to questions. I appreciate it. And w

hich R.A. had no comment. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Jesse. That concludes our speakers questions from members of council. Councilman Cashman. Yeah. Again, as the property owner. Available. Her name is Amy. Yeah, I think she's in the attendees. And so, Amy, if you could help, we've got her moved over already. All right, Amy, you might have to unmute yourself. There you go. Go ahead with your question. Harassment. Yeah. Thank you very much, Madam President. Yeah, Amy, I just. Can you tell me what your plans are for the property? Yes. Actually, my initial reason in doing this was to increase the square footage. Of. This house. It's roughly 1200 square feet. And when I bought the house, it was categorized in the MLS as a one and a half storey. The second floor is basically a finished attic space, so. And they counted it. They advertised it as a two bedroom home. So the upstairs is more of a open loft area. So it's technically a one bedroom house. So really I'm learning as I go in this process. And my initial concept was to create additional living space, whether it's, you know, a studio apartment that's rented or maybe it's an in-law suite . Maybe it's the master bedroom for this house. It's. I wanted to do this through the proper channels so it could be a possible rental if I choose for. That down the road. So the main option was to just create a bigger footprint while utilizing the existing footprint of the garage. Q So you want to expand? The House by. Enlarging the garage. Is that what you're saying? No. I wanted to convert the garage to living space while utilizing the existing footprint. Okay. Virtual garage never gets utilized, right? Street parking happening and it's just storage. Sure. So that was. Those are my intentions. So it sounds like your plans are still evolving. Yes. Yeah. No, not. That's just fine. Frequent frequently the case. And from what I. Understand, you know, as I've learned in this process, that potentially ADAS will be, you know. An option for the majority of the city. I would never pretend to be an expert about it, but I wanted to do this because I wanted, you know, to apply versus. Wait it. Down, you know, how many years will that be till that comes into place? So it's really just being more proactive around having the opportunity. Sure. Great. Thank you very much, Amy. Appreciate that. That's all, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Seen no other hands raised by our colleagues for questions. The public hearing for council bill 20 dash 098 for us. Closed comments by members of Council. Councilman Cashman. Sure. Thank you again, Madam President. Yes, similar comments. I mean, this is a neighborhood while I, I don't have the figures right offhand as to average average income for this neighborhood, as with most of our central Denver neighborhoods, real estate values continue to escalate. And this this is a property, a short walk from the Porter Hospital campus and and a little bit longer

walk and an easy bike ride from the University of Denver campus. So and 80 in this area just increases that middle middle area housing stock and open up the community to a mixture of income levels. So I think this is a great location and look forward to supporting this application. All right. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. And see no other comments. I am happy to support it as well and hope our colleagues will, too. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Cashmere. Can each. I. Which I guess I. The animal. I. So I. Pressed by black eye. Think about that. Okay. I. When I was mesmerized by accounts by clerks, Jackie. But also by. The great jacket. I. I. Hi. Hi. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the bombing and announce the result. 12 by 12 Eyes Council Bill 984 has passed our pre adjournment announcement on Monday, November 16th. Council will hold a one hour courtesy public hearing on Council Bill 113 to approving and accepting the East Area Plan. 13 Eyes Council Bill 20 Dash 1138 has passed. Councilmember Sandoval, will you please put Council Resolution one, two, three, six on the floor for adoption? Oh, I think you're needed. Sorry. No worries. That's not going away. I wrote that council resolution 20 days, 1236 to be adopted. Thank you. It has been moved. And second view councilman herndon. The 30 minute courtesy public hearing for council resolution 20 Dash 1236 is open. Maybe tell the staff the staff report. Right. Good evening. Melissa today with the denver department of housing stability. We'll try to be brief. I know I'm standing in the way of you and probably nighttime chores. So today we are have before you a contract amendment with brothers redevelopment for a temporary rental and utility assistance program. This amendment would add \$250,000 and extend the contract to March 31st of 2021. As many of you know, this program provides up to six months of rental assistance and two occurrences of utility assistance. Currently, we are paying the full amount due and serves residents at or below 80% of the area median income. And with this total contract, we expect to serve approximately 985 duplicated households. As many of you know and recent national reports continue to explain, we are facing major concerns in terms of renters not being able to pay their rent. So a recent report found that one in four renters nationally have no or only slight confidence

that they can pay their next month's rent on time. And in Colorado, unpaid rent could be more than \$600 million by 2021. And there's a more recent report that did a calculation for what could the cost of evicted rent renters who become homeless costs, which found that in Colorado, that would be between 724,000,001.7 billion. We have recently made some changes to our application and processes to more quickly serve residents who need rental and utility assistance. So we did, in previous contract amendments, remove the requirement for residents to pay. A portion of our new application

that went into effect in September now provides a self attestation for hardship rather than documentation. We are utilizing income qualification, leveraging documentation based on receiving other benefits. Provided a clear checklist for required documents translated into several languages and continued to do so for those that are needed. And we are working with our community navigators and others to receive ongoing feedback and make changes as necessary. And also been doing a lot of work focused on equity as part of this program. We have more formalized partnerships between community navigators and our tour administrators and nonprofits. That includes trainings as well as ongoing monthly meetings. And when I think the Neighborhood Equity Stabilization Team who funded some organizations for community navigation and this purpose. We've also been working closely with the Office of Social Equity and Innovation, as well as UC Berkeley. We are in the midst of a racial equity project targeting mailers to residents living in neighborhoods vulnerable to eviction and involuntary displacements. Testing, different messaging and then evaluating short and longer term outcomes. We're further working with the Office of Social Equity and Innovation on our equity plan. So while I know we gave a presentation to Safety Committee a few weeks back, we know that that's not a full equity analysis. And so we are committed to and grateful for Oakley's support and commitment in furthering our work and improving our data collection and analysis on equity, not just for this program, but for many programs, policies and investments. So far this year, we've served over 2000 on duplicated households. This is more than double what we were able to serve in 2019. So it's been a huge commitment to our nonprofits and our partners. And obviously, the. Commitment and assistance with the community navigation piece has been critical. We also have seen an increase in the number of a number of months of assistance in 2019 that averaged about two months. And this year we're seeing a higher average at three months. I'm going to read this to you because I think it's important. I don't think that we give our nonprofits enough of our thank you's as well as our community navigators. We also have heard of a staff member and a community navigator who have both been diagnosed with COVID one, who's a single mother of several children, one who is pregnant. And so I think taking an opportunity to just thank them and hear the story from one of our local navigators. As a navigator, I'm the front line person. I gather information to create intakes and make sure people can access an application. I listen to people's stories of crisis and validate their feelings while giving them hope. The help is within reach because whether they owe \$50 or 5000, their crisis is real. I laugh with people and help them forget their troubles for a few minutes. Every so often I hear a story that leaves the lasting impres

sion. Like the frail voice of an 80 year old woman. Who was two days away from eviction or the 20 year old college student who cried in disbelief that we would help him pay his rent. Or the mother who described to me what it was like to sleep in her car with her five kids. Upon being evicted. Then there was the woman who buried her husband who had succumbed to COVID 19 on Sunday and left a hysterical voice message, pleading for help with her utilities on Monday. Sometimes I have to pause and have and have a cry. Then I make the next call. I've been on the receiving end of assistance and there's nothing worse than being kicked when you're down. The most gratifying part of my job is the thanks I receive from people for treating them with kindness. Even if I wasn't able to help them. Although my hope is that COVID 19 will be eradicated and there will no longer be a need for truth, I fear that that will be a long time coming. And for now, funding for this program is beyond necessary. It's crucial. And I'll just end on several snippets of letters that our nonprofits have received over the last few months from recipients of the rental assistance program. And so today we are asking for your support and approval of this contract amendment for brothers redevelopment. I'll take questions. And I also believe we have Kim Desmond with the Office of Social Equity and Innovation on ABIE with Brothers Redevelopments and Jana Happel with Colorado Legal Services, who are available as well. All right. Well, thank you very much, Melissa.

And we have five individuals signed up to speak this evening, and our first speaker is Jana Happel. Hello? Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. So because of. The restrictions on our federal funding with Colorado Legal Services, I am an attorney running the Denver County Court eviction clinic. I cannot speak for or against anything. But I'm here to answer. Any questions. All right. Thank you, Jenna. And our next speaker is Mary Reyez. We wouldn't have no chance. You know what is funny radius? So you don't see anything. Anyways working in any way. Smooth. If we renew, he said it is the program and thus opportunity is a serious genuine master e to be I guys convince them into an your parents TV the moment those decreases etc. I mean they it seems to me. They can make the. Them. Hello. My name is Mary Reyes and I am a resident from Westwood and I have been a beneficiary of this program on two occasions, one in March and one in September. And I am great. I am so grateful for this opportunity that has been granted to me during a time of crisis when I was not able. To pay my rent. We are very lucky. De la Plata is Daniel Entones so he made us ultra thin. You can start only when Gaza intones. It's a myth that our limited implemented misled us as the canal. It does. It starts talking about that our whole complete. Operability subsisted for each member of that. And due to the due to the fact that DPS has to shut down the schools most of the y

ears. I have a son, I am a single mother, and this has made it so that I have to be at home working a few hours a night. This has been very difficult for me to find full time employment so that I could exist and and subsist here. The cone of. Code is familiar. They study ketamine and steel and if it's interesting but Esperanto. Historical society. Circuit throughout the middle ages your mother's moon chess persona on the replica durante toys. They are no key to sample history. Lizzie McGuire knows Dracula. You don't know what you got, but on the nose. Yeah. Minus Ambien. O'Reilly went, Oh, yeah. I'm in LA. Tranquilly up and up. But I think the myth. And I know a lot of families that have been applying for this, and I know that China has been overwhelmed with a lot of requests in this and and sometimes that of families that we feel like maybe they're not calling me and maybe I'm not going to get it. But then we later get an email or we get a phone call and that gives us courage and that gives me an excitement to know that you're covered for the next month. Those plus mosquitoes are not going to see me in the company. Any sort of. Deliberately. Continuing. Promotion, though, as programs are continuing. I'm not fond of specific area images be seen as I get this done in any sinuses. You ain't usually always. This begins with the. World replicating animals. Mrs. Parker. Mr. Biondo. So more than anything, this is just a support for this program. It is something that that we should be able to continue funding or add more funding because like me, there's going to be a lot of families and me, myself, I find myself thinking that I may need to reapply for this again because I am finding myself that I'm going to be short again. Since I guess to prevent my. Bias and your solution. I know anteriormente the obvious time that is up. Okay. Okay. No, we're grabbing voice in the annual. Por la pandemia. Entones. How many lessons? Thunderstorm. You must listen to some of the scene that is done. The best Guinness is done. It must be is the Apollo escuchar, which is a la movie and they they these two we continue. E was and still continue. We must hear the finale scene. So I know that this program has been around for several years, and I know that it was never a such a strong program as it is now because of the pandemic. But I know that there's a lot of families that that really need this and now that it seems more accessible to families. So I think that will need it to be able to exist this year. And since Buzz is must. See me, it'll be sensible to put any other point about a key testimonial. He was one of those hostess. So I am very grateful and thank you again for allowing me to give my testimony and for each one of you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Next up, we have Gabriela medina. But for now, as much as Menominee has got my DNA. Yes, I am not going to talk. So. Good evening. My name is Medina and I am a connector. So connector right now being either a communi

ty at Westfield Denver Community Connector program. And I am a connector now. I'm a community. Navigator. And I work for. Denver Community, a Westwood Denver Community Connector program. This town was a key commodity that my importance in information that you can also process almost all of the various the facilities in the community that some Chicago is this is a support of in Seattle. And I am here in support of this program. And since I am one that I hear stories every day of people soliciting for this economic support. It's helpful. And I support the Metropolitan Trade I live on, which has families established upon to sell this on with some of the reality TV. Davis And this program has brought a lot of relief to a lot of families that were going to be displaced or evicted. It has brought them some funds to be able to pay for their rent and to pay for

some of their services. Utilities, drugs, because, as you said, tobacco income control as navigators in the trauma control personnel and what do that in the community that's not going to complement that application. And then documentary programs for these are tobacco must face in jeopardy this awareness application in memoriam. So thanks to the navigators and the community navigators that have been working with the community, with the families and with a true a program that community navigators have been helping in completing the application and making sure there are no documents missing. And this has made it easier for tool to be able to process this application. All right. Well, thank you very much for joining us tonight. And our next speaker is Jesse Paris. Being able to counsel those watching. My name is Jesse Paris. And my brothers in law. Let's stocks and more for self defense positive action coming in for social change as well as the military party of Colorado and mile high. And I will be the next mayor of Denver in 2023. I am in favor of this.

Proposing. Tonight's. Oh, I wish something like this existed when I was going through my homeless crisis, when I was going through evictions. This is a life saver for a lot of people. I mean, we had a crisis before COVID and that was the under house neighbor crisis. So this is going to help a lot of people remain in their homes now with without it not be able to and would be on the streets being swept up by the car when I spoke earlier tonight. So I'm definitely in favor of this. I just had a few questions. Let's. To date, how many families or individuals has served? And going on into the future, does it expect to serve? And. If that information is available, the demographics of the people that are being served. If I can please after those questions, I will greatly appreciate it. Thank you. Thank you. And our last speaker this evening is Megan Miles. Everybody. I'm Meghan Myles and I work with the Western Renaissance Collaborative and with the Western Community Connector program. And you heard from Gaby, one of our community Connectors. So I will be

brief. But I do just want to reiterate my support for this program and speak a little bit about the partnership that we have with Brothers redevelopment from Brothers redevelopment reached out in June, July of this year to begin a partnership with this program in order to expand access to the trail program. Because we know that it's one of the strongest tools that Denver has to help families stay in their homes and in their communities. But we also know that a lot of families either don't know that the program exists. They need some level of assistance to complete the application, to gather documentation, and some maybe just don't feel comfortable applying for a variety of reasons, including concerns over residency and citizenship. And so Brothers has been really great about working with our connectors to train them on the application process. Melissa mentioned that for presentation to answer any questions as they arise to troubleshoot if there are any difficult applications or challenges. They, along with hosts and the other nonprofit agencies, responded to the feedback from our program and from other community organizations who brought up challenges. And the changes that have been made to the application have just really improved the process and made it much easier for people to get through the program, get their applications submitted and get the support that they need. And so a few of the changes that I want to highlight that I think have contributed to increasing access to this program includes increasing language access, which means having an application translated, but it also means having people who are able to assist applicants directly in their language. So our bilingual connectors. For. Example, have been really critical in reaching residents and helping them process the application. We also have a direct referral system with brothers so that people who indicate that they need assistance to complete their application get referred directly to the Western Community Connector program and then can get walk through your application. So this means if they need to, they can come in to fill the application out, they can do it over the phone, they can have it dropped off. So this has been really critical for people who previously may have needed to wait to get their application in the mail and then had to figure out how to fill that out on their own. It also includes gathering documents, printing, scanning. We're doing direct mailers to vulnerable printer households to let them know about the program and how to access it. But we also know that knowledge is not enough and that we really need these programs and connectors who are able to build trust and answer questions as needed. So we're moving into month nine of this pandemic. We know that people really need this program. So thank you for your support that. All right. Well, thank you, Megan. And that concludes our speakers questions from members of council. Councilwoman Ortega. All right. We'r

e going to try to get Councilman Ortega here. All right. We might go ahead and bounce over. Councilwoman Cates, do you want to go ahead and go? Sure. Thank you, Madam President. I want

to thank the speakers and the staff. Melissa, I just wanted to ask one update from committee. When you were in committee, you reported on the raw numbers of recipients by neighborhood. But I asked you to wait that by by number of renters, because sometimes raw numbers can be misleading. Where you have neighborhoods with mega complexes, they might have a high number, but a low percentage. Did you do that? And how did some of the nest neighborhoods come out when you rent, when you waited the recipients of the aid by their by their number of renters? Can you just respond on that? Yeah, our data analyst did add that category to the dashboard that she created. It's okay. I'll share my screen. I actually have that in the appendix. Little late on a monday to operating quickly. You feel you. I know, I know. We're all in this together. All right. So this is the 2020 payments, January through September of this year, weighted by the number of renters. So what this shows us. I'm just looking at just making sure I'm reading this right. We've got Globeville here is at and DIA is a little bit of an anomaly. It's got 90 applicants, but it's got a smaller number of four. So so we got a far northeast neighborhood there. But the Globeville here at 3.7 is is the second highest rate, for example, twice as high as Capitol Hill at 1.6. Am I reading that right? So as a percentage of renters who are in the neighborhood who've applied for this assistance. So so we've got West Colfax is a East Colfax I'm sorry, is in this neighborhood. We've got Elyria, Swansea in there, Westwood. We've heard from tonight. So, so many of these neighborhoods, as I look at this, are are in the highest percentage of renters receiving assistance. And so I just thought this was important to put in context as an update since committee, it doesn't mean we don't have more work to do, but thank you for explaining. That. We are in fact giving more assistance to the neighborhoods that are more vulnerable to displacement. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilman Ortega. Sorry about that. I was talking away and realized that I wasn't connected, so. No. Is there someone from Bray that can answer a couple of questions? I heard we had somebody from there. Yeah, I think we have Jeff Martinez, the executive director, as well as Gabby. Okay. If they can raise their hand. Yeah. So is he promoted yet? I'm working on it. It's just martinis. If you could raise your hand. Who is the other person? Melissa. And you got Jeff. Jeff. Hi, Jeff. How are you? Area is. Good. Good. He. Can you tell me if you guys have a wait list of people that are waiting to be processed as soon as you get this money? Absolutely. I'm not sure what the number is to date. But, you know, we have a waitlist right now of about two

weeks to three weeks for assistance. And that's just based on on sheer volume. The volume of inquiry we're receiving right now, of course, during this crisis has had has had peaks and valleys. But, you know, it's it's not going away. And there are just a lot of people in desperate situations right now. How many staff people do you have that are assisting people, processing their request for payments? We've right now we have six individuals who are on the team who are administering rental assistance on behalf through it. We have folks who are just frontline. All they do is try to gather documentation and make sure that everybody is submitting the necessary documents to be able to qualify for the program. We have others to just simply facilitate that payment. And then certainly we have a backroom folks who have to process those requests and then others who make sure that the files are up to snuff, they say, and can pass muster just on the compliance side for the city. But, you know, we've we've really worked to staff up since well, since July. We started talking with the city organizations who had shared concerns about some of our process, as well as members of council, who also expressed concern about just how we were facilitating some of those and some of the backlog. We have worked to address all of that over the past few months. Since May, we've administered more than \$1,000,000.7 million in rental assistance on behalf of the program, and we're very proud of that. As you heard from our navigators, you know, they are working on the front lines and, you know, they see and hear and feel the stories of really desperate situations that folks are facing on a daily basis. And it really is both a rewarding program, but it's a it's a daunting program. But, you know, that's what coverage does. We're here to help anywhere we can. So those six people, are they actually available on a phone line where somebody is given? So I know a lot of the calls are coming through 311. So when you send somebody over, is there a number they're calling in, you will actually have people answering the phone and are. You know, telling people what they need, and then there's a place for them to get the applications to you. And we we have. Yeah, we. We received inquiries. Thank you, gentlemen. We received inquiries via the phone, and we also received them through email. So we have an email you just the email entry in the brothers that gets them back to us and before it goes along. Yeah, we're working on all fronts to do that. We also have a drop site. Our office is closed due to COVID, but we do have we have

virtually catered regularly with clients so they can send in all their documentation. And so we think we're addressing the need that exists. Working as hard as diligently as we can to fulfill all those requests for rental assistance. So I know we have other organizations doing this in Denver. Are there certain neighborhoods that you all are? I don't know if restricted to i

s the right way or want to ask this, but targeted to sir. Yes. So we we serve essentially the the west side. I always said Broadway is more or less the dividing line. I think that's still true. Listen, I can speak to that more definitively. Now, we we have zip codes just to the west side of town. Okay. And then my last question is, what is your turnaround time from the time somebody gets a complete application into you? What's the turnaround time to get a check out? And is that written directly to that landlord as opposed to giving the check directly to the the individual? Excellent. Abby, speak more definitively to the timeline. You have more information on that? Absolutely. All of payments are made directly to the landlord. Thank you. Abby, I don't know if you want to add anything more to that. But I think Jeff's Jeff's question was too pretty or answer was helpful. I don't like in there, but no, I'm good. I just wanted to get some of those on the record so that as people are looking to this source of funding, they know where they can go. They know they can call 311. Brothers is not the only entity. I know you guys were selected to do some of the state true a program as well and that covers other areas of the state. I don't know if any of those dollars were available to Denver residents as well, but I think it's just helpful for the listening public to know what's available to them and how to how to access it. So thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Councilwoman Torres. Thank you, Madam President. Just a couple of questions to Melissa. So we took action last. Week to reduce the mortgage. Assistance side, about 500,000. Did all of that go right back into the true a side, the rental side? Yeah. So 500, it was a reduction of 800,000. 500 of that went into true. However, that's a different funding source from this contract. So those are. Coronavirus relief funds. Okay. That was my my next question. The relief funds and and have to be extended by the end of the year. What's what's true. Is funding come January. What is that. That look like? So we had, I think last week or two weeks ago, Northeast Denver Housing Center contracts amended to increase funding and extend into March of next year. And then this additional funding will also be extended into March of next year. The reason for us doing that. Is we. Are on a timeline by which our 2021 notice of funding availability contracts won't be executed by the end of the year. And so as to not have a gap in this program, these will kind of buffer that. And we have sent award letters since the last time I spoke with you all for some of our 2021. No. First so I can say a little over \$3 million will be dedicated to two for 2021. Okay. That's great news. Thank you so much. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman. And I didn't have any questions, but I wanted to give Gabriela medina an opportunity to come back up and the queue. Her wife, I froze, and she

had an. Idea that missed opportunity. That is not my connection. The status pregnant though I was the moment of parasitism at LA communication. Yes. Thank you. Thank you. Because I don't know what happened. My connection got frozen and I. Apologize for that. But I mean, it's more important that this Esteban Sackett is the most active participant because that extreme adamant, the preoccupied, they must have the cell pockets they've been willing to lose. For me, it's very important to give you this message. This participant was extremely troubled because she was going to be evicted because she couldn't pay for her night. Yeah, this could happen to me. That can be alarming. Amanda suarez when i was takata para las personas. They're standing by credit card. They say that are for large order remembering that they may be infected. Maybe they lose. Hi, my name is yolanda suarez and I am extremely grateful for the people who are making this program available and the people who have helped me pay for my light and gas level. That is to receive that status. And this is an extension of mutual respect for me. And I am truly grateful for what you angels are doing for our families. And it's just another standard tongue twister title. It's not a copy estimator noting from the official on the scene of what for you that the stadium movement. They told us. They thought I couldn't. So this COVID has affected us so much in our families. That it could help remove some of. That's what little corazon. Muchas gracias. Organization. Maria Startup agenda at Todos Los Latinos get no Podemos de la Europe. What a chicken Carrillo el presidente de. From the bottom of my heart. I thank you and I thank everyone who is in the program, who works through. This program. To be able to help all of the Latino community who was not able to receive the stimulus check from the president. The guitar that are going to be Apollo comedy on the passenger

getaway economy in total momentum. CUOMO Well, what about the stress on the killers? And it's the moment the promoter in the photos. And I want to thank Gaby, who was there with me during this time that I was that I needed her help. And like, I will repeat once again, you are the angel for angels, for many of us. Yes, but I'll you then I'm with Jeff. I mean, that's a symbol for power, for a system that is working against us by this God loving. And we're just grateful for everything that you're doing. And I also want to say thank you to just consider other families that don't have the funds to continue paying for their rent. There were that the chairman says eradicate in Moscow is the program. I continue to serve with my son most of my days and that this is that we are living in this moment of necessity. There is such a high need and we really need the support so that we can help the families that truly. Really, really need it at this time. That's. Well, thank you. Thank you, Gabriella. And glad that we were able to get that letter read into th

e record. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 Dash 1236 is closed. Are there any comments by members of council? Councilwoman Torres. Thank you, Madam President. Just a quick one. I want to thank Western Renaissance Collaborative, who has been working on connecting folks directly with through community connectors, residents from Westword who are working with their neighbors to get them signed up. And it's not it's not easy. And I know that Nola and Brendon, who are also working with connector programs in their respective parts of the city, have also been doing similar work, and I thank them for that as well, because the beginning of the pandemic really demonstrated how difficult it was going to be to get families who were in desperate need and who had some egregious disparities, particularly with Internet connection and hard copy capacity and a variety of things kind of get through some of those barriers. And I know that working with Kim Desmond's office and the tenacity of the host team to get some of those things ironed out is is really seeing some, some good outcomes. So I'm grateful to DRC, Mary Reyes, Gaby Medina, Megan Myles and Yolanda for submitting some comments because I think through community connectors, it's one of the ways that this equity divide in West Denver has helped get helping, getting bridged. And thank you all for that. And I hope to continue to see true of funding levels that we need it. Thank you. Well, thank you, Councilwoman. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. But I. See the burqa, a far right. When I. Herndon. I. And I. Cashman. I. Can I? Ortega, I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. I. All right. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please call me. You have announced the results. 1313 ICE Council Resolution 20 1236 has passed. On Monday, December 21st, 2020, Council will hold the required public hearing on Council Bill 1177, changing the zoning classification for 3621 Lowe Boulevard in West Highland, and a required public hearing on Council Bill 1184, changing the zoning classification for All right. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Ah, and thank you, Crystal, as well. Our next item up is Council Bill 1271. And Councilmember Flynn, would you please put Bill 1271 on the floor for final passage? Certainly, Madam President, I move that council bill 20 dash 1271 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved. And we have a second from Councilman Hines. Questions or comments by members of council. Councilmember CdeBaca. Thank you. Madam President, this question is for legal. I tried several of the property owners within the five points did reach out to me about not having a voice in the board decisions, especially during the pandemic. And there's been a concern and a desire to lower the mill levy. The five points bid has, I believe, the highest levy of our bids and are probably the most some of the most marginalized businesses left. And so I'm wondering from legal, what is where is the right plac

e for people who are taxed by the bid to be able to have a say so in the mill levy? And what is the what are the requirements around? Property owner participation in these operating plans. All right. Thank you for that question. And I had Michael Carrigan listed as our staff support and then Beth Moisi. And so I'll leave it to you to answer. Hey. Thank you for allowing me to speak today. And I'm not I'm not part of the city attorney's office, so I'll give my comments. And then maybe if there is a city attorney on the line, they can they can help fill in some of the questions, too. So regarding the the places where the constituents can talk and voice their their concerns, their expressions about the the mill levy that is actually during the budget approval process. So all bids are required to submit a a an open public meeting for, for all of their constituents. And, and then at that meeting, that's the constituents can come in and talk about the the mills. They're going to be a set of the mills that are going to be led. And then they can also talk about how those dollars are going to be spent. And I am sorry I didn't catch the rest of your question. Well, I think it would actually be helpful to dove a little bit deeper on that. So at the meeting where the budget was decided upon, this was a

conversation that was not allowed to occur. And so what? What happens then? So I was not at that meeting. So I. I don't know what happened at the meeting. I don't know. Is there is there maybe somebody from the the bid that they can make comments to that question? Hi. This is veteran whiskey with the Downtown Denver Partnership. And we do work on behalf of the five points. We we help manage the meetings. But I also wanted to call out board director Ryan Carbons, who is on the call as well. And he was present at those public meetings. All the bid, all the five points board meetings are open to the public. That's right. Yeah. And Ryan, you know, I was president and that was raised in the chat because there were only the executive board is allowed to participate in the virtual decision making. And I made it clear that there were other people on the call who wanted to discuss the mill levy. And Paul said that that was not a topic of discussion. I appreciate that, Councilwoman CdeBaca. I may tend to disagree, of course, in terms of the fact that we had several opportunities for public comment in the reminding ourselves as well that as I was part of the Five Points Business District Board that birthed the video and had a very extensive community meetings surrounding the amount of mill levies and what that tax look like. And of course, in order for the bid to pass, we needed the involvement of all the stakeholders which were the property and business owners along Wheldon Street. And so and I'm reminded that, you know, although our I believe we're at ten mills, the Cherry Creek area is at 15 mills. And so. So the question is, was it discussed at the budget meeting?

So these pieces were discussed at the budget meeting this year. This year, yes. Can you provide that recording? I don't hold those recordings, but I can obviously seek those out. And I think this has been a point of conversation that we've had in terms of making sure that we address some of the concerns that you have coming before the vide meeting. And I know you've just concerns regarding folks that had dissension on the bid and challenges with the bid and where they were, where we were at tax wise. I know we've asked those questions in terms of let's reach out to those to make sure that those folks, whoever have questions, get those questions answered. In addition to that, making sure that we also reach out to those legacy business owners, and so trying to figure out who they are, I guess, is the question. While it's the. Participation. Dr. Cousins and Ms.. Steiger have both brought up reducing the mill levy. And there's never been a board discussion. They've never had that question entertained. And just so we know, those aren't just regular folks in our community. Those are actual you know, Dr. Cousins King was actually a board member of the bid. Correct. Ms.. Stiger is obviously a current member of the bid. And for her for us to have a conversation, of course, in a discussion is very simple for her. I have never heard either one of those parties raise those issues. And of course, I am also there at Coffee at the point every single day. And so. Mr. Carrigan, is it possible, since this is not a single reading resolution and this is a bill, is it possible for us to delay this one, to make sure that we get some of those property owners in to speak about their desire to lower the mill? So this is actually the second reading for this ordinance. And a city or a state statute does require council to vote on the D.A. budgets by December 5th every year. But today is actually the last opportunity. And, you know, those property owners did have an opportunity to speak at those board member those board meetings and very public comment section. So there's really not an opportunity at council for additional comments to be heard by but by those by those property owners. But what I'm explaining to you is that they they have raised this concern and it has not been addressed. What recourse do they have as property owners that are taxed by this, Mel Levy. If you don't mind, Mr. Carrigan, if I take 2 seconds on that one, the five Points Business Improvement District is something that years ago was on a wish list for us as the Five Points Business District Board. And to be clear. Part of the feeling, of course, my business celebrated its 10th year anniversary right at well in 27 a week and a half ago. Part of what we feared in our area is that Fivepoint wasn't being taken serious. Our feeling was we did a tremendous amount of work to pass the bid. A tremendous amount of work to pass the video with incredible amount of community engagement and investment in other i

ndividuals to help us ensure that we're reaching our our are not just our property owners and our business owners, but also our neighbors, our residential residential neighbors as well. The two individuals, Councilwoman CdeBaca, that you refer to, have probably just a voice in our neighborhood, but probably one of the loudest, louder places in our neighborhood. Steiger and Dr. Cousins came. You know, if there is dissension among those two individuals that I have not heard of from attending just about every community meeting going back to ten years and including the

surrounding meetings, even with the rhinos that exist in five points, you know, I will personally, based on you, will reach out to them to see if they have questions. But I see no reason why to hold up the process, to further set our neighborhood back. I just I appreciate your time. Thank you, Mr. Collins. And this? The city would be out of compliance. If we entertain a motion to delay. We do have this on the floor for final consideration for a vote. And so just want to make that reminder. Next up, we have Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. I just want to ask someone from the city. Wow. That so wise state statute. We have to vote by December 5th. What? What happens if we say no? So if you do not accept the the budget tonight, the the budget would be and I'm paraphrasing because I'd have to go back and actually look at state budget law. But I believe that the district has to operate on the approved 2019 budget. And then I think there's there's some sort of a reduction take off of that budget as well. But I'd have to I have to do a little research to find that exact language for you. They approved the 2019 budget, even though this has been 20. Oh, sorry. The the approved 2020 budget. Sorry. Okay. Uh. Okay. Does anyone here able to answer what the 20 what the differences between the 2020 and the proposed 2021 budget is is there a significant dollar difference? I can go ahead, Mr. Collins. Yes, I can. I can pull that up. It'll take me a quick second. There is a 2020 versus 2021 on here. Yeah. So that I've got that too. So in addition to what you guys are approving tonight, you're approving an amended 2020 budget which approves a projected actual column of the budget. So the 2021 amended budget, what you what you be approving is \$377,661 in total expenditure. And then the 2021 budget is \$271,461 in total. And what what about. So, so thank you. But if we were to vote no, we would vote no. Also on the amended 2020 budget. So we would, by default adopt the unamended 2020 budget which we adopted council adopted last year. So what would that number be? So that was 275,116. So 275 116 And then the proposed 2021 budget is 50 something to 71 for 61. Okay. All right. So if we said no. We would theoretically be throwing a five point bid that they should lose about 20 K And then, Mr. Kerrigan, you mentioned that maybe there's a penalty as well, some sort of discount. Yes, I think it's I

think it's a prescribed percentage reduction. And I can remember with that with that exact percentages. Okay. Thank you. Thank you both for your for your answers. I I guess that as Councilmember CdeBaca mentioned, this is one of our most underserved communities. So I have reservations in and in making them even more underserved. But I'll just leave it at that. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Hines. And so Council Member CdeBaca, we have this on the floor for a vote. Or are you looking to do a motion to delay? I. Is it possible to delay since we're at a compliance, or is there a possibility to reopen it mid-year? Michael, is that an opportunity to open it mid-year? I guess I don't understand what you mean by open it mid-year. Can you elaborate a little bit on that, please? So what you're hearing right now between myself and Mr. Corbyn's is at odds and there is video that could clarify. In fact, I think I see Jessie Perry's on the call right now, and he mentioned he could get Ms.. Stiger on the call or speak to his experience in those meetings. He's participated in all of those meetings as well. And the way that it was classified by Mr. Coleman's is not true. There have been several concerns. And for Councilman Hines, I understand that on its face it may sound like you would be disadvantaging a disadvantaged area . The issue here is that you might actually save businesses that are going out of business because they can't afford the levy imposed on them. And so that is why we should be listening to the property owners in this bid who are saying they can't they simply cannot afford the ten mills, not before the pandemic, and especially not now during the pandemic. And so my concern is that, you know, people could very well lose property if we don't act to lower this mill. May I respond. Sir? Well, the first. The first thing is, is that we don't have that power by council to do that right now, because we're not the board. And so I know we've talked about this quite a bit. This did come through thin gov. And unfortunately, we're ending up doing a lot of committee work to nine eight on the floor. And so I it doesn't sound like there's an opportunity to open this up midyear. We have a motion on the floor to vote on this. Or the only other option is. Councilwoman, for you to make a motion to delay it. But you would have to have a majority vote of council in favor of delaying it. And I don't believe that you're going to have that support tonight on it. And so right now we have it on on the floor. And so I'm going to go ahead. And we haven't heard from Councilman Herndon tonight on this one. And just a quick reminder, we have one more question, and then we do have five public hearings scheduled tonight, albeit three, that we're going to gavel in and gavel out of. But I want to be cognizant of the members of the public who are also joining us here tonight. So, Councilman

Herndon. Yes, ma'am. I was just going to kind of go back t

o our responsibilities. As I mentioned earlier, we are going to approve a budget. It's either the 2021 that the the 5.3 idea worked through and went through the process or we vote no. And as Mr. Carrigan explained, we go back to the previous year's budget and I've not heard a compelling reason at all to not support the budget. So I would when we hopefully get to this vote really soon, I want to I will I will be voting yes. And I appreciate Mr. Comments for all his work that he does in five points. Thank you, Mr. President. Very good. Thank you. Well, we have a motion on the floor. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. CDEBACA No. Clark. Hi. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hines. Cashman. Hi. Can each I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I swear, I. Torres, I. Black I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced results. One Ni 12 I's. 12 I's Council Bill 1271 has passed. The next item up is Council Bill 1200. Councilwoman CdeBaca, please go ahead with your questions on Bill 1200. Thank you, Madam President. Who is on the call for the project? Jason Gallardo. I'm actually looking for the applicant. Yeah, I think we need to upgrade. Steve Ferris. Ferris? We've got him in the queue. Go ahead with your question. Mr. Ferris, I'm curious about this vacation. Originally, it seemed like it set up the ability to have private parking. With vacated public land. And then I understand you all got permits to encroach in the right of way so that there public spaces. I'm curious about how that will be possible because are you not protecting managed in road into those public spaces. Me, I guess. What we have is a former right of way. If vacated, that would have an easement. Or utilities underneath it. So we couldn't remove that roadway. We couldn't build on top of it. In other words, either the driveway would remain and then the six parking spaces you referred to are going to be in public land , 20th Street right away that is not being vacated. So I guess I'm trying to get my head around your question, but I believe by telling you that, you know, that that easement in that driveway will be remaining, there will always be access to those six parking spaces. Does that help? Kind of. I'm looking at the picture and trying to understand how someone would access those parking. Are they on the street? Yes. Those six bases and I can share a screen if everybody else wants to see it are going to be in 20th Street. Right of way. Okay. You got me. And I asked Jason earlier if they were going to be metered spaces because it's predominantly a metered area. And he said that they are not going to be metered. Can you explain, Jason, what the thinking is around that? Yeah. So my comment is. At this time, we don't have a plan to meter those spaces, but that doesn't mean that we won't be moving forward with meters if the site eventually gets approved and moves forward where it's just too early for us to do a parking assessment with our team, our parking assessment team, to be able t

o go there and find out the best way to meter these if if it is to meter and we're not neutral, we just can't answer that question yet is too early. So what is the square footage split between the parking's and the rest of the land vacated? The land being vacated is just under 3000 square feet. The six public spaces that we see, I guess I'm looking at, they're not even measured in the sense that they're in 20th Street right away, that subject to an encroachment permit and a transportation engineering plan, both approved by Doty. But I mean, the average parking space is 300 square feet, so you could say it's 1800 square feet in those six spaces. And then, of course, we also constructing that pedestrian walkway, an accessible route, also into 20th Street right away in and around those six parking spaces. Got it. And so. There was something in your application that said that the plan was to in the future that this would this vacation would contribute to another project. Is that correct? I might have been the only project we were referring to at that time. You know, we've been working on this for 18 months and there's about six different permits from zoning to engineering plans to variances, and I mean several. So I might have been it's all one project with an encroachment permit with six different permits. So maybe I was referring to that those relationships. Got it. I don't recall. It's never been there's only been one project planned here, and that is a 17 car parking lot. Got it. Just making sure that there was nothing else. That's it for my questions on this one, Madam President. Right. Thank you, Councilwoman CdeBaca. That concludes our items to be called out. All bills for introduction are ordered, published. And Mr. Farris, we're just going to ask you if you could remove your screen sharing for us, sir. Madam President. Oh, I'm sorry. That's right. Councilman Hines, I'm so sorry I had the wrong view up, and so go ahead with your question, Councilman. Thank you, Madam President. I'm sorry. I have questions for a couple of questions as well about the the vacation. It appears that the purpose that you intend to use the land for is a parking lot. Right. Mr. Harris. You're muted if you are, which is. I thank you. I got unmuted. I thought

we were stepping away and I forgot. But yes, there's up. The parking lot will be on land to be vacated and land to be maintained is right of way. But of course, as part of that parking lot and it was part of the understanding when we first proposed this plan that we would construct that walkway and accessible route to a wider up from the backside of the King Soopers there. So this parking lot is for that. Theoretically, the people who would park in this lot would be going to King Soopers. If they wanted to go to King Soopers, they could park in the public spaces. We intend most of the 11 spaces to be serving the existing retail operation that's there now. It's a two story building. Okay. Some other businesses w

ay. So how did people get to these other businesses now? The business that is there, the retail marijuana shop is not. I think people are walking or biking to it. There isn't really any parking serving. I think there's one spot in the front. I'll have to look, I think, as I recall. But otherwise there is very, very limited. And you want to add 17 spaces or 11 spaces. To serve a retailer that. Currently all their customers walk or drive. Well, we've what we believe and this is that they their Canada has asked them to have a 13 year lease, an option to extend for another ten. The business is thriving, but they feel that parking is in demand in that area. And there's a shortage of it. And they feel it's part of the lease and part of the services they provide would be assisted by having more parking. Okay, so I noticed that the accessible cost of travel and all the accessible parking spaces are in the right of way. But non-vaccinated right away is what let's say we we don't know for the vacation. Are you going to proceed forward with a lot? And with a smaller amount of parking. Or you see it at all. We're not going to proceed at all because we have to package it as a work, as a as an investment for the time and money. To do it without the vacation is what we look at in our analysis. And so who's profiting? So there are no meters on the spaces. There are. This is a public life. So you say that the finances it doesn't make it is unprofitable. How is someone profiting? From public parking spaces without meters. Well. We came in with this plan that we wanted to try to construct parking there, and we started talking to the city about how to do that. And they pointed out that the Division Street right of way and the small section of a water in the front of the lot really impeded our ability to get access to any parking. So we discussed how best to do that. And they there was an interest in this accessible walkway and we said and there was interest in public parking. And however the city decides there are six spaces are metered or left for the public. Either way, we're not we're not planning on using them for the business. And that's that's up to the city. And we're flexible on how they want to provide that or limit that access. It's it's kind of like on street parking, as far as we're concerned. It's it's not under our control. But to answer your broader question, I think about why we found out that we couldn't get access to the internal lot without requesting the vacation of Division Street. Right of way. If you look at the site. Okay. You want me to share it again? No, no, no. I get what you're saying now. Okay. Thank you. The reason this curiosity is because all of the accessible improvements are dependent on the vacation. And as someone who would use that, I just I don't want to I want to make sure that we're if we're going to install a parking lot, that it isn't using a justification of the disability community to put in a line

that may or may not actually be available to people with disabilities. But and that's let me add that's a fair question. You know, that would we proposed ten car lot I believe we would have one accessible space. We proposed seven 1617. So the ratios required us to provide to where we put them wasn't as important. They just seemed to fit over there best in, in, in the layout of the site. We could have put them on private property, too. It really wasn't a deciding factor. You know, we we just they it was the way the design work that they they take up more space and they fit well. They're we're happy to I think they're I think they're great that they're public. But it's not it wasn't like they were. We insisted on that. So long as you're in compliance with FDA, I'm not going to. I don't think this is the reform you talked about. So thank you. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilman Hines. Glad we were able to get your final questions in there. All right. That concludes the items to be called out. All bills for introduction are ordered published. Council members remember this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote. Otherwise, this is your last chance to call out an item for a separate vote. Council Member Flynn Will you please put the resolutions for adoption and bills on final consideration for final passage on the floor? Muted. Oh, you're muted. Council and offline. You're muted. We can't hear you either. Yeah. Thank you. You go. All right. Sometimes I click it and it works and sometimes it doesn't. I move the resolutions be adopted and bills on final consideration be placed upon final consideration, and do pass in a block for the following items. All

series of 2020 1188 1330, 1331, 13, 32, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1340 1339 1349 1350 1357, 1114 1228, 1265, 13, 28, nine , 28, 11, 17, 13, 16, 13, 24, 13, 25, 1343, 1189, 12, 70, 12, 72, 12, 73, 12, 74, 12, 75, 12, 76, 1277, 12, 78, 1279, 12, 8012, 81, 12, 82, 12, 83, 12, 84, 1285, 1149 1211 92. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. It has been moved and seconded by Councilman Ortega. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Black eye. CdeBaca. I. Clark. I. Flinn i. Herndon. I. I. Cashman. I can. H. I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Madam Secretary. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 13 eyes. 13 eyes. The resolutions have been adopted and bills have been placed upon final consideration and do pass. Tonight, there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 1123, changing the zoning classification for 2483 South Josephine Street. A required public hearing on Council Bill 1124. Changing the zoning classification for 1634 Xenia Street. A required public hearing on Council Bill 1162 Changing the zoning classification for 2580. South Clarkson Street and Council will convene separately as the Board of Directors of the Reno General. Denver General, just Denver excuse me and will convene separately as the Board of Directors of the Reno for General Guide , Ge

neral Improvement District, Denver, 14th Street and Gateway Village Improvement District to approve a work plan, adopt a budget, impose capital and maintenance charges, and make appropriations for the 2021 fiscal year for each district. Anyone wishing to speak on any of these matters must go online and sign up during the recess of council. If there are no objections from members of council, we will take a ten minute recess. Members, please remember to turn off your cameras and mute your microphones and we will return at 7:26 p.m.. Thank you. The magical spirit of the season comes to life in this acclaimed production and beloved holiday favorite. Tune in to view this special presentation of Colorado Ballet's The Nutcracker on Rocky Mountain, PBS. It premieres on Thanksgiving at 7 p.m.. Your Colorado Symphony is pleased to unveil an on demand digital video and audio content portal called Virtual Stage, featuring new and never before seen content from the Colorado Symphony go to Colorado Symphony dot org. For tickets and more information, enjoy the holiday safely at both the Gardens, York Street and Chatfield Farm locations with the blossom of lights and the Trail of lights. Go to Botanic Gardens dot org for guidelines and ticket information for both events. This year's parade will be a multi-week, socially safe extravaganza of activities across downtown. The parade floats will span from Denver pavilions to Union Station, offering multiple chances for you to relish in the charm and excitement of the holiday season . Go to downtown Denver accom. For more information. It's official. Zoo Lights has been making magic memories and even marriages for 30 amazing years. Don't miss this year's historic celebration. Tickets are only available online at Denver Zoo, dawg. The 20th annual Denver Chris Kindle market is moving to a spacious open air location in Civic Center Park. Go to Chris Kindle market Denver dot com for more information. The Clyfford still, M.K. Denver and Kirkland Museums, along with the History Colorado Center, are closed to the public to comply with the state's recent public health order. We will let you know when they are able to reopen. In the meantime, stay connected by checking out their virtual programing. Most are free. Please stay safe out there. And that's a quick look at what's happening in Denver this week. This week on your city. Now, officials enlist new measures in the COVID 19 battle and the expansion of housing opportunities continues. These stories are just ahead on your city now. As the second wave of COVID 19 infections continue to spread across the nation, Colorado officials have updated the state's dial system in an effort to mitigate the need for a full lockdown. The state has moved Denver to the new red level as of 5 p.m. on November 20th. Thus, new restrictions are in place across the city. Indoor dining has been suspended and the consumption of alcohol must end by 8 p.m.. But outdoor dining, as well as pickup and del

ivery options, are still open. Offices and gyms are limited to 10% capacity. Retail operations can stay open, but are limited to 50% capacity. Denver DMV offices will cease all in-person operations as of Monday, November 23rd. With the holidays, it's important to do everything possible to keep yourself and your loved ones safe while celebrating. Personal gatherings are prohibited under the new level. It has been advised you only interact in-person with people from your household and don't travel to visit family and friends. Continue to wear your mask and keep six feet of distance from others while in public. The new restrictions will be in place until at least December 18th. Housing on Colfax Avenue is changing as several multi-family developments are being proposed along what was once called the longest wicket of street in America. Here are some examples. On

East Colfax, near Downing, there are plans to possibly tear down the Ramada Inn Hotel and replace it with a seven story building with 300 plus units. Further west, development plans have been filed for the 55 acres directly south of Empower Field at Mile High. Plans would include a mixed use neighborhood with market rate and affordable housing office, entertainment, hospitality and other stadium related land uses. One of the more unique proposals comes from Tucson, Arizona, based Startup Steakhouse. They plan to offer tiny homes out of 320 square foot shipping containers, with prices starting at \$45,000. Stackhouse is currently under contract for a quarter acre site at West Colfax and Knox Court, where the company hopes to build a five story tower that can house 50 of the so-called alternative living units. Earlier this year, Denver Parks and Recreation closed all internal roads and parking lots in the parks to avoid crowding and promote physical distancing during the pandemic. Now, Parks and Rec is asking for your opinion via a survey about making this a permanent change. There's actually a variety of considerations that go into it. So obviously, if we're reducing vehicular through traffic, we're reducing the potential for pet and bike conflicts and can make an enhanced park user experience. It's a little quieter. There's a little more space to use. Obviously, there are other considerations that come into play. Our parks have regional attractions and regional destinations that obviously have a need for vehicular access and loading, like pavilions or large athletic fields. We want to make sure that we are providing an appropriate added parking access so that everyone can access these parks. So it's sort of balancing those considerations. We've been able to sort of through our day to day field operations, see how people have repurposed the streets and get individual feedback. But as we continue to evaluate whether there's opportunities to keep park roads or portions of park roads closed in the long term, we want to make sure we have a broader perspective and get as much feedback as we can thr

ough our online survey. The survey is open through November 30th. Denver City Council unanimously approved a rezoning of the Chaffee Park neighborhood to allow accessory dwelling units throughout that northwest Denver area. To rezone 1400 doors with no comments or questions from my colleagues. I was pretty shocked and really surprised. It was a great win. Chaffee Park neighborhood came to me as the councilwoman in 2019 after I was elected and asked if I would be interested in working with the neighborhood to rezone the entire neighborhood. It allows people to build a smaller apartment type structure in the backyard, and they can use it for a long term rental. They can use it for a short term rental. It adds some stability to a neighborhood and allows somebody the ability to build an accessory dwelling unit and have another source of income so that they can stay within the neighborhood. To learn more, visit Denver Gov dawg. You can catch new episodes of your city now every Friday. Thanks for watching Denver. The magical spirit of the season comes to life in this acclaimed production and beloved holiday favorite. Tune in to view this special presentation of Colorado Ballet's The Nutcracker on Rocky Mountain, PBS. It premieres on Thanksgiving at 7 p.m.. YORK Colorado Symphony is pleased to unveil an on demand digital video and audio content portal called Virtual Stage, featuring new and never before seen content from the Colorado Symphony go to Colorado Symphony dot org. For tickets and more information. Enjoy the holiday safely at both the Gardens, York St and Chatfield Farm locations with the blossom of Lights and the Trail of lights. Go to Botanic Gardens dot org for guidelines and ticket information for both events. This year's parade will be a multi-week, socially safe extravaganza of activities across downtown. The parade floats will span from Denver pavilions to Union Station, offering multiple chances for you to relish in the charm and excitement of the holiday season. Go to downtown Denver AECOM for more information. It's official Xu Lites has been making magic memories and even marriages for 30 amazing years. Don't miss this year's historic celebration. Tickets are only available online at Denver Zoo North. We have six public hearings tonight. Speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses. When called upon, please wait until our meeting hosts promote you to speaker. When you're promoted, your screen will flash and say Reconnecting to meeting. Please do not leave the meeting. You will be reconnected and you will need to turn your camera on if you have one on your microphone. If you signed up to answer questions, only state your name and note that you are available for questions of counsel. Speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yield enough to time. If translation is needed, you will be given an additional 3 minutes for your comme

nts to be interpreted. You will see your time flash on the screen when you have 30 seconds left. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members as a whole. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Councilmember Flynn, will you please put Council Bill 1123 on the floor for final passage? Go. Yes, Madam President, I move that council bill 20 dash 1123 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded the required public hearing for Council Bill 20 Dash 1123 is open. May we please have the staff report? Let me know if you can see my screen. And how we can see it. And we just need you to put it in. Full screen for presentation. That is not working. Thanks for an. Excellent. Good afternoon, members of City Council. My name is from Pineville and I'll be presenting tonight an overview of the Map Amendment four 2483 South Justice Street. The subject property is located in Councilman Paul Cashman, District six. In the University Park neighborhood. The subject property is between Wesley Avenue and Harvard Avenue, and it's only one block east from University Boulevard. The subject so note is approximately 7500 square feet and the applicant is proposing to rezone the property from. You as you see to you, as you see one Southern district which allows for the Urban House and the touch accessory dwelling unit building for us. The maximum height for a house is 30 to 35 feet and 24 feet for the Dutch. 80. The property is currently in the urban single unit season district, which allows for a minimum standard of 5400 square feet. And as you can see on this map, most of the surrounding properties are also sold. U.S. you see with some U.S. you d to the south and grx5 to the west. Site is currently occupied by a single unit home and it is surrounded by mostly other single unit uses to the north, east and south by you can see out to the west there is some mixed land use. This lake here shows the existing area with the site of the proposed rezoning on the top right and on the bottom right. On left, you can see some images that show the character of the neighborhood. So you can see in the bottom left the five story building to the west. Speaking to a process. Information on notice of the application was sent on July 21st, 2020. Planning Board recommended approval on September 30th, and notice of this public hearing was sent on November nine and the property was appropriately notice of present. One letter of support from the I.R.A. and three letters of support from the public have been received. The Denver zoning code has five review criteria, which I will go. The first criteria is that the rezoning request must be consistent with adopted plans. Therefore, adopt the plans that apply to the request rezoning. We have a comprehensive plan. 2040 Blueprint. Denver Housing and Interest. Denver and the University Park Neighbor

hood Plan approved in 2008. The rezoning is consistent with several of the tragedies in comprehensive plan 2040, but I'll go over a couple of them. This MAP amendment will promote equity by creating a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood, and it will lead to an environmentally resilient Denver by promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. Now looking at blueprint Denver the subject properties map as part of the urban neighborhood context. This context is described as containing small, multi-unit, residential and mixed use areas that are typically embedded in one unit and two unit residential areas. Look, buttocks are generally regular with a mix of alley access and they have been described as having a high degree of walkability, likability and good access to transit with less reliance on cars. Now the future places map designates the subject property as low residential place type. This place types have predominantly two single and two unit uses, and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. Josephine Street is designated as a local street, which is mostly characterized by residential uses. But it's important to note that the property is only one block east from University Boulevard, but it's a mixed use arterial. The growth area in Blueprint. Denver is full of areas of the city. This area is anticipated to see a 10th percent employment growth and 20% housing growth by 2040. Blueprint also has specific policy recommendations. So the housing policy number four talks about diversifying housing choice through expansion of accessory dwelling units. Throughout all residential areas and a city wide approach to enable it to use is preferred. But until holistic approach is in place, individual rezonings to enable you to use in all residential areas, specifically where tools Second, I just wanted to get one in. Madam President. I get can each I. Ortega, i. Sandoval, i. Sawyer, i. Torres, i. Madam President. i. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 13 eyes. 13 eyes. The resolutions have been adopted and the bills have been placed upon final consideration and do pass. Tonight there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 20, Dash 1414 changing the zoning classification for 3397 South Geneva Street in Hampden and a

required public hearing on Council Bill 20, Dash 1435, changing the zoning classification for multiple properties along East Hampden Avenue in Hamden and Southampton. Anyone wishing to speak on any of these matters must go online to sign up during the recess of council. If there's no objections from members of council, we will take a ten minute recess. Council members, please remember to turn off your cameras and meet your microphones and we will return at 6:46 p.m.. We have two public hearings tonight. Speaker should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so, their home addresses when

called upon. Please wait until our meeting hosts promote you to speaker. When you were promoted, your screen will flash and say Reconnecting to meeting. Please do not leave the meeting. You will be reconnected and will need to turn on your camera if you have one. And your microphone. If you have signed up to speak or to answer questions, state your name and note that you will be available for questions of counsel. Speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yielding of time. You will see your time flash on the screen when you have 30 seconds left. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Councilmember Torres, will you please put Council Bill 20, Dash 1414 on the floor for passage? I move that council bill 20 dash 1414 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved. Okay. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. The required public hearing for Council Bill 20, Dash 1414 is open. May we please have the staff report? Can you see that? Yes, we can. And then can you make it full screen? You see? There. Very well so. Little. Maybe we might have to go back to your previous one so we can see the whole presentation. It's not. It's. Sorry about that. Is that working now? There you go. Yep. Go ahead. Good evening. My name is Sammy Barnes. I am with Community Planning and Development. And today before you we have 30 397 south geneva street currently zoned seu f and the applicant is requesting seu f one. It's in Council District four and Kendra Black's and it is in the Hamden neighborhood. So the request itself is for a single unit residential asking specifically for the cf1 existing zoning itself, as if it's surrounded predominantly by that use in the neighborhood. You do have some open space and some residential uses nearby. When we look at the land use itself, it is a single unit, residential and Geneva Street as well as around daytime. You can see that it's predominantly single unit residential. And so the subject property is on the upper left corner. And as you can see, some of the surrounding properties are between one, one and a half and two stories. And then on the bottom left, you can see the multi multifamily residential building to the south of the site. So this went before the planning board on October 20th and it was approved unanimously and it is before you today. And as of present, we've had one coming of opposition, which is in the staff report. And primarily those concerns were regarding to absentee landlords not maintaining their properties, landscaping and maintenance concerns to the subject, property and other properties in the vicinity, as well as a home occupation permit for another property, not specifically the subject property and noise coming from an elementary school. I did reach out to the applicant, this individual

that had concerns and opposition and was able to address all their comments as well as I had the applicant reach out to that individual and address their comments as well. And so. So before you, we have five specific criteria that we analyze when it comes to reasoning. And I will dove into the first one. The first one is consistent with adopted plans, and we're really looking at just two plans, which is comprehensive plan 2040 and Blueprint every land use and transportation plan 2019. So within comprehensive plan 2040, there are several specific goals and policies that give direction and I'm going to that there are highlighted in the staff report. But I want to highlight some here just in this presentation. One around equity around the equitable, affordable and inclusive go to strategy AIDS. Create a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood for all individuals and families, as well as an equitable, equitable and inclusive. Go through strategy, be use land use land use regulations to enable and encourage the private development of affordable, missing, middle and mixed income housing, especially where it's close to transit, as well as to ensure neighborhoods offer a mix of housing types and services for diverse populations and around climate is to promote infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. When we're looking at the blueprint Denver, a 2019 plan, the subject property is in the suburban neighborhood context, which are predominantly large, single family homes. When we're looking specifically at the place types, it

is classified as more residential, which are primarily large single uses as well as accessory ordinance are appropriate. And Geneva Street is a local street, which is primarily characterized by residential uses. As well as blueprint. There's a specific language about aid use, specifically policy for in the language in built form housing is the diversity housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units through all residential areas. And the staff report also does mention the other review criteria as well. And so therefore CPD recommends approval based on all findings and all review criteria have been met. I am available for any questions you might have as well as the applicant is here to answer any questions as well. All right. Well, thank you very much, Edson. Council has not received any written comments on Council Bill 20, dash 1414. And we have one individual find it to speak. Storti. Hi there. So. I think that it's I just wanted to shout out the part about inclusive and affordable housing that is a part of the Denver plan. And. And I'm just. Hoping that city council can keep that in mind when we are. Planning, which, you know, I hope. That that type of planning is happening. It doesn't always feel like that, but when we are planning for our unhoused neighbors, so it seems like it's of relevance and it's being taken into consideration by the community and Community Devel

opment Development Department. And I just don't know who to speak with regarding how we can take measures in the same vein for everyone in Denver. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of council. All right. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I have some issues surrounding the. Use of aid to use in suburban contexts where we don't have alleys. I've talked about this before and when I read the staff report and I saw some some indecision or some issue over a detached ADU and how that would be applied to this slot. Thank you for your email today. You said that the applicant intends to do an attached ADU, but also with a separate garage on the property. Is that correct? The applicant is here and clarify that as what is intending to do with an additional garage or not. Okay. I don't know if Aaron is if we want to promote Aaron Roediger and have him respond to what what his plan is here. I know that we have some few of our 500 and think 548 A.D. use now in the city, according to the permitting office in the last ten years. And very few of them are on parcels that don't have access from a from an alley or a street. And so I wanted to I am concerned that CPD developed first some sort of guidelines for the suburban context, which is primarily dominated by lots that may be on cul de sacs as this one is, or actually on the end of a cul de sac. So the actual frontage isn't isn't very great. So the question was, how do we determine the rear plot line? How do we determine the envelope within which a detached adu could be built? I understand again that that this is going to be an attached adu. Aaron is in here. Mm hmm. Aaron is. You might need to re pose your question, Councilman Flynn. I'm curious what your plan is. As I understand, it's to be attached to you, but also with a garage. Is that for certain now? Thank you for that, Councilman. Thanks. Aaron Roediger and the property owner of Geneva. Yes. So my my original plan was to actually build a detached garage, which would have a garage on the first floor, obviously, into the living unit, second floor, and that would be in the back. So if you look at the front of the property, there is a very wide entrance for a gate, basically for steel to pull in. So the plan would have you would have a driveway going through the back area and. The garage detached. Within the property. You probably wouldn't see it. On which side of the house is the is the access going to be? That would be the the east side would be the left side if you're looking at it. Okay. Whether it's a gate there now. Yep. Okay. Are you currently renting the property out? I live here currently. I have two roommates, but I know it's the harvest. Okay. And so you're living here now? Not in California? No, I do go back and forth, but I do. Okay. I'm a software engineer. I work remotely. So I do like to jump around and possible. Okay. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilman Flint. Next

up, we have Councilwoman Torres. Thank you, madam president. Edson I'm just wondering if you can share for folks that are watching. I know we've had a couple suburban applications come through in this question about absentee landlords has come up, done all of them, I think. Can you just share a little bit of what what you might have shared with the commenter who originally opposed this about whether or not that would be an issue with an edu rental? Yes, great question. The individual that originally wrote the letter of opposition was under the impression that the property owner didn't live on site and that it was completely being rented. And so they had concerns that it was going to be two units being rented out completely. And so the proper owner does live on site. And then there is a provision in our zoning code that states that states that end single units on

districts where 80 days are allowed, that the property owner must live and maintain that unit. So if Aaron decides to build the attached avenue and he is required to live on site, and that's only if he decides to build the ADU or not. And this happens for any zoned district, whether that's attached or detached. Thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. All right. One final look. If there's any hands raised in the public hearing for Council Bill 20, Dash 1414 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilwoman Black. Thank you, madam president. And thank you, edson. We talked a bit about this at the looting meeting. It is the first application to make it to council in a suburban salt zone district. And I am very curious about it, as is Councilman Flynn, because we don't have alleys mostly in these kinds of neighborhoods and there's big setbacks . And so it'll be interesting to see what happens with this. So I guess here we go, suburban zone districts. And I guess I'll just look forward to seeing what the project proposal is and Mr.. Right after. I'm glad to hear that you live in Denver, New and I guess that's all I have to say. It meets the criteria as laid out by Exxon. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Black. Next up for comments, we have Councilwoman Sandoval. Thank you. Councilman. So just a little side note. I live in an urban context and I have no alley. I live and like several of my blocks in northwest Denver, have no alley and a half a block. Rezoning is actually coming forward for the 46th and more for accessory dwelling units that have no alley. So this isn't, I think, just in the suburban context, I think this is a context everywhere in Denver where you have no alley. Because I know some of my neighbors would like to see an accessory dwelling unit in my neck of the woods. But once again, we have no alley, so I'm not quite sure. How do you determine that? So just wanted to go on the record saying that I would support CPD looking at this in all context where there is no alley and how do we address people going in and out from the yard? And I guess I'm more person

ally curious because I have lived for 20 years on a block that has no alley right in the smack heart of northwest Denver. I know several people as well. My mom lives on the same block as I do, and I'm interested to see how these rezonings come forward with no alleys. So just wanted to go on the record to say that as Councilman Black mentioned, he did meet the criteria. But I still hope that CPD studies this a little bit more. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman. Next up, we have Councilman Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. Just wanted to jump in on that conversation. As Councilman Herndon and I are looking into the rezoning in East Colfax for 80 years. This is an issue because there are blocks that don't have alleys in East Colfax and it's very site specific. We've actually been talking to the fire department about what that looks like and the fire department and CPD in site review have a plan for that. So there is conversation happening about that, but it is very site specific and it very much matters exactly what is already on the land. So it'll be interesting to see exactly what happens with this particular one. But it matters what form and structure is already built on the land. So it's very interesting. Thanks. Thank you. Next up, we have Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I want to support Councilwoman Sandoval in her request. That's exactly what I was going to suggest. Also that CPD take a look at the different settings and determine that rather than a one size fits all, even just determining what envelope they could be built in. Take a look at such things as life safety and public access and things like that. There is no I mean, there is no public access to the rear of this particular property. So I think that's appropriate. And I support Councilwoman Sandoval in asking CPD to take a look at that going forward. Thank you. Wonderful. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. And I'll go ahead and chime in, seeing that this meets all the criteria. I am happy to support it, but I think we're all paying close attention what this looks like for suburban context and where we go forward. It's an exciting time to see what this might look like. And so seeing no other hands raised for comments. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. What I said about the. I. Clark. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Fine. Hi. Cashmere by. Can it? I. Ortega, I. Sandoval, I swear. I. All right. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 1313 IES Council Bill 20 1414 has passed. Our second hearing tonight is 20 dash 1435. Councilmember Taras, will you please put Council Bill 20 1435 on the floor for passage? I move that Callum Hill 20 dash 1435 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and I think Councilman Herndon got that second in the required public hearing for council bill 20. Dash 1435 is open. May we please have the staff report? We've got Jason Morrison here from Community

Planning and Development. Good evening. Members of Council. Jason Morrison, senior city planner with Community Planning and Development. And the rezoning in front of you today is for a

legislative rezoning sponsored by Councilwoman Kendra Black in the Hampton and Hampton South neighborhoods. The Map Amendment resource owns a number of commercially zoned properties along East Hampton Avenue, with the goal of improving design outcomes by decreasing setbacks and requiring greater build to percentages. As I mentioned, we're in Council District four, Kendra Black's district. In the Hampton and Hampton South Statistical neighborhoods. And the request. The proposed rezoning includes three large areas along East Hampton Avenue. These three areas include approximately 122 parcels or 164 acres from Interstate 25 to the west to south of Anna Street to the east. The proposed Map amendment intends to rezone properties that are in the former Chapter 59 Zone District and the S.C. three s annex to mix three and six five within the Denver Zoning Code to S-Max 3amx5a. The purpose of the rezoning is to facilitate better design outcomes along East Hampton Avenue. And in addition to bringing many of these former chapters of the nine properties into the Denver zoning code. The additional design standards found in this mix three eight and in the next five eight districts include improved building form standards along this corridor to create an active and uniform street front. This includes, among others, reducing setbacks of current zoned districts, increasing build to requirements, eliminating surface parking between the primary street and the building, and finally requiring entrances to face the primary street for pedestrian access. There are many existing zone districts included in this rezoning, including several business districts pwds within the former Chapter 59 zoning code and mixed use and commercial corridor districts within the Denver Zoning Code. The existing zone districts are largely commercial districts which allow parking between the primary street and the building. And these zone districts also contain generous setbacks. More information on these individual zone districts can be found in the staff report. A portion of Area One, which is near Interstate 25, is within the sophomore Park U. Plane. This results in building height limits ranging from 12 feet to 42 feet. The view plan does not does allow exceptions in allowable height, including that any district zone for businesses may be built to a height of 42 feet above the natural grade. Furthermore, in existing structures that do not comply with the height, restrictions may be replaced with the current height and use the proposed zone districts within the view plan RSM s3a and 658 and have a maximum height of 45 feet and 70 feet respectively. We're looking at the existing land use, the properties contained within this rezoning, our commercial, retail and office with some industrial mixed use and parki

ng uses. The proposed rezoning is adjacent to mostly single and multi-unit residential uses as well as park and open space. And here's a look at some of the existing building form and scale within area one of the proposed rezoning. And to orient you, this is near Interstate 25 in East Hampton Avenue. And here's a look at some of the existing Brill Building form and scale. Near Yosemite Street and East Hampton Avenue. And then finally within area three, just near Havana Street, near Kennedy Golf Course. This is some examples of some of the existing building foreman skill in that area. The Map amendment application was unanimously recommended for approval by Planning Board, Planning Board and before it by committee. Since the staff report was published, we received no public comments. The Council office held an open house to discuss the rezoning back in November of 2019, and overwhelmingly, residents agree that they'd like to see new, walkable, mixed use development that activates this area. Because this is a legislative rezoning. It's only subject to three of the review criteria shown here. We'll start first with consistency with adopted plans. We have two adopted plans and that's Plan 2040 and Blueprint Denver. There is no neighborhood plan for this area. Looking first to comprehensive plan 2040, the proposed MAP amendment is consistent with several strategies from current Plan 2040 shown here and also detailed in your staff report. Specifically, this application is consistent with two equitable, affordable and inclusive goals and strategies. Because the proposed districts allow for a variety of uses that will provide services and amenities to the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods, and the design standards will promote greater walkability and accessibility to those uses established along the corridor. Similarly, they're consistent with the climate strategy because the text and map amendments will allow high quality and mixed use development at locations where infrastructure is already in place. Switching gears and looking at Blueprint Denver Blueprint Denver maps, this area is mostly as a suburban context. The proposed zone districts are consistent with this plan direction of commercial development that is focused along main corridors and the aspiration to make the context more urban in nature. The western portion of Area One, which is near the South more RTD station along Interstate 25, is mapped as the urban center context. These areas have a high mix of

uses and street level activation. Blueprint states that neighborhood context are meant to guide which zone districts are appropriate and may be interpreted with limited flexibility. The 63a and five zone districts will implement the mixed use and walkable areas that are envisioned within the urban center neighborhood context. Looking at future place type. The frozen districts are consistent with the future places mapping of this area of community center and community corridor which all

ow for a mix of uses with heights up to five stories and typically have an active street level. The proposed districts are in mixed use districts allowing 3 to 5 stories and include design standards that do promote an active street. Hampton Avenue is a mixed use arterial and other streets within the rezoning are commercial arterials and residential arterials and collectors. I'm honored to. Madam President, this is proclamation number 21, dash 0050 honoring Nick Mitchell for his services, Denver's Independent Monitor. Whereas Nicholas E Nick Mitchell was born in New Jersey in 1975, moving with his mother and brother to Brooklyn, New York, in 1986 and following his primary and secondary schooling in Brooklyn, Nick studied political science at Evergreen State College in Washington State, after which he returned home to take a job at the New York Civilian Complaint Review Board in 1999. And. Whereas, in his job at the review board, Nick investigated complaints against NYPD officers and presented his officers findings in court. But his desire to be on the other side of the witness stand led him to enroll at the Fordham University School of Law in 2004. And. Whereas, during the summer of his first year of law school, Nick got a grant to work in the domestic court system in Sierra Leone and on a genocide case at the U.N. Special Court for Sierra Leone Finishing Law School, he took a job at a large international law firm, Allen and Overy in New York City, but never felt at ease defending CEOs from Department of Justice investigations. And. Whereas, in 2008, Nick joined attorneys around the U.S. who successfully sued then-President George W Bush to ensure that habeas corpus extended to defendants at the Guantanamo Bay detention camp in Cuba, visiting Gitmo to interview detainees about whether they had legally moved through the judicial system. And. Whereas, Nick's love of the great outdoors led him on a weekend trip to Colorado in 2011, following which he decided to make the move from Brooklyn to Denver and shortly thereafter took a job litigating at a local law firm. And. Whereas, not long thereafter, Nick applied for and was ultimately appointed by Mayor Michael B Hancock as Denver's second independent monitor in August 2012. And. WHEREAS, during his time as Monitor, Nick's office oversaw thousands of investigations into complaints of misconduct misconduct clearing many Denver Police Department officers and Denver Sheriff Department deputies while ensuring accountability for those who abused their authority in the public trust. And. WHEREAS, Nick issued multiple reports about problematic practices in the Denver Sheriff Department, including the mishandling of inmate grievances and the tragic death of Michael Marshall at the hands of deputy sheriff personnel, triggering major reforms in Denver's jails. And. WHEREAS, at the unanimous request of Denver City Council, Nick conducted a sweeping investigation into the Denver Police Department response to prote

sts in downtown Denver following the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis, Minnesota, making 16 recommendations for reform, all of which were adopted by Denver Police Department. And. Whereas, as Monitor, Nick served as co-chair of the Denver Sheriff Department Use of Force Policy Committee, which transformed use of force standards for Denver deputies. Nick also issued public guidance about deficiencies in the DPP use of force policy leading to the complete rewrite of the policy, and released an analysis of body worn camera use by DPD officers resulting in significant enhancements on their use. And. WHEREAS, he co-founded the Bridging the Gap Kids and Cops program, which is one national recognition for helping to transform relationships between police officers and youth in Denver. And. Whereas, Nick led three successful efforts to change the law that empowers the oh. I am including a city charter amendment passed in 2016 with the support of 72% of Denver voters. And. WHEREAS, Mitchell received awards from the Denver Bar Association and the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement has been recognized as an expert on civilian oversight and law enforcement reform by CNN. The new. Yorker and other national publications and consulted with numerous cities seeking to enhance oversight of law enforcement, including Phenix, Tulsa, Madison, Baltimore, Colorado Springs, Aurora and others. And. Whereas, Nick was selected to be a Gates fellow in the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, senior executives in state and local government program in 2013, elected as a director of the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement in 2014 and

appointed to the Board of Governors of the Colorado Bar Association in 2018. And. WHEREAS, on January four, 2021, Nick Mitchell left his role as Denver's Independent Monitor to oversee a Department of Justice consent decree with the County of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. The consent decree is a court ordered agreement designed to correct systemic, unconstitutional conditions in the Los Angeles County jails, the largest municipal jail system in the world. Now, therefore, let it be proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. Section one, the City Council of the City and County of Denver. Thanks, Mitchell, for his dedicated service as independent monitor, exemplified by his efforts to increase safety for all the residents of Denver, while increasing the transparency of oversight of Denver's safety agencies and transforming, transforming Denver's Office of the Independent Monitor into a model emulated across the country Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall fix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation and that a copy be transmitted to Nick Mitchell. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Your motion to adopt. Yes, Madam President. I move the proclamation 20 1-0050 be adopted. Okay. Thank you. It has been

moved and we've got the movement. And then second by Councilwoman Ortega comments by members of council. Councilman Cashman. Have we checked to see if Councilman Herndon wanted to cut in on that? Okay. I think we're good. All right. Thank you, Madam President. You know, the office of the Independent Monitor, the VOA I am, may actually be the best friend our safety agencies have in this time when the people and policies of policing are called into question on a regular basis. VOA I am serious to not only ensure accountability and transparency where missteps occur, but to show just as clearly when the facts reveal that those policies and those people have performed as needed. And as expected, Nick Mitchell has not just done his job during his time as Denver's independent monitor, but through his unquestionable integrity, has dogged commitment to searching out the truth wherever it may lie in his clear presentation of the truth he has uncovered. He has strengthened the position for those who will follow. His predecessor will step into a far different context than did monitor Mitchell when he was appointed. While the Monitor and his talented staff and his dedicated cohort received much attention and deserve kudos for high profile reports such as the Marshall Report and the recent report issued after George Floyd's murder led to protests across the country many hundreds, perhaps thousands of less publicized but equally as important investigations received the same detailed attention that monitor Mitchell and his team devoted to the tragic events I mentioned earlier. I enjoyed working with Nick Mitchell. He worked hard. He maintained good humor most of the way. And his personal agenda, whatever it might have been, was set aside so as to not sully the search for the truth. I mean, I'm guessing there are other folks out there who can serve Denver with the same skills and the same backbone that Nick Mitchell brought to the job. But I'm also sure they are few and far between and the search committee has a rough job ahead to fill some big shoes in a big city in today's America . I can think of no job more important than an independent monitor. And in closing, Madam President, I just want to thank Nick Mitchell for all he has done for for Denver. Happy trails, Mr. Monitor. . I can think of no job more important than an independent monitor. And in closing, Madam President, I just want to thank Nick Mitchell for all he has done for for Denver. Happy trails, Mr. Monitor. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Next up, we have Councilwoman Torres. Thank you, Madam President. Just hearing Councilman Cashman read through your accolades, it hurts even a little bit more to know that you've left the position, Nick. But I know that Denver really benefited overwhelmingly in the deal to have you as monitor over these last several years. I was thinking back to Public Safety Review Commission days when the only authority we had was subpoena power and we got files that were three

inches thick of redacted testimony and information. And it was it was a it was a tug of war to get any information back then. And the model that was created was the structure. But you really gave it legs. And I just want to thank you so much for putting such integrity and trust in place that we really have a really wonderful team to work with and a really confidence system that will only improve. And I just really appreciate you as a mentor and supporter and always somebody that was willing to just have a side conversation, talk something through. We will miss seeing you around, especially when we get back into the buildings, but hope to connect with you soon. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Torres. Next up, we have Councilwoman Canete. Thank you, Madam President. Nick, I'm so sad to see you go. I know this is to celebrate you, but I just had to

say that I have that word coming through. Me too. One word that comes to mind. Having sat with you through many meetings, we sat together through the use of force meetings. I missed very few of them and it was a long process. And we sat through some really tough discussions about the 2019 bill that council passed and some tough negotiations, frankly, with agencies and and so but so so during all of that , I see you in your public meetings, but it's really working with you in those smaller settings where I feel like I've gotten to know you and see your strengths. So first thorough. You know, you are one of the most thorough individuals I've ever met. And and it's you take your job so seriously and so so it's part of your your gift. Secondly, ethical. We have this big debate every year. The city has these evaluations that we do. And the question is whether you can exceed expectations in being ethical or is it like being pregnant? You either are or you aren't. And we have this big debate. And and I just you're one of these individuals who makes me think there must be an exceeds expectations and I will just name for you the example which is that our community sometimes comes to you in great pain and what they want is for you to indict and blame and light it on fire. A member of our safety department where someone was hurt at their hands. And you've had to do that a number of times. But I have watched you with great integrity, share how sorry you are for the pain, but that the investigation did not result in a finding that someone was at fault and and affirming, you know, that decision, which is probably one of the tougher things when people expect you to be, you know, finding fault. And that's an example of why I trust you so much and why our community has trusted you so much when you have found fault, because that's not your default. You start everything neutrally and then you go where the facts and the investigation lead you. You're so thoughtful. You know, Councilwoman Torres mentioned, you know, talking through with you. One of the biggest debates we've had in our community is whether

or not we want someone else to make disciplinary decisions or whether we want an independent monitor who watches and oversees that. And it's a tough thing, right? If you become the decision maker as the oh am, then no longer are you independent. You're a decision maker, and then who's watching you? And so but you are so thoughtful about helping community and helping councilmembers to unwind these subtle philosophical questions. 13 Eyes Council Bill 20 Dash 1471 has passed. Councilmember Clerk, will you please put Council Bill 20 Dash 1477 on the floor for passage? Yes, Council President. I move that council bill 1477 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and we've got the second by councilman herndon. The required public hearing for council bill 20 dash 1477 is open. May we have the staff report? Yes. I just mean it. Okay. Can you see that? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Okay. Awesome. Well, I am Libby with an IEEE, and I'll be presenting the application for 4144 Hooker Street. This application is located in Council District one in Councilwoman Sandoval's district. In the Berkeley neighborhood. More specifically, it's located within the Harkness Heights portion of Berkeley. The apples are. The property is located on Hooker Street between 41st and 42nd Avenues. It's approximately 6250 square feet and is occupied by a single unit home. The property is currently in the urban single unit C Zone District and the applicant is proposing to rezone to a district that allows for an ADU USC C one. As stated previously, the existing zone district is urban, urban single unit C, which allows the Urban House primary building form and typically has a minimum zone lot size of 5500 square feet. And all the other properties within the Harkness Heights that are residential are also zoned to us, you see. The current use is single unit residential. Most of the surrounding area and within Harkness Heights is also a single unit. There are a small number of two unit and motel unit in the area, however. This slide shows the existing form and scale. The upper right hand side is the existing home, and then the left are other single unit uses on the block. And as you can see, this particular block is all single unit uses. This MAP amendment was complete in the beginning of October. A postcard notifying property owners within 200 feet of the site was sent out on October six. To date, we have received six comments. Five are opposed to the proposed rezoning, citing concerns with parking, affordability and infrastructure capacity. And we did receive one comment that was in support of the request. And then additionally we received a comment from the Berkeley Radius United Neighbors. R.A., along with Harkness Heights Neighborhood Association, sent a survey to neighboring property owners, and they received feedback that eight property owners were in support of the request and then 13 were were opposed. The Arnaud's are unable to release information on why the proper

ty owners were either supportive or oppose and because they did not do a permission to release comments in the survey. And so I don't quite have that information. But a member of the Brun Zoning and Planning Committee said that there were concerns over the current configuration of the buildings on the site and then in the parking. The Denver zoning code has five review criteria which must be met for approval, and I'll go through each one. So the first is consistency with adopted plans, of which there are two that are applicable to this site. The first is comprehensive plan 2040. And so for this one, there are two strategies that are applicable. First, this rezoning will create a greater mix of housing options in the Berkeley, particularly the Harkness Heights area, for all individuals and families. And then second, it will promote infill development where there's already infrastructure, such as water and sewer in place. And in Blueprint Denver, the future neighborhood context is urban. These areas are characterized by one and two unit residential areas, with some mixed use and multi-unit embedded throughout. BLOCK patterns are regular, and there's a high degree of walkability. Blueprint identifies this property as a low residential place type is place types are mostly single and two unit uses and accessory dwelling units are appropriate and can be thoughtfully integrated in the future. Street type for Hooker is a with an undesignated local which is mostly characterized by residential uses, so their request is zoned district to you. As you see, one would be consistent with this low residential guidance and the future street type. The growth area and blueprint. Denver is all other areas of the city. This is where we anticipate to see 10% of new jobs and 20% of new housing by 2040. Again, this is consistent with the rezoning to allow for an avenue because it will allow a limited amount of density that is consistent with the all other areas of the city growth strategy. Blueprint also identifies civic policy recommendations. The land use and built environment housing policy for states that individual rezonings to allow eighties are appropriate and should be small and area. And that's exactly what this rezoning is. It's just a single property to allow for an you. That also finds the requested rezoning meets the next two criteria the rezoning will result. And and further the public health, safety and welfare, primarily through its implementation of adopted plans and by providing a new housing type in a largely single unit area. Staff finds there's a justifying circumstance for this MAP amendment with the newly adopted guidance for Adams and throughout all Denver residential neighborhoods that's found in Blueprint Denver. And lastly, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the urban neighborhood context, the residential zoned district, general purpose and the specific intent of the USC see one zoned district. Therefore, based on the review criteria, sta

If recommends approval of rezoning. And that concludes my presentation and I know the applicants are also on AM if you'd like to ask them questions to. All right. Thank you very much, Libby, for the great presentation. Council has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 20 Dash 1477. We have three individuals signed up to speak this evening, and the first speaker is Christine Roe, who is the applicant. I had. Please, Christine. I'm connected. Good evening. My name is Christine Roe, and we are requesting to resign our property at four men for four Hooker Street to allow us to renovate our existing two story garage. When we bought our house 20 years ago, one of the things that drove to it was this two story brick crutch in the back. Although the structure was 100 years old. It had electrical. Outdated water and a sewer connection. Research at the laboratory shows the first floor garages original and the second floor was addition was built about nine years ago and in 1921. We've always wanted update the structure and started looking into what it would take to legally fix it up a few years ago. Our goal is to have an updated. Structure with an office in the apartment upstairs and a storage space downstairs. Our existing house, including a small edition completed 12 years ago that was permanent through the city. Walls and four. Floors under the required building lot coverage allowance. We do not intend to increase the footprint of our existing garage. During the planning. Board meeting, concerns about parking and traffic in our neighborhood. But rather I just want to note that our. House has a driveway that easily accommodates two vehicles and that our block has an average of about 8 to 10 vehicles parked on the street during the night evenings. Currently, there's two houses under construction, so we have seen or are not under construction but are having additions and so we are seeing more construction vehicles parked in front . But typically, I mean, I've been going out at night and just looking and you know, we averaged 8 to 10 cars out there every evening and we reached out to development services in early January and understand that if approved for an ADU, a next step would be to follow up with the city regarding all the design and code requirements for the existing structure. Again, we are requesting to design a property to allow an additional dwelling unit. Thanks for your time. And please ask any

questions. All right. Thank you, Christine. Our next speaker is Jesse Paris. Good evening. Members of council, those watching at home. My name is Jessica Sean Paris and I'm representing a Denver homeless out loud, black star action movies for self-defense, positive African-American for social change, as well as the Unity Party of Colorado and Mile High Knowles, along with from allies to abolitionists. And I will be the next mayor of Denver for. 2020. Three. I'm in favor and so eloquently stated and meets all the five of my. See, Jesse, your

Wi-Fi connection. Just to see what adaptive plans. We don't need you to turn your video off. The. We're not able to hear your audio and fortunately, Jesse. We might have to have you turn your video off so that we can get a better Wi-Fi connection with your audio. Can you hear me now? Yeah, we can hear you better now. Oh. Okay. It looks like we might have lost. Jesse but we'll try to get him back in the queue. Or Jesse, if you want to go ahead and move, we'll try to get the rest of your testimony in. Go ahead. So I was just saying that meets all five of the criteria, which is listing out the criteria. I think I left off on criteria three, which is, uh, further public health and safety and welfare justify circumstances, consistency with neighborhood contexts, residential zoned, district purpose and intense. So saying that this meets all five of the criteria, I'm going to be in favor of the rezoning tonight. The job of Mount Istanbul. I just wanted to know how many of these rezonings have been passed within the last year in District one. If you can answer that question, I'll greatly appreciate it. Thank you and have a good night. All right. Thank you, Jesse. Our last speaker is Tess Storti. Hi there. Um. Hi. I just wanted to. Ask some questions about access to these public comments. And I know that, you know, the sign ups, the window is pretty short and tersely. We would ask that you speak directly to the bill that we're hearing tonight. It's 4144 Hooker Street. It's an Adu. Okay. So if I. If I had wanted to sign up for. To comment on the edu regarding this rezoning, I'm just wondering how I would have done that if I had a disability. I'm a special ed teacher. And so I was just wondering how someone with a hearing or vision impairment would be able to have seen that . City Planners PowerPoint because people that use visual overlays for seeing screens can't see shared screens. So access to the city planners presentation would have been impossible. So I'm just curious about access to some of these. And if I needed additional accommodations under the ADA, how I would have been able to get them in such a short amount of time, given that the signup was so short and connecting to services would likely take much longer than the 10 minutes or so that we have to sign up. So I just have some questions about access under the ADA. Thanks. All right. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of council. All right. Seen no questions from members of council. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 Dash 1477 is closed. Comments by Members of Council Councilwoman Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. So. Harkness Heights is a very unique area in northwest Denver, and it's gone under a little bit of a different planning process. In a few weeks, you will see me bring a conservation overlay for this area that we have been working on for about two predates me so effective Bernice's time so probably for about five years so that there is more outreach t

o this particular accessory dwelling unit than the last A.D. that you saw, which they're both in the statistical neighborhood of Berkeley. But Harkness Heights is its own R.A. within an R.A. And so due to that fact, they have had some more robust outreach, actually, that conservation overlay for \$300 going to the planning board this coming Wednesday. So I'm familiar with this site and I know that Adus, as we all know, are somewhat controversial in some parts of the neighborhood. And Harkness Heights has worked really hard on this overlay, and we did not create standards for an overlay within this, that we did not create standards for the ADOS and the overlay. So there's some conversations moving forward that we are going to probably have to go back on. But given that we are voting on this criteria, I just wanted you all to have the back story of why there was a little bit more robust outreach on this application prior to the one that we heard at the beginning of the night. I do believe it meets the standards and all five of them, and I do think that they are going to do a good job of doing adaptive reuse and adding any type of gentle density into our neighborhood is always a good thing. So to answer your question, Jesse, I don't know the exact number of accessory dwelling units that were voted on in 2020. I led an application for Chaffee Park so I can get that. If you want to email my office, I can have some research done for my staff. Naomi I have no problem helping you find out that information. I just don't know what off the top of my head, but I just wanted to enter that question for everybody. And with that, I would ask my colleagues to support you for your support on this application. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Sandoval, and

happy to support this one as well because it meets the review criteria and seen no other comments by members of council. Madam Secretary, roll call. Sandoval. I. Sawyer, I. Torres. I. Black Eye. CdeBaca, I. Clark. Right. Flynn. I. Herndon, I. Hines, I. Cashman. I. Can each. I. Ortega, i. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 13 Ice 13 Ice Council Bill 20 Dash 1477 has passed. On Monday, March 1st, Council will hold a required public hearing on council build 20 1-0015 Changing the zoning classification for 1570, 15, 80, 1586 and 1596 West Bayard Avenue in Belford and a required public hearing on We have one public hearing tonight. Speaker should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residents and if they feel comfortable doing so. Their home address when called upon. Please wait until our meeting. Host promotes you to speaker. When you are promoted, your screen will flash and say Reconnecting to meeting. Please do not leave the meeting. You will be reconnected and will need to turn on your camera if you have one and your microphone. If you have signed up to answer questions, only state your name and note you are available for questions

of counsel. Speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yield of time. If translation is needed, you will be given an additional 3 minutes for your comments interpreted. You will see your time flash on the screen when you have 30 seconds left. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from personal or individual attacks. Councilmember Black, will you please put council bill 20 dash 088 on the floor for passage? Yes, Madam President, I move that council bill 20 dash 088 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and we've got a second by councilman herndon. The required public hearing for council bill 20 dash 0888 is open. First we'll hear from Laura Alterity, the executive director of Community Planning and Development, followed by Britta Fisher, the director of Housing Stability. And we'll round out the team with Andrew Webb giving the staff presentation. So go ahead, Laura. Thank you, Madam President. For this evening and. Councilmembers for the opportunity to talk to you this evening and introduce our team and the project. For the past three years, our staff have listened, researched, studied. And finally wrote. One of the most important zoning code updates of our time. This work would not have been possible without the partnership and energy. Your officers have poured into these amendments and the time and energy of thousands of residents and care providers who participated in this process along the way. I'd like to thank all of those who've shared their time. And lived experiences. With us over these past few years. But tonight, the subject matter is gives us an opportunity to begin rectifying the role zoning has played historically in dividing cities based on race, class and perceptions of people. I'm especially proud of this work because I truly believe this is a. Watershed moment for. Denver. And a foundation. From which we can continue working together. To build a more inclusive. City. Tonight's amendments represent the best of compromises. They retain the laws we currently have allowing families of any size to live together and allow in small shelters in all neighborhoods. But they recognize the need for new regulations on residential care that allow us to provide for the most vulnerable residents while putting in place protections to ensure facilities are safe, that they're good neighbors, and. No longer. Overly concentrated in just a few areas of our city. This proposal is a huge step. Toward. Modernizing our codes and ensuring that our policies reflect our values. Thank you for allowing me a few minutes to speak tonight. And I'll turn it over to Britta Fischer, the executive director of the Department of Housing Stability. If you. Laura. Thank you. Madam President, members of Council. It is with gratitude that I start by reflecting upon the recent

passage of Denver voters of ballot measure to be to create a homelessness resolution fund here in the city of Denver with an additional around \$40 million annually to spend in housing, shelter and services for people experiencing homelessness. I think this shows that most people are in favor of working together toward housing and sheltering. Solutions. For people experiencing homelessness. These zoning changes in this proposal will improve Denver's ability to provide for our unhoused residents in several ways. Shelters that have been effectively frozen in place today due to nonconforming status or bed limits will be able to make renovations or reconstruct existing structures to more effectively service our guests. This includes all existing shelters downtown. There will be clear criteria for emergency expansion of shelter capacity for things like a pandemic or things like in very low temperatures or a bomb cyclone. These things are crucial for our ability to max maximize the bed space in order to get more people inside. And very importantly, this proposal

will give us flexibility for use types across the continuum of housing stability. This is certainly a given, an example of a royal village, a place that has shelter, housing and supportive housing all in one site. The ability to have small amounts of emergency beds and shelter in many locations will help us to have more successful examples like a royal village. Passing. This proposal moves us toward our equity and our housing stability goals. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you, Laura. And. We'll go ahead and kick it over to you, Andrew. Great. Thank you. I'm going to pull up a Stanford report presentation here. It's not showing up on screens the way you would expect it to. Yup. Good to go, Andrew. Great. Thank you. So thank you again. My name is Andrew Webb. I am a senior city planner for community planning and Development. And for the last three years I've been the project manager for this effort to update the Denver zoning codes regulations for residential uses. So everything from conventional households and, and condos and apartments to residential care and other types of uses that where people live. We are doing this for several reasons. One is to move away from and move away from current regulations that prohibit or are obstacles to providing the types of residential care users we need for our most vulnerable citizens, or simply allowing people to make their own housing choices and find affordable solutions for housing. We are also seeking to move away from exclusionary regulations of the past that basically relegated certain people only to industrial districts, industrial zones of the city, often bordering some of our most underserved neighborhoods. We are also seeking to fix a lot of known problems with the Denver zoning code, ranging from outdated and unclear language, some of which dates back to just after the Second World War and unpredictable permitting and notification req

uirements that are the result of many amendments over the years. So to summarize what these amendments would do, they would update the way the zoning code regulates households to allow up to five adults of any relationship to live as part of a household, but no more than five in households. We're not all adults in the household are related. These regulations would preserve the existing provisions allowing unlimited family members to live together. It would create a new congregate living category in the zoning code that would consolidate uses where more people than would typically live in a household, live together over care is not provided, such as rooming and boarding type uses, single room occupancy, that sort of thing. And we call this use congregate living. These would only be allowed in higher intensity zone districts and going back to household again. I want to just clarify that that rent by the room, rooming and boarding type operations would not be allowed in single unit and two unit low intensity residential areas. They would only be allowed as congregate, living in higher intensity zone districts where similar uses are allowed now. And then finally, these amendments would consolidate all residential care uses. Any use? Any residential use where care is required as a condition of residency into a single use type called residential care. Moving away from regulating by the people served or their housing status, and instead regulating these uses by size with spacing and density limitations for larger facilities and the larger facilities as is currently, the case only allowed in higher intensity zone districts like multi-unit and mixed use. We are also are proposing a new upfront community meeting requirement for residential care uses, serving 11 or more people to given the opportunity for neighbors to get to know the providers and understand the types of uses that are coming into their neighborhoods. Want to highlight a few of the changes that were made to these proposals during the land use, transportation and infrastructure process, which took place from September to December of last year, and then will give me an opportunity to go into a few more of the details as well. This slide shows what is currently allowed now in dwelling units. Household uses in Denver permit in one detached home up to two unrelated adults to live together with unlimited relatives to each. This is the current regulation. And then in duplexes, apartments and condos, anything with essentially two or more attached homes, up to four unrelated adults are permitted to live together again with unrelated or unlimited relatives to each. This is an example of the kind of change that we're proposing to allow more equitable housing solutions, allowing more people, unrelated people only to live in higher and higher density. Housing means that those families of people who are not related by blood are only allowed to live in dwelling units that are on average half the size of

Denver's detached housing stock. The slide shows how other cities that we looked at around the country, primarily west of the Mississippi and in Colorado, regulate households and specifically unrelated adults , unrelated adults permitted in these cities that we looked at or shown in the blue columns along the top and then the average household size. According to the American Community

Survey, census data are shown in the yellow columns. You'll note that most cities that we looked at in Colorado and in the front range allow at least five unrelated adults to live together in households, but that in even in cities that allow many more unrelated adults and have done so in all these cases for decades, the average household sizes tend to stay the same. So we can take from this that while the way people live together has changed, we know there are groups of people who are not related by blood that live in cities all over the world, that people still tend to choose to live together in similarly sized groups regardless of what zoning regulations require. During the discussion at LOOTIE. When we came with our earlier proposals, we heard a lot of common themes support for allowing blended families, two families, to choose to live together to share housing costs, or allowing some number of unrelated adults to live together. But concerns about overcrowding in houses and in the perception of commercialization of neighborhoods was a major concern that we heard. External impacts seemed to be a really big issue as well, especially parking. And we heard that any regulations, wherever we landed should be simple to understand and enforce. So this is what the city council draft that's before you tonight would propose. This is how the zoning code would regulate households. If adopted, we would retain, again, the existing provisions for unlimited related people to live together. But if a household has adults in it who are not related, then there would be a maximum of five adults allowed in that household. And during the LUDI discussion, we did revise out some of the earlier proposals that would have allowed relatives to each or more people in larger dwelling units. So this would be a maximum of five people in houses were not everybody is related. And I should just reiterate here that the zoning code does not regulate children. We're just talking about adults. Next few slides will go through some of the additional details about residential care. During that discussion, again, we really took a deep dive into some of the issues related to residential care. These are uses where people are receiving care of some sort, whether it's custodial supervision or assistance with day to day activities, perhaps medical replacement therapy for addictions. The themes we heard is, is that councilmembers and we've heard that or reported to us that they were supportive of people having access to daily needs, things like transit and employment. There w

as support for encouraging more equitable distribution of future facilities around the city and preventing concentration of facilities in any one part of the city. There was support for moving away from regulations that exclude people based on the type of care that they need. And there was a lot of input really recommended that we ensure that these facilities are not out of scale with neighborhoods. These are the revisions that were made to the earlier proposals during the LUDI process. One of those related to community corrections specifically those are residential care uses that serve non paroled individuals nearing the end of a period of incarceration and allows them to begin employment and job training and that sort of thing before they're released and transition back into the community. There was a lot of concern about allowing those directly in the lowest intensity zone districts in residential neighborhoods. And so these amendments, based on revisions made during the LUDI process, would prohibit residential care used to serving non paroled individuals in single unit two unit in the rowhouse 2.5 zone districts. The three lowest intensity residential districts. We also heard concerns about the concentration of all types of facilities, but especially the smallest types of residential care facilities and neighborhoods which currently do not have a density limitation. In response to that, we did propose a new density limitation for the first tier of residential care facilities, those serving ten or fewer guests year round. And that would be a requirement of up to no more than three similar facilities, residential care facilities, within a one mile radius of a proposed site. So cumulatively, over time, this would help prevent concentration of these facilities in any one neighborhood. We also made some changes to the second tier, the type two residential care facilities. That includes reducing the maximum size of those facilities in the three lowest intensity residential zone districts to 20, essentially bringing it in line with what is allowed now for a residential care large in single two unit and row homes own districts. Additionally, in those districts, these uses would only be allowed. So this is the type two residential care. Serving 11 to 20 people would only be allowed on parcels that had previously been used for residential care use or some civic or public or institutional use, such as an unused church or government building. Want to focus a little bit on community corrections because I know this has been a particular interest during this whole discussion. This map shows where community corrections are currently allowed in. The existing facilities in Denver are shown as the black squares and the circles around them show their current spacing and density buffers. So where you see an area in hand that falls under one of those

those additional circles, that means additional analysis would be needed to determine whether a new facility could be permitted in one of those areas. As you can see, there's currently very little land left where a new community corrections facility could be established. About 1200 parcels around the city, mostly in the. Essentially that inverted L along the park and along I-70. This map shows where community corrections users would be allowed if these amendments are adopted. That includes higher intensity areas near RTD stations proximate to downtown, as well as mixed use and commercial corridors and similar areas throughout the city . The there are still would be spacing requirements for community corrections facilities to be spaced apart from other larger residential care uses, as well as a density limitation of no more than three larger residential care uses within a one mile of a proposed subject site. And those buffers are shown on this map. So the next few slides will go into detail about the staff report itself and our analysis. And as always, there is a lot more detail the in the full staff report which you have. The first couple of slides highlight the public process. We started this project back in March 2018 formulating a 40 member advisory committee of volunteers from all walks of life, including registered neighborhood organizations, providers of all types of residential uses, residents, people with lived experience in all types of residential uses. This is the largest volunteer advisory committee Cipd has ever convened for a text amendment. We kicked that those meetings off in March of 2018, and these were public meetings. And we also put together a website at that time where we announced the upcoming meetings if people wanted to come, and also preserve an archive of all the discussions we've had at those meetings and all the presentations given. Also since March 2018, we've presented to now about 55 registered neighborhood organizations and other community groups throughout the city. In August of 2018, we held a public open house to review and discuss the problem statements that the advisory committee and project team had had analyzed. During that first half year or so of the project. And then in early 2020, we held for public open houses around the city to to present the proposed amendments in response to those problem statements, answer questions and take feedback from the community. In August, we went to the planning board, which unanimously recommended approval of these amendments. We then came to the alluding committee in September and the slide shows that process and we'll read through every single one of these. But as you can see, we we held seven full meetings of the committee to really dove into not just these text amendments, but a lot of the the external issues that are related to this project, including former Chapter 59 enforcement, that sort of thing. The in their recommendation of approval, the planning board did recommend two conditions. One of those was that CPD do post-adoption monitoring of these amend

ments to ensure that we are meeting the goals that we set out within the project and not having any negative unintended consequences, especially in areas vulnerable to displacement. And and we we certainly agree and have already begun that work in the background updating the SLA system that we use for our land use information management so that new permitting data will be generating the data that we need as a project team to continue monitoring these outcomes in future years. And we're committed to reporting back to City Council and Planning Board for at least four years post-adoption. The the planning board also recommended community meetings for community corrections facilities in low intensity residential districts. During the committee process that proposal, we ultimately revised the amendments to not allow community corrections in those districts. So that's no longer a relevant condition. And then, Lou, he can be considered the revised version of these text amendments on December 22nd and unanimously recommended sending it to city council for a final vote. Just to summarize some of the outreach I did mentioned we had one problem statement workshop and for open houses to go through the proposed solutions which had more than a thousand attendees across all of those meetings. Many meetings with community organizations. 36 meetings of our Volunteer Advisory Committee. Throughout the process, we've sent out 26 newsletters to all RINO's and Councilmembers and other stakeholders making people aware of this project. And we've also been featured now in more than 20 media articles about the project. And I already talked a little bit about the advisory committee, which we pulled together, really seeking people that had the lived and or work experience with all aspects of the zoning code. This slide attempts to visualize geographically where we've done some of the outreach. Again, we offered presentations to all around OWS in the spring of 2020 and about 55 of them took us up on that. And you can see that here as reflected in the blue dots. And then we also held our open

houses in essentially all four quadrants of the city to make sure that people had a meeting and they could easily get to. Since we first rolled out the proposals in early 2020 and made a couple of major revisions both in May 2020 and again at Luti in December, we received thousands of comments and, and petitions about this project. The majority of the opinions expressed, especially in some of the petitions we've received, have been in opposition. And I will just note that a lot of the changes that we made during the LUDI process and that I highlighted a few slides back thought to address many of those concerns that we heard from , from people during that process. And we in our in the written staff report, you can go through and see full details of how we tried to specifically address all of the concerns that we heard. Quite a few RINO's

have voted and sent letters indicating that they do not support these changes. A few of them are highlighted here and the full record of all comments received is on our project website and has also been provided to City Council and is on the star page for this item as well. We've also had more than 40 community groups and RINO's indicate that they support these amendments as well. And you can see a list of a few of them here. It's not a neither of these are exhaustive list. But again, the staff report details some of the organizations that have reached out. So text amendments in the Denver zoning code are required to be consistent with our adopted plans and must further the public health, safety and welfare and result in the uniformity of district regulations and restrictions. These are the criteria from the Denver Zoning Code. These text amendments would advance two key vision elements of the Denver Comprehensive Plan. Equitable and Affordable. Equitable, affordable and inclusive housing. By implementing city policies for the creation of a complete range of housing options in every neighborhood so anybody can live in the neighborhood they choose. Programs that help individuals and families, especially those who are vulnerable to displacement, seek flexible options to reduce housing costs and ensure that flexible housing options exist to meet the needs of all residents . These amendments also advance the strong and authentic neighborhoods vision element by expanding outreach. We are proposing a new upfront community meeting requirement that would give neighbors the opportunity with mailed notification to two neighbors and renters and businesses of the opportunity to learn about the potential operators that are proposing a residential care use in their neighborhood. These amendments also implement the blueprint. Denver are integrated land use and transportation plan. I'll just highlight a few of the strategies that these amendments advance, but you can find more detail on that in the full staff report. They would ensure that our land use regulations support modern or equitable approach approaches to housing options. They would accomplish a blueprint strategy of providing a more inclusive definition of households by allowing people to live with chosen family members in the households of their choice. It would expand the allowance for different flexible and affordable housing types and was developed through a robust and inclusive community process that I detailed in the previous slides. It would also they're also consistent with the guidance set forth in the blueprint equity concepts that are shown at the top of this slide. These amendments would expand flexible housing opportunities citywide and enable providers to increase the range of housing options that they provide so that people of all life circumstances can have access to daily needs like health care and transit. So improving the or advancing the vision element of

improving access to opportunity. They would help reduce vulnerability to displacement by allowing people to choose how they want to live without fear that their housing is in zoning or in violation of zoning. And they would expand housing diversity by allowing for creative, new and reemerging housing types like single room occupancy, co-living and other approaches, of course, subject to our existing building and safety regulations. Finally, these amendments would advance policies in housing and inclusive Denver, including expanding options for residents who are experiencing homelessness by expanding the flexibility for shelters, especially for operators to offer a continuum of housing types on one site. And they would allow for the evolution of models of residential care and housing. These amendments would further the public health, safety and welfare by implementing adopted policies for enabling more housing options for all populations, removing barriers for obtaining legal and safe housing, rectifying discriminatory zoning codes, and by creating more predictable, transparent city processes. And they would result in the uniformity of district regulations and restrictions. Essentially, by establishing processes and regulations for residential uses that are uniform within each zoned district in which those uses are allowed. So with that, our

staff recommends that City Council adopt this text amendment based on a finding that all review criteria have been met. And I'm happy to answer any questions. As we go through testimony. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Andrew and Laura and Britta. Tonight, council has received 1143 written comments on Council Bill 20, Dash zero eight. There are 619 submitted comments in favor of the application and 524 submitted comments in opposition of the application. All members of Council that are present have certified that they have read each of the submitted written comments. Do any members of Council need more time to read over all of the written testimony that was submitted? All right. See? None. Council secretary let the record reflect that all written testimony, both in favor and in opposition of Council Bill 888 has been read by each member of Council and all written testimony will be submitted to the official record of the hearing. Tonight, we have 150 individuals signed up to speak this evening, and we're going to go ahead and get started. And I'd like to remind folks that if you don't need the entire 3 minutes, you're not required to use it. And so you can just wrap up your comments and say thank you, and then we'll go ahead and move on to the next speaker so that we can get folks home at some point, either tonight or early this morning. And so we're going to go ahead and kick this off. And our first speaker is Kristin McArthur. Hi, my name's Kristen McArthur and I'm a resident of District Six. First, I want to thank the City Council for your service in my leadership roles, both professional and volunteer. I f

ace the struggles of making good decisions and I know that the solutions to problems often come with winners and losers. That's also the case with these zoning changes that I propose that they leave way too many people losing. When I bought my home, I chose it with the zoning protections in place that not only made it a safe home for me, but that preserved its market value. Like many people, my home is my most significant investment, and I'm too close to retirement to recover from a sudden loss of value due to the zoning changes you're proposing. We all want people. We all want to help people experiencing challenges. But we must also be realistic about their struggles and abilities to overcome them. The City Council has not been forthcoming with the truth about the negative implications of this group living community corrections and residential care facilities that currently exist in the city. While there are a few notable exceptions, the vast majority of these facilities are rundown and have alarming numbers of police calls. And it's critical that we don't lose sight of the impact to school kids of removing school setbacks. They were put in place for a reason and are needed to protect our children. In summary, the proposed zoning changes both to our residential neighborhoods and by removing the protection of school setbacks, will be very detrimental to all the residents in the communities losing those protections. Please don't make our communities and our children the losers in your solution. Please go back to the drawing board and find a solution that helps the people who need it without harming so many others. Thank you for allowing me the time to speak. Thank you. Our next speaker is Mary Claude Coddington. My name is Mary Coddington, speaking today on behalf of the Neighborhood Development Collaborative in cities with similar policies to the one proposed within the group amendments. The fears of double doubling density, falling property values and parking problems haven't come to pass. Most homes still have just over two people, as has been the case for decades. And Denver's really far behind most cities when it comes to common sense group living policies, expansion of areas where residential care facilities are allowed, and the expansion of where community corrections facilities are allowed really needs to happen. The community corrections facilities are designed to get people on their feet and to reconnect with society. But this is undercut if their facilities are still segregated from. Most of our. Communities. In D.C. supports the expansion of allow locations for community corrections facilities and really looks forward to a future in which Denver bases all of its zoning choices on the characteristics of the built environment instead of the characteristics of its residents. The lack of adequate rehousing options for people exiting the criminal justice system is one of the key reasons for recidivism, which is counter to the very intent of

the community corrections facilities. Organizationally, most members of DC will not be directly impacted by these changes. But the mission of increasing affordability to ensure Denver can be a city for all will be negatively infected and affected if you vote against these proposed changes. And then on a personal note, I have lived experience living in a household of five adults. We were a teacher, a school librarian, a flight attendant, a personal trainer and a tech employee. And every year we would go Christmas tree shopping and decorate our tree together. We would have family dinners. And among the five of us, we had two cars. We did serve as a family for one another, and I

stauchly believe it's not the role of government to define what a family is. Unfortunately, the proposed amendments that they've as they've been changed, so do define family. But at least they're offering a more expansive definition. Please vote to approve these changes. And thank you so much for your time and for your work. Thank you. Our next speaker is Christy McCarrick. Or you can correct my pronunciation of your last name. Thank you, Counsel Gilmore. Councilwoman Gilmore. Thank you, Counsel, for allowing me to speak in opposition of this proposed amendment. My name is Christy McCarrick. I'm a Denver resident, a Denver public schools educator, a mother to a student who attends Denver Public Schools, and a volunteer who is committed to volunteerism within Denver communities to help make Denver an exceptional place to live. The amendment you are about to vote on lacks clarity and equity in many areas. If this amendment is passed, as is, our city will move down a path we cannot turn back from. There are no take backs. Your vote tonight is much more far reaching than current debate represents one of the individual areas of concern in this amendment school buffer zones, strip search of the most basic considerations for their safety. Our children deserve clearly understood and well-defined buffer zones for all our schools. This amendment has lacked clarity of purpose and equitable authorship from its creation with undefined implementation and oversight. Please Council members hear my words tonight, especially when I say being held accountable may feel like an attack. If you're not ready to acknowledge how this decision will affect the community fabric of all who live in Denver. Please make the best decision. Denver, which is a no vote on this housing amendment. Please help us to remember you as the City Council who cares about everyone's choices, safety and quality of life. Thank you for your time tonight. Thank you. Next up, we have Jonathan Petticoat. Yes. Good evening, councilors. John for Tokyo District three. Tonight you've heard, and I'm sure we'll continue to hear the many benefits of reducing restrictions on group living in Denver. Even the most current proposal continues to discriminate. You'll also certainly hear more regurgitation of unfounded claims about drastic

negative impacts. His proposal will have given that I'm not going to spend my time countering those points. Rather, I'd like to address to 11th hour modifications made by the Land Use Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. To be clear, even before these two modifications were made, the Sixth Amendment did not do enough to support vulnerable members of our communities in Denver. But I called them out for their particularly disastrous impact on the project's goals, as well as the fact that they've been wedged in without any sound reasoning to support them. The modifications in question are one. Capping the number of adults allowed to live together regardless of residential units, size and two permitting type two residential uses only on parcels previously used for civic, public and institutional structures. Both of these proposed modifications derail this multi-year project from meeting its core goal of enabling more inclusive communities and avoiding harm to vulnerable residents. On the first, I take issue with disallowing more residents, even as unit sizes were larger. Much of the opposition to large household sizes has centered around the concept of preventing overcrowded homes, and the term overcrowded is regularly misused by detractors. But if we accept it and follow the same logic. A large home should have room for more people. There are existing co-ops in Denver today that have more than five residents in sufficiently large homes, and they will not be protected if the test amendment passes as it stands. That means that if it passes, we know that good, upstanding citizens in our community will continue tomorrow to live in fear despite all of the work put into this project. Simply the notion that a 600 square foot property should be treated the same as a 3600 square foot property is patently absurd. Larger properties must allow more residents on the second modification. Limiting facilities to only existing civic or institutional buildings does not support and is not supported by any of the stated goals of the project. At the same time, while excluding this new provision does no harm to the project's aims, adding the requirement could do harm to the project's outcome. This provision would limit the supply of available lots and properties for these community enhancing residential care uses, which will increase the cost of providing these services. Further, it places community serving organizations at odds with one another. If former churches and civic institutions largely represent the few places where these new residential care uses can sprout up is essential. Third, places in our city will face pressure to close or sell to residential care groups would themselves seek to serve our neighbors with unique needs. If only existing buildings can transition to residential care, we are binding the quality of life of our current and future residents to the needs of residents who live far in our past. We cannot build for the present reality of

Denver if we rely on reusing spaces designed for a different era. Thank you for your time. I urge you to remove these two modifications before a final vote progresses. Then please pass this text amendment for the betterment of our community. Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan. And our next speaker, we only have Kay is the first name and D as the last name. So if you are in the attendees, if you wouldn't mind raising your hand, we can get you promoted into the panelist. And so we'll go ahead and. Give it a second. Right. If you can't get to your phone right now, if you go ahead and raise your hand, we'll try to get you up into the queue. Our next speaker is Kevin MATTHEWS. Hi. My name is Kevin MATTHEWS, and I live in the Congress Park neighborhood. I'm also with the NB Denver, but tonight I'm speaking on my own behalf as a homeowner, a husband and a father who is just trying to raise this kid. Right. Firstly, I think you really screwed this up. He took a well thought out and researched design proposal that was already a compromise. And your budget that the current proposal will break up families and I won't let you pretend that that is not what you are doing just because some of you some of them don't care, but you should amend it and fix it before passage. Only a couple of weeks after Donald Trump has left office, we can't shake the stench of the politics of Trumpism, of hate and division. Of course, the undercurrent was there before he came into office, but were really surprised. Me is how many of you have failed to recognize the significance of this moment? Politically, this should be slam dunk for a few of you. Sure, the opposition is loud and strong, but they have to be. There just aren't a lot of them. People are still talking about what happened in D.C. just a few weeks ago and why did so many Ryan do what they did? I'm sorry to say the answer is simple. For those people their entire lives, the only way they could feel good about themselves is by stomping on someone else. As Adam Suhr recently wrote, the cruelty is the point. It's the rejoicing in the suffering of those that they hate and fear and sorry. But that's what opposition to group living and residential care is really about. It's not about property values. I live in Congress Park. We have group homes already and there are two residential care facilities, a walkable distance from my home. One of them is a community corrections facility. You should come see my property values. No. This is about some people's need to exert dominance over people that they feel are lesser than them. For those of you are still patting yourselves on your back for your current station in life, you should understand that you didn't arrive where you were are today because you made good choices. You got there because you had good choices. At the Capitol. Many police officers were very badly injured and some have died. Who knows how quiet the Blue Lives Matter crowd had been, though, because blue lives was never a

bout mattering. It was code saying The Black Lives don't. People who want to feel. Free to speak to the topic of the hearing. The group Living Amendments. Yes. So people who want to feel safe and sound don't really want to feel safe and sound. They want you to take a tool away from them that they can use to terrorize their neighbors who they think are lesser than them. If this proposal passes, that's really the only thing that changes from the status quo. Thanks. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you. Our next speaker is Tanya Wilson. I was wondering why it was on screen all of a sudden. Thank you so much for your time this evening. Just trying to get my note up. I'm here to ask you to vote no on the group living proposal. I submitted my final letter this morning. So you didn't get it in that packet from CPD, but it should have come through your email. I ask if you do believe that this proposal as written is the best possible solution for your situation. If you're thinking about voting yes because so much time has been invested in the process already, then I urge you to vote no. Four years of city planning time is a sunk cost at this point, and many of you have noted that CPD didn't do such a great job with this proposal. The work it's done lately to attempt to salvage this has resulted in this bloated and convoluted 200 plus page document of detailed text amendments most people haven't read. And I believe that Denver residents deserve better from their government. If you're thinking about voting yes because you believe the city can quickly come up with a solution for that inequitable Chapter 59 issue, then I urge you to vote no. Ten years have passed since the city has started, has been operating under two zoning codes, and an estimate from five years ago showed it would take two and a half years and over \$500,000 to fix the issue. Just last week, CPD confirmed that it has no plan and no dedicated funds to address the issue. Plus, as we know, the city is in a budget crunch. So how realistic is it that this fix will be a priority any time soon? And if you're thinking about voting yes because you believe this proposal will address housing affordability, then I urge you to vote no. The 2018 charter for the Group Living Advisory Committee specifically stated that issues around housing affordability were not in scope because those issues cannot be resolved in the zoning code. How likely is it, though, that an

unintended consequence of the proposal is less housing stock available for those who want to buy and occupy a single family house while the market is gobbled up by real estate investors intent on converting more houses to rental. To be clear, I'm not opposed to increasing the number of unrelated adults in a unit zoned a single family. I am not opposed to more placements for some residential care and I am not opposed to finding more equitable solutions than the Denver zoning code when I'm opposed to this entire process. The number of issue

s that the proposal attempts to address and a single change in how the city has handled feedback from those who oppose the proposal as written. Now you're in the awkward position of having to vote on sloppy work that doesn't meet the needs nor wants of Denver residents. So please do the right thing and vote no on this proposal as it is written. Start fresh. Tackle one issue at a time. Give some breathing space to everyone. And that would be a good first step in mending the divisions that this poorly executed proposal process has created. Thank you for your time and have a good evening. Thank you. Our next speaker is Jason Warnock. But evening. My name is Jason Hornick, and I'm on the board of the Chafee Park Neighborhood Association and Jimmy Denver. And I'm a new father. So I did everything right and I played by the rules. I worked hard and I saved up my money to buy a house in Denver, a house that cost literally four times as much as it did 20 years ago when the previous generations bought their homes. Since I played by the rules, why shouldn't I be able to choose what I get to do with my own property? My house is my biggest financial asset and the zoning code should protect my financial interests by allowing me to rent out my spare bedrooms to roommates. This would help me pay for my mortgage while also providing affordable housing. It's a win win. Why should the government limit my freedom to help others? As long as I'm not violating any health, safety or nuisance ordinances, I'm not looking to host a circus on my property. I just want to have roommates that I'm not related to. Okay. So the truth is, I neither want nor need to rent out my extra bedrooms. I was just trying to make a point by co-opting the self-interested language of the opposition, I'm lucky to be in a stable enough position to afford my mortgage. However, I do remember what it was like to not have this financial stability and to need to pool my resources with others in order to get by in this increasingly expensive city. If I wasn't able to live with multiple roommates in my younger days, there's no way I would have been able to then able to gain a foothold in this economy, and I wouldn't be in the fortunate position that I'm in today. So even though I won't personally benefit from this code change, I understand that maintaining a discriminatory status quo is worse than whatever theoretical problems might come from the change. And those problems are theoretical, especially compared to the very real problems that our current code creates for people with far greater worries than the appreciation of their property value. I should also mention that I live within walking distance of two community corrections facilities and my property value is still going up. If those facilities are good enough for some neighborhoods, then they're good enough for all neighborhoods. As far as compromises made to this bill and Ludy, I'm afraid that an effort to satiate the bigoted fears of some peop

le in this city, the committee has ruined the original intent of the legislation, which was to remove discrimination from our zoning code instead of compromising on the nuts and bolts, you threw out the original purpose and chose to maintain discriminatory language. Choosing to allow less discrimination is not a compromise. It's a surrender. There's no have position on discrimination. Discrimination condone is still discrimination. There's no half position. And bigotry. Bigotry condoned is still bigotry. This watered down version that maintains our codes unenforceable and unconstitutional attempts to legislate with whom we are allowed to live with based on genetics is bad and lazy governance. But this is where we are, so I urge you to vote on it anyway. We shouldn't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. If you're on the fence about this, please remember that you're going to upset half your constituency anyway, so you might as well vote for your with your conscience. Thanks a lot, guys. Have a good night. Thank you, Jason. Our next speaker is Bill Tanner. Bill. You might have to commute. There you go. Yeah. Okay. Can you hear me now? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Thank you very much. I appreciate the time. I want to start off by thanking everybody for all the work that they've done on this, particularly all members of the council and particularly Andrew Webb. I hope you give him a long summer vacation warmer than normal. He's certainly earned it through all the meetings that he's had in my community, which I'm going to speak to, is how my community voted on this rather than an individual vote. We did a survey. The survey was conducted among residents who had read Andrew Webb's proposal. We actually attached that

to the survey, and 82% read that and 94% had read a variety of different. Media topics on the subject in terms of voting, the majority voted against both the expanding the number of people that would be able to live in an individual house and also against the residential zoning issue. I want to let you know that we actually do have in the neighborhood two residential zoning facilities and they work very well in the neighborhood. So most of the discussion was not about facilities like the memory care facility that's in the neighborhood or about an assisted living facility. But we're concerned about the homeless shelters and community corrections, which I think is pretty consistent across the city. We asked people about their concerns, and there were just three or four things that they said, I think, that are key and that I would ask you to take a look at before voting for this amendment. One is, is that the zoning remains inequitable. I think people who are both for and against this have pointed that out. And I think that that's a very frustrating thing. I understood that it's necessary to remove askew to you and our age 2.5. From designing consideration. But again, that just perpetuates the inequity that you are trying to resolve for in t

he beginning. There seemed to be a lack of permitting and oversight requirements. I would ask you to take another look at those. It's a little bit difficult to argue with people who have experience living near facilities like these and have had problems. Call 311 and not have had the issues resolved. Thank you for your time and good voting. Thank you. Next up, we have Joseph Spaulding. I. So it just is kind of a big surprise to me to learn that Full House was set in Denver eventually would get evicted. That's kind of weird. Now that most good rock bands probably would have a hard time performing there because that type of living situation is a group living situation, my group living experience. So tells me that something tells me that houses are going to be better cared for. You just have a better, more skill set to take care of problems that come on internally inside of the house and externally. And there's a lot of encouragement from folks internally inside the household to make sure that those things are are kept up to par. I did want to tell counsel to council generally that like we stated previously, you're going to anger quite a bit of your constituents on this no matter what. You might as well be on the right side of history. If we look across the country, there are cities doing things like ending single family zoning outright like Berkeley is working on right now, or parking minimums that they just ended. The reality is we're dealing with the legacy of segregation and zoning laws in every major metropolitan area in this country. And every city has to carry their weight when it comes to fixing these types of things. It's very disappointing to see a process happen where an honest attempt at addressing that very real, very existing segregation. Remember, racial covenants were legal to be enforced back until 1960. Up until 1969, we're talking about, you know, stuff that that a lot of folks can remember, you know, black people who couldn't can remember not being able to live in specific places because of the covenants on those homes. And now we're trying to dissect and bisect on black families. Denver has a real opportunity to open this up by undoing the damage of those amendments that happened in the process and coming back and passing this this amendment as written originally. And I do want to talk about that process specifically, because I do agree that this bill was this this tight, this man was needlessly watered down. And it's you know, frankly, anyone who is familiar with any type of city council process and they learn about the city of Denver and how entrenched the neighborhood organizations are and how there's no access to city council. But through them, it really, really shows how much of a lopsided influence the people who own versus the people who rent in the city have. So I do want city council to walk away from this knowing that they're going to have people that have their backs who know that they're fighting segregation . An

d we are going to scream very, very loudly that you are helping us like and this abomination, this legacy of historic racism in this country or, you know, we're going to do the other go the other way. So things have become. Thank you. Our next speaker is Donna Krentz. Good evening. My name is Don Occurrence City of Denver. My letter was submitted by email to council today. It was not included in the package. Group Living Zoning Amendment is one massive, unproven urban social experiment with the mayor. CPD G lack and a few council members want to impose on all of Denver. And in spite of the growing opposition, the pledge of a public servant takes should be defined by the Hippocratic Oath. First, do no harm. The amendment is a mayor's and a few council members a way of shifting major burdens of the city in the shoulders of residents into stable, single family neighborhoods. CPD in a stacked and biased du Lac, failed to create creative solutions to the problems that face Denver. Even the g LAC Charter States Zoning will not resolve affordability.

Simply put, the amendment will not make purchasing a home more affordable and instead promotes renting. Not owning the most current changes to the amendment are insufficient and do not go far enough to protect law abiding citizens who have made significant sacrifices to live in safe, stable neighborhoods and who have invested a lifetime in their homes and communities without further changes to the amendment. And should it pass, the city should prepare for people to flee to safer refuge as the city goes in decay, similar to the flight from cities to suburbs in the fifties and sixties. Look no further than what happened in the last 60 years in the cities of Buffalo, my hometown, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Chicago and the like. People with the means to do so fled to the suburbs while the criminal elements stayed and those with less could not escape. Many of the cities of those cities have been plagued with crime for decades, overrun with drugs, gangs and turf wars. However, this time, swing urbanites will not return to Denver to live. There will be little need to do so because technology and the rise of telecommuting is going on. It is happening right now across the city, prompted by COVID 19 impacts. Urbanites are moving to the suburbs and leaving the growing issues of cities behind them and there is no going back. Overall, the amendment will serve to destabilize existing, stable neighborhoods. Denver will evolve into a landlord's paradise, just like New York City, where only the wealthy will be able to afford to own property as the middle and lower income classes are squeezed out. The remaining population will be struggling, renters that cannot escape and the criminals that will prey on them. I urge responsible council members to show political courage and resolve in the face of adversity. And vote no on this amendment. Save our city. Thank you for your time and consideration. Q Our next speaker up is

Kiara Jackson. Hello. Can you guys hear me okay? Mm hmm. Go ahead, Kira. Okay. Perfect. Um, my name is Karen Jackson, and I'm just here as a lifelong resident of Montebello, which is in District 11. And I'm asking you all to vote yes in favor of the amendment. I thought about sharing my story about being a young professional, having to work multiple jobs and still not being able to afford a mortgage on my own. But instead, I want to share some stories of my neighbors who could not be here. You know, I feel like everyone is now really familiar with the talking points commonly used to advocate for this ordinance. Um, you know, that will help people see how it'll help move the city towards more equitable zoning rules, etc.. But I think often it's easy to read and hear these talking points, but forget the context behind them, the stories behind them. And so I want to bring you real stories that my friend Myra Gonzalez and I have been trusted with. Well, we're keen to educate and gather support for this ordinance. Over the last couple of months. Um, well, I wish they were here to share this themselves. The nastiness, devoid of compassion or understanding surrounding this topic, has made them fearful to speak publicly. Um, and I hope that when you review the signatures that we've shared, you think of these stories. So the first story is one of our neighbors that lives with her significant other and another couple. They are barely able to afford that mortgage, that that shared mortgage they basically rented together without the other couple that's that the rooming with they have recently been able to go into this house from living within their car and have a baby on the way, but are now in fear of the neighbors calling and reporting on them , forcing them back onto the street, forcing them back into their car, forcing them back into a situation that they've so desperately and so have worked so hard to get out of. Another one of our neighbors who has a really large family, is fearful again of their neighbors supporting them because they would assume she breaking the group living ordinance and the danger that puts her family and as undocumented peoples. I just want to highlight to everybody that this issue is bigger than fighting over cars parked along your street. These are our neighbors and these are only two stories. But I have lost count of how many times I had heard these very stories told in fellow in Spring Valley and Central Park on the West Side and all over Denver. And I use the word excuse me. I use the words our neighbors deliberately. These are our neighbors. Please vote yes in support of this group Living Amendment, even though it's watered down. We need to start somewhere. Somewhere. We need a support system. Start supporting all of our neighbors, even the ones that don't look like us. Thank you. Thank you. The next speaker is Steve. Well. Hi. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Thank you. Mm hmm. Thank you, counsel, for allowing me to speak

against this amendment. I'm Steve. While I live in Cap Hill, where I grew up. News reports suggest that this initiative was introduced by the corrections industry and other businesses pushing for group homes regardless of impact. Let's be clear. While improving services and housing is a good

thing, it is bad to do it at the cost of ruining our stable neighborhoods. The amendment does not address unintended consequences. Ironically, although I am a businessman, I oppose this form of group density that promotes the destruction of community despite its pretense of social justice. Allowing the mass conversion of private homes into income property is bad investors. Investors. Will buy more previously privately owned homes, same as Wall Street did after the oh nine meltdown. Why is that bad? Because it makes it harder for folks and first time owners to buy homes. We as a society. Prefer more. Private home ownership or rentals. As a third generation Dem right. I'm also a historic preservationist and board member of historic Denver LoDo Design Commission and my neighborhood association. The history of Cap Hill is that formerly single family homes became boarding houses or worse. Most converted homes are investment properties owned by absentee owners, which are badly, which age badly, and create lasting blight with more crime. Distressed areas, encourage work in the suburbs, allowing group density to monetize every room in every house will result in the same. Who among us bought our homes as income property? I bought my house for quality of life, not a business. The irony is that this social engineering adversely impacts all individuals property rights. The unintended consequences far outweigh the benefits. There is already too much demand on infrastructure in many areas to support a massive increase in density. Try parking in my neighborhood after 6 p.m.. Try navigating the streets, alleys overflow with trash. Furthermore, it will monetize single family homes. Making individuals compete with Wall Street. Allowing every bedroom to be rented will create income property that will discourage and compete with individuals for homeownership. If you like the boarding house model that ruined Capitol Hill in the postwar years, you will love the density initiative. Cramming more people into already dense areas has unintended consequences. It's one thing to allow a few unrelated people to share homes, but not five, ten or 15. Also, do not allow this to be a cash cow business model, encouraging investors to buy up all the housing stock. It's one thing for a homeowner to share their home, but another for absentee owners to buy more homes. Vote no. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Chris Applegate. Hi, this is Chris Applegate. I'm at 1289 South Raritan Street in Council District seven. I've actually. Just moved to this neighborhood. Park and I have been a former resident in councilmember tourist district for the last six years, until recently moving this past

week and a half. But I wanted to. I wanted to share that. I'm I guess. I would love for you all to vote yes on this group. Understanding change. As someone who considers myself like one of these folks that have moved to the city in 2013, I guess I'm hearing a lot from folks, some of. The opposing sides that. I'm not welcomed here and I'm a I'm a white dude and I can only imagine what it's like for people of color feel even less welcome in this city. I'm a millennial. I had to pay \$145,000 on my student loans, eight year, almost nine years to get them paid off. And I feel like I'm so far behind, I'm a human being purchased a home that I've thought about. Maybe there's a way to do co-housing of sharing a home with someone. Because if you want to live in the city of Denver and you're not rich, you're not elite, you're not super privileged, then you're going to need a lot more money. I even look at the salaries of the council members and I'm like, I don't know if that's enough to buy a place, you know, if that was your starting salary, you had to start saving today for a home. Sit down. It's it's unreal. Uh, um, I just think that we the key word that I'd change would do that. It is a compromise. It's not perfect. No, sir. Any change will ever be perfect. But I appreciate the effort that has been put in, and I would really hope that we add that flexibility into our housing crisis that we have in our city. We have folks living on the streets and we have the city did vote yes on the \$40 million last November. And that's another tool in the toolbox. Every tool we need, all of them, as many as possible to ensure that we build an equitable and inclusive city. I saw what Lakewood did about a year and a half ago with their vote on restricting building of housing. And I don't want Denver to be kind of lumped into that bucket. We've had four years of Donald Trump. He wanted to build walls. I think Denver is slowly taking down their walls to build a more inclusive city. So I hope that we can ensure that we are building that inclusive city of the future and providing more tools for that. Thank you all so much. And please vote yes. Thank you, Chris. Up next, we have Lynne crazy. And when you might have to a new. I didn't see that. Can you hear me now? Go ahead, please. Yes. I'm urging you to vote no. I'm not sure why I'm supposed to suffer financially and my quality of life, because as featured in Sunday's Denver Post, a graduate from a private school who came from out of state can afford to live in my neighborhood, the one that I saved to buy into but wants the zoning change so we should accommodate those young person from maybe California where most people are coming from so he can live with his friends. Some of us had actually moved back in with our

parents or we rented apartments or other things and didn't ask people to have a zoning change that affected other people's equity in their homes. I think you're kidding yourselves. If you think increasing the number

of unrelated people cramming into houses will make for a safe, clean neighborhood. Do you really think putting four five unrelated people with all the cars and noise is an environment that supports safety. How many pitbulls will they have? Do you want your kids living next door to this situation? Mark my words in just a few words. In just a few years, Denver will be grossly overpopulated. Remember, we already have water shortages. The streets, alleys, front yards will be full of vehicles. We won't even be able to see the green spaces. They'll be trashed out yards in. The hard working people will move, leaving the mess behind. It's been done before. It's called White Flight. And you created it. Thank you. Vote now. Thank you. Our next speaker is Chris Miller. Hi, I'm Chris Miller. I live in the Sphere neighborhood along with 10,000 other residents in District seven. I'm here to speak in support of group living changes and to ask that the limit of five residents be allowed to increase with the size of the dwelling units. Now, I can speak in front of Denver City Council tonight as a millennial homeowner, one who's worked hard but has also been graced with many advantages. That privilege enables my voice and my liberty to be here. I know that my story is not one that is very broadly shared in the way that it should be. Well, we may not hear. Tonight is the stories of those who have less voice and less liberty, those who've been forced out or priced out of Denver because we have made housing options unavailable to them. Our liberties and the policies we have and what we enforce, it plays out. And who can and who can't live here. We as a city have curtailed liberty for decades. We've lost the stories of so many people. We perhaps can't get those people back, but we can make Denver a home for more stories in the future. Now I can't or won't speak to what those who have left, what they might have wanted for themselves and their choices. But I will speak for their liberty to choose what they would have wanted because we can't know. Liberty is messy, but it always has been a worthwhile goal in and of itself. And part of our nation's founding principle is that we should continually move in that direction. Moving towards greater liberty won't mandate how you get around or what dwelling you choose to live in. It just makes it possible for others to change their own circumstances as they see fit. Liberty. Liberty allows for those who want to share a house because they're concerned about climate change to take their individual actions, reduce their carbon emissions. Liberty allows for people to save up for a down payment. Liberty allows people to choose their family and their community. To conclude, I. Encourage you to choose the bold. But noble choice of more liberty and more housing flexibility. Our community, our city and our planet depend on it. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Richard says. You might need to meet Richard. Okay. Hi, I'm rich site.

I live in district two, Kevin Quinn's district, and I am here tonight to ask you to vote no on live in the amendment. I wish that the adults component would have been separated from the community corrections and residential care components of this amendment. And maybe you can at some point at any rate, I'm asking you to vote no. I feel that the way this amendment has been developed has been developed in a way to benefit some very specific groups. The three groups we're talking about, primarily the unrelated adults that want to live in a home together, people in community corrections and homeless people and other groups that are in residential care. And I feel that very little time has been spent on how this amendment will or can benefit the majority of people who live in Denver. And I think that this amendment is unfairly asking the majority of Denver residents to assume a lot of risk. Risk to their quality of life. Risk to their safety. And risk to their financial status. We know in southwest Denver, where we have the Sanderson Gulch apartment, that the quality of life has been impacted negatively for businesses and neighbors surrounding that facility. You know, that facility is I think it's a well-run facility. We have a lot of issues with that facility and its negative impact on the neighbors and businesses. So much so that tourism, Mexican food across the street had to reduce its hours because visitors to that facility were harassing the people, the restaurants, customers. A safety issue affects safety for people surrounding community corrections facilities, and I think homeless shelters do. We know that there are some dangerous elements in living in community corrections facilities. That's why they're there. They're not there because they were doing everything right. They're trying to get things right, trying to live better. But there are a lot that are not doing the right things and can't do the right thing. Any little thing can set them off. And I think that presents a safety concern. We would ask that you please stay on the topic of the hearings or.

Well, community corrections is a big part of this topic. And lastly, I'd say financially. Studies have shown that any home that is within 500 feet of a community corrections facility or homeless shelters does experience a significant drop in their value. And I think the city council should consider that. Thank you. Our next speaker tonight is David Pardo. Hello? You guys, can you hear me? Go ahead. Thank you. My name is David Pardo. I am currently a resident of District one Radio. For six and a half years, I lived in District nine. I actually know and have spoken one on one with six out of the 13 of you. So I like to think that some of you guys actually know me. There are some things you may not know about me, though. In addition to now, currently serving on an advisory committee for the city government and now working for one of the developers here in town, having done a whole bunch of other

interesting things here. When I was 19, I made some poor choices and. Pretty much only because I'm a white dude did I not end up in prison a year later after having. Made some changes in my life. I took a job in a city I had never lived in before. And. I ended up fighting forest fires, which was great, but I made almost no money for the first half of that summer, and I was homeless, sleeping on someone's front lawn. In between those two things, I ended up living in a group home where I ended up working on the issues that I'd had when when I was 19. And right now, today, I'm somebody who can. Speak directly if I want to by text or by Facebook message to multiple members of the City Council. People who end up in community corrections. People who end up in group homes. People who end up living in a house where there are more people than is normally allowed per the city law, like I was when I lived in Boulder seven or eight years ago. We aren't bad people. We are people who deserve to have a chance to live in the communities of this city. We are people who matter and who are the future of this city. Every child that somebody who is against this talks about could grow up to be somebody like me. They could have things that go wrong in their life. They could need to find a place that's inexpensive to live. They may not be able to afford to live on their own. I am blessed to be able to do right now. And because of that, I really ask not only that you pass this, but that it is in addition to passing it, that you change these a few parts of this, most particularly that you're treating a 600 square foot home, the same as a 6000 square foot home in Bel Caro. That can easily accommodate a dozen adults safely and in a healthy manner. Of not. Thank you for your time. And I once again urge you to vote yes. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Anna McCaffrey. Hi. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead, Anna. Hi. I'm Anna, and I live in my. Congress park home for 18 years. I'm actually a Denver native. I've lived outside of the state enough to know that about living. Conditions that we don't want here in Denver. We don't want to be Seattle. Or Portland or any other overcrowded. Unregulated city. Changes need to be made, but we need to be more inclusive in the planning with. Thought out. Answers for future consequences to these programs. I work with low income and underprivileged. Citizens every day, and I'm presently working on the rent assistance program, so I fully understand the need. I'm so disappointed in the city council who dismissed the survey because too many people over the age of 36 replied. He said those. Respondents were overrepresented. Overrepresented. Isn't it the job of city. Council to represent all of us? Everyone in this city is important. Every single person. The three categories Group Living Home, Homeless, Shelters and corrections need to be separated and rewritten with more regulation and more oversight work done to prevent or prevent nega

tive quality of life issues. Five occupants in a group living home all have friends who all have cars. People who live have to live next door to a 24 seven frat house like. The nightmare that I have to live. Next door to for two years. When the four people on the lease who had ten people living there and 15 cars turned their. Garage into a strip club that opened. Up after the bars closed. Every night. I heard that noise every single night and no. One would help me. No one. And that was what? It was. Illegal. Everyone will lose the quality of life and the quiet enjoyment that everyone deserves when you have. To live next door to this. Senior citizens have totally been left out. They need. Services. The ability to get medical and daily care and maintenance services to their homes and themselves when access to their priced properties is removed by overcrowded overcrowding and non-existent parking will make it impossible for seniors to stay, stay safe and in place. These areas were originally designed for single families with three cars at maximum. Cars have to go somewhere. If the providers can't give to the seniors. They will bypass. Them. This is very disrespectful to senior citizens. In addition to all this, there's no guarantee of affordable housing. You say it's. Against the Colorado Constitution to force. Developers to build affordable housing.

Well, why aren't we working on changing that? It's just it was poorly written. The committee that Put the b the proposal. Together was stacked. With people. That stand to benefit from this. We're not afraid of change. The people that have worked to help you change this want to change it, but include everyone. And that includes me who happens to be a person of color. Thank you so much. Please vote no. Our next speaker is Megan Mize. Hello everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to share my comments. My name is Megan Mize and I live in District one in Denver. I would like to voice my support for the resolution to update the group Living Rules. Denver's current legal limit of two unrelated individuals in one household is one of the most restrictive of any metro area in our entire country and is discriminatory, classist and racist at its core. I fully support raising this limit. Like others have said, I do not support the government defining what a family looks like. I recognize that the value. I recognize the value in raising the limit from 2 to 5 unrelated adults. However, I believe that the advisory committee is original recommendation of eight unrelated adults. More fully accommodates the realities of living in an extractive capitalist society that we currently all reside in, and particularly during a global pandemic. I also urge you to allow more than five unrelated adults in residences of a larger size. I do. I also do not support the passing of any amendment that continues to discriminate against community correction residents by separating them from other residential care types. This discrimin

ation against community correction residents does not set them up for success, separating them from transport and job opportunities. This discrimination also perpetuates our current carceral state system. Denver has the opportunity to work to dismantle this discrimination. Right now. As other speakers tonight have said and have pointed out, opponents to these updates are classicists simply trying to predict their own capitalist's financial status that they only achieved based on a racist and extractive system. Denver has an opportunity to move our city towards a more equitable and anti-racist city. Thank you for your time, council members and to all of those organizers who have put in a lot of effort to moving this forward. Thank you. Our next speaker is Steven Benishek. Go ahead. Go. Mm hmm. Go ahead. Okay. So my camera's a little wonky, so it might go in and out, but. So my name is Stephen Bencic. I'm a resident of Denver District six, specifically University Park. And right now I spend about 30% of my monthly income on rent here in Denver. And I'm not unique. In fact, I'm rather fortunate in this way. It's because I have a well-paying job that allows me to work from home uninterrupted during this crisis. However, I know a lot of people in the city are not as lucky as I am. At a time when the Bureau of Labor Statistics projects unemployment in the Denver metro area at around 9%, most of that among minimum wage workers in the service sector who are struggling to afford the cost of living before we desperately need affordable housing in the city and able to continue paying rent even if it might be relatively expensive. However, others in the city are not as lucky as I understand that 30% is on the low side people in Denver. For others it can be 40, 50 and 60% of their monthly income in good times, let alone not without a source of income. The primary reason I'm speaking tonight is because of the people who these changes will truly benefit, but who are not here at this meeting right now. They're working their second or third jobs if they're lucky enough to have those, so they don't have to make the choice between rent, food or other bills. This month, however, this problem is completely avoidable. This current crisis of people in Denver not being able for basic necessities like a place to live is a direct result of the city's outdated and restrictive laws on group living. What worked for the city in 1961 is not working in 2021. We cannot continue with these Jim Crow policies. The Council has a chance to fix this crisis tonight by approving the group Living Amendments, not as initially watered down by committee, but as originally proposed. So for that reason, I urge you to vote yes on these amendments. Thank you for your time. Thank you, Stephen. Next up, we have Lawrence Murray. And we might have to have you unmute, Mr. Murray. All right. There we go. All right, Mr. Murray. All right. Thank you. I'm a resident, district 11. Let the people decide.

But the people decide. My name is Lawrence Murray, and I'm the vice president of the Global Network and a resident of my bellies since 31st December 1982. That was the day I closed on my first and only home. At that time, my wife and I had three young children, ages 4 to 10, to support and being an active duty airforce member at the time. It was a blessing to have a pay back loan to get our house. Both my wife and I work extra jobs at the Old Cop USA and I was a youth sports official. I was a it was a challenge at first between credit cards and a mortgage. But patience and discipline prevailed in the home as hours and hours. A long night. Now, I still remember the

saleslady stating this was a fine choice as a starting home. Funny thing, I could not imagine going through that process a second time. I rely. Excuse me. I relate this story to simply saying things were promised to us and those of us purchased at that time. Things like green lawns, plenty of parking, nice schools, and the company of a newly arriving single family doing what single families do. My person purchasing a single family home with all that implies. Now, 38 years later. The city of Denver has unilaterally decided to change the rules of what it means to own a single family home in Marbella and the entire city, in effect, removing that phrase from our lexicon. They have been well documented and I have no desire to repeat them. The objections that that have been expressed so far. I simply suggest that this issue recanted. And just like the pit bull issue was handled last year. I implore the city council to simply let the people decide and let the people decide this issue. I oppose it wholeheartedly. Thank you, Mr. Murray. Up next, we have one Gutierrez. Good evening. Can even go ahead once. Thank you. My name is Brian Gutierrez. I live in in Denver in the District five neighborhood and work for the city and county of Denver, excuse me, retiring after 34 years of service. I decided to take this time to talk about the system your residents have witnessed during this process, and I will let the others speak on how we will see our city evolve. Investment is approved. For the record, I am opposed. As a city employee, I saw firsthand how, how and why some employees, and most notably politicians, are not held accountable for their actions or misdeeds. And I come to ask you to change that today. Recent Open Records lawsuit revealed much of this about the squad process and how some people on this committee could profit. If the amendment is approved, creating a conflict of interest as well as how 20% of the city under Chapter 59 zoning would be exempt from parts of this amendment. In our most recent elections, we also gave you City Council more oversight over the mayor's office in order to be more efficient, transparent and accountable to its residents. In my opinion, this lawsuit revealed how corrupt this process has been from the very beginning. Not only by Mayor Hancock, but also by some

of the committee members. They did their best to hide as much information as possible from us. Under the guise of knowing what is best for known, what is best for us. I was born in and lived in a communist country and now know too well what it means to live in a government that is not held accountable for its actions. These changes do not happen at the federal level. The seeds are planted at the local level and grow from there. The City Council has now the opportunity to do to right a terrible wrong and address the issues to its residents with full transparency. And then only then will we be able to have an open and educated opinions on this and any other matter you need to address in the future. If not, this may set a new precedent. So will you regret it? If that's it. And I ran out of time. No. You still have time, sir. Okay. If not, it will be president. It will be regret about many for many decades to come. You have been elected to represent us, not the mayor or his staff. It's time to do the right thing and send a message to this, to start this process with transparency. And it should have had, which it should have had from the very beginning. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Frederick Glick. I'll send somebody else from the. Hi. Good evening. My name is Fred Glick. I live at 3850 North York Street in the Clayton neighborhood. I'm here tonight to encourage you to pass the group Living Text Amendment before you. And also mention that the Clayton United R.A. has officially supported this amendment. This has been a long and well-publicized process. There have been numerous opportunities for public engagement across the city. Sadly, there's also been a lot of fearmongering surrounding this proposal, with statements and letters being put out there about how this will destroy neighborhoods and endanger our children and seemingly most dire threatened property values. Of course, there is no evidence that this amendment will do any of that. Quite the contrary. This amendment doesn't put us at the forefront of a vast experiment. It merely brings us almost in line with other similar cities. This amendment is about doing right by our neighbors and fellow citizens, all of them. It isn't going to solve our housing crisis, but hopefully it makes it easier for some of our neighbors to be secure in their housing, like those currently living in co-ops who spoke out about their experiences. Only to have the opponents of. This amendment try to intimidate them from continuing to participate in this public process. I reporting them. We know that there are large a large number of households currently living in noncompliance with the code and that a disproportionate. Number. Of them are people of color. This amendment is about doing right by our neighbors. At an. Earlier public hearing, a. Man stood up and spoke in support of this amendment based on his personal experience living in a sober home. His life was changed by that opportunity. I have no idea wh

at that man does for a living or how he lives now, but I do know that he took the time to come down to the city and county building to speak to our planning board about something which was important to him. He's the kind of person I'd like for a neighbor, someone who cares enough about his city and his fellow citizens to take the time to be civically engaged. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Travis Heath. And I know you're on the phone, Travis, so you might have to unmute. Travis, you have to hit Star six to unmute. All right. We're going to try one more time, Travis, before we have to move on. There you go. I think you're unmuted now. Travis, go ahead. This is Travis Heath, Denver City resident for 24 years. As a Denver property owner, I'm opposed to this group Living Amendment and not based on some of the reasons that others have insinuated on this call, such as property values, segregation, or people who look different from me. I feel it will have an extreme negative impact to the city on living conditions, and most importantly, it will not solve the problems that it proposes to solve. The number of unrelated people it would allow per square foot in a single family dwelling is absolutely insufficient and will have a drastic impact on neighbors and the neighborhood. Population density overall and the working people of Denver. This proposal was introduced in the midst of a pandemic, no less, when an emphasis on social distancing and contact tracing are vital to reaching an end to the pandemic. What exactly will happen when someone catches a communicable disease and lives in a single family dwelling with five adults and their children? Denver City Council has been deceitful and misleading through various stages of the proposal and has obfuscated the entities who are actually behind it. They've been the opposite of transparent on many, many aspects of this proposal. This proposal will result in overcrowding. It will place too much demand on the resources that are available for that space and the city services for that geographic location services which already don't meet the existing needs. Apparently it will allow up to six cars per single unit property. We already don't have enough parking in the city. How exactly is this supposed to work? It treats property owners and renters across various areas of Denver unfairly, and the potential for abuse of the new guidelines is significant. I ask for a no vote on the unfair group living proposal. Thank you, Travis. Up next, we have Carrie Joy. Good evening, counsel. Can you hear me? Go ahead. Awesome. My name is Carrie Joy. I'm a resident of District nine, and I'm here speaking in support of this amendment. It is outrageous that we. Would choose to define what someone's family can look like by law as a black queer child of immigrants who identifies as a woman. I've seen these legal restrictions inhumanely. Define the possibilities of my safe existence. And if we don't start changing that

today, then who are we? The arguments we've heard against this, we've heard about people who are part of the LGBTQ community in the past. About black people, about immigrants, and too many more. Because here we are again today. Please realize it's a non-fictional version of the beloved Golden Girls sitcom. Lived in Denver. You would call them criminals. It is also outrageous to. Limit the possibilities of housing during a housing crisis. While people are worried about their pockets, human beings are suffering, especially black and brown individuals. Who have been forced out of their once stable communities because of the priority prioritization of profit housing as a human. Rights. And the very least we could do is change archaic laws that create. More barriers than solutions to honoring the humanity of every single living soul in the city. Vote yes so that we can. Have legal, creative solutions to our housing. Crisis. Vote yes so that ten years from now or five years from now, your children. Friends and families don't find themselves suffering because we chose. Not to evolve in our thinking. Truth is. Anything that has happened to our unhoused neighbors and has forced them into some of the situation they are in today can happen to. You, me, or anyone listening on this call. A bad divorce, a chronic health condition, a job loss, an addiction or mental health condition that gets out of hand, which at least a quarter of our House residents are dealing with at any time in a given year. No matter the circumstance, the humane thing to do is to offer the life. Affirming solutions. To these to these human conditions. And one of those solutions is to make it legal for individuals, unrelated or not. To share space, share living expenses, and to. Love and support each other like Assata Shakur taught us. Although this is only a step in the right direction and I am disappointed. In the racism and classism that. Continues to segregate our. Neighbors transitioning out of prison. Please do the right thing tonight and vote yes. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Chris Ward. Go ahead, Chris. Thank you. My name is Chris Ward. I'm a resident of Denver, District ten. I'm the president of the Cherry Creek East Association, which is in Reno, representing the residents of the Cherry Creek East Neighborhood. We oppose the group Living Text Amendment as currently proposed. Based on a survey we conducted of

neighborhood residents in which 84% of over 100 response respondents opposed the initiative. I can give you a quick background on this survey. It contains CPD supporting reasons for the amendment, and CPD and Councilman Hines were given advance copies and invited to comment. Respondents were provided numerous information resources, including the CPD presentation, which 82% of respondents reported having read. In short, the survey was intended to be as informative, unbiased and fair to the intent of the amendment as possible. Concern service surfaced in the surv

ey include uncertainty about parking, noise, trash, maintenance and other externalities. Concerns about impacts on neighborhood character. Unlike groups have been grouped together, assisted living, grouped with shelters and community corrections, etc.. Inequitable application of the amendment by zone. Decisions will be made at the discretion of an unelected administrator position and absence of adequate enforcement provisions. These concerns are hardly unique to Cherry Creek East. We've heard all of them from other Arnaud's and from residents across the city. We feel it is inappropriate to pass the amendment without openly and effectively addressing these concerns. I urge you to vote no on the amendment as currently proposed. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Diane Thiele. Diane, we'll have to have you unmute yourself, please. All right, we're going to. See if we can get Diane unmuted. All right. We're going to go ahead and move on then to Karen McGuire. And Karen, you're going to have to unmute yourself. So I had. Thank you. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Thank you. My name is Karen McGuire, and I'm a Denver resident since the mid 1980s. Thank you, Denver City Council for holding. I'm sorry for hosting this public hearing. Though I am a strong advocate for more unrelated adults permitted to live together and have certain residential care facilities. I object to this group Living Amendment for the following reasons. One. The one size fits all allowance of five unrelated adults per residence does not reflect the impact this will have in the many Denver neighborhoods with smaller two bedroom homes to allowing ten person homeless shelters in any residential neighborhood vastly alters the character of that neighborhood. These are not the small residential care facilities currently allowed as portrayed by Denver City Council. This is a 25% increase from what is currently allowed. Also, Denver home owners made their investment based on current zoning. They didn't buy thinking there would be a ten person homeless shelter next door. Three. The current proposal removes buffers from schools for both correctional facilities where allowed and homeless shelters. These changes affect safety. Amanda Sandoval, in alluding to the last year, portrayed the Independence House Corrections facility in her District one as a plus. She failed to mention that over the last three years there were, on average, 72 to 3 car police call outs per year for serious incidents at this facility. More than one per week. Serious incidents include shootings, burglaries, assaults, fights and disturbances. This is the rest of the Independence House story. For. I think this proposal will further develop our city and perpetuate inequity because key components rely on investors and developers, many of whom do not and will not live here. The homes that will be bought for rentals. Homeless shelters and correctional facilities will be in the less expensive neighborhoods in Denver.

And this will create a disproportionate impact to lower income residents. My recommendation is to scrap this amendment and first write one that only addresses more unrelated adults per resident and proportion to conforming bedrooms. Evaluate its impact. Continue to foster RC ups as currently allowable and please complete the ten year plus effort of uniting Denver under only one new. Thank you. We're going to go back and see if we can get Diane Thiele back in the queue here. I'm going to need to unmute, Diane. All right. Looks like we're unsuccessful. So we're going to go ahead and go to Brad SIEGEL. Good evening, Denver City Council. My name is Brad SIEGEL. I'm a Denver Native who has resided on the 1200 block of Detroit Street in the Congress Park neighborhood for nearly 30 years. Tonight, I'm speaking as a. Co-Founder of All in Denver. All in Denver is a. Nonprofit advocacy organization that believes an equitable city is where all people have the opportunity to prosper and thrive. We're led by a board of 18 civic leaders. And 300 members, nearly all of whom reside in Denver. We strongly. Support the proposed revisions. To Denver's group Living Rules. We've supported earlier. Versions of these revisions, and tonight's proposal is not as strong as we would like. However, we respect the process and the spirit of compromise that has brought us to this place. Clearly, tonight's revisions improve Denver's. Stringent, antiquated group living rules and. Will help make our city more equitable and affordable. On a personal note, I also want to share that for nearly 30 years I've lived within one block of a residential care facility that

provides services to individuals suffering severe mental illness. During this time, my wife and I have owned our home and raised family. Never in 30 years has the proximity of this facility created a disturbance nor affected property values. Furthermore, we have a family friend whose son lived in the facility for several years to stabilize his condition and reenter society. He, like hundreds of residents over time. Now lives independently in our community by expanding options for these types of facilities. Denver not only becomes a more equitable city, but also a more compassionate one. After all, we're talking. About services for our neighbors. Our friends, and our. Families. Thank you for your consideration. Thank you. Our next speaker is Gayle Bell. Gail, you're going to have to unmute yourself. There you go. Go ahead, please. Yeah. Thank you so much, Stacey. I would like to say that I have. Lived in Denver for. Almost 40 years. And I am. Very upset, of course, about the homelessness. That has gone on that we have seen that is. So much worse during the pandemic. But I want to say it. Is city council and it's. Not just you guys. It's all the city. Councils that have been here before me that I feel like the city and county of Denver has never really. Addressed the homeless. Issues. As I worked at several museums downtown

n, I saw every. Day. Homeless people. In Civic Center Park. And this has been an issue that has been. Long neglected in our city. I'm glad that we are addressing it now, but we're. Addressing it because you can't look. Over, looked at anymore with what has happened. During the pandemic. One of my biggest. Concerns is. The fact that most people don't even know about. This pending change in our zoning. I know that Andrew's said that there have been multiple articles in the paper. I read the Denver Post every day. I listen to our local news channels. I can tell you. Of probably. About 600 people that live in my neighborhood. I would venture. To say easily 90% of them do not even know. That this is going on. I appreciate the meeting that Stacey. Did hold with my neighborhood. And I would hope. That you would put. This at least on. Delay during the pandemic, when so many people in our city are just focused on. Trying to survive every day, trying to overcome loneliness. They can't see their families, they can't see their friends. They don't go to meetings. And. You know, I think there are some good things in this, but I also think. That there needs to be more transparency about this. And I think that the process has failed in transparency. So I'm asking you to please. Hold. Off from voting until more people can participate in the process. Thank you very much. Thank you, Gael. Our next speaker is just Hebrew. Hey, can you guys hear me? Go ahead. Hey, I'm Jessie Broome. District three, longtime listener, first time caller. Thanks for being here, guys. And I am here to ask you to vote yes on the group Living Amendment. And also, I want to call on city council to make a motion to remove that hard cap of five unrelated adults as five is not enough. I was thinking about how in 2008 I turn the keys of the door of my first apartment in Denver. 28 And I cannot overstate the excitement that I had moving to the big city, a really big city to me at the time. I managed to get out of my tiny hometown that no one ever leaves, and then I managed to get out of an abusive marriage. And I came to Denver to start my life over in my rent on that spacious one bed, one bath, just off Cheesman Park with tons of closet space was \$400 a month. You remember? Can you imagine? And because I could afford to live here, I could build a life here. And I did. I rebuilt my life. And I was so lucky to find an amazing community of artists here in Denver. Musicians, writers, poets, muralist. We all found a place here. We found family and each other, and they've added so much richness and beauty to this city. And as housing costs have skyrocketed in Denver, almost every single one of these artists has lived in a place with four or five or six or more people that they were not related to. Group living allowed them to survive here. It allowed them to make art here. It allowed them to become a part of the fabric of the city, from the halls and venues of South Broadway and Colfax, to the walls

of Five Points in the Santa Fe Arts District. So here we are in 2021, and our city has worked so hard to draw people here and done so little to think about where to put them. We are in a housing crisis and we can see it everywhere from our unhoused neighbors who are a group that I'm with serves weekly outside of the very building that city council usually needs them. And and I can see it as my friends, my, my family, my friends family leaves Denver one by one because they can't afford it anymore. We have the chance here tonight to take a step towards becoming the city we want to be. I built my life here, and I want that opportunity to be open to everyone. Our existing housing policies originated in racial and economic discrimination and were intended solely to include those the most in need. This is not consistent with the city that we tell ourselves that we are. Whatever the intentions are of those who defend these exclusionary zoning laws. And I've listened to a lot of

them, and they do also sound rooted in racism and classism. The result is simply to perpetuate these policies that were designed to discriminate. The growing inequality in our city is an outcome of policies like we have now, but we can stop this. Denver wants to be a city where more than just the rich can live one with rich, rich with vibrant, with artists and immigrants and people of all backgrounds and income levels. We first need to replace these outdated laws and ones with aims, with inclusion and justice. Thank you so much. Thank you, Jesse. Our next speaker is Kathleen Brennan. Kathleen, you're going to have to unmute. All right. We're going to try to get Kathleen in here one more time. All right. Not seeing Kathleen able to unmute. We're going to go ahead and move to Nick Arnold. Oh, excuse me. Oh, there we go. We got you, Kathleen. Okay. Go ahead, Kathleen, please. Great. Thanks. My name is Kathleen Brennan. I'm a former resident of the East Colfax neighborhood and now a resident of the East Hampden neighborhood as a parenthetical. I do agree with the original. The early comments of the previous Speaker. Richard says I think is is name. I am in favor of group homes but in ten years I hope to be living in a group home for the elderly. Rather than in an institution. But I am opposed to the commercialization. Of our residential areas. Group homes have become a business. When multiple group homes are operated by entities. Especially for profit entities, they become commercialized. Commercial entities do not belong in residential areas. A major purpose of a zoning is to keep commercial entities out of residential areas. This amendment on group living. Propagates encourages group. Homes in residential areas. And I'm opposed to that. And I would hope that the City Council would take some of the previous comments. And consider portion. Passing out these different aspects of the zoning amendments and address them as individual. Categories rather than the large the large bill tha

t's before you now. B The. Commercialization of group living is evident in the. City's, quote, citizen working group on Group Living, which was composed of commercial operators. And not citizens of the residential areas. In eliminating its oversight, in eliminating permits for group homes. The city is giving up its oversight. Of group living. I am. Opposed to the removing of city. Permits for group group living. There need to be parameters for group living. But the. Distinct the distinctions of group living categories types. Are eliminated by the city. The city is lumping groups limit living children homes, physically disadvantaged homes, mentally disadvantaged homes, elderly at risk all into one pot and in group living. I do not believe that one part fits all. I think you need those different distinctions. So that you can provide the best possible. Services to these different groups. Without outdoing the. The sanctity of our residential areas. I ask you to vote no on the group changes. Preserve our residential areas. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Nick, an oldie. Thank you very much. And it's actually great to see you again. Thank you for your help in getting a crosswalk installed by my school in your district at Escalante Academy. I am a teacher, a union teacher here in Denver. And it's it's very difficult to in this area. However, just this past couple of years, we were able to move into Denver after owning a starter home in Aurora. So if you have to go through that process all over again, please let me know I can help you out. But to go back to my original point, we already have a city where people are housing insecure, or for a lack of a better word, homeless. I live in I own a home in District three and I work in District 11 and I see many districts on my daily commute. I have to go across the city diagonally. I'm a union teacher who was present when our union made the decision to vote for this change, to support this change, and speaking on my own behalf, I've seen the evidence of students who do not have a safe place to rest their heads. They don't succeed. Think about the children. Think about the students who can continue to be displaced while keeping this policy the same as it's always been. Underprivileged kids always feel the brunt of these policies or the lack of these amendments. So I urge you to vote in favor of this amendment. Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next speaker is Lauren. How. Lauryn Hill. I'm sorry, Lauryn. Thank you, Councilwoman Gilmore. My name is Lauren Howe, and I use she her pronouns. And I'm here tonight as a private citizen. I recently purchased a home in the park neighborhood of Denver at 1340 West Custer Place in District seven. As a woman of color in my late twenties, I want to express my sincere support for the amendments to the Group Living Code and more specifically, the proposed household regulations. I lived with six other roommates in an intentional community in City Park West for over a

year. It was a group of young professionals, graduate students, nonprofit directors, artists, educators, storytellers and activists. We all came together to live under one roof, to create positive social change in our community, and we were able to save significant money with affordable rent.

We held regular house meetings, shared a chore list, grew a community garden, and hosted public events like panel discussions and film screenings on refugee issues and political advocacy. It still amazes me that people with such diverse interests could not only coexist under one roof, but thrive and collaborate. Our house was like an organism, a place where each of us had a role and function to play, and we were much stronger together than separate. It was such a privilege, an opportunity to be able to learn from and collaborate with each other. Although I no longer live in this house, these housemates are my chosen family and have become some of my best friends in Denver. The foundation of my community here. It is shocking and disappointing to note the way we were living is currently illegal and it is also exciting and hopeful to know that future groups of individuals wanting to make our city better and more affordable through living in community or cooperatives may be permitted to do so under the proposed group Living Code Amendments. I am privileged and grateful to have just bought a home and I also experienced firsthand the lack of housing affordability and gentrification that's sweeping our city. I genuinely believe that allowing more than two unrelated adults to reside in the same household is one sustainable, equitable and anti-racist solution to the housing crisis, especially during a deep economic recession. I urge you to vote yes in support of these changes, ideally allowing more than five unrelated adults to live together. And I thank you for your consideration. Thank you, Lauren. Our next speaker is Arthur Alarcon. We're going to have to have. I got. There we go. Go ahead. All right. Thank you. My name is Arthur Alarcon. I'm a 44 year Denver resident, all in the same southeast Denver neighborhood. It's Councilwoman Black's neighborhood or district six. And I've been in the same home for 44 years. This bill will change the intended use of single family residential neighborhoods. The homes in my neighborhood were intended to be used for one family with appropriately sized amenities such as hallways, baths, kitchens, HVAC, light and ventilation. The infrastructure also was based on single family use. The size of the water, main sewer line, electrical service, surface drainage, etc. were all sized for single family. When you put four or five adults with unlimited children, you overtax the system. It has to be rebuilt or rebuilt sooner or totally replaced. The bill has gotten was begotten in a clandestine manner by the mayor and two council members. And beneficiaries are not the citizens of the affected areas, nor city and county of Denver r

esidents as a whole, but rather business interests that will profit handsomely from the redevelopment and enhanced rents received as a result of the passage of this bill, without the dedication of a Denver citizen to uncover the real interests behind the birth of this terrible bill. None of the residents would know that the mayor and two council members, along with involved business interests, planned this whole massive change of use. The ruling by a Denver judge allowed all this activity to be uncovered and then be disseminated, but very late in the process. The mayor is on record as stating he had no part in the origin of this bill. I urge the Council to vote no on this group Living Amendment and further urge Denver City residents to keep a close eye on future land use issues, since the current council has proven to need citizen review constantly. Thank you. I urge you to vote no. Thank you, Arthur. Our next speaker is Pete Winter, Chief. Right? Yeah. Hello. I'm Pete Winters. Shit. District one resident and I strongly support adopting this amendment. I've been a Denver resident for 30 years and change. I've lived in various parts of the city and similar to many of the other supporters here. At certain points in time, I have lived to tell of this law, and not once has it been. A criminal matter or brought to anyone's attention, which drives me to some of the numerous reasons that I support this amendment. First you can make the kind of libertarian case of this is a private household. What right does the government have to say? What my family looks like? You know, if. Who I'm living with and things of that nature and setting arbitrary limits there. Next. There's no. Deny. I mean, the this has been called out a number of times, but the racial and economic injustices brought about by this rule. Part of the reason that myself and many of the other supporters that have lived afoul of this law have gotten away with it is because we're largely of, you know, well-to-do class, you know, whatever that means, you know, a family with an opera living with them would currently be afoul of this law. But nobody is going to call 311 on that. A low income family with a cousin that's maybe not really a cousin. They're going to get impacted by the current law. Though what also comes to mind for me is the affordability and long term viability of the city. By preventing people from living in houses, we're creating more traffic. We're going to degrade our neighbor to hoods and limit the sort of residents that are allowed to live here. I have several friends in very well-paying jobs who cannot afford to live in Denver, that they have had to seek accommodation outside of the city, sometimes literally across the border where there is allowed

more than two people allowed in a household. Many of them commute to jobs downtown and drive on our roads, speed through our neighborhoods, and create smog and pollution in our skies. Well, this group Living Amendment won't change a

lot of that. We might be willing to decrease some of it. And I would say. Some of what really drives me nuts and drives me to support this amendment even more strongly is the nuts opposition that car storage is more important than housing people, which is what numerous of the opponents of this opposition bring up. Where will I park my car instead of what family is allowed to live next to me? Thank you. That's your time this evening. Appreciate you joining us, Pete. Up next, we've got Emmett Hartley. Mr. Hobley, we'll have to have you on new. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Hi. I'm a native of. Denver, Colorado. For 62 years, I've been a resident of Montebello for 1985, and I am second. By gentrification that has been allowed to take place in our city and. The zoning, racist zoning that has plagued this city for decades and centuries. I am a favor of the group labeling amendment. I am. That is payroll amendment being watered down. I am not in favor of more restrictions being placed on residents that it can least afford it. And I would urge the City Council to increase the group living number of participants. Get rid of some of the racist policies that go along with this and make sure that's equitable, equitable for the whole community and not just parts of the community. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Hobley. Up next, we have Brian Wilson. I thank you. First off, just thanks for allowing me to speak. I want to just say ditto to several of the prior speakers. Jonathan Stokoe, Kevin MATTHEWS. Jesse Broome. Hashtag five is not enough. I thought that was good. Lauren, how are we able to ask a clarifying question to Andrew Webb? Is that possible? No, not at this point. You can go ahead, oppose it, but go ahead. I think that there are several misconceptions that were brought up, particularly regarding the quote unquote, commercialization, not of the group homes, but of people coming in, buying homes and then using them as rental homes and being like absentee land landlords. It's my understanding that there's something built into this to prevent that. Maybe somebody could speak to that at some point. I'm if you guys can draw that down for maybe after, I think that's good or somebody can interject. Otherwise, that's. Yes. Please. I urge your support. And in particular, I would prefer that we increase in, if possible, make a motion to remove the cap altogether for unrelated adults. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Up next, we have Tanya Cohen. High Technical and District three. I'm going to summarize a bit of what the recent Denver Post article said on the subject. Much of Denver's zoning code, as we have heard, is completely outdated and pre-dates World War Two, which is just crazy. Many of the codes legalized discrimination as Denver grew, keeping lower income residents unable to access these single family homes. We need to follow in the footsteps of other cities who've experienced similar growth and high housing costs. Austin, Texas, which has

experienced growth similar to Denver's, allows six unrelated people to a house throughout their city and their city planner said he's heard very few concerns about living arrangements throughout the city. Seattle allows eight far more than we're asking. No other major cities in the country have a limit as low as Denver's. Much of the opposition coming from is coming from safe and sound. Denver and other clearly privileged folks are house owners seeking to impose more discrimination against more vulnerable, less privileged house renters. But city planners in Denver, Austin and Salt Lake City agree that many of the concerns are overblown. Obviously, allowing more unrelated people to live together. In a home would allow individual rents. To go down. Revising these severely outdated codes would also allow the renovation or reconstruction of large shelters, which we've heard, and also allow shelters run by churches, non-profits and governments to increase the number of days a year they can host people. These things are clearly needed to help our most vulnerable in Denver. Also, we need more halfway houses outside of remote industrial zones that provided much needed transitional housing and help to integrate people into the community in better locations closer to public transportation and other services. Austin and Salt Lake City already allow this, and neither city has seen any major issues stemming from those sites. We must oppose the blatant racist classes cries coming from those most privileged in Denver who already own houses and find new creative ways to help our most vulnerable and less privileged to stay and contribute to Denver. We need diversity in Denver. We must honor Denver's working class history and stop catering to those with money and power. Thank you. Thank you, Tanya. Up next, we have Pamela Clifton. We're going to Pamela's on the phone, so we'll get her connected to the audio here. All right. It shows that we're still connecting. All right. Pamela, we've got you connected if you want to go ahead and hit

Star six to unmute. Pamela? Yes. All right. Yep. Now we can go ahead, please. I lost all my Internet right when I needed to talk. Oh, no. Well, we've got you up in the queue. So go ahead, please. My name is Pam Clift, and I'm from Kansas. City Council. Seven. And I really want. To thank you guys so much for giving us the opportunity to speak. And I'm calling today in support of the city of Denver's. Efforts to update regulations and the zoning code. Because I am a. Homeowner who's a resident. In Atmore. Park and have been there for. Almost. 20 years and I'm near retirement. And I think this. Is the. Smartest thing we can do for our city because making Denver more. Equitable, diverse and inclusive in its importance to housing has been a long time in coming. And when people are. Safely housed and we. Are safer. Community. Equality and inclusive inclusivity by definition requires that everyone, regardless of who they are or where they c

ome from, has the opportunity to thrive in the city, which is deeply important when it comes especially. To our returning citizens and the opportunity to be successful when they come. Home. When there's equity, a person's identity does not determine their outcome. We need to improve access to opportunity. Flexible housing choices in all neighborhoods. So giving everyone access to goods, opportunities and. Services that they. Need to be as comfortable as possible. Listen, if this last year has taught us anything, it's that we. Need to have the flexibility to be nimble. And responsive in the face of things we've never imagined without dealing with the barriers. Of exclusionary practices. That require time and incredibly cumbersome processes to remove. One of the tax amendments that was added requires. Limiting new residential. New residential opportunities to existing buildings. I think that needs to be removed because it's too limiting and should be voted down. I do want to specifically want to recognize and support not only the city's efforts, but Andrew's extraordinary work to make sure. That all of this happened. The process was incredibly transparent. It happened over a very long. Period of time. And I. I, for one, am was excited to be able to to watch it unfold. So, please, I'm not going to use all my time, but I want to please, please vote for this. It's important and we need it. Thank you, Pamela. Up next, we have Paige Burkholder. It's moving for the gala. Good evening, City Council. Thank you for having me on tonight. I'm Paige Burkholder. I'm a sophomore park, southeast Denver resident of District four. And I've lived in Denver for 30 years. As many of you all know, I'm involved with Safe and Sound Denver, which is a diverse, nonpartisan, grassroots collaboration of Denver neighbors from across the city that oppose the current group Living Zoning Code Amendment. This is a massive and complex amendment with lots of details, and I'm still trying to figure out some of it with the latest revision. There have been many flaws in this process. This amendment didn't come about from a need that was identified. But the community that originated from the mayor's office in 2017, the group Living Advisory Committee, was comprised of special interest groups and not diverse and not didn't and did not include many neighbors from across the city. Also Chapter 59, which exempts a big 20% of the city and in some areas a pretty substantial amount will divide neighborhoods. And for example, my fellow, it goes right through the neighborhood where some places will be considered exempt and others not. It's unfortunate that this wasn't addressed until after the planning board approval and it was brought out by neighbors and safe and sound. Denver. This amendment is not equitable and it does not spread equity throughout our city. In fact, it will punish the very communities that the city states that they want to help. So tonight, here we are. I ask you to consider

r when voting this evening these questions. Is this really the right and best solution for Denver? Does this truly represent what most Denver neighbors desire for our city? I'm sure like I have. You've read the passionate letters and comments that have gone to your council office and to CPD. They've been written by crime victims, people that have suffered from and UN enforcement violations, tight living quarters, noise, trash. The list goes on. There's a large list of. Arnaud's that opposed the group Living Amendment on the Safe and Sound Denver website, including the Inter Neighborhood Cooperative, which also opposed this amendment and asked for the city to break it into separate sections. Did you go to Change.org and see the petition signatures? Over 10,000 people have signed the petition asking the council to vote no. Well, the zoning change this amendment. Well, the zoning change in this amendment enhance or diminish the many unique and diverse neighborhoods. We ask you to vote no tonight because this vote is so important to the constituents that elected you. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Kinsey Halsted. That meaning. Thank you to the council members, Andrew Webb and the folks at CPD, the advisory

committee and the many hundreds, if not thousands of residents who have done the work to get this. Important policy consideration here tonight. My name is. Kenzie Hazard and I am a Denver resident, but I'm here representing the organizational interests of enterprise community partners, or am the state and local policy director. I'm here tonight to voice Enterprise's support for. The group Living Testimony. Enterprise works nationally and here in Denver to make home and community places of pride, power and belonging for all. Including by meaningfully advancing racial equity. We do so through capital investment. Policy and programmatic engagement. And advocacy. First Enterprise supports increasing the number of unrelated adults who can lawfully create and share a home together. While we supported earlier iterations of this proposal that allowed more unrelated. Adults to live. Together and did not draw. Such stark differences between those. Who are biologically related, did not. This proposal represents much needed change. Denver's current cap of two unrelated adults lags far behind bigger cities, with many implications. This restriction is rooted in discriminatory policies and beliefs and still today stands to disproportionately impact bipoc. Immigrant, LGBTQ, single parents. Lower income and other systemically marginalized households. Moreover, Denver has a long standing housing affordability crisis. Prior to the pandemic, 70,000 Denver households were cost burdened. And COVID has only made it worse, both in this moment and for the long term. Denver writes Need more options for affordable, high quality homes. Expanding the number of people who can share the costs and benefits of living together will not fix the crisis. But it is one such

option. Second, residential care sites and services should be available in and supported by more Denver communities. Enterprise supports the city's overall effort to consider these programs by a number of residents rather than type. Though, we are disappointed by the exclusion of community corrections from any sign of any size from single family and duplex zoned areas. This reflects longstanding deference to affluent households and may not fully enhance residential care participants access to services. At the same time, we support the text amendment as a meaningful step forward. It is critical. That Denver's jobs, public transportation and community resources be available to folks who rely on group living situations to maintain their sobriety, find temporary shelter, leave confinement, or thrive with their peers with the appropriate supportive care. Finally, you may not have been hearing from as many organizations representing and serving those who. Would benefit most from these changes. As someone with the privilege of. Working with and learning from many of these groups, I can tell you that it's not that interest in support. Isn't there rather some fear for their safety? Some are stretched too thin meeting. Their own basic needs and those they serve through these extraordinarily challenging times. But these people care very much. We urge your yes vote. Thank you, Kinsley. Up next, we've got Michelle, a crew. Thank you, City Council. I do implore you to vote no on this text amendment for a couple of reasons. Not that I'm against group housing or finding more economical ways for people to live. Now let me back up. I am a long time resident of District two, but I oppose this particular amendment for many of the reasons already discussed. And so personally my own is that I do believe there are unintended consequences by having a bill of this size all grouped together. I do think that you would get more support and you would find more people favorable if this bill were broken into smaller pieces and not lumped into a 200 page bill that is difficult for citizens to read and filter through and follow the laws. I do also believe that this amendment does not support truly the common interests of those families that are struggling to make ends meet and do want to share, rent or mortgage with other adults. Not related. And the reason that I feel this way is because of the. Well, what has been said the. Sorry. I lost my train of thought. The. Lawsuit that had to be founded this week, that things were just not put out, put forth honestly and openly since the beginning of all of the research has been done. So excuse me, the information that has come out seems very one sided and almost like propaganda as to we want this bill to pass, but we're really not looking at the people who are financially struggling. There may be financial interests that are actually conflicts of interest. So yes, there are good things in this bill, but the size of the bill, the appare

nt conflict of interest that exist are too questionable for this to pass and really support what the majority of Denver residents and households look like. I'm urging for a no vote. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Next up is Myra Gonzalez. Hello, everybody. My name is Myra Gonzalez and I am a resident and counselor at District 11 since 1995. My family and I have lived in the Montebello neighborhood. We love our city community and our neighbors. Over the years, we have seen and

lived the impacts racist policies have had on our health, housing options, economic opportunities, education, and much more. Today we are seeing the impacts of redlining and are feeling the pressures of gentrification. Our neighbors, community and my family included, have had to get creative with our housing options to avoid the violence of displacement. I am here today to support the proposed group Living Zoning Code Amendment, specifically because it will increase the number of unrelated people allowed to live together and it will categorize residential care and group living homes by size rather than type of facility or service being provided. Together, this ordinance will advance people's ability to live in places that are accessible to transit jobs and other community based services. I am also here to directly fight against the racist, xenophobic and classic classist efforts of wealthy groups like Safe and Sound, who have hijacked the process and conversations around group living and have attempted to invalidate years of planning efforts, research and outreach. Groups opposing the ordinance have mailed letters directly to households around the city. These letters that we received in Montebello contain lies and inflammatory language meant to confuse and create opposition for the ordinance. This propaganda has led to hurtful community conversations where our own neighbors have begun to adopt anti-immigrant sentiments. Residents during community calls, quote, directly from these letters. We have heard our elderly residents crying on Zoom calls hosted by our Seattle City Council office because these letters have made them afraid of their next door. Neighbors afraid. This propaganda has created widespread fear. And as my colleague Kiara Jackson shared over an hour ago, our immigrant neighbors are now scared that their neighbors and other residents who oppose Group Living will call the city on them if they have large families placing them in danger of the deportation machine. And Montebello. We already have families who are living grouped up in single family homes. I lived this way for over ten years and finally have had the means to purchase my own home, which I continuously fear I may not be able to keep because of the gentrification machine. And so I am asking council today to vote in support of this group amendment. And I hope that you can stand up for the against the propaganda being distributed by folks who have nothing to lose and help protect those of us who are vulnerable to housing, insecurity, displacement and homelessness. Thank you. Thank you, Myra.

Our next speaker is Florence Seaborn. Go ahead, Florence. Good evening. My name is Florence Bern, District six. I've been involved with this amendment since January of 2020. You can go ahead. We've got your audio right now. All right. Thank you. I was under the impression the video was also going to be there. So I've been involved with this amendment since January of 2010. I mean, my background is in research processes and rules. And I approached this issue from that standpoint. I submitted numerous Colorado Open Records Act requests to find objective, factual information. The court documents show that the origin of this effort was the mayor's office and the council members. The reasoning behind it is the failure of Denver programs to adequately address community corrections, homelessness and related affordable housing issues. The group Living Advisory Committee was specifically chosen for their expertise as providers of services, and 85% of those organizations represented on the committee will benefit from this amendment. Black conservatism consisted of 48 members. A majority were service providers and eight represented neighborhoods. Six out of 11 council districts had zero representation on black. Fully one half of the city was not even represented. There were eight full group black meetings of the 48 members, meaning attendance ranged from a low of 14 members to a high of only 34 members. The meeting where the number eight was decided is the increase of unrelated per household had only 18 members present a 37% attendance rate. The final meeting where draft language was approved had only 20 members, a 41% attendance rate. So for the last two out of three years, only a handful of people were making decisions about this amendment. When the public was finally involved in February and March of 2020, in a series of four open houses, it was just before the COVID lockdown. For the duration of 2020, CPD and City Council expected Denver residents to educate themselves on a 200 page zoning code amendment while struggling to keep their jobs, school their children and stay healthy under extreme COVID conditions and restrictions. There was no authentic public engagement in 2020. There was simply pushback as word spread to those who could minimally engaged. There has been 31 days since the draft revision was posted online. Again, not enough time for authentic public engagement for an amendment that will affect every Denver resident owner or renter in the city of 712,000 people. I started a Change.org petition as a way for Denver residents to safely and easily express their opposition to this amendment. Signatures poured in from all over the city, and I verified them with voter registration and residency databases.

I submitted 3759 residents to Denver to the public comment logs. Today I submit 266 more for a total of 4025. These are your constituents. And they say st

op reset and readdress these issues. We ask for your no vote on the amendment tonight, and I thank you for your time and consideration. Thank you. Our next speaker is Leah Tani. Hi there. My name is Leah Charney and I live in the diverse KOL neighborhood in District nine and I live in an area that's already zoned for some of the group housing that folks seem to be concerned by. Yet somehow property here has increased in value by two points. Like two and a half times in the past decade. So it's more than doubled. I've heard so many fear based comments tonight that I cannot believe I have to say this, but I urge you to vote yes on this matter and vote to make roommates and families legal in Denver. In the current code, roommates are effectively illegal unless you live in an apartment or a duplex. Logic that makes little sense. It is just as against the zoning code for unrelated adults to buy a house together as it is to rent one together. An infinite number of related adults can already live together though. So we're defining what a family is. Also, being married in a civil union or in a domestic partnership does not count as being related under the current zoning, which also shouldn't matter because serious relationships are not defined by paperwork. So again, I ask council what business does the city have in defining a family? As we've heard, the city has engaged in a very long process to update the more than 50 year old classist, racist, homophobic, outdated zoning code. As an aside, it wasn't a big secret which citizens were on the initial committee drafting the proposed changes. It's been on the city's website this whole time. When I stumbled upon this about a year ago, it was very easy to see who was part of the committee proposing these changes, and the changes that they proposed have evolved so that what is before council today is a code that matches the zoning of surrounding areas like Arvada and Lakewood, and those are cities that don't suffer from lowered housing values or higher crime rates either. So this new zoning code is neither unheard of, nor is it particularly modern. I think in many ways it literally brings Denver to a status quo that's already followed by most municipalities. So let's also be clear that much of this just decriminalized is the way that people are already living. It is the right move for the city to adopt this change. Ideally, it would be the previous set of suggested updates, but at minimum I urge you to pass what's before you, because the proposed code also updates the code for other group living situations like supporting the unhoused residential treatment facilities and nursing or group homes. This update classifies them by size instead of type. Folks seem to be concerned that the zoning changes will mean criminals on every corner. So I again remind you that that hasn't happened in other cities or towns with much more modern zoning than what's proposed here. I urge Council and my fellow neighbors to keep in m

ind that those kinds of formal group living situations are heavily regulated already and that what you do that's outside. Of the time we have allotted. We appreciate you being here tonight. Our next speaker is Jerry DICKERSON. And Jerry, you're going to have to go ahead and unmute, please. All right. We're going to try to get Miami. There you go. Yup. You're in. Go ahead. Okay. Okay. My name is Jerry Dirksen and I'm 45 year resident of District four in the Southeast Denver. There are many flaws in the Group Living Amendment, and it's certainly impossible to address all of them in the time allotted. Community planning and development had three years and professional staff to construct this amendment and put together their sales pitch. But we only got 3 minutes to respond, so I'll do my best. An analysis of public commentary in all phases of this process shows 80 to 90% opposition. It would seem that by itself would be enough to put an end to this ill conceived idea. But here we are. Due to time constraints, I would only comment on one or two aspects of the amendment. The draft, as it currently stands, allows for the single family residence to be occupied by up to five unrelated adults, plus an unlimited number of minor children and up to six vehicles, one for each license driver, plus one more. This would create an undesirable situation for anyone unfortunate enough to live in the immediate vicinity. However, this scenario is downplayed by CPD by displaying a chart on the group living pages of the Denver Govt website, which shows the average household size for other Colorado cities and several tier cities. Here's the chart. The sustained chart that Andrew Webb presented earlier in his staff report is from a low of 1.94 in Aspen to 3.10 in Kansas City. Even in Seattle and Vancouver, where up to eight unrelated adults are allowed, the number is 2.12 and 2.46, respectfully, respectively. That being the case, it would seem logical to cap the number at three. It's apparent that allowing a number greater than three does not result in an increase in the average number of unrelated adults occupying a hall. However, a cap of

three would prevent the occasional high occupancy situation from adversely affecting a block and in a neighborhood where it could occur. There are other solutions to high housing costs than increasing density in residential areas. The second item I'd like to address is allowing homeless shelters to exist in residential areas. The if not to homelessness has been going on. Program in the years when you were in much worse than it was then. At a cost of umpteen millions of dollars. It seems to me that an objective view of the situation indicates that efforts have been misguided living with the causes of homelessness, primarily drug and alcohol addiction and mental problems. Money is thrown at providing food and shelter. This provides only temporary relief, does nothing to solve the very. That's the time we have allotted for you. This area

will. Do in our next speaker. To transfer the problem is Robert Ray. Go ahead, Robert. We're going to go ahead and get you in the queue. And I want to just remind folks, you got 3 minutes to speak. And if you're repeating things that folks have already said, we've got about 150 speakers and we're just starting our 50 seconds speaker. And so just a quick reminder for folks. Go ahead, Robert. Oh, and I think you might be muted. We don't have your audio, Robert. Oh. Oh, there you go. Okay. Cause sometimes I have problems with that. Thanks for the opportunity. I'm a resident of Council District ten Council Councilman Hines District. I've been following this debate for a while. I was at some of the in-person hearings. So, you know, 18 years ago or whenever it was. And, you know, have caught through those and through these. A lot of people talking about how they you know, they get an opportunity to make it in this city. And they've been able to buy a property they've been able to rent and kind of their personal story of succeeding here in Denver. And I think, you know, what's what's kind of both pro and against the theme I've heard is that that people get to succeed in this city. And I think that's pretty awesome. I feel the same way. You know, my wife and I had our first kid this year and are really looking forward to kind of succeeding ourselves in raising a family here. And I think if that's going to be a story for everyone, if we all agree that that Denver is a place where people can see succeed in people of all kinds, we need to be searching for every opportunity to promote success, whatever it looks like, and promote the different ways of living and of being that that means. And I think this is just a really great example of that. I think Andrew Webb and everybody at the city council and everybody that's been pushing for this have done a really good job of trying to find a way that that really draws the line of allowing current homeowners and everybody that, you know, has property and are worried about property values to keep that and everybody that that either chooses or has to live in a different way to to find housing that works for them. And so this just just I am amazed at the amount of hard work that has gone in to find a solution that really draws that line and promotes that sort of future where everybody can succeed. Hearing in in Congress part where we live, there's some signs that talk about how, you know, they support I can't remember exactly they say but they support an inclusive Denver and their support and they say no high rises and I think that that just doesn't fit and that a lot of these arguments you hear about this really go at that that that they're attacking some way of people succeeding some people want or need to live in highlighted high rises. And if we want an inclusive city, if we want something that works for everybody, then we've got to be open to all solutions. And I think this this measures that. And so I'm

going to give back those 25 seconds. Thanks for your time. Thank you, Mr. De Ray. We're going to go next to Derrick Coker, witness. Derek. I believe you're in. You might need to unmute your mike. Derek. You're still not unmuted. Derek. One more try. Okay, Derek, keep trying at that. We're going to move over to the next speaker, which is Steve Harley. Mr. Harley, can you and your mike. Thank you. Counsel For those who don't know, the Zoom. Call just changed and we can now see quite a few of the participants and the participant list. I don't know if that's intentional. My name is Steve Hali. I've lived in Baker District seven in one home since 1999, and I support the group Living Amendment. I want to take a moment to thank Myra Gonzalez, because I was really impressed by her powerful testimony. I'm not going to go into depth, but that was the one that I heard so far that really nailed it for me. I'll speak on some slightly different issues. I'm a citizens student of Denver planning issues, and I've helped my neighbors understand this amendment since its inception in 2018. I'm involved in Baker's. Neighborhood organization. But I'm speaking tonight on my own behalf. The thing that I think a lot of us share. Is that we had a lengthy youth. During which for in my case, I lived in several group living households. In every case, we shared meals, resources and inspirations, and calling us family would be completely fair. Those experiences also were also

fundamental to developing my civic involvement. I'm familiar with and I support the amendment's careful realignment of residential care and group and congregate living rules. The new rules are a compromise, but they'll help Denver move forward. They're not moving anything backward. I am, however, very disappointed in the household living compromise limiting households to five adults. It means that some people will continue to wield inequitable, complaint based enforcement over upstanding residents. I hope you will. Reconsider this cap now or in the future. But I do want you to pass this amendment. Thank you for making your decision carefully. Thank you, Mr. Harley. I think I saw. Mr. Coke of Venice? Yes. Okay. Thank you. Hello. Good afternoon or good evening. Thank you. Sorry about the muting and so forth. Anyway, I'm strongly. In opposition to. This group Living Amendment and for a variety of reasons. Also, I've been listening. I sort of had a proposal of things that I would address, but I've heard so many speakers talk about various things, and I frankly think all of the comments regarding racism and classism and bigotry are incendiary remarks. They're insulting. They're not accurate. They these people that live in single family residential neighborhoods such as myself, are not not classes. We're taking care of our homes. We're taking care of our neighborhoods. We're watching out for our neighbors

. We're supporting local cultural organizations. We're supporting nonprofits. We're supporting food banks. We are, you know. Doing good things in our neighborhood. We're growing trees. We're, you know, adding to the quality of the air. This whole racist, you know, it's just an argument that's just an excuse is just a way to cast blame. People, you know, make the point that, you know, that there's an unfair treatment of people who can't afford housing. Well, that may be true. Denver Denver's an expensive city that was. Caused by a lot of. Reasons, including, you know, giving variances to developers, building massive homes on what was single families, small, you know, homes and lots, those kind of things. You know, they have they were building has gotten out of control. Housing is gaining control. There clearly are elite people in the city. That's not something you can change. That's not something the group amendment is going to address. What it's going to address is driving people out of the city, taking people that are paying taxes, taking people that are supporting local. Nonprofits. Organizations that everybody in this benefit, including these people that are griping about unaffordable housing, their amenities are increasing vastly as a result. I really you know, the the slides and arguments we've been given from Andrew Webber, you know, ad nauseum slides to the point where it's, you know, it's it's just too much information. But basically, we're talking about destroying neighborhoods. We're talking about driving people out of the city. We're talking about people, neighbors, including in my area, that are afraid to go out at night because of homes that are have too many roommates and have criminal problems. And we're talking also about zoning department now who's not intending to or not, you know, about to enforce regulations, people or, you know, neighborhood inspection services become, you know, the contrary to the the good of the neighborhoods people cannot get through and make an effective argument. People are they're essentially told that, you know, we don't need to hear those comments anymore. And, you know, you're singled out. You're actually looked at the you know, the perpetrator when you're trying to address a trash issue and overcrowding issue or parking issue, police, you know, criminal issue, that it's just not appropriate that, you know. These things. Never forget the time. We have allocated for your speaker. Our next speaker up is Tacos Bourdain. And we're going to need you to hit Star six to unmute. Hello? Mm hmm. Go ahead. This is Birdie. Okay. Um, I'm a member of 2020 in Montebello, and I'm against the group Living. And I don't I don't understand how you can try to pass this amendment because no respect was given to our community. This group believe in can change our lives, our way of living. And we already have some problems in our community. And I wish some of the people would have decided to come out, some of the council pe

ople to come out into our communities and see what was going on before they decided to do this and see what was going on. And it and how can you say say you you're concerned about the homeless, putting people up in houses together when you are taking people to keep a distance. Telling people to keep a distance from each other. The problem that I have is that we are tax payers and we are asking the City Council and the planning board to put this group living on hold during this pandemic. This is one of the most difficult times that we are having and this is not a problem that we need. And there's something else I want to say. I know and I appreciate people talking

about the homeless and people and the people who cannot afford different things. But I don't like the attitude or the idea that whenever they are talking about the poor or whenever they are talking about people who don't have housing and all this kind of stuff, they use the blacks as an excuse. We have lived in this community for over 30 years. Nobody helped us buy a home. We did it all on our own. We had many neighbors that bought their homes out here. We were military personnel, retired military and retired government workers. So we were not poor. And we don't like the attitude of people making it look like every time there's an issue in the city or anywhere else, black people are the ones they call on because that is not the truth. And I don't appreciate it. And I don't know of any black who do, so no matter what. This. This has got to stop. If you want to try to pass something and do something illegal or do something that you know is not right, do it on your own time. But don't use us as an excuse because that is not right. And we don't appreciate. All right.

Thank you, Mrs. Bourdain. Up next, we have Susan Young. And it looks like we don't have Susan in the queue. And so up next, we have Lucia Browne. You'll have to meet your yourself, please. Hi. My name is Lucia Brown. I live in Baker in District seven and I'm the president of the Baker Historic Neighborhood Association. And tonight, I'm speaking on behalf of both the association and myself, because our positions are the same, so be it. They voted overwhelmingly on two occasions to support the black proposals. In fact, we voted that they didn't go far enough with allowing only five unrelated adults living together instead of the original eight. The dilution of what the black originally came up with is truly sad. And here's why. Baker, like all older neighborhoods in Denver, was developed before there was such a thing as zoning. As such, it grew organically at a human scale with various types of businesses interspersed with various types of residences. Fast forward, when the city was imposing zoning on all parts, Baker was zoned almost completely residential, a mistake we've spent the last couple of decades trying to rectify. None of the residentially zoned parts of Baker are single family, yet Baker is full of single family homes.

In fact, Baker is a wonderfully charming and walkable neighborhood made up of a diverse housing stock from single family homes, duplexes, triplexes row houses. We have publicly subsidized units and penthouses, high rises and large market rate apartment complexes. We also have group homes, transitional housing, mental health facilities and private businesses sprinkled throughout. If Denver is to provide housing for all its citizens, then we must allow higher density in all areas of the city. If Denver wants to improve its carbon footprint and become a 15 minute city, then we must have mixed use throughout. If we want to reduce the recidivism rate, then we must provide a healthy means for those who committed crimes to re integrate into our society. If we want to correct the tragedy of redlining and systemic racism built into Denver's zoning code, then we must all open our neighborhoods to families that don't necessarily look like the stereotypical nuclear family . If anything, this amendment doesn't go far enough. Denver should join the leadership of Minneapolis, Sanford, Sacramento and the state of Oregon and get rid of single family zoning altogether. Thank you. And I yield back my time. Thank you. The cheer. Up next, we have El Nath. And after her, we have Kate a Kate Adams. And Kate, if you're in the attendee queue, please raise your hands so we can get you moved over as a panelist. Kate Adams In the meantime. L Go ahead. Thank you very much. Good evening, council members. My name is Al NEF. I'm a member of Council District ten and I'm here to show my support for the updates to our currently archaic group Living Rules. As former coordinator of All in Denver and an advocate for social equity, I've been following the for the group Living Conversations for over a year. I know the updates are a result of years of research and countless compromises, many of them questionable. It's time we acknowledge that work has been done and listen to the cries for help from frontline organizations so we can move on to other solutions. My passion for social equity is likely tied to the fact that I grew up experiencing a lack of housing myself. I was raised by a single mother who suffered from schizophrenia. I was kept off the streets thanks to group living situations. We lived in homes of friends, shelters, organizations like the Safe House and shared student housing. Had we not been able to live in these situations, I would have been a child on the streets had we not lived in cities where there are less restrictions on group living. I may have also been a child who didn't get to go to school. I've heard a majority of the arguments against passing these updates, and I'd like to briefly address the main ones. One. What's the point? If group living is an enforced, often the laws as they stand, give corrupt landlords more grounds to threaten the livelihood of tenants and supporting the group living laws as is. Sends a message that the city supports their corruption.

The second argument is shelters and rehabs will appear everywhere, ruining our neighborhoods and making them less safe for our children. Not only are there regulations within the amendments and other limitations like expensive building codes making this impossible. But this is a telling argument as it shows a level of ignorance as to what leads people to homelessness. Whose children are you seeking to protect? Certainly not all of them. Think about the purpose of these facilities. Stability. More children attending schools. More support for addiction. Emergency mental health support services that can provide follow up and consistency. The only argument remaining is parking spots. One that is most bothersome to me. First off, no landlords will be forced to house more people than they're comfortable with. Take it up with them. Also notice this is an argument often made by the same people who say that group living is an enforced fear seems to represent issues that run deeper than their protectiveness of a parking spot. Again, the work has been done, compromises have been made. Pass these updates and rest well knowing that you're helping us take a step toward more housing solutions. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Cassius Burdine. Oh. Okay, I'm on. Can you hear me? Go ahead, Mr. Burton. I'm a Vietnam. Purple hearted veteran. And I'm now 82 years old. And I have lived. Here over 30 years in the. Same. House. Marbella group living. I'm not far. The things this may change is here. We fought to get them. And we certainly don't want to just give it to in the trash can. Everybody that was coming at it goes to the same thing. I agree with everything my wife said 100%. Now we all have. Two and three garage. Space. And driveways and hold the car. But yet there are people parking on. The streets so we don't get a street swept half the time because this. Car is parked there. So the sweeper gets to the street and is in and out. In Tulsa below me. They park all the time. The bus stop was even. Blocked. Where the kids. Can't get on it. I'm talking. About the TV and if it comes a time where somebody. Get run over, then we get concerned about it. We need to be concerned about it up front now. This is not right. And the changes we fought for. We don't intend to give them up. Okay? No. I've seen trucks. Tractor trailer trucks. Parked in driveways. That was a no no. So nobody's backing up what we did. I've seen new driveways poured and I just. Said, well, let's see if is inspector is going to come and check it. We need the. Inspectors. Are you supervised? You need to get off your hind ends and get out to the area and look at some things yourself. Don't assume that. Person that's in charge know better. If they did, they would do the work to begin with in the right fashion. When you put blacktop around railroad tracks. You might do it seven times a year. When you put cement there. It'll last for. Seven years in one. They've been cheaper in the long run. So the

job needs to be done right to begin with and not just throw trash at you. And that's what we shouldn't see in better. We didn't have that before. And we're beginning to get that now. So we don't need that. Our Press Council members, Bill Roberts. Even have paint. It was better. And Bill Roberts was just great. He always let. Us know what was coming. And we was there. To back him up when he in the. So things are not going like it should. And I don't respect that. And I don't intend to let. Nobody change the thing I got to do about it. So that I stand with. The group that. Says. We don't need group living. And that's done. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Bourdain. Up next, we have Kate Adams. Good evening. My name is Kate Adams and I live in in Denver, District six. This is my third rezoning process and council meeting. I really understand the dif. The. Difficulty. Of the process and the. Potential impacts in May. I begin looking at the group Living Amendment. The first thing I found with the words nonprofit. Had been taken out of the household definition, essentially leaving households for profit. I believe people have value and households are people, but people are not for profit. Nonprofit is back in now and I appreciate the effort of Blue to remove some of this amendments egregious snus and other researching. I found the. Support for Group Living, a California organization. Committed to density and alternative transportation. Changes in Denver started. To sound familiar. Active in a number of Western and Midwestern cities, an article about Minneapolis laid out their process over a. Period of years. Begin to activate the community, influence a new 20 year plan. Voter increase favorable. Members to city leadership positions, diminish the voice of RINOs, including getting rid of the city to cut ties. Getting the city to cut ties. And over several. Years, as was mentioned earlier, they eliminated single family housing in the zoning code. Some yimby cities even have the same name for their initiatives, including Denver's upcoming residential infill. To take precedence, it seems, over the auditors recommendation to bring the. City under one zoning. Code. The group Living Amendment is not for Denver by Denver. Tonight, I'm asking you to vote no. I'm well. Aware that asking for a no vote. Includes no on two of the changes. That could be the entire scope of the vote increase. The number of unrelated adults in

a household seemingly supported by both sides. Expand the area of the city for large community correction facilities. In my opinion, the city has chosen to take two Denver needs and included wants of. Outsiders or those. Who will profit from the amendment. While. Applauding the changes made by Rudy. I'm asking you to vote no on the inequity of two zoning codes and essentially unfunded mandate, with no increase in city services. Displacement of affordable homeowners like those in Virginia Village. The precedent of the city acting as proxy for. Outsiders

over residents, but most of all. Silencing the vote of. Neighborhoods. This is Denver. Please vote no for the entire amendment. Thank you. Thank you, Kate. Our next speaker is Megan Yankey. Thank you. Council members, can you hear me? Go ahead. Megan. My name is Megan Yankee. My family and I own a home in District one. Maintaining an inclusive city requires that we provide diverse housing options for everyone. Our current limits. And I'm speaking in support of the amendment. Our current limits on group living are among the most exclusive in the nation and impose very traditional cultural norms on everyone. When compounded with other exclusionary zoning practices, we are building a truly exclusive city. The group living proposal at hand increases. The opportunity for density while maintaining architectural character. It truly Win-Win. We must resist the urge to impose our living standards of more privileged generations. And persons on others. My family and I have considered living in community because first we can't afford a bigger house on our own. And second, we want to live with other family to support us as parents. We don't have a lot of family nearby, and it is super hard to raise a family alone. Why shouldn't we have this option when it would improve our lives and would allow us the option to continue to afford to live in Denver? Without these group living options, we will likely be forced to leave Denver for the suburbs where we can find cheaper housing. Further, the proposed changes allow the city to better serve. Those most vulnerable. In our city to prevent homelessness. I currently live near several restricted properties serving individuals that were formerly experiencing homelessness, including the formerly incarcerated and have seen only positive impacts to my neighborhood and property values. When given the opportunity to build a more inclusive city. Why wouldn't we rally to support that opportunity? Thank you for your consideration. Thank you, Megan. Next up, we have David Johnson. David. You're going to have to. Yes. Can you hear me? Go. Go ahead. Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity. I'm going to take a little bit different tack on this. My wife, Stephanie and I moved to Denver in 1983, and we've lived here for nearly 40 years, and that's 40 years. We have always lived in the Capitol Hill area. And when we first moved to the city in 1983, the city was going through a transition from multiple family residences to single family residences. We actually participated in changing the zoning and a piece of the city that we lived in from our three to r one. And part of the reason that we participated in that is we felt that there were lots of different houses. There were lots of different conditions in those homes. We saw a variety of dilapidated homes that weren't being taken care of because of the multiple family situations that involved those particular homes. Once we got the zoning changed, we saw a radical change and a radical

difference in the property conditions, how how homes were being maintained. We saw more stability. We saw less transition in the neighborhoods. It was a heyday of neighborhood schools. We really saw a tremendous improvement in this city back in the seventies and eighties when we first moved here as a result of reducing multiple family situations to single family situations. I think what's happening here is we're not looking at history and we're ignoring that history. Because what we're doing is looking backwards and kind of reverting to those those times when we saw that kind of situation in those kinds of home conditions affecting our lives in Colorado. So we certainly our lives in Denver, but we certainly do not support the amendment for those very reasons. We think that there's a lot greater security that we saw, more stability, more family involvement, families moving in with children. It was a wonderful time in our city, and I don't want to see our city to go back to that where we have to we have to go through the same problems that we did back in the seventies and eighties. And I strongly urge that the group Living Amendment be voted voted down in the city council for those very reasons. And I really hope you you think about that carefully. Thanks. Thank you. Up next, we have Carson Bryant. Okay. Hi, I'm Carson Bryant. I'm a resident of District ten, and I'll be speaking in favor of this proposal. So the way we treat each other is really reflected in the fabric of our physical environment. So, like, how we exclude, displace, to devalue and marginalize our fellow citizens is especially evident. And where we do and do not live. Most residential neighborhoods in Denver reveal both history and present practice of exclusion on

grounds ranging from race to class to lifestyle to the care that someone needs. The lingering imperative to exclude, stigmatize and devalue has been on full display throughout this process, relying on fearmongering notions of the other invading sacrosanct single family neighborhoods. Rather, we need to emphasize the ways in which this proposal helps meet the needs of our neighbors. From those seeking stable housing to those looking to reenter our communities is the responsibility of our city government to adopt policies that prioritize those needs. I'm confident that my fellow Democrats seek to live in a city that reflects principles of equity and compassion. Tonight, I encourage you councilors to demonstrate that commitment. Please support this group living proposal. Thank you all so much. Thank you, Carson. Up next, we have Samuel Hargraves. You. Is that correct? Mm hmm. Go ahead, sir. I on? Yes. Great. So apparently, I'm a racist. I'm a bigot. I'm an elitist. I'm homophobic. Apparently, I have some basic character flaw because there's no way I could possibly oppose this on any kind of substantive merit. The raising of. Of of racial shaming, of all these kinds of shaming techniques is counterproductive. It's possib

le to substantively disagree with this proposal. Number one to. To try to regulate residential zoning. The same way you regulate half way felony zoning is ridiculous. It defies logic. They are two. Completely. Different kinds of zoning and use. I don't know anybody who really cares if there were a couple of extra roommates in a house. People care if there is going to be felons living next to them or felons living in their neighborhood. It's reasonable. To expect when you move into a neighborhood that the. Zoning means. Something. It provides some system stability, some belief in how it will be. What you're proposing. These stabilizes the city, it doesn't provide stability. And the idea of that, that somehow it's to make up for past racial, racial and racial injustices. Is insulting. It's patronizing. The opposition to this is not political. The opposition to this. Is opposition by citizens of all colors, all ages. All political. Bents. I just. It's it's just. It's. It's awful. Um, I am also, uh. Though the lack of transparency in this process makes it exceptionally suspicious. Yeah. I just it's hard to trust anything, any of the statements that have come out of this this city council regarding this proposal, because it has been such a closed, opaque process. I urge you to vote this down and start new and handled residential and felony separately. Thank you. Thank you. Up next, we have Joseph Halprin. Evening evenings. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead, Mr. Halperin. Thanks. My name is Joe Halpern. I live in District ten. I own my home. But like many people in Denver, I started out as a renter and saved up over quite a number of years. I opposed the group Living Amendments, which I may call JLA in its present form and urge you to vote no. I'm a 42 year resident of Capitol Hill, which has the most diverse housing stock and people in the city. Given Capitol Hill's density and mix of housing, buying a home in Capitol Hill involves not only choosing a neighborhood, but also choosing a block based on weighing many factors, including density, traffic, noise and safety. The group Living Amendment would allow residential care facilities of many types in any single family house and would have a serious adverse impact on homeowners who chose a neighborhood and a block seeking relative peace, quiet and safety and yes, quality of life matters even in Capitol Hill. The group Living Amendment removes existing licensing, permitting and other protections in the current zoning code and also treats all residential care facilities alike, even though their impacts can and do differ significantly and enforcement provisions in the new provision in the new Act. The new amendments are completely inadequate. In addition. I remind the Council of the Law of Unintended Consequences, which we've seen over the years on many zoning issues. And unfortunately, it's very difficult to ring the bell. It takes time. And normally because the city attorney tells you so, you need to gra

ndfather it. Anyone who was granted imprudent permission to do something detrimental. Think about this. The slot zoning issue, the slot house zoning issue. This amendment should be broken into smaller parts and reconsider it in a truly open and robust citizen process, not a process dominated by the very commercial interests that stand to benefit financially from the group Living Amendment. For the record, I do not oppose the concept of increasing the number of unrelated adults sharing a single family house. But as written, the amendment would allow commercial landlords to easily evade the household definition. All that a landlord needs to do is prepare bylaws for a house and have all the owners sign something saying that they all choose to live together. I urge you to vote against this proposition. It is the worst proposed zoning amendment I have seen in my 40 years, in 42 years in Denver, including 29 years as the liberals see the neighbors zoning chair. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Our next speaker is Lincoln Miller. Oh, thank you. Hi. My

name is Lincoln Miller, and I just want to thank all the members of the City Council for serving your community during this very difficult time. I want to speak in favor of the proposed zoning changes, although I don't think that they go far enough. The Planning Board asked you and I attended that meeting virtually to go to eight unrelated adults and hear you only go to five. And I would like you to consider allowing houses to scale up the number of residents based on square footage. And let me tell you where that comes from. So I've been doing affordable co-operative and group living development or living in cooperatives for the last 25 years. And we've learned some things over that time. So one of the things that we learned is that the economy of scale really works when you have about ten people give or take. And so that's why when we worked on the ordinance in Boulder, we had 12 people in a single family home. As long as you have at least 200 square feet per person. So it's within the health and safety guidelines. The House is big enough. You can have more folks. Guess what? We did that since 2017 and the sky did not fall. We're still okay. The city is still intact. Family values are still intact. And why is this the case? This is the case because community. Living and co-ops provide affordable housing, because folks are allowed. To share. They provide sustainability. Because. Again, the sharing. Leads. To less energy use. In fact, one third in our engineering study of the energy is used in shared houses compared to other Colorado households. It creates community and it helps to build residents skills. So it's a real. Problem when your zoning code punishes low income people who can't afford housing, especially during a pandemic. That's what an occupancy limit does. It criminalizes poverty. It criminalizes low income folks. This is why the occupancy limits have been struck down in multiple states beca

use they're inherently unfair. So homeownership is. Completely out of the question. For many people. But what this ordinance could help to. Do is allow for sharing, which can lead to affordable. Rentals. And also this sharing can allow people to buy a house together and create equity co-ops that are affordable for ownership. So I urge you to approve the ordinance and zoning changes before you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Anna DeWitt. The Evening City Council. I'm on a to with a teacher union. Member and resident of D ten. I've lived in. Denver for eight years and when I first moved here I was filled with it, except with excitement. What a cool city. But rent was really high for me. A teacher to afford. So to make ends meet, I shared a one bedroom with two other adults for three years. And I know it sounds crazy, but you do what you do in order to survive. But wouldn't it be nice if people could thrive instead of just survive? I hope that when people think about how the group Living Amendment will change Denver, they think about the lower middle class workers who deserve to live in a city in which they work. But the question is, who should get to live together in the year 2021, both legally and morally, as anyone who wants to be? Yet, unfortunately, our living codes are. Outdated and don't reflect current views and beliefs. Now listening to a lot of comments. I've heard the term frat house a lot. Would you be against group living if you knew your child's teacher would directly benefit from it? Would you be against group living if you knew your child's friend could live in a secure environment that his family could afford? Are you aware of the. Many Denver residents. Denver children and families who are living in housing insecurity? Hundreds of people and hundreds of children. The group living proposal is not an experiment. Denver is quite literally late to the game. Many other states have already. Passed a measure similar to this. So where is all. The commotion coming from? People are scared. We just heard someone say that they're scared an inmate is going to live next to them. But if this amendment passes halfway, homes must still go through state and. Federal law in order to exist. Denver can pass any progressive housing bill it wants. Yet it would do little to allow more halfway. Homes due to strict state and federal. Regulations. And again, for those who are in opposition, I hope you recall the 2019 election was a 300 initiative. You know, the one many of you voted no on with the presumption of we can do better. When is better going to come along? It seems that any time we have the option to support people who are housing insecure or an option to support the working class, we always. Say no. This amendment has everything to. Do with who can live next to. You and not how many people can live next to you. Let's be clear with that. In a world where blended families co-parenting, gay marriage and single parenthood is the norm, I think we should

take a strong look at our individual actions and ask ourselves, Are we on the right side of history or do we support outdated living systems from the 1950s? Let's be the progressive city we pretend to be. Please vote in favor. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is fluorine now. And you're going to have to and meet yourself as well. Thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight. I have been a

resident of Denver for 43 years in Park Hill. And I have been the owner of that time in three homes, been in the current. One for 22 years. And I, I have to say, I agree with the one of the gentlemen before that resented the implication that I was could be racist or homophobic because I oppose this amendment. That is not at all the case that I moved. We purchased a house in Park Hill specifically because it was a racially diverse neighborhood. Now, since that time, it has gotten less so due to all the housing increased housing prices in Denver. Which is exactly my. Concern. With this amendment. First, let me tell you, I am totally in favor of expanded opportunities for safe houses, correctional increased correctional facilities in residential areas and sober living homes, care facilities. My problem is with this amendment is that I think. That it is leading people to believe that it is the solution to a housing problem that it is not a solution to. There is nothing. What I see is an economic issue and. There is nothing to say that. A developer. Or a I'm sorry, an investor, real estate. Investor will not just take a home that can now house five people. Be it. A thousand square feet or. 2000 square feet and charge. Rents that are exorbitant. Just like now for a one bedroom. 1200 dollars. 1400 dollars. A month. We're implying that this is going to help us and it's not. What I urge you to do is bifurcate this issue. Take the. Care facilities, the other housing issues, a group living issues separate them and try to really. Address the affordability. I have two adult children who grew up in Denver. Neither of which, both with good paying jobs, neither of which who can afford a house in Denver right now? So I support the concept of increasing the number of people who can live together. But I do not believe that this is the answer. And I think. Accepting this answer. Will. Will not be a solution in and is detrimental. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Samantha Hinshaw. Hi. My name is Samantha Hinshaw and I am a Denver native and current resident of District ten. I'll be speaking in favor of the proposal, though I don't think it goes far enough. I would like to see allowances made for more residents living in larger homes. I lived in a limited equity cooperative house in Denver for four years and my life has been transformed by this experience in a multitude of ways. First there, the financial benefits. So I hope the previous speaker is still on the call because of the affordable rent that I pay. In our shared expenses, I have been able to break the

paycheck to paycheck cycle and build my savings for the future. When I had an unexpected medical bill a couple of years ago. My housemates were able to help me cover the rent, and I've had the chance to do the same for my other housemates, especially during the pandemic. During times of job loss and more unexpected medical bills, I can finally see a path to homeownership in my own future, which I never thought would be possible for a millennial public school teacher saddled with tens of thousands of dollars in student debt. Even more important than the economic benefits, I have learned so much about myself and others while living in community, I have gained skills around the shared decision making, conflict resolution, listening and sharing. I become more civically engaged, clearly socially and environmentally conscious, and I even eat vegetables now. I learned how to fix a garbage disposal, how to speak up for what I need, and have shared some of the most growth filled years of my life with strangers who have become my family. I want this opportunity to be available to all Democrats, whether they live in Capitol Hill, my fellow Five Points or Cherry Creek. Whether they are exiting homelessness, incarceration, college, or any other phase of their life. Whether they are related to the people in their home, by marriage, by blood, or by common purpose. Please vote yes on this proposal and make Denver more accessible, more affordable and more inclusive for all. Thank you. Thank you, Samantha. Our next speaker is Tuwei tuwei. Ang and we have a translator as well. And so we'll let you go ahead. And I'll have to go ahead and unmute yourselves, please. Oh, God. Mingle. I want you. Hello, everyone. Good morning. I'm actually on cable there. My name is straightway. I'll stand by my need to furnish UAV. I have been living in the East. Coast for ten years and call first Lambeau, Omaha. These are little more subtle political point out here. I'm right there for. Residents and also a. Small business owner of the East Coast Community College. Claudia, where we let you buy barrier. I'm also a board member of the Deep Coltrane Community Collective. Jamal, meet our unit at Loon, Your Mind and Our Money. We do have that in a U.S. dollar, rather. I came to the. United States as a refugee to my dad, Manuel Mule, the boy Jabari. I love to live in Denver. Anyhow, whenever I do have that, it should. We walk out in the yard. Now you worry. I believe separate is a good place for people. Who have financial difficulties to live and to be met by Mark, who is really not happy about it. However, right now the rent is becoming so expensive to live in any community buying one. The motto is to leave it limit the chilling of honor at a time during worship when we are out here. I have seen my neighbors get kicked out of their houses and they have moved to other states or their states that are

really. The town's stadium. There is it or we are here tomorrow. Maphumulo celebrated who?

Younan Omolola Chiluba. I'm going to people that I still have links to others. However, I still want to stay in that group because I was reporting the jungle that month and naturally late at night I need I need done by all that. You guys have really divided you up. Yeah, yeah. No, we don't need you. With all my other friends that have moved. To other states, including their children, want to come back and they suffer. And living in Denver. Deep down by my need. Not. Who are she? Middle to Maria. I believe that there is a way that everyone can live. Separately but do need to meet are who they are. The channel mothers are in my world to do it and got it. A John Peabody. One way, I believe that many families in my community can afford to. Endeavor is probably living together with different people tomorrow. You know what? I don't know. Mid-afternoon. But how about you? I also believe that many different people come together and say. You know, is it Hillary demanding that, you know, Jomana, my wife, would be ready to do me out while me Jamal, a jazz warrior. Because I know that it is expensive to buy a house. Myself and my friend want to buy a house together. By Peter Lesser or Jamal Joaquin Winograd let down by a young vigilante model, when on May one we were able model guard, soldier, general law. The reason her friend and my friend and I are buying a home together is because we are low income and we cannot afford to buy a house by ourselves. I'll be mad tomorrow, delay arranging or be no more mid-afternoon hassle. Matthew Needham with our Chengdu China Daily My new low me are also there. How would you model whenever I think about it, I don't the model in my neighborhood when I marvel. I do not believe that when I learn that different people from different families cannot live together. Because of that, my friend and I, we try to buy a house together, schedule a change, how to do this in a lot of ways when we natural web do. For one hour I to do down by my time water. Hello do do want. To a name are with you the channel mother we need her and I go tomorrow I'm your. As he and other people hope that people who are low income people for. Refugee families will be able to live together in a. Safe place in the near future. I mean, I didn't. Think of it that, oh, I got my gun back. Yeah, I bought it down here downhill. I love living in Denver and I do. Not want to move to a different neighborhood. That's something that I'm also a. Mom and I'll phone in about an hour and a chimichanga. All you need to meet up with me when we are mostly not one winner and we both have what we call our middle young. You are here. But I would like to say that. I hope all the families for four. Different families who live together at my house. Together, the model that will be the. Model that. Will nominate our union below. I know it's a model that will be coming to visit to America. We do not understand a lot of the state laws and regulations, but I hope that it can be changed in

the near future. Dave Luba, thank you very much. Thank you. Up next, we have David Hagan. I mean, you can't. All right. Up next, we've got. Sorry about that. Oh, there we go. All right. Yes. David, here. I would like to say I'm in favor of voting on this with a yes. I again, I don't think it goes far enough. I would like to like to say that. I think that. The reason when we are frustrated that somebody calls us racist, it's usually because we are racist. I'll just say that. Get out of the way. And I also want to say that the reason we need to be doing this is because people are struggling. Using COVID as an excuse to not do it doesn't really make sense. We need to go ahead and help people not be on the streets, help people not get COVID. And when we are together, we yes, we may we could potentially get COVID, but it's less likely to be spreading into the entire community if somebody is not on the street, you're less likely to die if you're not on the street. And I also wanted to thank all the folks that voted. I want to vote no on those that kept their cameras off. I would just request that they turn their cameras back on, just like we asked the KKK members take their hoods off to see who you are. I hope you all have a great night. Thank you. All right. Our next speaker is Alicia Blackman. Hi there. First, I want to say thank you for the process you went through. I was able to come to a meeting a couple of months back and before COVID. It was really deep and thoughtful. And I really appreciate all the information you gave to folks. I'm a teacher and I've been in teacher for 13 years. This zoning change is really close to my heart for a variety of reasons, and I'll only really speak in depth about one of them. I'm not going to talk much about how, as a school teacher, I couldn't afford a home in the Parkville neighborhood because that's already been discussed and how I pay my mortgage every month for the last eight years because I have roommates. And also that it's my choice to have roommates because I love raising my two year old with my partner in a home with other adults who have helped me be more resilient and help me with childcare during COVID so that I could continue to be employed part time even during a pandemic.

And we do lots of things to keep each other safe. We're really good at communicating. We take care of our house and it's not junky looking. But we don't need to talk about that because a lot of other folks have talked about those things today. Thank you. For those who have addressed the misinformation about property values going down and the imagined safety of our children being at risk. Yes, I'm also a teacher and a mother. I just don't believe that having people in need in your neighborhood are a risk to children. I think that that is a bigoted reason to oppose the zoning change. What I want to speak about more is probably less popular and related to more stigma, which is that two of the people I love most in my life lived in

residential care homes. This issue is deeply personal to me because I kept waiting for my younger sister for the day when she wasn't going to live anymore. But because she was able to live in a residential care facility. Now, she's been sober for five years. She's found a husband who also has been sober sober for five years. And they have their first child. They both have graduated college and they're gainfully employed. She met my sister, met her husband, Orlando, who served our country in the Marines and became addicted to drugs when serving our country, which is not uncommon in part to help him manage his untreated PTSD. Together. They have gone on the most challenging journey that I can imagine, and they're incredibly resilient. Here is a picture of my sister. I don't know if you can see her at her wedding and at my wedding. They are not people who need to be feared. And when you tell me and people like my sister and people who want to live in a different way, that they don't belong, what you're doing is you're continuing the history of telling people you don't belong in this community because you look different. And that scares me. Thank you, Alicia. Next, we have Lenny Rush. Good evening. My name is Lanny Rush. I'm a District nine resident. I thank you all for your time and your commitment to hearing everyone speak and reading all those comments. I know that folks have commented about the transparency and the process, and I would say that it has felt quite transparent. It has felt that there was a outpouring of community engagement, at least in the past year. I know it's been going on for longer than that, but that's when I was made aware. I don't think I'll win for originality. And I a lot of what I have to say is similar. So I'm going to opt for brevity. I really ask you all to vote yes on these text amendments, because if all these amendments did were, as per Mr. Webb's slides, rectify discriminatory codes. That's worth your yes vote. Unless we want to say yes to the racism and status quo of the past, which to that point, all of the people who have come on here to say, does supporting me make me a racist? If you're not a head dog, don't holler. So please think about the legacy of changing these codes to something new. And will they be Denver's codes for as long as the last one was? Probably not, because we all agree that that's been outdated. However, I think this is the best that we've got, too. There have been a ton of compromises, so I really, really hope you vote yes. I think the worst thing that could happen is that this goes back to committee and we have to sit through another year of making no progress. I really hope that this goes to a vote and that regardless of the outcome, we can move forward and continue to build a better city that works for everyone. Thank you all very much for your time. Have a great rest of your evening. Thank you, Lainey. Up next, we have Jason Fellows. Good evening, everyone. Thanks for taking my comment

s. I urge the City Council to vote no. The narrative that those of us who are in opposite. Opposition are a classist, racist, homophobic. That's not true. My belief is that the group Living Amendment, which would convert single family homes from a two or three income model to a five income model will have the opposite effect. It will destroy the affordability of single family homes for those who are seeking to start out in Denver. And for that reason, I ask you to vote no. I think the GLA will have a profound impact on our city. It was not debated during our last election and as the last two and a half hours have shown. This is a contentious issue. I don't believe the city council has the mandate to make a change of this magnitude to our zoning code. And I think if you want to move forward, you should. As Lawrence Murray said. Take it to the voters. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Leslie Tory Kautsky. High Council president. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead, Leslie. Okay. Thank you. I'll keep it brief, because I know it's a long night. First and foremost, I want to ask you all council to please support this group Living Amendment. I'm very excited about the work that has been done. I don't think it's a perfect piece of policy. And so my second ask is that you will keep your hearts and minds open to revisiting this policy in a couple of years when this went through. Planning Board Susan Stanton, God rest her soul, suggested that we revisit this policy in two years. And I want to reiterate that. Finally, my third ask is that, as you know, it's now

almost 10 p.m. on a monday night. I know Councilman Herndon has brought forth the concept of looking at timing for public comment in front of city council. And I think this night is a great night as an example of how this becomes problematic that people are asked to stay in until 10 p.m. on a work night to give comment. So I will wrap up just by asking once again that you support group living, that you revisit this policy change in a couple of years and that you revisit the policy change surrounding public comment at city council. And with. That, that's all. Thank you. Council President Gilmore. Thank you, Leslie. All right. Our next speaker is Sandra Petrie PD. Sorry. And I believe we're getting her connected. Yes. Good evening. This is Sandra Petty, and I've been a Denver resident for almost 30 years. I live in Mayfair. You said cross streets, Monaco in Colfax. We have a very good, diverse neighborhood. Black, white, rich, poor, young. Old. It's enjoyable. And this program is utopian in nature, and it's destructive. And it will destroy the quality of life in Denver. We have I can't tell you how many times I have lost a day's work because I could not get out of my driveway. There was a house that was just sold a few months ago on what was just sold a few months ago. It's about 1100 square feet and a basement. It was bought by investors. These investors rented it out to four unrelated adults

, each of that, each of whom have a car. The I think it's kind of public knowledge that the majority of individuals who are supporting this amendment have. Shall I say, selfish interests. And as a taxpayer. And as a property owner, I feel as though I am being discriminated by this amendment. One of the things that really concerns me is nobody has ever brought up infrastructure. We have roads that are series of pavement batteries. The crime rate in Mayfair has increased dramatically. We've had that murder on 11th and Monaco. There are two reports just yesterday, one at 13th and Locust in one at 12th and a little bit to the left of people just coming into the house during the day when people have been in that house to rob it. You know. It's. It breaks my heart. This breaks my heart. It legitimately breaks my heart. I wish the council and our mayor would take into consideration who pays their salaries and who voted them into office. And you figure the majority of the calls today have been in opposition of this. And again, we're not opposed to growth. If you don't grow, you're going to die. You have to grow. But uncontrolled. And the right. Time we have allocated for each speaker, we're going to go ahead and move to the next. We have Paul Duncan. All right, Paul, we need to have you go ahead and then you. All right. Can you hear me all right? Mm hmm. Go ahead, please. Great. I am going to keep it brief as well. I just want it done. Share that I'm a resident of District three in the West Colfax neighborhood. I'm a member of the We Can Reno Land Use Committee, although I'm only speaking on behalf of myself tonight. I just wanted to encourage city council to support this initiative. And I don't want to provide my exact address because the current regulations make my living situation illegal. And that's because I have two roommates. And that's probably a pretty strange thing to seem illegal. But as Mr. Webb pointed out, it is illegal. So unfortunately, I know people that have been evicted in Denver after receiving a complaint from a neighbor just for having three unrelated adults living in a home. So this is not a hypothetical. The current regulations have resulted in friends, people I know becoming temporarily homeless and during a pandemic. That's the last thing we want. But I think even outside of a pandemic, if we're wanting to address homelessness, affordable housing and equity, the current regulations make it really prohibitive to. Ever imagine owning a home. So I just wanted to encourage everyone to vote yes. And to note that although it's not a silver bullet for affordable housing, we do need to stand up for people that are formerly incarcerated dealing with substance abuse and legalize the way that many of us in Denver already live. So I thank you for your time. Thank you, Paul. Up next, we have Sarah Wells. Thank you. In 2015, my husband and I bought a 1902 Denver Square in Capitol Hill, a sprawling seven bedroom house with over 4000 square feet

t of living space. Over time, we filled those spacious bedrooms with people who were looking for accessible housing and a sense of community. We currently share ownership in our home with living expenses for each person affordable to those making 50% area median income. Over the last five years, residents of our co-op have been entrepreneurs, counselors, teachers, lawyers, civil servants, social workers and artists people who make the city a better place to live. The number of people in our house is illegal in the current zoning code, but does not violate the building and fire code because it is not unsafe. We live together responsibly. We cook meals together, share chores, manage maintenance, mow the lawn, park our cars off streets, have avoided any COVID infections and support each other through our successes and failures. We operate very much like a family. In

fact, it is the only family of my six month old son has ever known. We know many community houses like our own throughout the city, both owner and renter occupied but do not feel safe making themselves known because of the current outdated code and fear of displacement. We made the choice to make our home more visible in this fight for a more equitable zoning code. Because over the last five years we have received hundreds of inquiries of people wanting to live here. The citizen citizens of Denver are desperate for an affordable, nurturing place to live. Over the last three years, I had the responsibility of serving on the Group Living Advisory Council and contributing to the recommendations for voting on tonight. The very first thing we agreed on in those meetings was that we should not limit who can live in a house based on blood relationship, that zoning should not be defining or chosen families. To see blood relationship persist in tonight's vote is demoralizing. To see the proposal watered down from eight adults to five unrelated adults will not go far enough to legalize many cooperatives in the city. I support tonight's proposed changes because they are better than the current rules rules which have been used to perpetuate a system that disproportionately favors the wealthy and leads to segregated neighborhoods. This is a disappointing conclusion to what could have been a truly inclusive and progressive move. But if it's the best we can do, let's embrace it as a step forward. Cooperative housing has had a profoundly positive impact on my life and so many others. I urge you to vote in favor of the proposed changes as it represents a vote in favor of a more equitable, connected and compassionate city. Thank you. Thank you, Sarah. Our next speaker is Jesus Gonzalez. Hello? Mm hmm. Go ahead. All right, everyone. Good evening, everyone. My name is Alice, and I grew up in and currently work in East Colfax. I live in Central Park University Hill. And now I'm I'm at a home in Capitol Hill. And these are these locations I, like many others, have at one point or another lived with multiple,

unrelated adult women starting from a young age, several people that my parents knew from their towns in Mexico, and they made their way to Denver and found their first American home within our home. Made up a big part of my childhood. Having them there was incredibly enriching for me. And they helped my parents with costs around the house, including adding a driveway for at street parking, which has been very convenient throughout the years. And growing up, though, I remember my parents always kind of living with this concern that and the way, you know, in Spanish community, when I told you that that someone would call the city on us, that's okay. The city and was as if they were doing something wrong. But according to this outdated code, they were. And when I talk to them about this text amendment, they have told me that as a young immigrant family, they felt targeted and harassed by their neighbors early on who would call the city on them. But over time, you know, they introduced themselves and they got to know us and they learned that the people that chose to live with us respected the neighborhood as much as anyone. And when I hear from opposition that these changes. And when I hear from the opposition to these changes, I feel like they're calling the city on my family. Now. I went to a pretty privileged majority white, middle, middle and high school. So I talk to my friends about roommate situations. It's never one person that they might be doing something illegal or that someone might call the city on them for living with too many people. And trust me, we live together because a whole lot more reckless than my parents ever did. But I had my parents that were harassed and that impression from that kind of intimidation from their neighbors has never really gone away for them. It's shaped their impression of them. And I see these changes as taking away some of the tools to discriminate and harass people like us. Even though watering down the original proposal is a step backwards. We have to start somewhere. As we consider the importance of stripping discriminatory policies from our code, it's equally important to support. The residential care, the expansion of residential care facilities to be expanded throughout the city so that people, especially in those communities of color, get the support they need in places that make sense. There is discrimination, and I urge you to see these changes. Thank you. Thank you, Jesus. Our next speaker is Meek and Sawyer. Hi. My name is Megan Slater. I live in District three in West Colfax. I'm speaking in favor of the group Living Amendment, and I'm doing so at personal risk because under current zoning regulations, my housing situation is illegal. When I got married, my husband moved into my half duplex and we went over the limit of four people. Our house is 3000 square feet five bedrooms, two kitchens, two baths and two laundry rooms. And it is still illegal. Even though these houses were built to hou

se multiple families and have done so for over 100 years. People argue that increasing the amount of roommates increases trash and parking issues. But what's happening in my neighborhood is

these traditional, unofficial quad boxes are getting razed and eight luxury townhome units are going in on each lot that allows 16 residents and 24 cars. And somehow that is legal. But our housing situation is not. And I'll be honest, the main benefit for me and my husband is we get an affordable housing situation with a yard close to downtown with public transportation. We'd be fine if you if you enforce the regulations. But the reality is we would have to evict one of our roommates and raise the rent 30% on our other two roommates. And that means that bedroom would remain on rented and unavailable for people like our previous roommates, the social worker, the person going through a divorce for students and the minimum wage job cook. And you know, my situation, my demographic, maybe you don't care about it, but all down the street, there's people that look very different from me and very different financial situations. But almost all of them are living in communal housing situations. And just this idea that allowing more roommates is going to cause people to live in overcrowded housing situations is just ridiculous. All it's doing is making legal what's already happening. And I will tell you from firsthand experience, there are unscrupulous landlords who utilize these types of zoning regulations to threaten their tenants from seeking legal action against them for illegal practices. And again, maybe you don't care about my experiences as a rich white college student, but there are other members in this community who are affected by those kinds of practices. The current policy of two unrelated adults in single family housing units is discriminatory. It prevents families that defined themselves as anything other than blood or marriage. You know, if you want to move in with your girlfriend and her sister, that's illegal. If you need to move in a caretaker to take care of your aging parents. That's illegal. You know, these housing laws shouldn't exist just to protect the housing values for married families that got lucky and bought a house before the housing market exploded. It should be protect the housing stability for all residents. Thank you. Thank you, Megan. I just wanted to do a quick time check. We've got about 50 more speakers. And just want to remind folks if you're repeating points that that folks have already made. We would love to hear them, but ask that you maybe share new information and just wanted to take a time. Pause there. And so up next, we have Michael Henry. Go ahead, Mr. Henry. You're unmuted. Good evening, Council members. I'm not sure if you can see me. You can use video. Listen on. Can you hear me? Yes, we can hear you. Actually. Mm hmm. My name is Michael Henry. I live in District ten at the corner of 13th Avenue and William Street. And

I served on the group Living Advisory Committee for the last three years. The reason I was appointed to the committee was that I had worked for at least a year in the mid 1990s as a member of a committee to develop a proposal. Two regarding spacing and regulation of our shelters and group homes in correctional facilities. At that time, I was the parish president of Veterinary Bird Corporation and the chair of the Agency Planning and Zoning Committee. Well, unfortunately in the past. 25 years. As we all know, the ordinances have become very, very outdated. And just not meeting today's needs in the way people live. The Administration and city council appointed the group living committee three years ago. And I take great umbrage at the accusations which are untrue, that most of the members of the group Living Advisory Committee were all looking to make a profit. In the first place. The providers that were on the committee. Work for nonprofit organizations, but there were many of those who simply lived in neighborhoods around the city. Oh. For the past 45 years. I have participated in were observed many. Advisory committees were working on public policy for the city. I've come to observe what I believe many of us call the Denver Way of research published to make. And that is to put together a balanced group of citizens, citizen volunteers, by the way, who carefully study very complicated issues. Another element of the Denver way is transparency and open meetings. And there's been plenty of that. And unfortunately, some features of this particular process have been not part of the general review by including much misrepresentation, anger, fear and even threatening to recall city council members. I urge you all to vote in favor. Andrew. That's the time we have available. Our next speaker is JJ Gorsuch. And we're going to get JJ. Connected. J.J. is on the phone. So give us a moment, please. All right. JJ. Good evening, counsel. My name is due to Gorsuch. I reside in the Park Hill neighborhood, though I've been a resident of a variety of the neighborhoods in our fair, clean city of the plains for nearly my entire life. The intentions behind this change are certainly novel. Like any idea that hasn't heeded or listened to its opposition? It is incompletely formed and it seems as if it will have many unintended consequences, some of which will actually exacerbate inequities in our communities. The change seems to be benefiting developers looking to capitalize on pushes for density under the guise of equity. Results are very likely for overcrowding, lack of parking, streamline infrastructure

and that really can't be underscored. Yeah, I would love to have a fully pedestrian city, but our infrastructure is at risk here too. And it's in areas where we're already falling short of the city's own green space planning. Why can't we focus on more tangible and very specific solutions? Read Less Brides dipping for housing costs, for roommate situations, for co-op si

tuations, perhaps using the maximum square foot per person based solutions for shelter development and for rehabilitation spaces. But not forget about the city's commitment to green space. What about resolving for former Chapter 59 to actually remove some of the institutional inequities and narco? Split the problems up and take a step backward in the process to get better, more specific, more elegant, and, by the way, more equitable solutions. Please, please vote no on this amendment. Thank you very much, council members, for your time and consideration tonight. Thank you. Our next speaker is Greg Holm. Good evening. My name is Greg Home. I live. I've lived in District seven for 32 years and I'm asking you to vote yes on the proposed group. Living Ordinance with the qualification. That larger homes be permitted to allow up to eight unrelated adults to live together. And there are all types of group living facilities be permitted. In all neighborhoods. The original group living. Proposal would have permitted social services to be provided in neighborhoods. Throughout the city. In natural and authentic settings, including the provision of rehabilitation services in community corrections settings. All neighborhoods should share in supporting our most vulnerable citizens. Please remember that all prisoners. Will be released eventually and that our communities are made safer when we provide prisoners with the services and education needed for them to successfully. Reenter society. I would also like to ask why an unlimited number of related adults are permitted to live in a house, but unrelated adults are limited. I would like someone to explain the. Justification. For this distinction and why government should define what is and. Is not a family. Claims have been made that unrelated adults living together would have too many cars, have parties, make noise, commit crimes, etc.. Is it. Not. True that related adults also. Drive cars. Have parties. Make noise, commit crimes. Engage in domestic violence, drink and do drugs? There is no justification for the disparate. Treatment of related. Versus unrelated adults. It is an outrage that wealthy white neighborhoods, i.e. single family. Duplex and townhome neighborhoods, were exempted by ludy from this ordinance. Once again, wealthy white neighborhoods are using their privilege, political power and. Exaggerated outrage to exclude those who are different. And less privileged. Our current housing crisis has its roots in explicit. And deliberate racist. Housing policies. Implemented. By federal, state and local governments from the 1930s to the late. 1960s. While current policies are no longer explicitly racist. Denver remains strongly segregated. And the cost of housing is out of reach for far too many Denver ites, both of which evidence the ongoing inequity and racist impacts caused by our zoning policies. Please undo the changes. And allow up to eight residents in large homes, as well as ensuring residential

care. Facilities can operate everywhere in Denver. Thank you. Thank you, Greg. Our next speaker is Janice McGuire. And Janice, we'll have to have you on your cell. All right. We're going to wait and see if we can get Dennis McGuire. You're up. Next. All right. We'll go ahead and move on to Meredith Turk. Hello. Finally here. Thank you so much for listening. I am really happy that so many of the people that spoke have already spoken for me. So I'm going to do my best to introduce new information here. I was a former resident of a co-operative in Cape Hill, and I am honored to sit here as a homeowner of a single family home. And I'm here to tell you that single family homes are not the future. Even though I sit in one, because what's missing and what we have to create in this new space is the community that is is not here. And when I walk outside of my home, I don't interact with my neighbors the way that I interacted with my housemates. I don't see babies every day. I don't have people cook me meals. I don't have the same sort of community that I had in my old home. And what we forget when we create these policies is that we are not creating for a sustainable future. We're not creating for what we want to live like in our elderly age. And I think we have to recognize that the world has changed and that our society has changed and that we need to take down the fences that we keep putting up. We need to tear them down, and we need to be able to look at each other in the face. We need to be able to ask for help. We need to be able to tell each other what we need. And that is not a way to do it by isolating ourselves in single family homes for the rest of our lives. And this policy, if it is not changed, will do that. So what I ask you is what is at stake if we do not change this? And what is at stake is a future where we can all learn to live

together and realize that it's okay to have conflict with your neighbors. That's actually okay. We don't need to regulate everything. We can talk to each other and we can move through life together as a community. And this is one very small step. It should five is very small. It should be at least eight. So I'll keep my comments there. But I will say that I have seen what community can give you, and I understand what it feels like to lose it. And I will spend every part of my life trying to rebuild it in the world around me. So please vote yes for this. Thank you. Thank you, Meredith. We're going to try to go back to Janice McGuire and see if we can get. Denison. You're going to have to unmute yourself, Janice. All right. We're going to go ahead and move to Len Bruning. You're going to have to admit yourself. And I see that we're bringing you in via phone. So we'll give it a moment here. All right, Lynn, go ahead, please. Okay. Lynn, you're unmuted. Right. I'm not having stuff. Oh, there you go. Very good. All right. You're going to have to hit Star six to unmute, please. All right. Looks like we're having some

trouble getting Lynn. Burning connected. And so we can work on that. We're going to go ahead and move to Denise Larson. All right. Looks like we've lost a few folks. Next up, we have Darryl Watson. All right. Or going down the line here, Terry Burns said. Hello. My name is Mary and I live in District six. And again, I apologize for my camera not working. I don't have any trouble with anybody saying I want to add my voice to those who are speaking in favor of the group Living Amendment. And I especially want to thank Jason Fournier and some of the people who spoke before, especially Jason who used irony and satire to ventriloquism the language of get the government off my back that so many people normally in opposition to measures like this use. And to point out the inconsistencies and the absurdity of their arguments. Bravo, Jason, for some good theater for us. I also want to point that out, because some of the people in opposition to this measure do indeed appropriate the language of the other side as well, although they do it without irony and seemingly without a sense of humor when they speak of inclusion and equality to defend their property rights. And I also want to address the issue that so many of the opponents have brought up of taking umbrage at being called racist in classes, sexist and homophobic, etc.. Now, I understand that because it's certainly not a pleasant thing to be called those things, and I have no crystal ball to see into another person's heart. But I want to point out to these people that redlining and. Gentrification, what Mario. Gonzalez so eloquently called the gentrification machine are structural problems. They are not necessarily simply matters of mustache twirling business villains sitting in a cabal somewhere, though, the history of Colorado real estate certainly does not preclude that. They are structural problems and they go beyond the individual. But as for those taking umbrage, when you look at the history of our community and our society as a whole, you have to look at whether you are supporting the status quo or not. And if you are supporting the status quo, then you have anti-racist work to do so. I'm sorry that you took umbrage, but be part of the solution. And City Council, please support the group Living Amendment. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Mary Beth Wells. Hi. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Well, I'm nervous. My name is Mary Beth Wells, and I live in Parkhill on Ivanhoe near Colfax. My husband and I were able to buy a house about 50 years ago for about \$38,000 when early twenties college graduates. No student loans. And it was really easy. That early investment gave us the opportunity to build equity for our futures. My concern my concern is for the kids coming out to pay crushing student loans. And they can't afford rent. They can't afford to build equity. They have no chance. Community, living, housing, whatever you want to call it, is a great way. It's a great solution to the hous

ing crisis that we face, the affordability crisis that we face. And I urge the committee to vote in favor of the community housing legislation and the zoning changes necessary. I agree that larger houses should be allowed to have more than five people. I think it could be done safely. And finally, I want to say that the five person policy that has been proposed addresses many concerns fairly and equitably. For every objection, I have found a sound and reasonable solution. There are rules in the code that keep people safe, and we should not discriminate against people based on their blood relationships in the opposition. What I have heard is a failure to consider the future of this young generation who can't afford to buy houses. I urge the city, please, to vote for this resolution. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Emmanuel Campbell. Emanuel. We'll have to have you on. Meet yourself, please. All right, I'll try to get. Oh, there you go. Good deal. And you will go ahead, please. Okay. Good night, everybody. My name. My name is Emmanuel Avila. I'm. I'm leaving East Colfax. I'm living at Yosemite Street. Almost six years since I came here. I'm immigrants from

Democratic Republic of Plenty. I just. I came here six, six years ago, but I still love to live in this area of Denver. But it's Colfax. I'm on. I tried to be a volunteer on East Colfax Community. I'm working to help my fellow new people come. And I'm also in East Colfax, the neighborhood. I'm in the board of member there. But I see, according to me, I have some experience who are facing the newcomer like me. You'll find some of our community. They are living in a sharing home where everybody can pay like 500 or 600 bucks so they can get how to live in Denver. But they are they're hardworking. I think, according to me, this proposal should pass. So it will help the so many people to get opportunity to stay in Denver to make their future. Like me. I'm trying my best to stay in Denver. These proposals should be voted on. Yes. That was my idea. That's all I have. All right. Thank you very much, sir. Next up, we have Adam Astrof. Hey. My name is Adam Astrof. I live at 361, a lady in District seven. But tonight I'm speaking on behalf of Yimby. Denver, YIMBY. Denver stands for Yes in my backyard. And we're a group that was created to fight for affordable and abundant housing for everyone. And that's why we're promoting this group, Living Amendment. We agree with many commenters that the changes dismantled some of what this was trying to do throughout the 20th century. Land use was used as a way not to regulate what kind of buildings we built, but to discriminate against other kinds of people. I think it's really important that we remember and explicitly state that redlining and single unit zoning are the same thing. Redlining was accomplished through deciding who could and what kind of housing could be built in different neighborhoods. This group, Living Change, will start to dismantle that s

ystem in Denver. And, you know, thank you to all of you who are choosing to vote yes. This is not going to be a silver bullet. It's not going to end all of our problems. But this will go a long way towards ending our use of the zoning code as a way for homeowners to exercise their prejudice. I'd also like to just point out to folks who are taking umbrage at being called racist that systemic racism is not whether you hate people of color. Personally, the city council we have today is less racist than the City Council of the 1930s. I can say that as a fact, but our zoning is producing the same outcomes as it did when it was explicitly racist. Again, I call on you to pass these group living changes. Thank you for listening to all of the residents who are telling you how important this is. And tomorrow, let's get up and fight again, too, to help solve the housing crisis. Just to speak personally, you know, I'm very privileged. I haven't had housing insecurity personally, but my wife is a DPS teacher and every year she has at least one kindergartner who's homeless. We should not have homeless kindergartners in our city. Group living is one way where we can turn our single unit housing stock into affordable housing. We don't want to demolish all the buildings in our city, but we do need to increase affordability and group living policy will help us get there. So again, thank you to those of you who are voting yes, to those of you who are voting no. I'd ask for you to consider what you're going to do for the housing crisis moving forward. But again, thank you for all your time and your service in this long meeting. All right. Thank you, Adam. Next up, we have Taryn Blake. Getting Tarrant connected via telephone here. So, Taryn, you might have to hit Star six to unmute. Hi. Hi. Go ahead. Okay, cool. Hi. My name is Taryn Blake. I'm 34, and I have lived in South Park Hill for five years. I am a proud communist, an immigrant rights organizer and a digital organizer on the rent strike and eviction defense group that came to exist during COVID 19. Where I'm in Colorado, families get evicted every single day. My family has lived in Denver for over 125 years, and not me, my brother or my parents own a home here. My parents had to sell my grandfather's studies at home and the housing crisis and still lost their home in north London. I have a massive amount of student debt, have owned a car in ten years and I'm a child care worker making just a dollar over minimum wage. My wages get garnished. I am to a bad mistake from homelessness myself. And there are generations of young people like me who always rent and never own a home because a student loan something that brings me to tears thinking about when I walk through my neighborhood in Park Hill. People of all ages benefit from a house sharing like I do in this insane capitalist economy we live in. Capitalism is a system in a state of constant displacement from the refugees of imperialism to the housing crisis at

home. As an educator who works with families. I also support changes in zoning to increase access to healing, rehabilitative services and accessible housing. As people are recovering from the trauma of being tortured in a Denver County stage or living without shelter, our city can do better than 60 fucking tents in a church parking lot. Save our communities, have more resources and people should have access to healing services in every single neighborhood. Transit dependent

users also benefit from resources available in every zip code. Additionally, my work in public schools and with families has shown me that people of all backgrounds struggle with housing addiction and any permaculture coming to it. Commenting today who opposes the zoning change, doesn't understand addiction, poverty, or how the austerity of capitalism keeps on working class people's necks. That's not in my backyard attitude. It's classist, eugenic and displaces people. Period. Anyone who does not want services for the sick or poor in their community just doesn't want sick or poor people in their community. The Denver police are a greater threat to our communities and school children than a homeless shelter nearby. Please support this zoning change from growing rural, working class people like myself and to commit to a free culture of people over property. A city where people are safe and able to access basic human services. A city where residents are not being pushed to the edges of town, warehoused in jails and shelters, or being completely forced out of the city. Denver can start having people and doing better if a city does not have what activists like myself will have to start having to reclaim empty houses and buildings and forcing the city to house people. As seen by housing activists in California and all across the country this past summer. Thank you. Thank you, Taryn. Up next, we have Loretta Koehler. Go ahead, Loretta. There we go. Sorry about that. I was trying to get my video going and it's not seeming to let me let me let it go. So. Okay, you won't have me on video. Maybe I will be all right. I'm going to talk as best as I can, because that's what I have to do with only 3 minutes. So I want to talk about some of the things that have been spoken of today. But I also I want to speak as a member of the group Living Advisory Committee. I became a member of the committee because of EMC. And so I and she's been working on this issue for three years. I'm not here, as you know, speaking for ANC, because ANC as a whole did not take a position for or against. We asked for some suggestions and that's a miss representation from safe and sound. Denver So I want to just acknowledge that again. So but I am here as an individual who participated for three years and gave a lot of information back to my neighborhood and my neighborhood came out in favor. Baker Historic Neighborhood Association came out in favor of the group living. I'm in favor of Group Living. And again,

as some of those other people have said, I'm for more than five members to a household. If you have 4 to 5000 square feet, why should we not be environmentally, you know, appropriate and use that space appropriately? Over 49% of the people, the residents of the city of Denver are homeowners. That means 51% of the people of Denver and growing numbers, because the increase in apartment living and in our neighborhoods is increasing dramatically in the major and the major central core of the city. And with that comes, you know, more insecurity that people are unable to afford housing. And we're one of the top five cities in the country in proportion to income being unable to afford to live in this city. We've heard from so many people. I've lived with 50 roommates as an adult. Yes. It's certainly illegal in many cities that I've lived in. And just like everyone else, we were professionals. We weren't, you know, people half the time I didn't own a car. That's very typical. I've lived I've had insecurity in house for so many times in my life. And it when people come back and say we had selfish interest and being on the group living well, if my selfish interest is that I'm promoting housing for other people, so be it. If I'm promoting housing for people who are coming back from criminal, from criminal, you know, it's they're not criminal. They're just back. They're trying to come back into housing and they coming back into the same community they came from. I agree. We should you should all support this. And I and those people who've spoken against it have been the people who are homeowners and older. Look at all the young people. It's not 1950s and 1960s. It's not 1970. It's not 1990. Those of us who still have student loans, it's hard to buy a home in Denver, help people get to that place when they can live together. Thank you. Thank you, Loretta. Our next speaker is Joe. I'm going to let you pronounce your last name, Joe. It's way too late for me to even go for it, so go ahead. No worries. Good evening, counsel. Thanks for your time. My name is Justice Like. I'm a resident of Denver living in five points. And I'm here tonight to strongly urge you to pass the group Living Amendment. I also want to thank city planning staff for their work on this important issue. This is not a radical proposal. There are no other major cities in the country that have an unrelated, unrelated adult living limit as low as Denver's currently is. Research also suggests that household sizes remain the same regardless of government imposed limit. And with low limits, enforcement is often predicated on the whims of your neighbors. Additionally, it will serve to add legitimacy to the likely thousands of Denver kids who are already living with two or more unrelated people. Today's proposed amendments will serve

to make Denver a better, more inclusive city. And if anything, they don't go far enough. On a personal note, when I was younger, I lived for many years with four u

nrelated people with no issues. It allowed us to be a supportive unit for each other at a time in our lives that many of us needed, especially as a member of the LGBTQ community, where traditional biological family is often a significant challenge. Why does the government get to define and limit what a family is? The current group Living Limits are systemically racist, classist relics of another era. I strongly urge you to lead and vote yes to pass this proposed amendment. This is just one of the many tools we need to move Denver forward to join the 21st century. Thank you. Thank you, Joe. Joe. Up next, we have Tiffany choice. Tiffany, you'll have to go ahead and unmute yourself. All right. We're going to try to get Tiffany. Up. Okay. It looks like we're not able to get Tiffany, so we'll go ahead and move on to Travis. Go ahead, Travis. Hi. Travis Leiker, president of Capitol Hill, United Neighborhoods. I just want to say thank you to everybody who spoke tonight and to thank the city council for sticking with us at this late hour. Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods is committed to keeping our neighborhoods bright, vibrant, accessible places to live. And we're proud of Capitol Hill, a rich history of being a welcoming, inclusive and diverse community. And as Denver's largest and oldest registered neighborhood organization, we feel it's time to address policies and correct the decades long discrimination that still exists in our zoning and housing policies. As such, we believe that the current restrictions limiting people who are not related by blood or marriage is outdated, unnecessarily restrictive and discriminatory. And so to keep it short and simple and sweet. We support the recommendations as outlined by land use, transportation and infrastructure. The Group Living Group Living Advisory Committee, as well as the other many thought partners that have been a part of this process. It's a good process. It was thoughtful, thorough and certainly a lot of years time and energy and dedication has been put into this process. And so with that, both Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods has endorsed this policy recommendation and encourages council to vote in the affirmative. Thank you so much. Thank you, Travis. We're going to go back to Tiffany and see if we can get Tiffany into the hearing here. So we'll do one more call for you. Tiffany. All right, I oh, there we go. We got you. Go ahead. Hi. My name's Tiffany Choi. I'm the president of the Denver Classroom Teachers Association. I'm a high school French teacher. I represent almost the 4000. 4000 members of educators across Denver also represent social service providers. And we earlier this year brought the amendment, the group living to our rep council, which is our biggest representing representative body, had about 100 people in attendance representing all of our schools across the district, and we voted to support the group Living Amendment because of all the reasons that were shared tonight. I'm not

going to get into them, but essentially we believe this is helpful for our educators, but also for our community and for our students. And so we we as the CTA are supporting the group amend the group Living Amendment. Thank you. Thank you, Tiffany. Next up, we have Ian in fresh. Go ahead, Ian. Hello. Hi. Go ahead. My name is Ian Fresh. I'm at 201 East Mississippi Avenue in Park Wash Park, West Area. I want to strongly urge the City Council to vote yes on the Group Living Amendment. Removing the current group living restrictions is a huge positive step forward towards fighting high housing costs. Homelessness, poverty, crime and discrimination citywide. It's been watered down twice already, which I was very disappointed to see. So what we currently have is like a huge compromise. But if it's a step forward, then it's a step forward. I see the discrimination in the zoning code that we have now is very anti-American because it's regulating the type of people that can live somewhere and just listen to yourself. Say that it doesn't sound right. It doesn't sound fair. A new proposal won't completely remove it, but it is a huge step forward for a more progressive city. And some people are complaining about parking spots. And I see that as a totally separate issue. I mean, it is storing your private vehicle on the public right of way, first of all. But it can easily be solved with permit programs paid if they have to be. And if the city continues to prioritize free parking for cars over housing for people, we won't be able to make any progress. Legalizing basically legalizing cheaper housing through sharing costs and allowing more residential care facilities, including community corrections, keeps people off the streets in stable housing. Preventing. Oh, I think we lost you somehow. In. You might have to unmute yourself again. Oh, go ahead. I'm not sure what happened there. Go ahead. Sorry. I was saying legalizing cheaper housing through sharing costs and allowing community corrections and other residential care facilities keeps people off the streets in stable housing, preventing them from falling into poverty,

crime habits of desperation and homelessness. We do have a huge homelessness problem here, and there's some people saying this change is going to increase crime. And I see it as the opposite. We're keeping people off the streets. It seems that some neighbors against the proposal would rather have people thrown out onto the streets or in the neighborhoods other than theirs because they got theirs and nothing around them can ever change. And that's not best for our city. I would like to stay and get people house and not flee the city and make progress towards an equitable dinner. Denver Please vote yes. Thank you in. Next up, we have Tess Dougherty. Okay. Go ahead, Tess. There. Thank you. My name is Tess Doherty. I am in District nine and I am here tonight to support the amendments in the group Living Law. When I had a meeting with the City Planner

, which I really appreciated that being offered, I'd love to see more of those offerings for public engagement for different, different bills that are coming before a vote. It has been very difficult to engage with committee. I know it's been suggested that rather than us coming to speak here that we speak at committee. But I actually have not found another opportunity except for this one tonight to just be and maybe I'm just not finding them. But this month of February, it doesn't seem like there's very many other opportunities to speak at committee. So while that suggestion sounds great, it just doesn't seem like it's an actual way to engage. So if somebody could help me with that might be great. And so anyway, but when I spoke with the city planner, he said that this law was actually from the 1940s and and that it really hasn't been revised since then and that that it was revised in 2010, I think. But it was literally just copy and paste it and it was expressed that the reason that the cap was moved from eight. I'm sorry, what is that. The reason that the cap was moved from 8 to 2 five was that a lot of people on city council felt like we were moving to, you know, we're like moving too fast, too soon. And so I guess I would just like to question how quickly do we need to move away from the nuclear family ideals of the 1940s when our society and our housing practices were racially segregated and when when mixed type of households didn't exist and they were actually illegal. So I think I would argue that we're really. Far behind where we should be. And given that at the Denver County jail downtown, we put people in cell blocks of eight. I'm not sure why we can't do that in our community. But aside from that, I just wanted to read a poem. This year, we, my husband and I have lived in 15 different places due to an asbestos and fiberglass spill, and we've relied on friends to two houses at times. And so under the group living as it currently stands, we would have been I mean, it would have forced us to become homeless if we couldn't have, you know, if we had gotten in trouble. So just want you to consider that. Thank you, Tess. That's the time we have allotted. Next up, we have owned our. Okay. Well, I didn't have time. So anyway. Uh huh, go ahead. So, yeah. Thank you. So I'm a resident of District nine, and I want to speak to the issue of unrelated adults. Unfortunately, that I have some direct insight into this, as I have in the past, was in a household of unrelated adults in central community or co-op, which was illegal under the current zoning code. I know that really a lot of ways I probably would have become homeless at various points if I hadn't had that form of housing. But then I also the back end studying, planning and urban geography firsthand from that perspective as well. And so I've been trying to say with the opposition, if anything, for a while, as I'm sure you're aware. Most of this is really fearmongering is based on possi

bly a few red herrings, but mostly just ugly stereotypes, pretty flimsy thought experiment. From my perspective, having actually lived this way. It's hard to get my head around how exactly they these horrible, imagined kind of dystopian outcomes would actually plausibly come about if this were passed. None of the people I know who live or who have lived like this are noisy, unsafe, unclean or out to destroy your property values. I think they actually take better care of their yards and their houses and a lot of folks who have fewer hands and skill sets to do so. We already have noise ordinances and things like that in place other than people who seem to be using what houses are boarding houses or this is of course completely different things . The only even sort of concrete thing I've heard cited is the parking issue. So I don't think that you have some insight on it. To be clear, I still think that there's poorly, insufficient substantiation for this kind of imagined uncontrolled slide into a ruined city. But you should know that most people who live in collective houses, in cars actually don't own cars. When I was there were only about a quarter and a half of us at any given time we did. A lot of folks drawn to that lifestyle tend to be environmentalist, ride bikes, etc. And when you have a lot of people living together, enables them to not have to own cars if they're someone who would need a car for errands and things. On top of that, those of us who did have

cars all pretty consistently went out of our way to park around the corner on the side of the block that didn't have property fronting it. So we weren't stretching and just making fun of our neighbor's houses. No one asked distributors and people were complaining or anything he just told us to do. This doesn't make sense. We wanted to be good neighbors. Also, there are plenty of household oriented systems, places, zoning with wood, not all the sudden flocking to the form of housing , stressing the existing infrastructure and so forth is great in many ways. I personally got a lot out of it, but it's also hard in many ways and it's not for everyone. And I think the majority of people who want to play are already doing so. They're just living in fear and with greater precarity as others like, looking to see if it were to afford to somehow drive down other people's housing values we would already be seeing. That would. Of course it's not. So when I was living in at the time, as well as the other properties on the block, increased steadily. The whole time I was living there, I was there almost seven years and I know this is similar for other such houses have gone up all over the city and of course people continue to want to move to Denver like many others. So I encourage the council to remove cap limiting household size to five unrelated adults before passing on it. It is not too late for all the reasons that people still can say it was. It was a huge compromise to put that in that neighborhood

d to the balance. That's the time we have a lot of this evening. Next up, we've got Delaney Co. I thank you, counsel, for hearing our comments today. My name is Delaney and I'm a resident of Cheesman Park and District ten and here to ask the council to vote yes on the group Living Amendment because, one, it will make housing more accessible to people across the socio economic socioeconomic spectrum in Denver. Two, it will reduce bias and threat to marginalized people and housing. And three, it will simply provide much more needed housing solutions. My story shows what this amendment will actually look like rather than what the fear mongering will have many people believe. So I'm going to tell that as a survivor and later, a social worker in Denver, I was only able to afford living here by making a home and sharing costs of my friends. Three of my friends, two are who are siblings and I think that shows just how irrelevant relation as we have all been siblings and that would have been a totally different situation. But two who are siblings and two who are unrelated or should a three bedroom home in the Sphere neighborhood making it possible for me to stay here in Denver, to invest in Denver, as I have in the many years that I've lived here as a volunteer and an enthusiast of local businesses. So a lot of investments and every person has much to give and every person deserves the same opportunity to make a home here. I'm ending these discriminatory housing restrictions, make housing more affordable and accessible, which positively impacts the economy and strengthens our community. Throughout my time living in that home. We've housed over. Ten people, one. At a time for short periods of time, giving people a caring home during transitional periods of their life. One was a friend who could not leave her abusive relationship without losing her housing. Another's housing was tied to an explicit Adobe. Friends and family stayed in our basement rather than staying in abusive homes, jobs or in shelters or on the streets. Yet doing this, allowing a fifth person to live in the basement of our two story home. Further put us in opposition to Denver law. But this amendment does allow communities to support each other and form our own housing solutions when the city just can't seem to offer them. Not to mention the expansion of options as part of picture described at the very beginning of this so nicely to offer other housing solutions and residential care. This amendment is an important step to improving the housing landscape in Denver, though we of course, have a very long way to go. Lastly, when we sign the lease, of course our landlord told us we would be out of compliance with the city statute but told us it wasn't likely to be a problem. After all, someone would have to report us and we were for young white women. Which brings me to my last point. This current statute has roots in racism and classism, and you need to easily be applied in a prejudiced w

ay. It is more likely to be used against already marginalized people, as has been eliminated by so many other speakers. Many people are already group living in Denver, but not everyone is equally affected by the current two person restriction. I urge you to vote yes so we can bring about more equitable housing options for everyone here in Denver. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Kirsten Mitchell. And it's a phone number, I believe. All right. Looks like we've got you in. Kirsten, go ahead. Hi. My name is Kirsten Mitchell and I live in the spear neighborhood in District seven. I want to thank and commend city staff, particularly Andrew Webb. I supported the original version of the

changes to our zoning code and it is my preference that City Council passed that version. First, I want to correct an error in the staff report. However, The West Marsh Park. R.A. was listed as being in opposition to this amendment. However, the board voted on February 2nd, 2021, against taking any position. It's very important that this be corrected. Now I'd like to make three points. First, I'd like to address a continued distinction between unrelated and related household members. To retain this structure strikes me as to condone this underlying discriminatory structure. I don't think we as a community should get kudos for this. It's baffling that we do this in the face of unprecedent costs, homelessness, and overwhelming need. Our neighbors deserve better. Please pass the original version which proposed to increase the legal limit to eight adults and up regardless of blood connection. Second, I support the inclusion of all types of residential facilities and congregate living across all residential areas. It's important that neighborhoods do not exclude who can and can't live with them based on the facility in which they live. Separating our neighborhoods based on commercial residential needs and further by living type such as single family homes and congregate living results in car centered, disconnected and segregated neighborhoods. In addition, there's no factual basis for the fear based comments I've heard tonight. To the contrary, our community would be more resilient, sustainable, and an overall better place to live if our neighborhoods were not so segregated. Please don't vote against these changes on the basis of these unfounded fears. If parking is a problem, the city can regulate parking. If trash is a problem, the city can modify trash policy. If traffic and pollution is a problem, then fix mass transit and increase mobility options. Finally, I would want to say that it is City Council's job to Mira to help us meet the city's current challenges, but also to plan for the future of its residents. Our city government does this in other areas, like planning for infrastructure needs. But why do we prevent this approach in the context of housing? Instead of giving into pandering to the fears of unfounded consequences. We know. Of another nonsense root

ed in racism, classism and homophobia. It is not city's city council's job to condone discriminatory policy under the guise of protecting extraordinarily overvalued property values. Doing so would continue to come at the direct expense of the majority of Denver's residents who are, in fact, renters. I ask that the original version of these changes be passed tonight if there is not sufficient moral courage to meet. The. Courage to meet the moral obligation of the moment. I ask the current version be to. Up next, we have Suzanne Collier. And Suzanne, we're going to need you to raise your hand so we can get you promoted into the panelists. Hmm. Let's see. We've got your. We're going to get you moved over. All right. And you just need to unmute yourself. There you go. All right. Thank you. And I first want to say that it's great to see so many people participating in democracy tonight. I think it's fantastic considering that we almost lost it. I'm a lifelong Denver resident. I grew up here and without telling you how old I am, I can say that I've. Seen about four or five boom or bust cycles. Boom and bust. Cycles, the most recent one being probably the most. Transformative. All of this has brought a lot of change. And I don't hate all of it. It's brought great cultural change to our city. But as Meredith Turk pointed out. The future is definitely. Not in single family homes. I'm speaking in support of the amendment, by the way. As an anthropologist, I can tell you that living in these nuclear families is very unnatural. And we've only been doing it for about 80 years, tops. Before that, we lived in extended families or in villages and tribes. So. And I also want to remember, remind everybody who's in opposition to this that private property rights are supreme in this. Country and the rest is pretty much window dressing. So no property owner will be forced to do anything that they don't want to do. Landlords and property management companies will still have the right to enforce or mandate resident numbers at their properties. And even though I did grow up here, I had no idea that this archaic law was still on the books. Until a few months ago when I was alerted to it and. I just want to say it's so it's high time we got rid of it. And for all the people who are wondering what to do about the huge. Vast problem. Of systemic racism, this is something you can do. This is something tangible that you can grab on to. Have a little courage and have a little faith in your fellow human being. And do and. I don't know if it's going to have unintended consequences. It might. But when you're dismantling such an evil system, it takes everyone to make small sacrifices and. Small to medium sized. Leaps of faith and courage. Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next speaker is Eliza Cunningham. Hello. Hello. My name's Eliza. I've been a Denver resident. My. I grew up in Denver. I have three generations in Denver. My father. Was a state representative. For decades in C

olorado. I want to speak on behalf of asking city council members to vote yes for the changes. And I would like to give an example of how it is very these present zoning laws are very racist in classes. For example, my mother, who died recently at age 92 when I was growing up, we had housemates, we had more than one housemate and my mother was a white, middle class woman. I don't even think she knew about this zoning laws, but I grew up with a lot of people. We didn't have parking problems. Most people didn't have a car, we didn't have trash problems, we didn't have squat. We didn't have those types of problems that people are worried about and. My daughter, who's 20, grew up with housemates. And she's a loving, kind, wonderful, empathetic person because I believe she had so many different wonderful experiences. Again, we had none of the problems that were mentioned. And I want to speak. What's really important to me to speak to is the young man who talked about the Latino man who talked about his parents, who were afraid of being called by the city because they were poor and Latin. My mother, who later in life in her nineties still had housemates and that enabled her and her husband to be able to stay home. Her entire life she had housemates. She never once worried about the city being called on her because she was white and wealthy and at the end of her life lived in the Cherry Creek area. And they never once did she worry about that. And that just shows the racism and the classism inherent in the zoning laws with this other gentleman who spoke about how his parents were so worried. And they were poor. In Latin family. And that that really breaks. Breaks my heart. And I. I want to ask. The City Council. To please vote yes to change all of these amendments and for bigger houses to allow more people. And I think that's it. I'll give up my last 20 seconds, but thank you, said city council people and please vote yes on all of these proposed changes and amendments. Thank you. Thank your next speaker is Joel Noble. Good evening, City Council. My name is Joel Noble and I live in the Curtis Park neighborhood in five points. I'm speaking to you on my own behalf tonight. Although I do serve on the Denver Planning Board, I'm testifying only as myself. And that's because this topic is so important. Tonight, I'm asking for every council member to vote in support of this package because it implements the philosophy, goals and specific strategies and comprehensive plan. And in Blueprint Denver in the Comprehensive Plan. Equity is woven throughout. And I'll quote to you one portion. It says, Equitable, inclusive communities are places of value that provide provide access to resources and opportunities for all people to improve the quality of their life. And that flows down into Blueprint Denver, which has three equity concepts improving access to opportunity, reducing vulnerability to displacement, and expanding housing and jobs. Diversity. All three of those

and the entire concept are integral to the proposal in front of you tonight. Blueprint Denver also has a theme throughout of complete neighborhoods. I think that's very well supported here, and it speaks specifically to an evolving city, not a static city, a city with and this is a quote from Blueprint Denver A measured common sense approaches to growth should be taken. And this is one essentially we are making legal what people already do in every city and every time. Now, I want to go specifically into some of the specific regulations in the household definition. I'll just draw your attention to page 82 of Blueprint Denver. This proposal was not made in a vacuum. Blueprint Denver called specifically to update the definition of households, and I wanted to go after the previous speaker who talked about how her parents used this to age in place by being able to share expensive expenses. That's one of the examples specifically referenced in Blueprint Denver. Now for the household definition, the original proposal forwarded to you treated families that are related in families of choice the same. And that was better. And I'm disappointed that you've had to step back on that in order to find consensus, because, frankly, there is no rational basis for the government to continue different treatment of families, families of by blood or families by choice. But this compromise is still a huge step forward and will legalize what people do today for congregate in residential care. I'll just say that five points as has more small rez care uses than anywhere. It's not a problem and this improves the situation by having spacing and density requirements and for community corrections. I understand the compromises you've made. I'm asking that every council member vote vote in favor of this. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Jack. Peter. I'm out of council president members. Good evening. My name is Jack Taylor. I live in a six person cooperative house and in 1902, Denver Square in the Spirit neighborhood. We bought our house from our landlords in 2018 and we have had as many as nine housemates. Two of my housemates are expecting their first baby this summer, so more neighbors coming soon, acknowledging that the history of the zoning code is impacted by the systemic racism and homophobia that have impacted housing policy for generations. I do want to mention that we're a multiracial, mostly LGBT house

and a mix of service workers, small business owners , librarians, political operatives. And white collar professionals. We have found our friends and family here. Our annual incomes ranged from 19000 to \$120000 a year. We love our house. Some of us own. Some of us rent, and the care we have for each other enriches our lives immensely. We pay the mortgage each month based on income, using a calculator that I developed myself to cap payment at no more than the 30% of full time minimum wage of people who \$500 a month to live, here are some over 1000. It's a great

system. It's particularly beneficial this year. One of our husbands was laid off. One was furloughed. One had to close their small business for a few months, and we were able to slide their rents to zero and collectively cover the rest. I hear the outrage you're getting from some of our neighbors. People are worried that the house next door will become something like something about white flight. Apparently a house with too many neighbors out with the wrong kinds of neighbors houses. More than 3 million adults exist across the city. Our house has eight bedrooms and a downstairs apartment. It was literally built for families like ours. The question is whether the city should be able to determine what counts as a family. For the record, our property value was over \$999,000 at our most recent appraisal in April. Based on how property values have continued to climb, I am sure that wholesome house is now worth over \$1,000,000, which is absurd. And I want to be clear that the value of our house does not make us better than our own house , neighbors or incarcerated neighbors or community corrections. Our neighbors in Cherry Creek hate those measures so much they should take heart that zoning measures will make it permissible to have a live in au pair or live in home health, or even live in security to protect your neighborhood from the scary families trying to live with their grandparents. In a year when renters across the city are facing eviction at a scale that none of us have seen in our lifetimes, and the worst economic contraction in history group Living provides an incredible opportunity for not only affordable housing, but for stable housing. That's how you get to know your neighbors. They get to stay in your neighborhood. If any of you ever have to live in supportive transitional housing or an assisted living living. I hope that you will be able to do so in the neighborhood we already live and that you already love. I bet my spouse at a dinner at our house, we got married this summer, which hilariously does not make us related for the purpose of zoning. I live in a house. My family cooperative housing has had a profoundly positive impact on all of our lives. Belongingness and security we gain from our home is worth legitimizing in the eyes of the city. We are good neighbors. It's a shame that our House of six will remain illegal under these most recent amendments. But we will take this as a start. Vote yes. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Teeter. We'll go next to. Austin Luce. Hello, everyone. Good evening. Thank you for listening to us in this long and lengthy process. And I just want to start out by saying how much I appreciate the opportunity to speak and have this conversation and hope that on the many issues that we see coming across through city council, that we can do more of this maybe not so late next time, but if we need to go late. Was sure as nice to hear all of the voices from all of my colleagues coming out. And I am here to support and

tell you to vote yes. On this on this this piece of policy. That would help to create something where more people would have access to housing, something that we really need in Denver. There are so many people on our streets, we have thousands where we need to find solutions. And this is just one little step where. There are more, that. There's so much more that we need to do. This is such a small piece. I think that even though it's taken years, this is this is not going to alleviate the massive amounts of work that we need to do. And but it's just a piece of it. I think that we need to have more people that are allowed to live in a single home. Maybe we remove the cap. I agree with my colleagues. I, I feel like as a mother, I live in District one and as a single mother, I went through a divorce myself. And I've heard that a couple of different stories in the same situation. That I wouldn't have kept my house had I not. Been able to rent and provide an income to be able to sustain myself and my children. I actually until looking at this issue that we're talking about tonight, I never knew that what I was doing was even illegal. So I think there's this has been something that is already happening. Like so many people have said. This is just making sure that this isn't a situation where people are allowed to call the police in the city to come and give a hard time to people who are just trying to make ends meet, especially in this day and age. And the issues with parking was never a problem. The issues were trashed, nothing changed. The noise level in our and our neighborhood did not change. If anything, what having more people in the in the house with me allowed myself as well to be able to raise my children in a different and more collective way. And

also one other piece is that we had a recently had a shelter open in our neighborhood and I wasn't even aware that it was open. I think these are all ideas that we're putting out there that are most definitely fear of the unknown. And sometimes we got to venture into that to really blow the roof on the innovation that we're able to achieve if we let ourselves vote yes. And have a wonderful night. Thank you, Dr. Lewis, Katy Blakey, you're up next. I thought I saw her in there. There we go. Hey, sorry. Go ahead. I'm asking you to please vote yes on this amendment. My mom grew up in a relatively large house in District five with her parents and six siblings. Under our current zoning, only two people, two unrelated people, could live in that house today. People have a right to live with whoever they want, and their options shouldn't be limited by who they're related to, whether they want to relieve their financial burdens, prevent social isolation, or live with their chosen family. They should have that opportunity. Most excited for the possibility of residential care facilities and community corrections in more areas of the city. Residents of these facilities are members of our community and they deserve

to live in a way that gives them the greatest chance of living happy, fulfilling lives. This amendment will have immediate, positive impact on their housing crisis. Well, it isn't perfect and doesn't go far enough. It's a step in the right direction to undo some of the harm of our existing zoning and ensure a more equitable future for all Denver residents. Thank you. Thank you so much, Katie. Our next speaker is Blair Sagan. Hello, everybody. Thank you for staying up late and taking the time to hear us out. I'm Blair Sagan as they them pronouns. My address is currently approximate because I'm currently living in my jeep. Due to the rapid increase in housing prices in Denver and I also am preferring and wanting to live in more alternative, smaller scale housing styles. Also predatory landlord vampires suck all they can out of their tenants. And I have been the target of that in the past, and I'm privileged in that I have a car as a shelter. I'm not at risk of hypothermia. And yet I would never dare park in the residential areas of Denver because all of that, some of the homeowners that care about their property value above all else, not their fellow neighbors, would undoubtedly call the police on me for having a home that is on wheels. Young people, people of color, lower income folks, immigrants and community servants such as firefighters cannot afford to legally live in the city with the zoning as it currently is. As Pete brought up earlier and several others, it's really shocking to me how many homeowners commenting here tonight value the storage of their car over housing their fellow humans. So I urge you all to vote yes tonight on this group living measure and make us proud to be Denver. Thanks. Thanks, Blair. Next up, we've got Jaz Lee Kane. Hi. My name is Jocelyn. It's a lot that I wanted to say has already been said, so I'll be brief. But I am 20 years old. I have lived with House. My mom and I have lived with housemates my entire childhood. Growing up, I believe it has improved my life for the better. We had many different housemates who I learned a lot from and were close to numbers of people in a household should be dictated by health and safety standards, not blood relations. This will not fix everything, but it is a step forward. I ask for your compassion for your fellow humans, and I respectfully ask the City Council members to do the right thing and step outside the box and vote yes on the zoning propositions. Thank you for your time. Thank you. Next up, we have Frank her. All right. I think I'm unmuted. Good evening. Thank you, counsel. President Gilmore. And thank you for running the council meetings with thoughtfulness, focus and smiles. Long night. My name's Frank Logan. Tory, and I'm a resident of City Park West in Council District nine. And I speak to you as a resident in support of the group Living Amendment and my points that basically all have been made. So I'll just leave you with a paraphrase of Einstein's quote about war

that just keeps rattling in my head. And the paraphrase goes something like You cannot simultaneously support affordable living and limit the housing options for people. And some people fear what is unknown to them because others have spread fear through misinformation on social media and supporting the group. Living Amendment requires courage and resolve. And that's exactly what my ask is of you this evening is the courage to look beyond the fear and the misinformation and to have the courage to lead with your heart full of compassion and to lead with your head full of the knowledge and the facts about what the group Living Amendment actually means, and to know what it doesn't mean. And that's what the opponents have been claiming and much of their misleading information. So anyone who has some type of sentence that starts off with I support affordable living but dot, dot, dot. Well what comes after the but indicates that in fact they don't support affordable living. So today is historic. It's not because of the group living amendment,

but it's because every day is a piece of history. History. It's not an event. It's not a date. It's not a speech, a tweet, a YouTube video. It's the accumulation of the the daily decisions that we all make that contribute to our community. And your decision tonight will be part of that history. And so what will that be? I urge you to vote for the group Living Amendment, please. And thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Paul Bindal. Thank you for having me. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. A city council considers a group Living Amendment. I'd like to look back to 1989, when Denver City Council voted 7 to 6 to allow two unrelated adults to live together. According to three male city council people, it was a step towards destroying our city. It was a sad day in the city of Denver. It was an ordinance that kicked the family in the behind. Then, as now, the reports of the unraveling of Denver's social fabric and its property values were highly exaggerated. My name is Paul Bendell, and I'm a District ten Denver property owner or co-owner of a housing cooperative with more than two unrelated adults. I asked Denver City Council to support the adoption of the Group Lending Amendment to expand the places where people exiting prison substance use and homelessness can access supportive housing and to make Denver zoning code align with Colorado's zoning rules by allowing eight unrelated adults to live together, as recommended by the clerk and the Denver Planning Board. Across the street, my single unit, Denver Square, is a multi-unit Denver square with six units. It's 1000 square feet smaller than our house, but instead is zoned for multi-unit. Each of its units can have four adults for a total of 24 people. Do 24 people live in this building? Probably not. But I can testify that the average household in Denver is less than three. All the evidence from poor cities, including Seattle, which allows eight adults, suggests

it will not considerably increase if this change passes. At the same time, the smaller house across the street does have more people than our house. So why should a single family going to be prescribed a two people or even five people simply because they choose to share a kitchen? For better or worse, most land rights are chosen to live in a smaller household. But as you can see this proposal, I hope you will support a zoning code that meets the needs of all people in Denver, not just the majority, the housing needs of the elderly, people with disabilities, people exiting prison, people exiting homelessness, people needing support for substance use, and people seeking to simply reduce costs should not be minimized, dismissed or gaslit due to the fears of people who already have permanent housing. We didn't see Denver unravel due to allowing two unmarried adults living together 32 years ago, and we won't see it unravel if we allow eight unrelated adults to live together today. Please cast your vote in support of a more inclusive zoning. Thank you. Next up, we have Jesse Perez. Oh did evening members of council those watching at home. My name is Jesse. Mission Personal Representative for Denver Homicide. Loud Black Star Tribune for Self Defense, Positive Action. Social Change as well as the Unity Party of Colorado mile high levels and from allies to abolitionist. And I will be the next mayor of Denver in 2023. I am fully in favor of the don't group living, uh, change proposal tonight. This has been a long time coming. I support up to eight plus people living in the same dwelling. So I don't think it goes far enough, but it's a start. I myself was on house for almost a decade. I lived in a house in co-op for about five years. So I know exactly what this is like. Experience to live in living. This experience has taught me a lot about. How archaic and old and racist and prejudice the city's zoning code. Policy has been over the past 100 years or so, 100 plus years, not to mention this country's long, historic history of marginalizing and disenfranchising black foundational black America as American defenders of slavery. The people that built this country. So I am full favor of this reasoning tonight. The people that were in opposition are clearly white supremacists. The Klan wears hoods, hit dogs, hit holler when they get hit. And white supremacists will do everything in their power to deny the fact that white supremacy is in full effect and has been on full display tonight. This is bigger theater and I've been getting my kids from it. When I'm in favor of this reasoning tonight, please vote yes on the zoning proposal. We need solutions, especially since we said that we can do better. And we spent \$2.5 million in 2019 lying to Denver voters saying that Initiative 300 wasn't the answer and that we can do better and we see the same opposition with this. Not in my backyard, nimbyism, that a lot of the people that have been an opposition, outspoken tonig

ht have been displaying and putting in a rare form. So racism, white supremacists, their full effect. We have witnessed that tonight. And. What sort of history are you going to be on? Are you going to be on the right side or the left side? It's 2021. We can no longer continue to have policies from the 1940s and thirties or whatever. At the time you thought America was great and if America was

great, it was because of foundational black Americans, American descendants of slavery who built this country. So vote yes in favor of this tonight. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is John. Good, Vanja. Not bad. I love you for hanging in there. My name is John Goodwin. I'm a resident of Denver and a homeowner. I've had many other family members who live in Denver. I live near Speer and Pearl, and that's District seven. And I do want to say I have 12 years of elected service in Colorado Springs on two different school boards, two different urban school boards. So I know something about governing and boards making difficult decisions, and you have a difficult decision to make. It was several years ago when I did that as a youngster, placed yourself in the position of five years out. Which side of history do you want to be on? So I'm here to to ask you to vote to accept these changes to the group, leaving coats their on on your agenda that are before you. This is vital to equity and fairness. It's vital to the historical writing are wrongs. The current proposal is already heavily compromised. I mean, you know, that's been clear. It still retains too many remnants of segregation and discrimination. But I hate to say it, but it represents necessary progress and some modest steps in the right direction. The advisory committee, the citizens, the city's professional staff, probably many of you have worked for years to get it to this point. So this legislation, 200888 deserves your support. I urge you to support it. Community feedback clearly breaks along lines of wealthy interests not willing quite yet to take their fair share of their civic responsibility to do the best for our fellow community members, even though these changes still segregate residential facilities away from their neighborhoods. So neighborhoods must share, must share and the civic and moral responsibility to create affordable and meaningful living options. It's not just the group, the group and the number of people, but it's a number of unrelated people. It's also the expansion of the traditional transitional and residential facilities in my neighborhood. In our neighborhoods, I welcome that. Please do the right thing here and vote yes to help address the racism and classism that's historic. And finally. To empower those who have no voice. I urge you to look beyond the scaremongering of the moneyed interests and the NIMBY neighbors. And let's make Denver better. Let's make Denver a better and fairer. We all need to do our part across the entire city. This is a start. Thank you for hanging

in there. Thank you for your service. Thank you, John. Sorry for mispronouncing your name so horribly this late. Up next, we have Brandy Majors. Can you hear me? Mm hmm. Go ahead. Excellent. Well, good evening, all. I have been amused and well entertained all evening with the nonsense about parking and people and my home value going down. How scared I am. And out of sexist nonsense. Almost castrated. But it's what the reality is. There are a lot of people that are unhoused and can actually utilize this plan. I'm in full support for two reasons. One, because it upsets you. That's off top. I'm glad you're upset. I'm glad that you feel fear like, oh, my God, I don't want this over here. It might upset my balance of, you know, this and then whatever else. Excuse. Yes, again, excuses. This is not just a historical thing because, you know, by all means, we've been here many times before and here we are yet again talking about something that should have been done a long time ago. I fully. Support. Utilizing, build it businesses, empty churches, whatever, to house or shelter people that need it. Do we need more shelters? Probably not. We actually need affordable, affordable housing and not what is considered mobile height affordable, but what is considered affordable for per person given their income in this world. What we have, whether it be zero or 55,000 a year or \$80,000 a year or whatever, hospitality number could come with it. I don't know. I don't care. But it should be affordable for everybody. And as it stands, there's luxury apartments that aren't being used. Can we do better? Should have done better a long time ago. But here we are again. Like I say, can't we do better? At this point, I'm starting to wonder. I would hope so. But I've been disappointed before. You're disappointed when we now do the right thing or get voted out? Simple as that. Because, like, you know, you could shift us and sweep us around. Surely we could sweep you out of your seat and move you around. Because if you can't do the right thing one of these days, you may find yourself on this end of the spectrum and might be unhoused. Or you might have to share your big luxury house with like eight or ten people because you can't afford to pay your bills to say. Anyway, so much. All I have to say. Thank you, Jeremy. Have a great night. Thank you, Brandy. Up next, we have Kyle Musselman. Hi. My name is Kyle Hillsman. I live in a group home. Spearman and I supported this proposal. First thing I just said, thanks council for staying up late and talking to you. Appreciate your time. And also community planning and development. Y'all have done an incredible job. I've worked in state legislative politics for a decade and this is some truly incredible state called in like you all deserve a medal. Andrew Webb and

team all deserve raises. This is incredible work that moved into this house. We call it Wholesome House back in 2015 when we were renting and nine of us moved into this. House

in the spare. Neighborhood. And we have group meetings, we cook dinner together. We care for each other. We support each other. When you come home from work, somebody. Asks you how your day. Was. And really developed a beautiful, amazing space and built great relationships with our neighbors. We built gardens, I mean, really took care of the space. After two and a half years. My roommate Jack and I approached our landlords to buy the. House and we're able to do it. Frankly, the only way I could possibly had. Access to. Know to do this, coming from a working class family and at the time making \$40,000 a year, was to be able to pull my money with another person and to co buy a house together and really opening up access. To the Denver market. We did that and have lived together with our partners and a handful of other roommates over the last two years. And it's been a beautiful situation. This is my family. My wife is pregnant. We are having a child in this community. These people really are who I look to for support and for love and for community and the place that I go for support. So I just want to note that passing this group Living Amendment would, one, legalize my family and legalize the way that I'm living. And to really get at this broader point of being able to open up equitable. Access. For folks to be able to rent affordably and to be able to buy into homeownership. This was noted early in the process, but we're talking a lot about unintended consequences that could potentially happen. But we know for certain right now there are unintended consequences of the current zoning, and that is my family, my way of living . This home group living is the unintended consequence. Our property values have increased \$400,000 in the time that we've lived here, and the threat of property values going over is simply overexaggerated and unfounded. In our situation. I urge. Thank you. Thank you, Kyle. And our last speaker this evening is Steffan Polk. Great. And it's actually Steven Pollock. But thank you, Kyle. It's actually a pleasure to follow right after you. But my name is Steve and from District ten. I've lived in cooperative houses in Denver for the last 17 years, and I'm a better human because of it. The original recommendation by the group Living Advisory Committee of eight unrelated adults is the ideal solution in lieu of this best option. We support the compromise that we, the proponents, have made, which is by people. We've been involved in crafting this proposal with a group of living advisory committee for the last three years. And I can tell you that we are profits seeking developers where cooperatives, where community housing developers, where teachers, where firefighters or writers or active community members who believe that community housing, social housing, cooperative housing, land trusts and so on are actually ideal solutions to our affordable housing crisis. Indeed, many of us couldn't live in the city without these options,

but these options currently are more or less illegal because of the zoning code. So as part of a cooperative, we're providing affordable options at rates that the government nor the private sector can match through nonprofit or limited equity models and were democratically controlled. We need to not only legalize these community based solutions, but the city actually needs to actively promote them, which at the very least requires the group living proposal to pass by not passing this law for close on this emergent and incredibly effective solution that creates strong, activated communities who care for each other, who work together to cooperate , to find solutions at very little cost to the public. So it's a vote for community, not just individual homeowners. And it just makes sense. And I'll close with this, but a larger number of people currently in the city are in violation of this outdated and racist, classist, hobo phobic ordinance. By voting no, you're essentially telling your constituents who are in violation, sorry, but you're going to need to remain illegal. You have to make more money to be legal. And that's not the message that we need to be sending to our constituents. So it's immoral, though, to vote no to voter exclusion. It's to work for the residents who are the most financially well-off or at least impacted by exclusionary zoning. To vote yes, however, to vote for inclusion. To vote for racial inclusion, class inclusion, inclusion of the LGBTQ plus community. To vote yes. To vote for a whole toolbox of socially oriented solutions that can provide affordability, democratic ownership and power for communities and is something that starts tonight. So I urge you all to vote yes as a responsibility to our community and a responsibility to us all. Thank you. Thank you, Stephen. That concludes our speakers tonight. Thank you, everybody, for. A great. Required public hearing. We made it through and got everybody in, so I appreciate that. Questions from members of council. Councilman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. I was just trying to get my camera on there, so I just have two questions, and I want to say thank you to all of the people

who have written, who have called, who have taken the time to be part of tonight's public hearing. Andrew, if you wouldn't mind, I would like you to clarify a couple of things that would address some comments. Stephen Wilde from Capitol Hill had mentioned concerns about, you know, that we might be seeing business investors acquiring properties and renting out rooms at top dollar. So can you talk about the protections that are in place that would prevent that from happening so that we don't see a proliferation of acquisitions with that kind of thing happening? So can you address that first? Sure. So there are a few things if you want to respond to that. The first is that the new definition of nonprofit household that would be added to the code would specify that rent buy the room type operations are do

not constitute a household. And a household is a group of people who jointly occupy a property and live as a family or as the functional equivalent of a family. And so we would have that that rule as part of that definition if if there needed to be an enforcement case. We also are clarifying that that rent by the room type uses would be allowed as a as a rooming and boarding type use in places where those types of uses are already allowed and where they're appropriate. And so we're, I think, making the code more clear about where those where those those types of kind of for profit rent buy the room uses would be allowed. And that is considered a separate sort of section of the code than the the definition of a household. Correct? Right. Okay. Let me go to my next question. And this one was. Based on the size of a home. So if somebody lives in, you know, a 500 square foot home, for example, and it's only got one bedroom. Talk about how the fire code and the building code would address preventing five unrelated people in such a concentrated, little, tiny structure. So to be clear, the the city's residential regulations that which are enforced by the EPA and the building code, which is enforced by CPD, set forth the basic requirements for houses. You have to have a functioning bathroom, kitchen, you have to have safe, habitable spaces that have safe entry and egress points. But there is not a limit of persons per square feet currently, and nor would there be so. So right now, a family, if they want or to a very large family could live in a studio apartment if they chose to. But, you know, the data on household size suggests that people are not going to make choices to live that way. But the the building and and housing codes do set standards for how big rooms have to be in and what you have to provide in a house. But as is currently, the case with the zoning code would allow an unlimited number of family members to live in any size house. And and this would also allow a group of up to five people who are not necessarily related to live in any size dwelling unit as well. And the last thing I would like you to just reiterate that you stated at the very beginning of your presentation is looking at cities across the country that have higher numbers than what Denver has currently had in terms of allowing more people to live within a household and what the actual numbers look like across the city. Can you just sort of, you know, reiterate that point? Yeah, I can just quickly recap that. So we did we looked at about 45 cities, primarily west of the Mississippi and many cities in Colorado. Most of which allow many more unrelated people to live together as a as a housekeeping unit, as a household. And. And in most of those in all of those cities, that allowed more. Whether it was, you know, five, which is the most of many of the Colorado cities that we looked at, and then up to eight. The closer you get to the West Coast, the actual average household si

zes, according to the Census Bureau, were generally the same, ranging from two and a half to three people, the same amount of people who typically live on average in households in Denver. And we also talked to colleagues in some of those places as well. And what we learned is that people live in those cities the same way they live anywhere else. And certainly there are households of people who are there are very large families to live in, houses in Denver and elsewhere, and and groups of people who are not related. But none of those cities reported a change, either weather, sudden or gradual and average household size. Thank you, Andrew. I have no further questions. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Ortega. Up next, we have Councilwoman Mitch. Thank you. Council President Andrew. I wanted to ask about a couple different residential care forms, so I'm going to just start with. Homeless shelters are homeless shelters allowed near where other people live today? Yes. Are they allowed near, for example, apartments in some places. Are they allowed near single family homes or single unit homes in some places? Yes. And in particular, what about single unit zoning? Are shelters for those experiencing homelessness allowed in areas with single unit zoning? Yes, they are. And can you just describe what size they can be and the conditions for that last one? So a a government agency

or a nonprofit or a religious assembly, use of zoning terminology for a church and can provide shelter for up to eight people year round, or in most cases, up to 100 people for no more than 120 days per year. So like a seasonal shelter. And there are actually provisions in the code that would allow more people to be served year round or seasonally, provided those shelters or those uses can demonstrate that they need the code spacing and density requirements. So there are currently provisions in the code that would allow shelters in all zoning districts in the city except open space. Okay. And not just being allowed, but are such shelters actually in operation in Denver, whether they may be now in COVID or not. But prior to COVID, were they in operation? And there are shelters that are permitted. Yes. In all neighborhoods. Okay. Let's talk about are there any examples of large residential care allowed in single unit zoning today? Yes. So can you give just a couple examples? The very that actually operate. That actually operates though. So the zoning code allows a large residential care in single unit zoning to serve up to 20 people. And there are without looking at the map. There are assisted living facilities and transitional housing and many other types of residential care uses that serve a larger number of people that exist in single unit zoned districts. And as far as you know, those facilities have both residents and staff that come and go from them. That's correct, yes. Okay. Thank you. How about community corrections?

Are there community corrections facilities in Denver with people living next door to them or across the street from them today? There are, I would say, probably more than half of the existing facilities are directly adjacent to residential neighborhoods. And can you just speak to what kind of housing might be next to some of those facilities, apartments, duplexes, single family, single unit homes? It's all of the above all. All those conditions exist. Are you familiar with any residential care type that we are proposing changes to today that does not already exist in Denver in one place or another? No. Are you familiar with any residential care type that we're talking about today that doesn't have people living next door to it and in some type of housing in some neighborhood in Denver today? I am not. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you. A couple of our speakers raised the question about one of the changes that was made to the residential care in single unit and two unit zoned districts was that it needed to be on a parcel that had been originally in a building that was institutional. So either a church, you know, some kind of school or some building that was not a home and into an individual's home. I raised some concerns in committee that some of the structures might not be sound or transferable, but the idea of that being usually a larger parcel and used to having a different use on it than a single family home, but that we should, in fact, allow the property itself, the structure itself, to be renovated or torn down or rebuilt if needed, if historically, that's what was on the site. Can you just clarify whether or not the final version of the ordinance requires the use of the building or just requires that the parcel have been, you know, this type of building in the past, even if it's going to be rebuilt. Sure. It just would require that the parcel have been one of those previous uses in the past. Okay. So this was something that was changed in response to some feedback. So this was. Yes. Okay. Got it. I think that's it. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilwoman. Next, we have Councilman Flynn. Excuse me. Thank you, Madam President. Andrew, could you give us a little more detail on a question that Councilman Ortega was asking about the rent by the room? We frequently see ads on Craigslist or elsewhere room available in this house or that house seeking a roommate. And that seems that strikes me as a very good thing. Yes. When especially when we increase the number of unrelated folks who can share a house. And I would not want to see that. Coming to question. So could you explain to me what's the difference between that and, you know, people saying, I'll rent you this bedroom, I already lived there versus a for profit or one of these pad splitting companies that we've been lobbied by who want to come in and do that as a business and put people together. Because I understood that you said the council tell y

ou that that would not be allowed. So what's the distinction? I just want to understand. So thank you for the opportunity to clarify that the updated definition certainly would allow somebody to rent a room in their home and I can pull it back up on screen if necessary. But the new proposed definition would stipulate that, that the residents of a house, the make up of the household is not decided by an external third party or property manager. So then. So if it's someone in a house that wants to rent out a room, that would be fine. But if it's a company renting out the whole entire house, room by room, that would clearly not be a household use and would not be allowed in the lowest intensity zone districts. Okay. Could it be the case that the owner of that

house, the landlord in that case, could advertise by the room and put the four or five people together themselves potentially? And, you know, all of these would be all in any situation like this would be looked at on a case by case basis if there was an enforcement action called on the House. So, you know, I can't speak to how that would play out in practice. But the intent is certainly that the people who are living there have all jointly chosen to live there. Okay. Thank you. It almost has me wondering whether it's a distinction that we know why we bothering with it. If someone wanted to do as a business, put people together in a house. All right. Thank you. That's all. Madam President. Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President, and thanks, Andrew. One of the issues that we had talked about a lot is the issue of Chapter 59. So have we. How are we resolving that issue? So a few ways. But in the short term, as we've talked about previously and as I as I, as I presented to Ludi back in December, we'll be launching a follow up project right after this to if these amendments are adopted, that would apply the definition of household citywide, including in areas of former Chapter 59. And then moving forward, we'll will CPD will spend some time this year looking at what resources it would take and to to continue the work of rezoning the city into one zoning code, which is our ultimate goal. Okay, great. So just so I can kind of wrap my mind around this two sides of this law definition of household side, there will be a bridge amendment coming soon that will apply that definition of household to the entire city, including. The Chapter. Nine on the residential care side. That will take some additional time yet to be determined. Is that correct? Correct. So residential care is uses are already allowed in in former Chapter 59 zone districts. And that language was actually brought forward and adapted into the Denver zoning code when it was adopted in 2010. And so those areas will continue to be regulated by the former Chapter 59 code until such time as they are as they're brought into the Denver zoning code permit. Okay. Thanks so much.

All right. Thank you, Councilwoman Soya. Seeing no other questions from members of council. The public hearing for Council Bill 20 dash 0888 is closed. Comments by members of Council. Councilwoman Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. I'll try to be brief, because we've been here very late tonight, and I know people who have been watching have been with us for several hours now. But I wanted to start out first by thanking Andrew Webb and our entire team from CPD, who did not anticipate this process being this long. You know, it started out with the expectation to be a much shorter timeframe. But obviously with COVID, we ended up, you know, extending the public input opportunity and and they did an incredible outreach to the community to ensure that we got a robust input. And that input is what brought us to the kinds of changes that are in this draft bill tonight. So to those who attended all the public meetings, who gave their input. You were listened to because the bill that's on the floor tonight, you know, was was a compromise that that reflected a lot of that input. You know, no compromise is ever perfect. But I think it's a good start. And I think it's important to state the to a comment made by Leslie Tarkovsky that we would come back and revisit this. We don't have to wait two years if we find that there are real challenges and issues with any of these provisions, we could at any point in time look to bring that back. In fact, we're going to be doing that with the Chapter 59 components. I also want to extend my appreciation to all of the people who served on the committee. You heard from some of the individuals that were members of the committee. It was very broad in terms of its representation. And I just want to take issue with the comment made by one guitarist about this being a corrupt process. I've never been engaged with a more open and transparent process that, you know, had multiple outreach points with the community that was as broad ranging in the representation that was included. And, you know, at the end of the day, we've got something that not everybody's happy with, but it's something that is are important changes to move forward with. I understand there are oftentimes fears and concerns with change. But, you know, again, these are. Done with a lot of thought and much, much discussion that went into every single category. And I just want to say that where this actually started was me reaching out to the mayor's office on multiple occasions, asking them to look at changes because we had the community corrections section that was expiring and was expired during the term of this process where there had been a cap on how many beds could be in a community corrections facility. And when the mayor's office looked at this and talked with CPD, I think they thought that because we had some very outdated sections of the group living part of this code, that it made sense to look at the entirety of it and not just look at the community cor

rection piece. And I think that was a wise move. Now, you know, again, some people think maybe we should have separated it all out. And and, you know, chances are that maybe only certain components of it would have been successful in moving forward and other elements of it maybe were not. But at the end of the day, I think these changes represent. Very broad input from our community and I will be supporting them tonight. And I just want to again thank the hundreds of people who took the time to reach out, to call, to send emails, to be part of tonight's conversation and look forward to monitoring this. And again, we would be involved in looking at bringing any changes back if it looks like there are some components of it that just are not working. So thank you very much. Madam President, I'll stop there. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Councilman Torres, you're up. Thank you, Madam President. So I'll be voting in support of tonight's proposal as well. It is a good start to how we can remove exclusion and judgment from our zoning code. CBD should not be the judge of the relationship of those who live in a home together. The desire otherwise is to unnecessarily put our values and bias inside someone else's life and household. When you aren't paying their rent or their mortgage or their childcare or their school supplies, families and individuals throughout the city need more than one tool to help them stay housed. To stay near their child's school. To stay near their job. To age in place. We need to give as many as we can to help and not hinder that reality. My personal group, Living Experience, is what empowers me to ensure that we initiate some changes here. My mom was a single mom linked up with other single moms for meeting basic human needs, including housing. After we became homeless when I was a teenager, so now feels towards his daughter will vote to ensure families, individuals and elders have greater liberty when they make their housing decisions and either team up with one another in hard times or just because they want to. This amendment ensures greater liberty to folks who choose their family and their living situation. When such houses in my district sleep tight. And I have been so impressed with everyone who has met, who has lived there. One friend in particular who used to live there said, quote, I thought of the name sleep tight on the when we bought the place. It's a comforting salutation and one that invoked special gratitude for all I had at the end of the day while working for little pay as an outreach worker to youth in homelessness. Unmoored from local community connections. Sleep tight allowed much needed balance away from the individualism of finding self alone in a city to finding a place of togetherness. This house and its community was an ongoing project. An intention being realized. A physical shell for learning how to share, learn and find the feelings and life that you need to live it well. It's not all up to you. You c

an rely on someone. Someone can rely on you. You can disappoint someone. And you'll learn how to work things out. When this came to Ludi in September, it was thought that we would be here for a public hearing back in November. We took even more time that we needed to ensure the details were discussed. We could continue as council members to listen to residents and stakeholders in our districts. So to my colleagues, I just want to emphasize this is necessary. I can appreciate that you've all been lobbied heavily by constituents, by your neighbors. We've all been threatened to be recalled or voted out. So be it. We are voting not just on Denver's present, but Denver's future. And when we say we need more tools for housing, for shelter, for basic needs. This is where the rubber meets the road. Think of your constituents who work three jobs and didn't have time to email you to call you to attend an evening public meeting. Over the past three years to oppose these amendments because they're trying to make sure they come up with their rent or their mortgage payment. Think of the folks leaving jail and who actually who deserve an actual second chance. Not more barriers to work and live with dignity. We took the time to dissect household definition and the number was reduced from ten to 8 to 5. We took the time to dissect concrete living and community corrections was removed from single unit zoning and additional provisions applied to limit it. Now the time is come and this is necessary, just a necessary step. This deserves a unanimous vote in favor. I just want to read it a section of a letter just to make sure that it's heard. We, the undersigned, hope this letter elevates some of the supportive voices that have not been able to participate more fully in this process. Some who stand to benefit most from those overdue changes live in households deemed illegal by the city, and rightfully so, feel threatened by the prospect of appearing before governmental bodies to plead their case. Others are among our most marginalized neighbors who are daily overburdened just to meet their and their family's basic needs. We already ask so much of the organizations that represent and serve these individuals, which are typically under-resourced and stretched thin. The frightening realities of the COVID 19 pandemic have only made matters worse for these individuals and their organizations. In this health

and life threatening time, people's immediate needs have taken precedence over advocating for the group Living Rules update. However, that does not. These changes do not matter. On the contrary, the goals and outcomes of this policy change are much needed in our communities. The current code stands to harm large, biologically related families, even though it does not regulate them by giving inclined neighbors grounds to file a complaint and prompt the city excuse me, a city inspection. More often these are Bipoc families. According to a recent analysis. Black and Hispani

c households comprised 30% of all Denver households, but 72% of those with five or more adults. Making these folks five times more likely to live in a five person or larger household compared to their white counterparts. We beg the question of what and who we as a Denver community value today. We look to you as our elected leaders to take decisive action in this unprecedented moment and proactively remove some of the longstanding systemic barriers standing against fair, marginalized individuals and families, helping to make stable housing options connected to opportunity a reality. For more Denver rights signed on by all in Denver be connected. Chocolate Icon Coffee Park. Neighborhood Association, Colorado Center on Law and Policy. Colorado Children's Campaign. Colorado Coalition for the Homeless. Colorado Cross Disability Coalition and Colorado Village Collaborative. Colorado Young Leaders. Comedy Taco East Colfax Community Collective Enterprise Community Partners. The Facts Partnership. Globetrotter Elyria Swansea A Coalition Interfaith Alliance of Colorado. J. K Places. Social Impact Real Estate. Mile High Connects. Mile High Ministries. Monarchs. Sober Living Homes. Mothers Advocating for affordable housing. Neighborhood Development Collaborative one Colorado. Our Front Porch Races. Brewing Company Revision. Reclaim the Eastside Redline Contemporary Art Center. Social Justice Team of Congregation Rhoda Shalom Second Chance Center Inc. Servicios de la Raza Saint Francis Center The COVID 19 Eviction Defense Project, the Empowerment Program Together. Colorado Tribe Recovery Homes Warm Cookies for the Revolution Yimby, Denver and Young Invincibles. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Torres. Councilwoman Black. Thank you, Madam President and Councilwoman Torres and Councilwoman Ortega, thank you for your very thoughtful comments. I also want to thank our speakers. It was truly wonderful to hear so many perspectives and so many personal stories and also many thanks to the countless emails we all received when CPD first came out with their proposal publicly . About a year ago, I was not supportive. I had concerns about the process and concerns about the committee. Since then, I spent much of 2020 communicating and meeting with my constituents in parks and in backyards, on the phone and emails and virtual meetings and social media and those many conversations. I listened to my constituents who told me that they were okay with a modest increase in household size and they weren't comfortable with community corrections in residential neighborhoods. So I worked hard with council members and CPD and together we came up with a compromise. It is far from perfect, but it is a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, there's been a lot of misrepresentation of the facts causing fear and creating opposition. It's distressing that most of the opposition comments I have received referenced this misinformation was the which is the actual source o

f their opposition. Myra Gonzalez talked about how this misinformation created fear and confusion in her Montebello neighborhood. I've seen the same thing in my district, and I've tried my best to correct this misinformation, but many are just unwilling to acknowledge the facts. I make my decisions based on fact, not fiction, not hyperbole, and not the misrepresentation of facts in the facts do not support the rhetoric. My district is geographically very large and with more than 65,000 individuals, it is very diverse and I've heard very diverse comments for the proposal against the proposal and a lot who are very neutral on it and just wanted more information. And while it's clear that there is a very vocal opposition group from my district, they do not speak for my entire district. I'd like to thank my constituents and my colleagues and CPD for all of their hard work. And I will be supporting this tonight. Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Councilwoman Black. Councilwoman Sawyer. Thank you, Madam President. I want to start also by thank you, my colleagues and everyone who is engaged in this process. These are not easy discussions and there definitely aren't easy answers. We are a community that's divided. And Andrew, I especially want to thank you your I really appreciate your willingness to engage with me all the way along, knowing that I very much disagree with CPD on this issue. You've maintained your professionalism and calm and good humor through an incredibly difficult process. So I really appreciate that. Thank you. I strongly believe that the

definition of household should be updated. Denver needs to change its laws to reflect the way people in our community are already living. Like my own family, we have three unrelated adults who live in our house. And while the residents in my district have said that they would prefer to keep it for unrelated people per household, we worked really hard to find a compromise at five unrelated adults. And I can respect where we landed. I appreciate that. CPD and I believe Councilman Gilmore are working to create a bridge amendment to apply the changes to the definition of household for Chapter 59 zone districts, which is fairer. And for all of those reasons, I advocated really hard with my fellow council members for an amendment tonight that would have allowed council to vote on the definition of household separately from the residential care definitions. Because I support this change and I would have liked to have voted yes. But I was not successful and I couldn't get six other members of council to support me in this. And my concerns with the residential care side are too numerous to be able to support these changes as a whole. When I ran for office, I promised to be thoughtful about the land use decisions I made, and I am really concerned about some of the consequences of the residential care side of the zoning changes. Like my colleagues have expressed, I am extraordinarily disappointed by the misinf

ormation that has been spread in our community. It is absolutely unacceptable. And let me be clear. Residential care facilities are allowed in single family zone districts right now. Today, sober living facilities, assisted living facilities are already in your single family neighborhood. Today. You just don't know they're there and they are providing a valuable service in our community. So why do we need these complicated and confusing updates to this law, especially when they actually remove some of the rights from our neighborhoods? For example, very small facilities aren't required to have community meetings under the zoning changes. District five has a number of these facilities already, and in my experience, community conversations are essential to developing successful community partnerships. Are they easy conversations? Absolutely not. Do they take a bit of time and effort? Yeah. But they can and have been used to set clear expectations, create more positive relationships, and get better outcomes for all involved . And I believe that not requiring them is a detriment to the citizens of Denver. Again, this is not thoughtful development. Finally, and I think most importantly for District five, the changes to the residential care do not apply to zone districts. In Chapter 59 old code that covers 20% of the land in the city and about a third of the land in my district. This issue should have been addressed before this vote moved forward, and it wasn't. Denver changed the zoning code in 2010. CPD has had a decade to address this problem and chose not to. Now council has been put in a position of having to vote on a law where Chapter 59 has become a major stumbling block to fair implementation. And unlike the definition of household, it isn't possible to do a bridge amendment to apply the residential care changes to Chapter 59 zone districts. So it's maybe going to be years before that happens. And in the meantime, I don't feel that I can responsibly represent the constituents living in approximately 35% of the land in my district. When I can't predict how this might apply to them in the future. And it certainly isn't fair to the other 65% of my district or the other 80% of Denver to saddle us with a law that doesn't apply to everyone. That is not thoughtful development. And as much as they appreciate the hard work that has been done here in the compromise that has been reached, and as much as I would like to support the definition of household changes, I cannot support the changes to the residential care side of this law without them applying to the properties in the former Chapter 59 zoning code. This doesn't meet the criteria as far as I'm concerned, and so I will be a no tonight. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilman Sawyer. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. First, I want to thank everybody who took the time to talk with us tonight and who is hung in there until now. And I especially want to thank the Afghan And

rew for their work with us on this over the past year. A number of the provisions in this bill actually are adjustments to things we already have, as several speakers have said. As for household living, it's very clear that the law needs change, as we heard tonight. People already are living with unrelated roommates and they are part of the fabric of the community of several households. Within sight of my windows here that are that way. And I bet that when three or four people rent a house together, they don't even know that Denver calls illegal. And they go about their lives just as remarkably as households with large extended families. So I support that change, although I am mindful of the impact that it could have to drive rents upward as far as residential care or group homes. This is another thing we already have as Councilwoman Sawyer and others have already

said. I heard from a lot of people who had concerns about the bill, who didn't realize there already are a large number of group homes in our neighborhoods, including in the low density neighborhoods. We heard so much about tonight. In my district, there are four in Harvey, part two in Bear Valley, one in Mali, one in the tiny Green Meadows neighborhood, one in Pinehurst. This bill doesn't open up low density neighborhoods to small group homes that are already there. And more could move in tomorrow, even if we didn't pass this. What this bill does is allow those smaller group homes to go from eight residents to ten. And then there was the debate over community corrections. And although a lot of the narrative tonight and during this process has been that community corrections is confined to industrial zones next to vulnerable neighborhoods, half of them are not. In fact, my southwest Denver district has the most community corrections beds of any council district at 200 221 two facilities are in the Fort Logan neighborhood, right across the street from Boomer Heights and Pinehurst. The third is right up the street from Loretto Heights, and we also have a fourth community corrections facility right next to Loretto Heights, but just over the boundary in Arapahoe County with a dozen residential care facilities in my district. We are already carrying our share of the citywide total. Denver's demographics have changed since redlining came in the 1930s. Some of those neighborhoods, those very neighborhoods that were redlined, are now gentrified or gentrifying right now and becoming whiter by pricing out the households that have been there for a long time. And other neighborhoods that had been majority white are now majority households of color. I have a subdivision in my district that was filed in 1926 when it was Arapahoe County Ranchland, and it contained a provision you can see it online. It contained a provision prohibiting the sale or occupancy of any lot by any person of color. In the 2010 census, the census tract that covers that subdivision was 82% people of color. So last summer, when

we were working on this group living proposal, I asked staff to produce a demographic spreadsheet of my district. Southwest Denver today has more diversity, both race and ethnicity, and a broader range of incomes than the city as a whole. Denver is 54% white, according to the 2018 Census data from the American Community Survey. My district is 54% households of color. RV Park is almost exclusively single family homes. It's 65% households of color. 36% of households in Denver earn less than \$50,000, and income in my district is 40%. On the other end, 10% of Denver households ten 10% of Denver households have incomes greater than \$200,000 a year. In my district, it's 4%. My district currently has the diversity of class and race that this bill seeks to promote. My single family duplex and row house neighborhoods are not all wealthy and white. They are diverse. And they are home to families of color who sort out and enjoy that very character. My concern all along in this process has been that the kinds of policies that nevertheless have produced displacement and unaffordability through density and redevelopment, which was not the goal, will bring that same outcome to my vulnerable and currently affordable neighborhoods. As it has elsewhere. Several speakers testified and six of us on council last year had asked that this package be broken up into distinct pieces so that we in the public can focus on one area at a. Time, as Councilwoman Sawyer was saying, and the agency didn't want to do that. And so we have this stew of changes that contains things I wholeheartedly support, things I still do not like, and things I think could use more work. I wish we could work on some more. We need more community corrections sites and we could have pulled that out and worked on it more intentionally by determining, well, how many do we need and then do the hard work of siting them where they have the best chances of success instead of having it in this omnibus bill that opens up 15,000 properties citywide when we only need a. Half dozen or so sites. We need space, I think, for about 700 people in a city of 700,000. But we left that work in a single package that is overwhelming in scope. It's clear that this is going to pass and I support wholeheartedly support parts of it. But I don't have the choice to vote yes on one section, no on another, and maybe on the third, because we didn't unbundle this package. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Flynn. Councilwoman Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. I'd just like to also thank all of the speakers who are hanging tough with this or more and the viewers who are here. At 1220 in the morning, as we can tell, this is very complicated. And in northwest Denver, a lot of zoning issues have always plagued District one. And when I ran, I talked about a lot of the it's where I've done what I've studied since being a council aide in 2012. And I committed to my voters that I would be thoughtful and diligent in ap

proaching land use issues because of the conflicts and the issues that I have seen of our neighbors pitting against each other. And I think that's reflected here tonight that we're talking about this at

1230 in the morning. I wanted to make something clear. We had a speaker tonight talk about why this was coming forward and in the quarter and in the documents that she got from the mayor's office, quote. A 2008 moratorium on new community correction facilities will expire in May of 2018. One of the documents from the 2017 reads A public discussion of the current regulations is needed to identify any changes before the Community Correction Facility's moratorium expires. Since poor service providers and zoning staff have identified multiple examples of language and regulations that should be considered so. Since 2008, our halfway houses and our community corrections have been in a time capsule. I do not think that's progressive policy. I do not think that's keeping up with all of the changes that Denver has experienced as a whole. We've gone through a recession. We've gone through a pandemic. We've gone through tons of things since 2008. And I believe that the only way to change things is to create new systems and new opportunities for those who have been in these incarcerated to come out into our communities. They served their time. They deserve the opportunity to come back into our community. Another comment that I heard throughout the whole entire process was infrastructure, the need for better schools, the need for more schools, the need for trash services, the need for wastewater. And in December 12th, 2016, there was a Denver Post article and it was named titled. Denver is absorbing a lot more people, but it is more densely populated in 1950. And I'll quote from that article. Through. Those sent to states may show. Those census data sets may show that Denver. Denver is not more densely populated than it was six decades ago. There are important differences in how Denver writes then live now and are influencing today's infrastructures. Slightly fewer people live in each dwelling. Let me repeat that. Slightly fewer people live in each dwelling, according to city research. They own more cars about twice as much the rate as 1950. Even after the expansion of Denver Metro's modern transit system in the past 20 years in directions focused mostly on serving suburban commuters, only about 7% of residents in the Denver proper area use busses and trains to get to work a slightly slower rate than 8% who did so in 2002. I kept hearing talking conversations about cars. I did not run to represent cars. I ran to represent people. And I ran to represent opportunities. I also heard discussion saying that during a pandemic, we needed to stop things and stop progress. I absolutely disagree. During a pandemic is when we need to find more housing options for those who are experiencing homelessness. For those who have lost their jobs. For those who are living payche

k to paycheck, who need more resources. Right now, we have to act. Another concern that I heard was that the Independence House, which is a halfway house in northwest Denver, has tons of calls for service. I spoke with the commander, and that's not true. Any time that transportation is needed, a call for services come to the police department. The Independence House has been serving people since the seventies in northwest Denver, and they have done a wonderful job. So in District one I got several emails and they stated the zoning code should regulate safety and not be a tool for privileged groups to force discrimination in neighborhoods. The AARP wrote a letter to us and they said they are a strong proponent of age friendly, livable communities where residents of all backgrounds can thrive. We got another letter from the Neighborhood Development Development Collaborative, increasing the number of unrelated adults allowed to live together from 2 to 5 increases affordability and allows members of the community the basic freedom to determine the composition of their households. Let me say that again. We're having this discussion in 2021, and we're getting letters that talk about the basic freedom to determine the composition of their households. Expanding areas where community correction facilities can be sited. These facilities are intended to allow people who have committed a crime to get on their feet and reconnect with society, to get on their feet and reconnect with society. Who does not deserve that, that opportunity? The core of this idea is undercut if community correction facilities are only allowed in places that are segregated from most communities and segregated from access to transit and jobs. And that's what we have done in Denver. We have segregated these facilities since 2008. Let me repeat since 2008, and it is 2021. So with that, I wholeheartedly support this and the entire package. I work on land use and I hear all the time in Council District one on some of the proposals that I move forward, that people want me to piecemeal them and people want me to move them apart and only move one person forward and not the whole entire package. And when land use comes, it's complicated. And in Denver, we deserve to have a package that's progressive and is especially right now during a pandemic and people need more resources. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilwoman Sandoval. Councilwoman Canete. Thank you. Council president and to all of our speakers as well as to the staff who manage this process, but also who

managed this meeting tonight. We couldn't do our jobs without you. Thank you to them. So over three years, this group living conversation has been more than a zoning debate. It has really surfaced prominent American narratives like neighborhood and family. And it's also given us a chance to really debate how we are going to or whether we're going to live up to community values that I still think that most of us would say th

at we shared. So I want to address both those narratives and the zoning criteria tonight. So first one, what's a neighborhood? A dictionary might tell us. It's an area around people who live near each other. Sounds pretty simple, right? But in the residential care portions of this debate, some opponents have asserted that residential care users don't belong in or are incompatible with neighborhoods. This argument would require a much more nuanced definition of what counts as a neighborhood, because as we heard in the question and the answer every resident will use, care being discussed tonight exists in some form in every city, every single one they live across. People live across the street from them. They live next door to them. They live in apartments, duplexes, even in single unit homes. In some cases, the facility existed before the rules were debated, and so it's frozen in time in something called a non-conforming use. In other cases, we just treat some residents in their zoning differently than we do other residents. So if they are not all neighborhoods. Why not? Why are one group considered neighborhoods and one group not? Or if they're all neighborhoods, how do we justify in our zoning code allowing the uses to exist as they have for 60 some years in some neighborhoods and not in others at all? So I make no assertions about the intent or beliefs of those asking us to treat these neighborhoods differently. I want to say this again. I know not what is in the heart of any person who testified tonight who supports or opposes this measure. I make no assumptions and I label no one. But as I have talked about in other forums during this past couple of years, my focus as a policymaker does need to be on the structural differential outcomes. That's what I'm focused on. Are the outcomes the same? The zoning code has historically treated some neighborhoods with people living in them differently from other neighborhoods, with people living in them without a land use matter justifying the difference. The distinction can't be who lives there. And the distinction can't be who lives inside of the facility. In the zoning code, it's supposed to be based on something to do with the land, right? So for these reasons, I find that the proposed amendments not only satisfy the criteria of uniformity of zone district to treat neighborhoods more similarly, they're actually essential because without these changes , the zoning code does not have uniformity of zone, district and regulation. So that criteria is really important. These these amendments do need to pass. As to the criteria of public safety, health and welfare. The record includes numerous letters and testimony from residents who live near current community corrections. Current group residential care facilities. And they have described neutral or even positive experiences living near these facilities. So I find nothing in the record that indicates the incompatibility of this criteria with these cha

nges. Furthermore, while we've identified and some of my colleagues who spoke before me identify that these uses already exist, they did not acknowledge the fact that they are frozen in time and cannot renovate or redevelop to meet the health and safety needs of their current residents. So again, I find that to meet the zoning criteria of health, safety and welfare, we must pass these changes so that they can meet those needs of their residents rather than being frozen in time as they are now unable to change. I also find that the health, safety and welfare of residents who need care is advanced by this zoning change, that being able to expand them or to create them to fill gaps as they're needed, particularly around homelessness. We've identified several shelter types that are missing in our city that this not only helps to meet the health and safety, it also meets the criteria of plan conformance because our plans call for connected and economically diverse neighborhoods. You cannot be a connected and economically diverse neighborhood if you are nowhere near transportation, grocery stores, jobs or other services. So again, I find that the plan conformance criteria is met. Another narrative What is family? Here are the dictionary definition includes traditional people who are related by blood. But if you dig a little deeper in the dictionary, it also includes people who live together as a household. In our committee process. Community Planning and development previously shared Denver's history. So it's part of the history, the record before us tonight. The limit of blood relationships is not redeemed. It is not even 100 years old in our code. It was created relatively recently. It was not the way that it always was. And I want to share one example of why this different definition of family based on blood is so troubling and

exclusionary to some in our community. So an old friend of mine named Casey came out as transgender, and in large part he was rejected from his family of origin and estranged from them. Several years ago, he was diagnosed with brain cancer. It was a former partner and friend and her spouse who took care of him through this terminal illness. They took care of him physically. They took care of his financial and medical care, every aspect of his remaining days. I respect that some speakers are concerned about external impacts. And we've spent many, many hours in committee talking about the laws that exist to address external impacts. But the narrative that has come up during the testimony tonight and previously that somehow we can predict external impacts based on the presence or absence of a blood relationship that that has no basis in data. It devalues the relationships that took care of Casey in his dying days. And it over values the blood relations who reject too many in our community raising the household limit to five. And I know this is very controversial with supporters and opponents tonight raising the number to five. T

hose households from 0 to 5 will be treated exactly the same, whether they are related or not. That is a significant, significant change tonight. And it has value. It promotes housing stability for residents who are able to afford their housing costs by sharing them and therefore has, again, plan conformance. Our plans call for promotion of housing stability. And I find that this change promotes that. Now, I am sorry that we did not get the support we needed to treat all households the same in other size categories. But I do find that the plan goals are advanced and that we will have a more equitable zoning code if this passes than if we do not. I also just want to ground ourselves in our zoning code. There is no zoning code in the city and county of Denver in the new zoning code that is single family. We have single unit. It's about how many doors you have attached to each other. We have two units. So I find that all of the code amendments that we're making tonight on the on this side of it also are conforming. Finally, I just want to say that I am proud of this final proposal. I'm proud of both the policy changes it makes and the fact that it was molded and shaped with input from those who sat down to provide constructive ideas on how we could find common ground, even when I might have personally felt different. Lee I believe that this is good democratic debate and it's good to see that policies can change with that input and that engagement. I see the value even where I wish that we had come up with a slightly stronger outcome. So I just want to say the values that I think we share. So and I would guess that almost none of the speakers who spoke tonight would say they disagree with these values, but these are the values represented in these criteria that are being met. People should have access to housing they can afford. This proposal advances that value. And I believe the people who told me tonight that they share this value, this proposal advances it. And failure to do so would miss an opportunity to do that. A strong community must include places to live for those who need extra care in locations with access to food, medical care and transportation that they need to survive and thrive. I believe that that's a value most people would agree with. This proposal advances it. Finally, people deserve a second chance. If you have served your time, you deserve a second chance. And that includes, I think, this proposal and advancing that. I do not believe there is a fixed amount of quality of life in Denver and that if we have more people accessing it, that somehow someone else's is diminished. It is not a finite resource. I believe we have the capacity to accommodate families that need may not be related by blood services for the people who need them and strong neighborhoods. These things are compatible. We have the capacity to deliver all of them. And for those reasons, I will be supporting this tonight and continuing to work to advance all o

f these values in the other areas of our land use in Denver. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilman PANITCH, Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank one. Be sure my audio was on. I want to thank everyone on all sides who participated in this incredible discussion over the past couple of years. Well, make that almost everyone. Those of you who chose to resort to vile obscenities and meritless character assassination directed at those in the community and city staff at members of this council who you felt were not addressing your concerns adequately, you contributed nothing to the conversation. You actually demean the importance of this debate. And those of you who have intentionally spread misleading and hyperbolic gossip had made a difficult discussion needlessly more challenging. I have spoken with people on both sides of this debate who feel passionately about their position, with whom I have great respect and I think have great character. Our current definition of household size is two unrelated add ons, even with the allowance for all of their relatives is antiquated merits revision to

allow for a more broad definition of family, more in line with how people actually wish to live in 2021. Our sisters and brothers, our sons and daughters, mothers and fathers and uncles and aunts who either find themselves on the street with no place to call home or are trying to turn their lives around after being incarcerated for violations of the law, need additional facilities and services that give them the hand up they need to return to lives of dignity, whether that be full independence for those capable of that ascent or healing custodial care for those in need of more long term assistance. All neighborhoods should share in the benefits and the challenges of living in Denver, Colorado. We must redress the slanted policies of the past that have served some communities, not just at the exclusion of others, but at the expense of others. I really want to thank my colleagues for with whom I have had endless conversations in recent weeks trying to become clear in my own mind and thank my constituents as well, who've helped in that that bit of travel. I've spent more time on this in consideration of this proposal that on any policy I've looked at in my time on council, that is true of many of my colleagues as well who have had dove into this material in great depth. If the policy being proposed tonight passes, I do not believe it will lead to the destruction of our neighborhoods or imperil our safety. It is possible some communities will see a presence of services to which they're not accustomed. There may be discomfort for some, either due to fear of change or the reality of changes they don't like to say otherwise would be disingenuous. But the status quo has long been uncomfortable for many others. The process that got us here had some flaws that concerned me. This process Trump policy. I don't believe that's the question.

And that's like asking what's more important? The Constitution or democracy process leads to policy. Better process does lead to better policy. The proposal should have been divided into at least two separate bills. I still don't see what managed group living uses have to do with household size. It makes sense for a bill that's hard to wrap your arms around and causes debate to wander all over the map as we've seen in months past and even tonight. I do believe that if the committee that led to the proposal being put forth tonight had been comprised of more broad based or different representation, it would be a different proposal. But not being a soothsayer, I can't tell you precisely what that different proposal might look like. It might have created a more nuanced approach that respected reasonable concerns for buffers between users. I'd have been more comfortable with a buffer in place around corrections facilities. But that discomfort comes from the fact that I know a lot of my constituents have that fear. The data that I've looked at doesn't justify that discomfort. The information I've gotten from the police department, from Community Corrections simply doesn't justify that discomfort. I honor that it exists. Fear is difficult to deal with sometimes. I'm concerned by the fact that some neighborhoods may be more susceptible to to the abuse of household size than others. I'm concerned by the hesitance of CPD and Dottie to commit to beefing up neighborhood inspection services. Community members and members of this body have long requested better enforcement of existing ordinances, hence the concern that additional demand might arise from implementation of this wide ranging bill. In determining policy, it's important to have as representative a group as possible at the table not only to check a box under the column headed equity or to even the numbers, but perhaps more importantly, there will be ideas brought to the table worthy of discussion that wouldn't come forward otherwise. Different communities bring differing perspectives. After five plus years on council. I fully understand the complexities that citizen involvement bring to legislating and crafting a policy. But I've chosen to believe it is among the characteristics that define our government. From others around the world. Champion public comment before this body. Because I believe in its purpose and benefit. And I believe in crafting a system that binds the civic body for ideas, not just for approval. Also in my time on council, I've heard various city agencies urge this and that policy because developers crave certainty, an ordinance and guideline. Shouldn't neighbors be accorded this same courtesy? The roadmap for how we get to the new reality that more justly houses all Denver ites with dignity is getting ever more complex. Tonight's proposal is not being considered in a vacuum. We've seen the unintended consequences of short term rentals. That were supposed to be a way to keep str

uggling household afloat, but has grown into an industry all its own with benefits as well as consequences. We've accepted accessory dwelling units as a value in Blueprint Denver and in our comprehensive plan. But do we know yet what what the use of what the result of implementing its use is going to be? How is it going to affect property values in general? Are these truly going to be intergenerational households, or is it just a further wealth building for those who are already

advantaged? We're going to be looking at the affordable housing incentives. Program moving forward. After that, we'll be looking at residential infill where we will, in fact, question single family zoning. Where does it remain appropriate and where might it change? The discussion is more complex than some would have it be. I would. For that reason, I was not a fan at all of the original proposal. I thought it was too extreme from where we're starting now. It's my approach. It may be right. It may be wrong. It's the way I approach things. Move forward incrementally in a couple of years. If this passes, we'll look at it and will either say, Hey, we made some mistakes. We either need to back up a bit or maybe there is room to move forward even more. To say that the the compromises that were made over the past year to to the original proposal to say that these are minimal is simply not accurate. The original proposal, while many favored it were was for eight individuals in, I believe, 1600 square feet plus another individual for every 200 square feet with no limit and all their adult relatives to go from there. Whether you like it or not. Down to a cap of five adults is a major, major shift. To take community considered community corrections out of SOTU and Rowhouse neighborhoods is a major concession. There's. A lot of things that have concerned me about this program. But there's more. That I see. Good in it. Then I see harmful. I think the challenges are things we can manage. As I said, the safety concerns simply are not borne out by data. If they were, I'd be feeling differently about this proposal. The last thing I want to say and Madam President, I appreciate the time and I published a newspaper for a lot of years, neighborhood newspaper in South Denver. And the first historic picture that I remember getting from Denver Public Library was taken from I Live Avenue, just west of Colorado Boulevard. It was a dirt road. Looking at the brand new University of Denver campus in the late 1800s. And there was one house. All you could see in this landscape photo was one house. And it just makes me think of how when the area started to develop, how neighbors were feeling about those people getting closer . And then when we truly develop neighborhoods with setbacks of five feet. So your neighbors door, your neighbors window is ten feet away. The concerns that people had about those people living so close. I believe this proposal has challenges. I believe they can be met as fa

r as Chapter 59 goes. I wish the whole city was being treated equally and all the Chapter 59 land was under this new proposed policy. The reality is the whole city is not being treated equally right now. So I think we're moving in the right direction. I'm committed to meeting the challenge of any unforeseen consequences that arise. So after more thought than I have given anything since taking office, I will be supporting this tonight. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilman Cashman. Councilman Hines. Thank you, Madam President. A rich and not muted former council person recently recently reminded me that everyone is a little mad at me about my position and I've probably come to a good compromise given the need for the opposition comments that my office has gotten about this proposal. I think we're probably in that place. We certainly heard from those who tell me that we need to keep things exactly as they are. After all, they committed their family to a community because of what the neighborhood was when they purchased their home. This amendment is a threat to that paradise. We've also certainly heard from those who tell me that this proposal has been watered down too much. If only we could maximize the purpose of the tool. Affordability for all those who are coming to our beautiful city. They are struggling to find affordable ways to live in Denver and see this council body as one that continues to hamstring each affordability effort put before us. So I want to thank I want to thank you CBT staff, especially Andrew Webb Mr. Webb and a CBT staff working hard on a proposal that. And sorry. Someone's texting me on a proposal. It's been multiple years and field fielded calls of fielded lots of angry calls emails and other constituent outreach about group living. Also, thank you to the Group Planning Advisory Committee. These individuals put in hours and hours of deliberation and learning to present potential changes to Denver's code. These volunteers were willing to expose their private lives to public scrutiny, to push a conversation that has been difficult for Denver to consider for quite some time. Thank you to all the inspectors in our city. We're hearing some ugly stuff come out that alleges that inspectors are lazy or even worse, are willing to accept bribes. I have no reason to believe that any of this is true. And I'm sad that people would make these allegations before I was elected. I spoke quite a bit about how we all need access access to housing, transportation and representation. To that end, I chose to survey the residents of our perfect slice of the city, much like my predecessor. All the information is anonymous, and none of that information was presented at an individual level. It was meant to understand the district, not spy on an individual. The survey resulted in about a thousand responses and the vast majority were from District said. On its face, a

narrow majority agreed or strongly agreed with this amendment. However

, the comments showed that some of those against were opposed because this amendment, in their opinion, doesn't go far enough. The comments also showed that a considerable amount of those opposed took that position because of fear of unintended consequences like parking, sanitation and other symptoms, as has been heavily covered tonight. We can legislate to stop those consequences from happening. Some said they didn't want to complete the survey because of the questions that I asked. They said the questions were biased. They said the questions were invasive. So those groups decided against participating in my survey and created their own survey. That is, of course, their prerogative to go separately from a district wide survey. But here's the deal. I was trying to cut through the misinformation and preconceptions to make sure that people were thinking about the policy, not just reciting talking points. I was. I also wanted to see if this amendment could actually be that affordability tool that CPD is striving for. That means I asked about financial stability. That means asking about social networks that if they were stable and their social network was stable, then this amendment wasn't for them. If they were severely tax burden or if their social network was housing insecure, then this amendment was made for you. So setting aside the perceived survey bias, I'm deeply concerned about a different kind of bias than I want to talk about. It's one where people who have a good life here are genuinely frightened and feel very, very threatened by the policies that could ease affordability obstacles. Some of the email I received claimed that people who would want to share their homes with other unrelated adults were dirty, unhealthy, loud, that people would want to live together this way, would park in front of their lawns and take a ball to public parking spaces on the street in front of their homes. But these people would create nuisance properties and sell drugs and clog up sewer systems. So let me tell you about two examples of constituents that I know. One of my constituents is a single dad and a DPS teacher. He's living in a nice single family home with a playset in the backyard, a dog and a couple of chickens. He lives with a couple who aren't married but are saving up for a wedding and a down payment for a home to save up for braces for his son. He's been talking to a U.S. health student doing a residency about renting her the fourth open bedroom in his house, just living with a couple of means. He's violating code and would be even more if he added the roommate to his fourth empty bedroom. The second is a prominent older man in Cherry Creek who's facing housing insecurity but is too ashamed or too proud to talk about it. His wife had passed away after a long illness. They took out a lot of their retirement savings. He risks losing the beautiful, expensive home he and his wife raised their kids in. He's in great mental health and physical health.

No one would have thought no one would think of him as housing insecure. But he is. His home has four bedrooms and an office space. He has a friend who lives with a college students who helps him out with cooking and cleaning so he has a less expensive place to live. His friend suggested they all move in together and share the big, beautiful home. But here's what I want. I want TPS teachers to afford to live in Denver. I want to support a father's desire to have his son experience a backyard and a dog while growing up, even in densely packed District ten. I want to support the med student who might grow to love Denver and stay here helping save some brain drain from our city. I want to support this generational partnership. Affordability for someone starting out and affordability for someone who wants to comfortably stay in his home in his twilight years. I couldn't care less if three men choose to live together. I don't believe it's anyone in business if their relatives are not. So we've heard people talk about racism today. It's says it's a tough subject. So I want to set that aside. The discussion about whether people are racist or not. Certainly a good conversation to have. But instead what I want is what I see is a struggle between those who want to prepare, desperate for an affordable future and those who want to preserve Denver for what it is today. What I would say, though, is that our job on council is to shape Denver's future. The reality is that the secret is out. Denver is an amazing place to live. People are moving to Denver in droves from all over the nation beyond. My next door neighbor is from Paris, France, and he's. Here for work. If we weren't intentional in our approach to our city's future, we'll become an even more unaffordable city than we already are. And we will have even more people living in tents than we already do. A few decades apart of Denver, Denver's District ten was literally a dump. It was thanks to our leaders decisions back then that some of the most desirable areas of our city exist. A few decades ago, Colfax was known for a different kind of nightlife than what exists on Colfax today. Now, District ten residents and Colfax are unhappy when ten campers illegally take

residence on private property on Colfax. Change doesn't happen overnight. But you haven't entrusted us on counsel to shape Denver's future long term, not just make knee jerk reactions to this morning's news headlines. This improvement in quality of life in Colfax still has a ways to go, but it's definitely moving in the right direction. Thanks to far sighted leadership. This council responsibilities as relevant today as it was back when we removed the dump or cleaned up Colfax. So we must move forward with the shaping of Denver or risk having it shaped for us. We must use all the tools to find solutions for our unhoused neighbors. Yes. That means taking huge risk on locating city by force bases here in District ten. It was risky be

cause it was untested endeavor, and it was risky because more than a thousand we got more than a thousand e-mails on opposing those sites. It also means encouraging 100% affordable housing and developments like 13th and Sherman in District ten and encouraging our city counterparts to relax laws that allow us to get workforce, housing and every new development. And yes, it needs working sometimes with mercury developers to ensure we use every tool in our toolbox to get people out of tents and into homes. In that. Shaping, we should. Revisit the definition of the American dream. For some, that means a white picket fence and a single family home and getting into your car and cruising the strip on Friday nights. But others prefer multi-family buildings, and some don't own a car at all. It's time to recognize that my dream may not be your dream. But if we are going to dream, let's dream about our future. Let's dream to shape our city, to make it even better for tomorrow. I'm going to share two quotes from constituents. The first is from a resident in Congress Park. Do you remember as of council, I've lived in Congress parking a single family home for seven years. For the first five years I didn't recognize the two large houses on my block where group homes. I'm still unaware of the details, but I wish all the folks who are up in arms about having group homes on their block would spend some time here. It's a non-issue for that reason. And in supporting anti-racism policies, I fully support the changes being proposed to update group living rules in Denver. Medical Doctor. The last I want to end up. I want to end with a quote from a constituent who lives on Seventh Avenue. I ask my fellow neighbors and community members not to be driven by fear when they think of more adults living together and to not assume the worst. I ask that they assume that we are a community of hardworking adults trying to do our best in this world, regardless of race, religion and sexual orientation with whom we choose to live and how we are able to find a reasonable solution to pay a rent or mortgage is on each of us to solve every day. In addition. We should also take pride in supporting people in our community and group our elderly homes that are doing their best to transition to a better life or finish their lives with integrity and grace. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Hines. Councilman Clark. Thank you, Madam President. The advantage of going near the end here is that everything that I had to say, somebody else has already said. So I'll just say thank you to all of the speakers who took time to be here and to the 113 who are still hanging around watching right now. Thank you so much to staff. Andrew Webb, I think is going to be sainted having gone through this. So thank you to all of the staff within hours and hours and hours and a lot more hours at our request than it was originally planned. And thank you to all of my colleagues here on the Council for a

ll of your work. I know a lot of work has gone into this from the very beginning. At every point it was hard. And I know that there are people that are constituents of mine on both sides who were not happy about this as we worked towards compromise for many. This doesn't go far. Enough, and for many. This goes too far. But I believe that we have struck a good balance, a good compromise that moves us forward while mitigating many of the concerns that were brought to the table by the hundreds of people who got involved with this. And so I just want to say that I'm so proud to serve with all of you and to see that respectful and passionate dialog that represents all of the voices and feelings from our community can really make a proposal better. And I'll be supporting that compromise. And the really hard work, the really hard work it took to get there with a yes vote tonight. So thank you to all of you. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilman Clark, I see no other hands raised. I'll go ahead and round out the column, the comments here. Before we vote, I would like to also thank the speakers community. The original community met the original committee members, my colleagues on council. We learned alongside each other during this process and CPD, Andrew, Sarah, Laura and the amazing central staff who behind the scenes made sure that we were able to pull off this massive meeting tonight and make sure that we were able to hear all of the community members. So thank you to the central staff team. The March 13

COVID shutdown did slow the roll out of these changes, and we've had a lot of community meetings, we've had town halls. And throughout this entire time, like my colleagues said, the proposed amendment drastically changed from where we originally received it, and it was vital for us to hear the community's questions, ideas and concerns. We know that during this pandemic and even before, we were seeing alarming statistics on the state of housing security in our city. And at the end of the day, these proposals, these amendments are at the end of the day, trying to get more people housed in the city and county of Denver. Our cost of living has significantly increased over the last five years. But even looking back ten, 15 and 20 years, coupled with high unemployment, we must look at equity to correct some of these issues that we're facing. My family has lived in the community for 25 years. When my husband and I bought our home in Montebello, it was \$140,000 in the nineties. Reports now show that the average single family home is upwards of \$600,000 in Denver. So many people have faced multiple barriers to securing housing with the state of our economy and limited job opportunities. It makes it very hard, if not impossible, for folks to make enough money to live in Denver. We also talk a lot about the needs of our many of our many family members and loved ones. And in the far northeast area plan, we as a community talked about how important it

is for our older adults to age in place. Some of the uses for residential care include nursing homes, assisted living and different living situations to allow people to age in place. We need more locations within our city to support people's transition back into society and to have the support necessary to begin and maintain their recovery from addiction. On the other hand, we heard tonight from many community members, specifically in the Mount Velo community, that they don't support these changes due to decades, over decades of intended and unintended consequences brought forward from policy through our cities that negatively affected communities of color. Specifically, folks want to know how we're going to correct neighborhood inspections, how we're going to support folks in the neighborhood, and how we're going to ensure the quality of life in our community. I look forward to working with my colleagues on Council and community planning and development over the budget process this year. To look at how we can expand the ways that I ask works within our communities, similar to are having different professionals going out, knocking on doors, providing resources and support to the very people who are clearly in need. Concerns regarding absentee landlords who are difficult, if not impossible, to get in contact with has also been brought forward. This group living proposal brought those concerns forward and the desire to create a system where we begin to collect contact information and ensure rental properties are compliant. Since early 2019, I've been working on a rental license program called Healthy Rental Residential Rentals for All. I recently presented at the Budget and Policy Committee of Council on January 28, and my Council office is looking forward to rolling out this proposal through the program. The policy would ensure that those homes who are being rented are also following the Public Health, Safety and Welfare guidelines set forward in Chapter 27 of our minimum housing standards and create pathways for better outreach to help with these homes. When there are concerns, we'll also be able to support the residential. Program of Denver Department of Public Health and Environment to ensure the health and safety in our rentals in our city. This will also create another tool for host toolbox to enhance renter protections and provide more stability in our housing. Historically, in this country, we have seen policing and in housing regulations for years. There's been a practice of using the government against people who live in different ways than we do. It has been a tool that has been weaponized against people who aren't married, who identified within the LGBTQ community, who were of a different race and today against people who are roommates. There has also been real concern about how these changes are not equitable because they don't apply city wide. I agree. City staff have proposed a way to fix this issue by amending the Denver Revised Municipal Code, and I think that we as City Council members can ensure this happens quickly and expeditiously. We can amend the municipal code to extend the Denver zoning codes definition of household to areas that still have old code. Former Chapter 59 Zoning. This wouldn't impact residential care, but would ensure all households in Denver, regardless of their underlying zoning, are allowed up to five related or unrelated adults. As Council President and as someone whose district contains a large share of homes under old code zoning. I plan to lead this effort in partnership with community planning and development. This is something we can do quickly and make a priority in the coming weeks. Since it's a matter of equity again, thank you to the community

who spoke tonight on this group of amendments. Neighborhood groups who stayed involved gave us feedback and pushed us to a balanced position and the thousands of Denverites who've been involved in this citywide process. The last thing I want to mention and say is that we had a lot of speakers and a lot of folks talk about other individuals and carry on that bias and stigma that goes along with folks who come from families or personally have been affected by addiction, mental health diagnoses and folks in community corrections. And I'm not about that stigma. I'm about breaking that stigma and doing different in our city and supporting those who are most in need and need the support. And I will be honored to vote yes on this proposal tonight. Madam Secretary, roll call. Black eye, I. CdeBaca, I. Clark. I. Flynn. Immunity. If Councilman Flynn. May. When was a may? Herndon. I. Hines, I. Cashman. I can. I. Ortega. Absolutely. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. Now. Torres, I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Two. I am sorry. Two nays. You have a nice 11 eyes. Council Bill 20 dash 088 has passed. On Monday, March eight, Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 21, Dash 001 for changing the zoning classification of 1112 north for being a street in East Colfax. A required hearing on Council Bill 21, Dash 0033 Changing the zoning classification for 4700 East Evans Avenue in Goldsmith and a required hearing on Council Bill 21, Dash 0071 Changing the zoning classification for 2938 North Hooker Street in West Highland. Any protest against Council Bill's 20 1-001 for 20 1-0033 or 20 1-0071 must be filed with the council offices no later than noon on Monday, March 1st, due to the Presidents Day holiday. Thank you. I'll do a quick recap here under resolutions. Council members say to Barca has called out Resolution 386 for a vote under bills for introduction. Councilmember Torres has called out Bill 351 for comments under bills for final consideration. No items have been called out under pending. No items have been called out. The first item up is Council Resolution 20 1-0386. Councilmember Herndon. Would you please put Council Resolution 386 on the flo

or for adoption? Yes, Madam President, I move that council resolution 21.0386 be adopted. Thank you for the motion. And we have a second by Councilmember Hines. Questions or comments by members of council. Councilmember CdeBaca. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure to go on record. As abstaining from this one that I. Recognize as the collective bargaining agreement for our sheriff's department. It went through binding arbitration. And so tonight's passage is a. Formality, and I'd like to abstain for this vote. All right. Thank you, Councilmember CdeBaca. Madam Secretary, roll call. CDEBACA No. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hines. All right. Cashman I. Can. Ortega, I. Sandoval. Sorry. I. Oh, you're. A. Tourist. I black. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. One 812 Eyes. 12 Eyes. Council Resolution 20 1-0386 has been adopted. The next item up is Council Bill 21 351. Council Member Torrance, please go ahead with your comments. Thank you, Madam President. I won't take much time today. I'll save comments for final consideration. But just wanted to let folks, all my colleagues know that particular next week we will have staff from Denver Parks and Recreation, as well as Jerry Smith, who staffs the Denver American Indian Commission, available for any questions that you might have. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Torres. All right. That concludes the items to be called out this evening. All bills for introduction are ordered published. Council members remember this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote I. Otherwise, this is your last chance to call out an item for a separate vote. Councilmember Herndon, would you please put the proclamations and resolutions for adoption and the bills on final consideration for final passage on the floor? Yes, Madam President, I move that proclamations and resolutions be adopted and bills on final consideration be placed upon final consideration, and do pass in the block for the following items. All series of 2021 unless noted 040203180293029603060307026803140321032203230286031903 250082025302540255028202830289029002920227 and 0266. Thank you, sir. Has moved. And we have a second by Councilmember Flynn. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Black. I see the burka. I. Clark. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hynes. I. Cashman. I can. I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer, I. Torres, I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 13 813. les The proclamations and resolutions have been adopted and the bills have been placed upon final consideration and do pass. Tonight there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 13, changing the zoning classification for 1576 South Josephine Street in Cary Marrow, a required public I believe bankability micro-mobility could also be an equivalent missing middle for transportation. I believe the government has the responsibility to represent the people. After all, if we don't do

it, who will? Private sector for profit companies have a mandate to maximize shareholder value. And just as housing developers won't install affordable housing at 60% AMI unless we documented in our code transportation network companies or micromobility transportation network companies who have subsidiaries or child companies like Uber and Lyft will focus on shareholder value instead of the city's residents unless we document it. I remain concerned about leaving out people with disabilities. This is a group that we continue to overlook as a society. As technology disrupts industries like transportation and lodging. As examples, taxis make accommodations and taxis do not because ADA requires taxis to do so. Yet taxis didn't exist in Colorado until 2014. TMC uses in transportation network companies like Uber and Lyft hotels make accommodations, yet short term rentals do not. Same reason all legacy auto manufacturers allow adaptive controls in their cars, but installing even a third party party controller into a Tesla will void the manufacturer warranty. Again, the common thread is that regulation was around to regulate the legacy companies but not the disruptor companies in these contracts were now considering. The companies shall endeavor to provide some accommodation for people with disabilities within one year of the contract signing to endeavor a means to try. We're going to request these companies try to make their offering for everyone within a year. And if they don't try hard enough. No, we do. We have seen what happens in each of these industries when we aren't clear about requiring full and closet inclusivity. We have also seen what happens when these exact shareholders, when we don't require inclusivity. Unlike the contracts with Lyft and Line, our contractors and City Council's contracts with our constituencies that we either do or do not. There is no trust. I trust that if we extend the same lesson we learn from area and disruptive technology. I'm concerned about a five year contract. Entering into that contract for five years means we provide regulation for the technologies that exist today and not for tomorrow. That means cyber detection technology. Whether that exists in practice today or not is optional. I'm concerned when industries don't provide provisions for people with disabilities because they don't have to do that. They want to include additional technology for five years. Cycle also did not innovate for the entirety of their ten year existence. We're only getting new technology because of a new contract to touch on another conversation we're having today. We've wrestled in the past with conversations about having private, for profit companies perform critical services for our city. Once we entered into that sort of relationship, we faced lots of resistance in our attempt to disengage from those relationships. Next, I want to quote the public filings for these shareholders. They specifically list more micromobility as a threat.

at to their ride share revenue. Quote, We face the risk that our network network of shared bikes and scooters could reduce the use of our ride sharing offering. Additionally, from time to time, we may reevaluate our offerings on our multimodal platform and decide to discontinue an offering for certain features. I've mentioned in committee that I am concerned that we'll have a private equity some. We'll have a private entity come into Denver, cannibalize our public transit and then choose to exit, leaving Denver us worse off than we are today. It's already happened with OFO and bicycles. I'm concerned about these relationships these stakeholders have to the workers. It's been well covered in the press, so I won't elaborate now just on some purpose. Finally, I want to point out that these are new concerns. These have been brought up multiple times in committee. I've asked them again this weekend, just like our conversation of private prisons. Excuse me, just like our conversation about private prisons in 2019. And today we asked for changes to the contract, also like private prisons. There were no changes to support full inclusion to ensure we have contracts short enough to require continued technology innovation, to support public transportation, to support workers, and to encourage more dialog in future contract negotiation negotiations. I will be a no thank you. Council President. Thank you. Councilmember Hines. Councilmember CdeBaca. Thank you. I echo many. It's sure. I also. So. Just say that I don't. Support you not to intervene when there are market failures. And in this. Case, I feel that it's inappropriate that we're essentially. Creating a market failure here. With this duopoly that we're promoting and engaging in every other provider as a. He has no issues with transparency in fees with their ride share operations. What's to say that any of the benefits that we're extracting from these companies doesn't end up getting carried by other people in there? They're shifting. I don't. The value we're capturing, but have yet to see a profit analysis. And I think that's incredibly problematic if we're calling this a public good or if this is something that we have a desire to shift into providing as a government. So I absolutely do not support this contractor, the other one tonight, and I hope my colleagues will vote no. I've heard

many concerns that I feel have still not been addressed, especially with enforcement. And our constituents are not asking us to create a duopoly. Our constituents are asking us what? Do about scooters, gating a lack of access for people who need it. And for the public right of way that we're essentially giving away without having any kind of expectation that these companies pay for their existence in this city. So I encourage you all to vote no as well. Thank you. Thank you.

Councilmember CdeBaca. Councilmember Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. I also agree with my two colleagues, Councilman Hines and Councilm

an CdeBaca. I have several issues with this contract. I have several issues with the length of the contract. We asked for a shorter contract in committee, and we're not offered one. The city councilman talked council and was asked if there were public works or duty. Sorry, I would consider having a third vendor. They were told no and I don't agree with the fact that we are backing car share. And that's what the main purpose of Lift is. It's a car share and I don't think we're going to get the outcomes that we're seeking. And I have a problem with the fact that we are putting the onus of right away enforcement on eight people in committee. It wasn't even told to us if it were eight people or another group of people. But we are actually asking our city employees to put right away inspections on their their scooters, on their to do list. And I have been working in my office on this sign ordinance because there's signs all left in our right of way . I get complaints all the time in my office about signs after construction project signs after special events. And we were told last week that Dotty did not have the type of enforcement to actually move forward with any type of compliance with signs. So we can't comply with signs in our right of way. How are we supposed to comply with scooters in our right of way? And I made that very clear to Dotty, where my council aide made it very clear to daddy that we don't understand how we are supposed to be able to monitor all these scooters, yet we can't even monitor any of our signs. So I asked my colleagues to vote this down, and we can work with Dotty to come back with a better contract that will serve the people and bring the residents of the city and county of Denver. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Sandoval. Councilmember Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. Just wanted to weigh in on these as well. The bottom line for me here is whether the contracts are going to lead to better outcomes for our residents. We know Scooter's work to reduce vehicle miles traveled and we have the data that proves it. There's a lot of concerns about these contracts to my colleagues have made some really good points on why they should potentially be voted down and sent back to the drawing board. But the question I think is, is that going to bring better outcomes for our people? Scooters are here to stay. So whether it's two companies, three companies or ten companies operating in Denver, they will be operating in our city. And that means that these scooters will continue to litter our streets and block our sidewalk, access and inconvenience our residents unless we do something about it.

Trying to regulate those issues with ten companies operating here hasn't worked, which means something needs to change. And if Daddy has the bandwidth to manage this issue better for our community with less operators, then I think that will probably lead to better outcomes for our residents. So I am hesitant, but I am willing to support this toni

ght. Thanks, Madam President. Thank you. Council Member Sawyer. Council Pro Tem Torres. Thank you, Madam President. I will also be a reluctant. No on both contracts this. Evening. While I do want to see the city region in, I think what is probably a difficult to manage environment. With as many providers. As we have. I think we've got to move. Some swung the pendulum too far. In the other direction and perhaps. Made us poorly adaptable to changes as we've seen in. San Antonio. Both companies withdraw at the last minute. When it's when it ceases to be. Profitable to them. And I would like to see. Daddy's adaptability be. Covered by different types of scooter providers rather than. Two that are that. Operate very similarly to each other. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Council Pro-Tem Torres. Council member Clark. Thank you, Madam President. And thanks to all of the folks who have weighed in on this and all the folks who did hard work in committee on this. And thanks to Dottie for what has been a long road in a quickly evolving and changing landscape when it comes to Micromobility. At the end of the day, is this perfect? Probably not. If we could see into the future and see how this industry is going to evolve. Would we maybe make some some different choices? I don't know. It's it's a quickly evolving place. But I think that we, you know, learned with Cycle, which was a very different model, that that we were subsidizing that every year. And at a at a stiffer clip, we just kept upping how much we were paying for. And we weren't getting, you know, the latest technology. We weren't getting, you know, the the dockless we weren't getting

in other parts of town. The more we subsidize, the fewer stations and the fewer bikes that we had. And it's time, you know, for us to really move forward into this space as it is today. And I think the DOT has put a lot of work into that. You know, I would have loved to sit in and see all of the proposals that came back with the RFP. But that's Dottie's job. And if this does not go well, then Dottie is on the hook for the choices that they've made around this. I think that they've done it with the right intentions, and I think they've done it, you know, given a complicated landscape, the best that they can. And this will get us back up and running with a solid plan for bikes and for scooters in our city. And those are key to providing real options to people, getting people out of single occupancy vehicles. And so I think that the time has come for us to move forward with this. I will be a yes tonight in hopes that everything that Dottie saw in all of those proposals and believes will happen is the future that we will see and not some of the fears and concerns that we have. But I think that, you know, we have to get out there and try something. And I trust that the folks who are working on this put in that time to get us to the best place that we can be in. And so I'm excited for us to make this inv

estment in Micro-Mobility for Denver, and I'll be supporting it today. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Clark. Councilmember Kinney. Thank you. Council President I. I find the arguments from colleagues on both sides of this compelling. And I would like to ask the Department of Transportation and Infrastructure referred to as Dottie. But I've gotten asked not to break down our acronyms, so I'm going to do that. May I ask them a couple of questions? Council President. Sure. I'll ask until they're promoted because I know they can't hear during that process. All right. I appreciate that. I was going to ask you to give us a moment. All right. We've got Nick Williams up in the queue. And Stephen, so go ahead, please. Thank you. Council president. So, Nick, or a member of your team, you know that my colleagues have raised a number of concerns that maybe I'd like to narrow it down to two. One, can you please describe what would happen if one of these players exited the scene or if both did within short order? What would be triggered? What would the steps be? What would the implications be? Yeah. So thank you for the question. If one of the players I know would continue operating with the other operator, I think in a situation where both would agree, we would reconsider, you know, how we can bring. This mobility choice back to the market. So if one exited, the other would have a monopoly. There would not be triggered going back to the table with other bidders or a new RFP for a second provider. And so when we certainly if that were to happen. Yeah, exactly. You know, our our stance on having two stands. And so and that was part of the reason we wanted to was to at least kind of smooth out some sort of transition. But yeah, we would want to remain with two. Okay. So and then I, you know, this is a process question, but, you know, be patient with it. You know, we've had situations before where the administration is surprised by the feedback of counsel on a contract, you know, early in this council's tenure. And, you know, we, you know, we shot something down and had to kind of, you know, clean up the damage after the fact. In this case, you did get lots of notice with lots of concerns from council members and did not make any changes decided to push forward. I'd like you to explain why, you know, whether you just vote counted to seven and stopped there or whether or not could we not have gotten to a little bit of a better outcome on some of the concerns that were raised by what I'm counting is now a large number of council members. We'll see if it's a majority or not, but certainly it's a sizable number of council members. So talk to me about why we're here with with so little response to the feedback. Yeah. So, you know, we provided the contracts and licenses and reached out for comment, not receiving really specific, you know, comments and changes to the to the contracts. We just, you know, provided clarifications, ad

ditional information to. Contextualize that and, you know, felt that the the licenses, rather, would remain as is with those clarifications. And I think, you know, the license is certainly worth the process or the product of some pretty intense negotiations with two separate operators. Over the course of many months on there, we felt that we really had got the best deal for the city, you know, felt that we really, truly tried to attempt to address and answer concerns as we could, valid concerns. I think Councilman Clark is a very fast changing industry and really tried to address it the best we could, but at this point have felt that we still have probably the best deal we could and then to go back would really reopen those negotiations and push us back probably an acceptable amount of time on that, while still remaining confident with the product that we presented to you all. All right. Before we open a can of worms and have a bunch of colleagues chime in, let me try to

voice voice some representation of what I think they might say, which is respectfully, it sounds like pretty specific feedback to me to say that the term is too long and that, you know, that's feels pretty specific to me. The request for a greater investment in advertising and prevention, a request for a higher standard for who is responsible for monitoring those feel pretty specific to me. And so I get the idea that you felt like you struck the best balance you did. But to have the contract come to this point with such a divided council, you know, I always say that there is legal authority for the administration in the charter to plow forward without even any input while you're negotiating contracts. But that's not a requirement. You have the right to do it, but it's not an obligation. You certainly have the choice to collect feedback while you're negotiating and to take that feedback, frankly, to the negotiating table and use it to get better outcomes that might have clear support. So I just I want to ask about that. I have to because I don't know if this passes tonight, you know, seven, six or eight five. I don't know that we're in the best position as a city. And I just in not hearing that that iterative process on such a high profile public facing contract happened. And it concerns me that, you know, your legal your legal minimum is not always the best practice for the people of Denver. And I just am struggling with this one here. Understood. You know, I think part of the issue is that if we start to kind of pull on one string, we've talked about this before, that, you know, to to to address the question about the the term if we reduce that term, that decreases the value for for the operators and would then start to decrease the value of the free and then subsidized rights that we were able to achieve through negotiation. And kind of with that, you know, of course, as we're making these kind of value balances, we felt that the the risk the potential risk of a longer term

, you know, the fact that the city's not directly financially invested in this and the reduced taking us off of our our goal of these free and subsidized rates in a really substantial amount, really kind of reconciling, you know, as we build out our our public micromobility or bicycle scooter infrastructure on there, that really those free rides are kind of that key to unlock a lot of a lot more additional people to get involved in. And so really that specific one feeling like that that to pull that string of the five year term would then start to collapse the value that we were receiving in free and subsidized rides and kind of based on that, that value proposition stayed with the five years so that we could maintain the value of those free rides. I think I may just jump. In to add that there's a lot of precedent for, you know, a. Bike share contract similar to the. One we have being, you know, closer to ten years in a lot of cities because it provides that timeline for the private companies to invest in infrastructure and know that there'll be a return. We've seen in the shorter term permits, there was no investment in infrastructure. And so finding that balance between what makes sense for a license and contract in addition to how much we can extract from these operators, is definitely, you know, as you pointed out, a tricky Mickey Neal described there. That's a great point. Yeah, this. Sorry. Go ahead, Councilman. Yeah, my last question. So I asked on the one side, what happens if a provider exits? Let me just ask the reverse question. Just give me very briefly, what if this was a mistake? If we you know, what are some of the triggers by which we as a city can say we are not getting what we thought we were here? And so our ability to take action, particularly regarding issues that have been raised about, you know, blocking of sidewalks like chronic failure to really educate riders. If the education program, which is skinny, it's it's exists. And I did ask for it. I asked for it in cash and you did it, but it's skinny. So if it's if it's not working, frankly, what do we what's what what do we have to get out of this? Yeah. So, you know, these are revocable if they're in breach of the contract. So I think, you know, we anticipate to hold them to everything that has been inked. In the licenses and. Can always, you know, tell them that we don't want to do business anymore if they're not living up to those promises. You know, as we've discussed with the committee and some of the folks on this call right now, there are some, you know, penalties that ramp up to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars if they are not meeting the goals laid out in the license. So those are just a few of the quick triggers. Hopefully that answer your question. Yeah, ultimately, just like so this is a license, not a contract, but similarly to contracts, if they're in breach of that, we can revoke and that's that would be the expectation that if they're not meeting

expectations, we move on. Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Canete. Councilmember Herndon and our president. I will be brief because there are several other topics we're excited to talk about tonight. Here's the issue. The status quo is failing district date. And you can go back to any bicycles, micro-mobility scooter or electric bikes. It's a conversation I had. There are portions of the city where you see little to none. All the providers that we have little to none. And

District eight has been I've been very vocal about this. So what I appreciate with Dottie in this contract is you are telling them you will be in these neighborhoods, you will be in Northeast Hill, you will be in East Colfax, you will be in Mount Bello. And as we discussed in committee, there are significant penalties. I mean, the committee members were really surprised and I can't remember like a handful of numbers that talked about if you do this, you will lose the ability to have more scooters. So both of these companies have every incentive to do right by this contract. Otherwise, they will lose their ability to make a profit and their competitor can absorb that. And also, we're not giving the Y the ride away for free. The reason why the contract is longer, as I view it, is because of the infrastructure investments they have to make and we can't expect them to make. The infrastructure investments if it was going to be a shorter term contract is imperfect, as Councilman Clark said. Absolutely not. But I absolutely believe as a city will be in a better position moving forward with what is proposed than the status quo. That is why I am in. Yes. And I hope my colleagues will support it as well. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilmember Herndon and I had seen the hand raised. Oh, good. All right. Well, I know that this is a difficult vote for some folks, but understanding that we've got to move this forward in some way, shape or form. And so I am going to be a yes vote tonight on both of these so that we can move this forward. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. HINES No. CASHMAN All right. Carnage. I. Sandoval. No. Sawyer, I. Torres. No. Black I. CdeBaca now. Clark. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced the results. Four names, eight eyes. Eight City Council Resolution 20 1-0304 has been adopted. The next item up is Council Resolution 305. Councilmember Black, will you please put Council Resolution 305 on the floor for adoption? Yes, Council President. I move the council bill 20 10391 be placed upon final consideration and. Do pass. Okay. Thank you. It has been moved and we've got a second in there from Councilmember Hines. They required public hearing for council. Bill 391 is open. May we please have the staff report? And I see we have Scott Robinson here. Let me see, Scott. I don't know. We're not hearing. Or at least I'm not hearing your audio. All right, now it looks like you

're muted. Now you're not. But we're still. Do you want to try to leave the meeting, Scott, and come back into it? And we can hang tight here for just a second. Okay. Go ahead. All right. Well, go ahead and allow Scott to hopefully get back into the meeting and get his audio connected up correctly. For the public. We are on Council Bill 391. Can you hear me now? I can. There you go, Scott. You're back. All right. Nothing like a quick moment of panic right before you're going to do something. But go ahead if you want to, go ahead and share your screen. Yes. Sorry about that. Thank you, Madam President. And members of Council Scott Robinson with Community Planning and Development. This is a request to rezone 49, 49 and 4995 North Washington Street and 49, 30 and 4934 North Pearl Street from I am x 3 to 2 and five. The property is located in Council District nine in the Globeville neighborhood. It is at the southwest corner of 50th Avenue and Washington Street and then extends Southwest over to Pearl Street. It's about two and a half acres. And the property is owned by the city and is being positioned by our Department of Housing Stability for an RFP for development of an affordable housing project. Which I'll touch on a little bit more in a bit. And then Jennifer SIEGEL from Post is also here to talk about that in more detail. As I mentioned, the property is zoned. I am x three, which is industrial mixed use for a three storey maximum height and it also has the go to which is the billboard use overlay. You can see surrounding properties are a mix of industrial, industrial mixed use and urban center mixed use zoning. The subject property was a car dealership and you can see it is surrounded by a mix of industrial uses and also single unit residential uses in this area. Here you can see the subject property in the bottom right photo and then some of the surrounding properties in the other photos. So as I mentioned, the property is owned by the city and the host will be issuing an RFP to find a development partner for it. The federal funding that was used to purchase the property requires that a minimum of 50% of the housing developed on site be affordable and no more than 80% above. But it is hosts intent to exceed both of those requirements. That being a higher percentage of affordable and offering lower levels of affordability below 80%. Host also intends to include community serving users on the property in the RFP. As I mentioned, Jennifer SIEGEL can discuss that in more detail. He proposed zoning. As I said, it is GMAC five. That is general urban context, main street zoning with a five storey maximum height that would allow the townhouse drive thru and storefront building forms up to five storeys or seven feet. It requires significant build to and transparency requirements in the mainstream zoning that allows a range of commercial, residential and civic uses. This went to the

planning board on March 34, 31st and received a unanimous recommendation

of approval and went to the committee on April 6th. That has not received any public comment on this application, although HOST has been doing extensive community outreach to understand the community's needs and desires in shaping the RFP. As you know, in order to approve a rezoning, the city must find that these five criteria have been met. The first criterion is consistency with adopted plans. There are four plans that apply to this property. The first is Comprehensive Plan 2040, as described in the stat reports that finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with multiple strategies from Plan 2040. Putting these relating to mixed use development and infill development in terms of equity stuff on the proposed rezoning consistent with these two strategies from the Equitable, Affordable and Inclusive Vision Element Backup Plan 2040 relating to providing a variety of housing options in appropriate locations. And in terms of climate fines, the proposed rules are inconsistent with these two strategies from the environmentally resilient. There's an element, again, relating to infill development and mixed use walkable development. The second plan is Blueprint Denver. The future context designation for the property is General Urban, which calls for a mix of uses in street activation consistent with the general urban context of the proposed GMC five zoning. The future place designation is community center, which again calls for a mix of uses, ideally up to eight storeys, a strong degree of urbanism which would be provided by the proposed GMC 510 district. Washington Street is a commercial arterial calling for a mix of uses and bringing buildings up to street. And then 50th Avenue and Pearl Street are both locals providing that property, accessing connection, and then the city's plans growth area strategy. This falls under community centers and corridors, calling for 20% of new jobs and 25% of housing by 2040, which would be furthered by the proposed GMC five zone district. The third plan is the global neighborhood plan from 2014. The land use concept for this property is a mixed use, which calls for employment and a variety of mid to high density housing options, with a maximum of five storeys in height consistent with the GFC five zoning. Also calling for linking the building to the street, which the main street zoning would do a good job of, and also providing a broad range of housing types and price levels which this being a city affordable housing project would also advance that goal. And then the final plan is housing and inclusive. Denver, which is the city affordable housing strategy that calls for leveraging publicly owned land like this to provide affordable housing and providing development in mixed income and mixed use developments. As the intent is with this property and the proposed GMC five zoning would allow. So step finds the proposed rezoning consistent with adaptive plans. And the first criterion meant the second criterion is uniformity.

formity of district regulations. Staff finds the proposed rezoning would result in uniform application of the GMC five zone district. The third criterion is to further the public health, safety and general welfare of city staff finds the proposed rezoning would do so by implementing the city's adopted plans and that the James five zoning would provide extended community services and also require building for design elements that promote a walkable environment. Creating more health and safety. The fourth criterion is justifying circumstances on proposed rezoning justified by changing changing conditions. There has to be changes in this neighborhood turning over into more of that mixed use corridor that the plans call for. Then also the adoption of both the Globeville plan and Blueprint. Denver calling for that change justify the rezoning. And the first criterion is consistency with neighborhood context, zoning, district purpose and intent. Staff finds the proposed rezoning would facilitate the and consistent with the general urban context and the purpose and intent of the five zone district. Without specifying, all five criteria are met and recommends approval. And then, as I mentioned, Jennifer SIEGEL is also here to walk through the RFP process that you like to see that. Hey. Thanks, Scott. My name is Jennifer SIEGEL. I'm a housing development officer with the Department of Housing Stability, also known as host. And next slide, please. Since host is the applicant for this rezoning, I'm providing a brief overview of the request for proposal process we intend to follow to ensure that the site is developed for affordable housing in conjunction with the community priorities. As Scott mentioned, the city acquired the site with federal funds, specifically HUD Community Development BLOCK Grant. This funding source requires that the subsequent use serves households out of below 80% of the area median income. But please note that this is the maximum income allowed by that funding, and we expect that the final development will serve households at lower incomes. And did you term in the community priorities for the site host held to listening sessions last year. And we will incorporate those priorities into the RFP and we intend to

issue this RFP in the second quarter of this year, approximately June. And we expect to select a qualified development partner as a result of that RFP. Next slide, please. And here you can see an overview of the timeline. And please note that this is an estimate and could change. Once the hours our RFP is issued. We'll provide a response time of about eight weeks so that the closing date will likely be mid to late summer depending on the issue state. The selected respondent will be notified in the fall, probably around October and then negotiations will commence regarding the disposition of the land and that will take some time and will likely be completed by March, around March of 2022. That selected respondent needs to demonstr

ate this site control in order to apply to the Colorado Housing and Finance Authority for federal low income housing tax credits for the rental component of the site. And we expect that application to be submitted in the fall of 2022. And the construction starting completion portions on this timeline here assume that tax credits will be awarded from that application and that other financing could be secured. However, that's not really within our control and the timeline will be delayed if that financing can't be secured in that timeframe. Next slide, please. The review panel will include city staff with expertise in housing finance, site development and land use. Additionally, three community representatives are going to be selected through an application process and they will participate as non-voting members of the review panel. As you can see, the review process will be highly technical to ensure that the selected proposal meets the requirements for the RFP is financially feasible and can be completed in a timely fashion. Next slide, please. This process is modeled after the successful RFP process that was used for the East Colfax properties. At 8315 is Colfax. The RFP process was used to select Mercy Housing as a developer and are in the process of moving forward with a rental development that will serve households with a wide variety of incomes and will also include an early childhood education center. Next slide, please. And finally, Hostess captured those community priorities during the listening sessions, and they include both rental and homeownership development, providing units that can serve families so large size units and housing that meets a wide variety of income levels. Additionally, several community uses were identified, including potentially a grocery store, fresh food market and an early childhood education, shared space or library. So those are the various priorities that were captured, and we intend to incorporate those in the RFP. And thank you. And I can answer any questions that you are the community has. All right. Well, thank you, Scott and Jennifer, for the great presentation. And this evening, council has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 391. And we have one individual signed up to speak this evening and we'll go ahead and get Jesse Paris back in the queue here. All right. Go ahead with your comments, Jesse. Yes. Good evening. Members of council, those watching at home. My name is just the bishop here. And I'm represented for Black Stars to move for something pretty. Oh, Colorado and front line black nose. And I'll be the next mayor of Denver in 2023. We're in favor of this rezoning tonight. We have a housing crisis. I'm glad the city is finally realizing that we have a housing crisis and it's making it is due to create affordable housing, housing that people can actually afford years after the fact. So we are in favor of this rezoning tonight. I wanted to know what the army levels are going to be fo

r this specific property that's in question. I heard something about 30%. But how many units specifically are going to be at 30%, 30 to 80%? What is the. Army level range going to be for this proposed rezoning and some I could please answer that question. I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Jesse. And that concludes our speakers this evening. Questions from members of Council on Council Bill 391 Council Councilmember Hines. I thank you, council president. I apologize if this was already in the presentation. I had to use the restroom anyway. The only question that I have is we're intending for the city to purchase the land. Ah, well, I think I understand is right. We're going to purchase the land. Are we then going to give that to a community partner or are we going to do like a long term lease, like 99 year lease or how how how is the ownership going to work on this? And I apologize. Okay. Yeah, actually, I wasn't addressing the presentation. I mean, if we model the that East Colfax, that land was provided to mercy housing. I think it you know, a nominal \$10 rate. So the expectation is that it will be provided to the selected respondent at a very nominal cost and that will provide them with the site control that they need. When you say provide, you mean sell or lease? Well, I say so. If it's \$10, there's always a potential that it could be leased as well. But right now the plan is to sell the property. But that could potentially change if the city had decided to lease the land. But currently it's intended to be sold. So,

you know, \$10. I, I don't think that that will change my vote tonight, but it would be if we're purchasing it, it would be great for us. I mean, just long term to have to retain the land effectively. It would be the same for for mercy housing if we were to lease it for a dollar or \$10 a year. But but just I'm just thinking about I think Councilmember Sandoval has said seven generations. So, you know, if we're going to purchase the land, maybe we could the the financial amount would be the same in the end for the for the housing developer. But just seven generations from now, we would have more assets as a city. Anyway, thank you. Thank you. Council President. Okay. Definitely. I'll. Communicate that. Okay. All right. Thank you, Jennifer. And thank you, Councilmember Hines. And seeing other hands raised for questions. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 391. Council members say tobacco. I don't have any questions. Okay. All right. Sounds good. Seeing their hands raised. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 391 place. CdeBaca. I. Clark. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hines. I. Cashman. I can. I, Sandoval. Hi. So you. I. Torres. I. Black eye. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced the results. 12 Eyes. 12 Eyes. Council Bill 20 1-0391 has passed all right are pre adjournment announcement on Monday May 24th Council will hold a required p

ublic hearing on Council Bill 20 1-0515 approving a proposed and Arco market development agreement by and among the city and county of Denver, J.V. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Council Member Ortega, will you please put Council Bill 421 on the floor for final passage? A move that counts 20 1-0421 to be placed upon final consideration and do pass right has been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Council Bill 421 is open. May we have the staff report and I see we have Libby here. Good evening, city council. And you just pull my presentation up. All right. So I'm Libby Kizer with CPD, and I'm here tonight to present a rezoning request for 2394 South Lincoln Street. In this property is in Council District six, represented by Paul Cashman. It's on the west side of the Rosedale neighborhood. The property currently contains a single unit house on a 6250 square foot lot. The applicant is requesting to rezone from us u b1 to YouTube, which allows the Urban House primary building form on a minimum zone, lot of 3000 square feet, as well as the duplex and tandem housebuilding forms on a minimum zone. Lot of 4500 square feet. Detached accessory dwelling units are also permitted. The existing urban single unit B1 district allows lower intensity residential uses on a minimum lot size of 4500 square feet, as well as some civic uses. Surrounding zoning includes single unit and two unit zones, open space and mixed use and main street zones along Broadway. The existing land use is a single unit residential with a variety of residential uses in the area. A mix of commercial and industrial uses along Broadway and parks to the east. The subject. Property is shown on the right side of the top photo with nearby homes shown on the bottom. Lots in the area are served by alleys and detached sidewalks. Here. The top photo shows small scale shops along Broadway with recent streetscape improvements, and Rosedale Park is shown on the bottom. Throughout the rezoning process, application notifications have been provided according to code requirements. In April, the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval. And to date, staff has received zero public comments. Moving on to the Denver zoning code review criteria, it must be found that the requested MAP amendment is consistent with five criteria. In regard to criteria one, there are three adopted plans that apply to the requested rezoning, including the Comprehensive Plan Blueprint, Denver and the Urban Station Area Plan. As stated in the staff report, the rezoning is consistent with several goals in the comprehensive plan. The rezoning request is also consistent with Blueprint Denver. The subject property is mapped as part of the urban future neighborhood context, which is described as maintaining small multi-unit, residential and low intensity mixed use buildings embedded in single unit and two unit residential areas with British

blocks and alleys. Blueprint. Denver generally directs growth to key centers, corridors and high density residential areas that align with transportation options. Nevertheless, limited growth as this rezoning proposes, is desired in all other areas of the city. Specifically, 10% of jobs and 20% of housing by 2040. Blueprint. Denver designates the subject property as a residential, low future place type, which has predominantly single and two unit uses and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. Lincoln Street and Wesley Avenue are categorized as local or un designated streets, which are mostly characterized by residential uses. The rezoning is also consistent with the residential loan guidance in Blueprint Denver, which states that a departure from the existing zoning

pattern may be appropriate if it's supported by a small area plan. As such, the oven station area plan defines the property as urban residential, which encourages a mix of low and medium density housing types, including single family houses, accessory dwelling units, duplexes and row homes. New development should reflect the existing character of small lots with medium light coverage. Moderate setbacks. Detached sidewalks with tree lawns and parking accessed from the alley. The requested YouTube zone district. Is consistent with the area plan as it will allow single and two unit residential uses in building forms that are limited to two and a half stories on a zone lot of 6250 square feet with a maximum coverage of 37.5% and moderate setbacks. In addition, the property is served by an alley and a detached sidewalk with a tree lawn. The rezoning is also consistent with criteria two and five, as stated in the staff report in regard to criteria three. The proposed rezoning furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the city by allowing a moderate level of re-investment in the area consistent with the desired character and recommendations of the city's adopted land use plans. The proposed rezoning would also facilitate increased housing density within walking distance of parks, the Broadway commercial corridor, bus routes and the light rail station, thus providing increased access to opportunity. In regards to criteria for changing changing conditions in the area already justifying circumstance for this rezoning. The property is near the Broadway commercial corridor, which continues to attract reinvestment, including significant streetscape enhancements made a few years ago. There's also been additional residential development in the area near the Ovens Light Rail Station, such that it is in the public interest to allow more density on the subject property compatible with the changing character of the area. In conclusion, CPD recommends approval of the rezoning request and myself and the applicant are available for any questions. All right. Thank you for the presentation, Libby. Counsel tonight has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 21, Dash 0421. And we

have one individual signed up to speak this evening, and we will go ahead and call on Jesse Paris. All right. Jesse, we have you signed up to speak on 421, so please go ahead. Yesterday, members of council I was watching at home. My name is just a grainy black nose last night to the sense of asking me for the social change was the unity of our motto. Put the. Well, I'm black noodles now. Be 2023. Um, we're in favor of the seafood. Look. Okay. I think we got to there, Jesse. You went ahead and muted, so. All right. Jesse was our only speaker for this hearing this evening. Questions from members of Council on Council Bill 421. All right. Scene. No. Yeah, there we go. I was going to give it a second. Councilmember Flynn, please go ahead with your question. Know, I'm President Libby. When I look at the zoning map, this sort of looks like spot zoning. The there's there are two unit zoning to go back to my earlier screener. Two unit zones on the North River and a little bit, I believe, to the south. And but this is right in the middle of a single unit. And I see that there's one parcel to the east of it that has been resolved. How is this consistent? If we have to unit to the north, why is that not the area where two unit is is promoted while this has to remain single unit. Can you give me the rationale for that? Sure. And that is primarily due to the recommendations within the Evans Station area plan. This does kind of right within the radius of walking distance to the station area. And so that plan foresees some increased residential density in the area that's still compatible with kind of the overarching single unit character. And it's a pretty significant walk to Evans Station from there. What was the year of the Evans Station area plan? Let me check back on my part when it should be there. I want to see it. Seven. 27. I have it up here also. 29. Okay. So in the city wide rezoning, which occurred after this, why would this not have been made to you that at that time, as the other areas were? Why do you have any idea? You probably weren't there in 2010, but it seems to me that was left that way even after this Evans stationary plan for some reason. It could have been also based on public input and just that the predominant character of that area is single unit today. But certainly at the station to the station area plan leaves it open for additional density. And that site that was just just to the east, that's also YouTube was owned about a year or two ago. Right. Okay. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. And not seeing any additional hands raised. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 421 Council Member Cashman Yeah. Thank you. Council President. I do believe that this application meets the requirements of the criteria. I believe that it's a block off of Broadway. It's just a little over two blocks south of Evans Avenue, all active transportation corridors. So I will be supp

orting this tonight. One comment I did want to make in the application packet the applicant mentioned having made contact or attempted to contact their representatives, which they referred to as myself and Councilwoman Ortega, and said that there was no response from either office. Now, none of us are perfect. It's possible things fall through the cracks. I did a quick search and was unable to find any contact. But be that as it may it here in a rezoning application and something so important not just to the community, but to the applicant themselves. My idea of outreach is not I made I reached out on August 15th of 2020. If this was something that I was involved in as an applicant, I would make sure and cover all the bases. They're not doing me any favors, but they very well could have been doing themselves favor by finding out any problems ahead of time. But as I said, I do believe this app application makes sense and meets the criteria, so I will be supporting it this evening. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Cashman. And I concur that this does meet the criteria for rezoning and the guidelines and happy to support it this evening as well. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 421, please. Cashman. High carnage. I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. Torres. I. Black. I see tobacco. I. Clark. I. Flynn. I. Herndon. Hi. Hi. Hi. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results of Vice 12 Eyes Council Bill 20 1-4 21 has passed. All right. We're going to go ahead and move on. Thank you for joining us this evening, our second hearing this evening. The property is approximately 10,297 square feet, and there is an existing three story commercial building on site that was built in 1972. The proposal is to rezone to use x three, which is a three storey mixed use serving district that allows mixed use development. The existing zoning is U.S. C, which is a single unit in district. Prior to adoption of Denver's zoning code in 2010. This property was previously zoned B2 pursuant to a code chapter 59. Adjacent zoning includes a piece of PDS other U.S. you see DMX to and you must you. Existing. The existing land use for the parcel is office slash commercial. It's adjacent to single unit residential multi-unit residential industrial uses as well as Interstate 70. Just in context and building form and scale. The building and the site in question is the upper left hand photograph. Process slide. Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval back in April and Louise forwarded it unanimously to this board. We received no or no comments and no other public comments on this proposed rezoning. Five criteria. The Council must find the rezoning to be consistent with to approve the rezoning. We'll start with criteria. One consistency with adopted plans. We have a plan 2040 Blueprint, Denver and the Sunnyside Neighborhood Plan, as outlined in the staff report. The proposed rezoning is consistent with a number of 2040 goa

Is and strategies. Looking at consistency with Blueprint Denver located in the urban neighborhood context. In this context, small mixed use nodes within neighborhoods are appropriate. Future place types. This is classified as a local center, which primarily provides options for dining, entertainment and shopping and may also include some residential employment uses and heights, but generally appropriate up to three stories. Street street types. This property is at the corner of the 48 South Drive and Tyrone Street, both of which are residential collector streets. Growth area is the future growth strategy is all other areas of the city. Looking at the Sunnyside neighborhood plan specifically, it's in a mixed use area. The town street guidance says takeover offers a mixture of office, residential and commercial uses. When looking at criteria two, it is a uniform zone district that is being requested. This rezoning would further the public health, safety and welfare by the implementation of adopted plans and building standards and provide better health outcomes through increased physical activity due to the mixed use nature of the requested zone district. Justifying circumstances cited in the application is the city adopted plan blueprint Denver in this case the 2019 Blueprint. Denver reclassified this area from the 2000 to Blueprint. Denver had it mapped as a single unit area and 2019 Blueprint. Denver has it as a local center. That change is suitable just by circumstance. And it is consistent with the neighborhood context and history, purpose and intent. Staff recommends approval of this application, and I'm here to answer any questions. All right. Thank you, James. This evening, counsel has not received any written testimony on Council Bill 21, Dash 0448, and we have zero individual signed up to speak this evening on this one. And so we will close the public hearing comments by members of Council on Council Bill four for eight. I'm so sorry. I closed the public hearing too soon. That concludes we don't have any speakers but questions from members of Council on Council Bill 448. Do we have any questions of members of council? All right, scene one. We will go ahead and close the public hearing and now comments by members of Council on Council Bill 448 council members and of all. Thank you, Madam President. We met with the owners in September of 2019. My staff named me

and this building is very unique to northwest Denver, has a garden court. So actually that when we looked at it, we thought it would comply with you and next to X to have different uses. And so she did with it. But then when we actually got to development services because of the garden level, it actually is a three storey. So they did the neighborhood outreach to the Sunnyside neighborhood and to the neighbors that were impacted. It's already a commercial use has tenants in it, so they just want to make sure that the zoning matches what's currently in the built environment. So without

that, I would ask my colleagues to support this reasoning. Thank you. Madam President. Thank you. Councilmember Sandoval, I don't see anyone else up in the queue. And so seeing that this has met all of these zoning criteria, the rezoning criteria, I'm happy to support it as well this evening. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 448. Sandoval, I. So here. I. All right. I. Well, I. De La Barca. I. I. When? I. Herndon. I. All right. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. Can I? Ten I's Council build 20 1-0448 has passed. Moving on to our second hearing. Councilmember Herndon, would you please put council bill 461 on the floor for final passage? Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Council Member Sandoval Will you please put Council Bill 723 on the floor for final passage? I move that council bill 73 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for council Bill 7 to 3 is open and we have Sara Corse here and she'll be giving us a staff report. Go ahead, Sarah. Hello again. I'm Sarah, of course, senior city planner with Committee Planning and Development. I'll be presenting the application for 420 East 11th Avenue to rezone from GMU 503 to GMC'S three. So the subject property is in Council District ten. Chris Hines District. More specifically, the property is located within the Capitol Hill neighborhood. Currently there's a three story building with mixed use on the subject property, which operates as a bed and breakfast. The property owner is requesting to rezone to expand the uses allowed. The subject property is in general urban multi-unit with allowable height of up to five stories. In addition to that, the use of a three is a historic structure use overlay. The surrounding zoning is predominantly GMU five over three with eight to the west and Jimmy with 303 and OSA to the south. The building on the property is the Paterson Campbell House, which is an individual designated historic structure and as a contributing building to the Pennsylvania Street Historic District. This means demolition of the building would be strongly discouraged and also highly unlikely and subject for review by the Landmark Preservation Commission. Also, any exterior changes requiring a building or zoning permit would also be subject to landmark preservation design review for compliance with the with the design guidelines for Denver's landmark structures and districts. I'd like to point out one of the main differences between the existing zoning and the proposed zone district. So the existing zoning of Jim u503 allows residential office, not including dental or medical offices or clinics, art studio and bed and breakfast lodging with a maximum of ten guest rooms. The proposed zoning of Jim X three will expand the commercial uses already permitted and also allow additional uses such as eating an

d drinking establishments and retail sales. So the subject property has mixed use, land use and the surrounding properties are multi-unit residential office, single unit, residential and park open space land uses. Again, here are some images of the existing property. And here are the surrounding building forms. They range from two or three stories and are a variety of building forms, as you can see. So we are at the city council public hearing today. I like to call out that IT planning board at their public hearing. Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that city council approve the application. In terms of public comment, the Capitol Hill, United Neighborhoods and Auno has submitted a letter of support. The property also entered into a good neighbor agreement with Capitol Hill United Neighbors in which they have committed to items such as a restriction on hours. Alcoholic beverages may be served or sold. A restriction on the hours music or entertainment is provided. A requirement for onsite offsite parking and a requirement for making space available to nonprofits. A certain number of times per year. In addition to that, there were two letters of support received. One letter from an adjacent property owner reference how they saw the building endure years of disrepair from lack of use. But they have seen the building blossom under the current owner and that he has proven to be a trustworthy steward of the historic building. The other letter expressed support because the rezoning would support a local business and could open up the historic building to other uses with public access that could provide public amenity to the neighborhood. So let's move on to how the application meets the review criteria. So there are three

plans that apply to the subject site and they are the comprehensive plan 2040 Blueprint, Denver and East Central Area Plan. The application is consistent with several of the strategies in the comprehensive plan, so I'll move on to consistency with blueprint number. Blueprint. Denver identifies the subject property as having the future context of general urban. This context is described as predominantly multi-unit structures with one unit and two unit residential and low scale mixed uses that are embedded within the multi-unit areas. Blueprint. Denver also identifies the site as having the future place type of high medium residential. This can be described as having a mix of low to medium scale multi-unit residential uses, with some neighborhoods serving mixed use distributed throughout. In addition to that, 11th Avenue has the future street type of residential connector, and that's described as having primarily residential uses, but may also include schools, civic uses, parks, small retail nodes and other similar uses. The Growth Area strategy. The blueprint Denver identifies is all other areas of the city, which is expected to see around 20% of new housing growth and 10% of new job growth. So in Blueprint Denver, there

are recommendations that form a comprehensive list of policies and strategies to guide implementation of the plan. There are several strategies around historic preservation, re-use of existing structures and promoting small businesses that the rezoning request is consistent with in summaries. In summary, these strategies state that in historic areas we should balance efficiency with preservation through strategies that encourages reuse of structures and also states that we should look to support. Locally owned businesses new and old to expand involve the meeting to meet the changing needs of residents and visitors. So let's move on to East Central Area plan. So Essential Area Plan is similar to Blueprint Denver in terms of how it identifies the future place type, which is high, medium residential. And it also has the same description of Blueprint Denver that I just went over. There are also several strategies. East Central Area Plan. The application is consistent with one main strategy that supports this rezoning. Request states to facilitate adaptive reuse of historic structures by allowing a broader range of uses, including compatible commercial uses and appropriate additions. So the proposed rezoning two GM x three will result in the uniform application of zoned district building for use and design regulations. The proposed Official Map amendment does further the Public Health and safety and general welfare of the city through implementation of the city's adopted land use plan. As I said, the proposed zone district is consistent with Blueprint Denver's plan policies and therefore contributes to implementing the city's adopted latest plan. The requested Zone District of Gmc's three will allow the historic structure to have a broader range of uses which will promote adaptive reuse of the historic structure and allow further preservation of the building. In addition to that, the broader range of uses may bring more services to the area for the surrounding community to utilize. So in terms of justifying circumstances, the application references, the adopted plans, including the Comprehensive Plan, Blueprint Number and East Central Area Plan as recently adopted plans for the justifying circumstance as stated in the first review criterion , these plans provide a clear vision and strategies that outline the need for historic preservation, adaptive values, encouraging small businesses to thrive, and providing flexibility for small mixed use nodes with neighborhood serving amenities and uses to be dispersed throughout multi-unit residential areas. Citing these recently adopted plans to rezone two Gmc's three is an appropriate justifying circumstance. Lastly, the requested zone district of GMAC's three is consistent with the neighborhood context zone district. Purpose and intent. So based on the criteria for review and the Denver Zoning Code staff recommends approval of application 2020 II 00082. Thank you. All right. Thank you, sir, for the staff repor

t and for this first hearing, we have three individuals signed up to speak and all are participating virtually. And so we'll go to our first speaker, Chris Chiari. I thank you and council members. Thank you. Good evening. My name is Chris Kyari. I am a resident of Uptown and the owner of the Patterson Inn for the last three and a half years and heavily involved in day to day operations. I'm very familiar with the historic property and nature of the neighborhood and consider myself the caretaker of both the property and its history. My goal is to ensure the long term sustainability and viability of this historic asset. And for. That, it's important that I have the chance to utilize the building to its fullest. Potential. Currently, a large portion of the property is underutilized and neighbors often get to see the Patterson in from the outside, but they don't have a reason to come inside to see the splendor of the interior of the property. My goal is to activate the property to allow more people to experience it, not just view it. It's a property that dates back to 1891. The

property rezoning will give me a couple of uses I can't do now. One is potentially the expansion of rooms, the possibility of adding a small café or even a small boutique store, or possibly a club or lounge as an amenity to the guests. This is being Proactive. COVID had a significant impact on hospitality. I'm seeing that business come back, but this is a way to make sure this property has a bright and vibrant future. So I ask for your support tonight in this rezoning. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Jesse Pearce. Yes. Good evening. Members of council, those watching at home. Those are the council chambers. My name is Jessica. Sharpest represent for Black Sox. The mood for self defense positive social change was the only party of Colorado front line Black knows. And I'll be the next mayor of Denver in 2023. I was against. I was initially against this zoning classification. And so I understood now that it's just for preservation and to help out the Patterson House. So I thought it was going to be more rapid gentrification, more displacement, but it's clearly not going to be that. So I'm in favor of this slight. Thank you. Thank you. Our last speaker is Rebecca Posada. Hi. I'm here. My name is Rebecca Pizarro. I have lived across the street from the Patterson Mansion for 16 years. It is a gem of the Capitol Hill neighborhood. I saw it years when it was vacant and fall into disrepair. And I can tell you that Chris Geary has been a responsible owner, and I have seen the building blossom under his stewardship. So I give full support to rezoning and allowing optimal use of the Paterson mansion for the neighborhood. And that's all I have to say. All right. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council Bill 723. Councilmember Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. Sarah, could you just briefly detail some of the constraints that t

he landmark designation places on the building. If it were to incorporate these additional uses. The building would still be under landmark preservation and review and would have to follow their design guidelines. And I think, as I stated earlier in the presentation, depending on what the property owner wants to do, if he needs a zoning or building permit for it, it would have to go through Landmark for approval. So I would say, you know, certain improvements to the building are very restrictive in terms of what can be done and as well as potential demolition. And as I stated before. It would be highly unlikely. Or. May not occur. But certainly, I mean, that is one of the buildings I think many of us would lay down in front of Bulldozer if that were to occur. But I don't think that's I don't think that's an issue. What about signage? If there were to be a cafe or a boutique in there, would the landmark designation require a review of signage or would that just come under the regular signage review for any other property? I believe it depends on what is within the Landmarks Design guidelines. I can't directly answer that question right now. I could make the assumption that the signage would be included under that part of the review. But I can't. Take. That is a fact. Sorry. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. And we have Councilmember Cashman with the question as well. Yeah. Thank you, Madam President. And Mr. Kerry, where are those members speaking to you a few years ago when you first took over the property? And I believe you were talking about expansion possibilities of a few rooms. Can you describe what your thoughts would be? How many rooms you might be able to add? Councilmember. Thank you. The property would provide for the addition. Of two rooms above the carriage house, which is one of the plans I have identified as the potential path forward. Know that was my memory. Just wanted to be sure nothing had shifted over the past few years. Madam President, it is a gorgeous property and truly 1 to 1 of the gems on Capitol Hill. I appreciate the uses that are described. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Cashman, and seen no other folks in the queue for questions. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 723. Council Member Hines Thank you. Council President I want to thank CBD for your presentation. I also want to thank the applicant who is here testifying via Zoom. I want to thank him for for being here even though he has a fever. I've spent way too much time here myself, and so I want to thank him for his commitment to this process, too , to attend, even though he's not feeling well. I also want to thank Capitol Hill United Neighbors for their willingness to to talk with the applicant about a good neighbor agreement. And the intent of the good neighbor agreement is just that. It is to make sure that this building is and and the property and the busin

ess inside is continued to be a good neighbor with with the surrounding community in the capital area. And this as as one of the speakers said, this is a gym in Capitol Hill. And as Councilmember Cashman said as well. The owner has also been a pillar of our community. And I want to thank him

for all he's done for our community and Capitol Hill and in uptown this just as another vote of support. The owner, when he first came to Denver, he looked at this property and wanted to buy it, but it wasn't for sale. And he kept it in the back of his mind. I think he waited nine years before it. It actually came before the opportunity came for him to purchase. And obviously he has since purchased it. But this was one of his first properties that he spied when or that he identified when he came to Denver. And that he is committed to the property, I think shows that he wants to do nothing but good for the property. And again, he has opened his doors many times to the community to make sure that he is being a good neighbor. So I think that this meets the five criteria. I think that there are other criteria or there are other bonuses that will get in addition to meeting the criteria. So I hope my colleagues will vote. I know I will. Thank you. Council president. Thank you, Councilmember Hines. Next up, we have Councilmember Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I want to echo what Council Councilman Hines just said, and I want to thank Chris Chiari for his caretaking of the Patterson Mansion. There is probably no better way to ensure the preservation of a landmark structure than to find a really robust fitting and not conforming but consistent use of the property. And this sounds like this zoning change will allow for a better array of options to maintain this into the future. This beyond being a gem of Capitol Hill. It is one of four residences that still are excellent for the four individuals who owned the Rocky Mountain News from its founder in 1859 through its sale to Scripps Howard in 1926. The four individuals who owned the paper prior to that, their homes are still standing in the metro area and I think that's a testament to our commitment to preservation. This is by far the grandest. They belong to Thomas Patterson, a Democrat who owned the Rocky Mountain News at the turn of the last century. And this is my history lesson for the meeting. I'm sorry. I should have prefaced that at the turn of the last century and was a U.S. senator as well. And so I believe that the application meets all five criteria. I'm certainly very happy and eager to support this. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. And as always, I learn a little bit more about Denver's history whenever you comment on a rezoning. And so appreciate that and likewise happy to support this. Councilmember Hines seeing that it meets all of the review criteria. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 7 to 3, please. C

ashman. I. Ortega. I. I can change. I. Sandoval, I. Sawyer, I. Torres, I. Black I. See the Barca I. Clark, I. Swim I. Herndon Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 13 Hours 13 issues council bill 20 1-723 has passed. Moving on to our courtesy public hearing this evening, and thank you to the CPD staff for being here for the previous public hearing. All right. Wonderful. Thank you, Councilmember Swire. And we'd also like to wish Councilmember Ortega a very happy birthday today as well. All right. Seen no other announcements. We'll move on. There are no presentations this evening. Evening. There are no communications. There is one proclamation being read this evening. Councilmember Cashman, will you please read Proclamation 21, Dash 992. Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This is proclamation number 21, dash nine nine to recognizing National Suicide Prevention Week, September 5th through 11th, and the month of September as Suicide Prevention Month. Whereas, according to the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, suicide is the 10th leading cause of death among adults, the second leading cause of death among individuals between the ages of ten and 34 in the US and the fourth leading cause of death for ages 35 through 54. And. Whereas, more than 48,000 people died by suicide across the United States in 2020, with an average of 132 suicides completed daily. And. Whereas, 1312 Coloradans died by suicide in 2020, including 151 people in Denver with 79 Denver age having died from this terrible epidemic as of August 12th of this year. And. WHEREAS, each and every suicide directly impacts a minimum of 100 additional people, including family, friends, coworkers, neighbors and community members. And. WHEREAS, local and national partners serve on the front lines of a war that many still refuse to discuss, the stigma regarding suicide and mental health issues is far too prevalent. And. WHEREAS, September is known globally as Suicide Prevention Month, the National Suicide Prevention Class Action Month Proclamation was created by Chicago based Hope for the Day to raise the visibility of mental health resources and suicide prevention services available in communities nationwide. The goal being to magnify the conversation about the importance of mental health resources and the impact of suicide to help destigmatize the conversation and help connect people with the support they need. And. WHEREAS, the city and county of Denver is teaming up with schools from across the metro area and other community partners to provide a platform for teens and young adults to speak honestly

and frankly about mental health and wellness. The we got this youth summit will bring 400 Denver youth together October 25th on the University of Denver campus to raise awareness of the stressors teens are facing today. Explore a variety of coping mechanisms. Advocate for accessible mental health services and elevate the discussion within the community.

And. WHEREAS, those in severe crisis can call nine one, one can call Colorado crisis services at 8449438255 and the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline at 800 2738255 for immediate assistance. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver. Section one, the city Council of the City and County of Denver recognizes the week of September five through 12 as National Suicide Prevention Week and the entire month of September as Suicide Prevention Month, and encourages all residents to take the time to understand the importance of mental health, education, and recognize that taking care of others includes taking care of our own mental health as well. And Section two that the clerk of the city and county of Denver shall affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation, and that a copy be transmitted to the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment. Denver's own second wind fund and hope for the day. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Cashman. Your motion to adopt? Yes. I move the proclamation number 21, dash nine nine to be adopted. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council. Councilmember Cashman. Thank you, Madam President. This is a topic that grabbed my heart and my interest a number of years ago. The the tragedy of even a single life ending needlessly before its time, in many cases long before its time, is heartbreaking when we look at more global numbers. The thousands lost every year in our state alone, no less to tens of thousands nationwide. It just becomes truly mind boggling, just devastating. And my office work with Hope for the day a couple of years ago to fund a mural on Evans Avenue, just west of Daegu, letting young people, all people, really know that it's okay to not be okay and urging them to seek help when things look bleak. And then a friend here at work lost a loved one, and the horror of suicide came even closer. But for my family, it's been pretty much an intellectual, empathetic connection to those more personally impacted by the epidemic of suicide until a couple of weeks ago . When my young son Jesse lost his lifelong best friend to suicide, the boys had met in first grade at Stephens Elementary School, then at 11th and Columbine. They both turned 40 years old this past year. His buddy was one of those about whom I was only partially kidding when I would refer to him as my third son . I was at his first grammar school Christmas pageant at his middle school continuation, his marriage and the shower for the birth of his daughter and so many other events. He and Jesse, my boy, stopped by the house maybe a month or six weeks ago for a quick visit. As they were leaving, my son gave me a hug and JP just turned to get in the car and I called him back to give him a hug. And I remember thinking, you know, I wonder if he realizes how much he matters. I want to thank all the people who are working so hard every day to interrupt t

he process that lead so many to death by suicide and to those who are losing hope. Please keep the faith. There are ways out of your pain that will give you and those who love you a much brighter future. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. And please accept our sincere condolences for your recent lost, your recent loss, and that you're continuing on to bring this forward and your advocacy around it. Because the more we talk about it, the more we take that stigma away for folks to reach out and get the help that they need. So thank you for that, Councilman. We also have Councilwoman Ortega, who is going to give comments as well. Thank you, Madam President. Councilman Cashman, thank you for bringing this forward. It is so important that we talk about this. And I want to thank the organizations who are organizing this event from the day to help, especially youth who oftentimes feel like they're there's no place for them to go. And I'm pleased to see that the second fund is one of the organizations that is part of this effort. In the past, I had an opportunity to work with them. And the fact that they're in all of our schools, not just in the Denver public school system, but up and down the front range. And they have done amazing work. And as of my last check, they have 100% track record in preventing suicides with the people who are brought to their attention, either by other students, by parents, by teachers. And and I just appreciate the work that they've all done. We have amazing organizations in our city like Denver Mile High Mental Health Center of Denver Mile High Behavioral Health, Caring for Denver, which started a program through funding approved by the voters. And now we have the START program that is available trying to help address people that are in mental health crises. So to all of these

folks, to do this work day in and day out, I just want to express my appreciation because it really does take a village coming together and trying to let people know that their lives do matter and that we have resources available to them. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Ortega. Madam Secretary, roll call. See the background. Ortega. I. Cashman. I can h i. Sandoval, i. So here. I. Torres, I. Black. Clark. I. Fine. I. Herndon. Huh? All right. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. Travis 12 Eyes Proclamation 20 1-992 has been adopted. We have 5 minutes for the proclamation. Acceptance Council member Cashman will go ahead and start the timer and please call up who you'd like to accept the proclamation, sir? Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to call up a good friend in Denver, suicide prevention coordinator Rick Padilla. Thank you, Councilman Cashman, and thank you, City Council, for your courageousness in not only doing the proclamation, but creating something to address what's really a salad epidemic. I won't apologize if I get emotional. February 14th, 2019. We lost our 15 year

old son, Jack, to suicide. He's one of five kids that died in the school district in six months. It changed my life. I decided that there had to be a purpose in life. And as President Biden said in acceptance speech, when he had all the tragedies that he's experienced, he found a purpose in life. I found a purpose in life. And I've been blessed at city and county of Denver and yourselves have really seen this issue. It's a silent epidemic among youth, and I've really made a concerted effort to address that. After Jack passed, about a dozen of his friends came to our house and we sat in the basement. He said to rules, put your phones away and participate. They came up with 11 things they wanted to see accomplished. First and foremost was they wanted a voice. They wanted to be heard. We did a number of things. Number ten was we'd just recently passed the governor, signed House Bill 21, 1221. So bullying, prevention, education in schools. Number 11 was what Councilman Cashman referred to as the we got this youth summit. I've been working with folks from across the spectrum, parents, kids in particular. We surveyed kids last October or last August excuse me, we identified 27 behavioral health categories and we asked them ranked these high, medium or low. And we got the they we're we're going to run it for ten days for excuse me for 30 days. We closed it out. In ten days we got over 2500 2400 responses from youth from across the state of Colorado saying, here's what our priorities are. We did a factor analysis, identified those from that. We recruited 15 youth with lived experience from murder, suicide, suicide attempts, knowing friends that had died by suicide and they had put together abstracts. I'm working with Children's Hospital Health one center, health mental health center, Denver and others. They're create this half day symposium and it's by youth and for youth. The entertainment industry has stepped up. The construction industry has stepped up. We all recognize this at this time, an epidemic and it's really frightening. Councilman Cashman gave the statistics. Every 11 minutes, a person dies by shooting suicide in the United States. It's unconscionable in my mind. And as you said, Councilman Cashman, it doesn't only impact the family and impacts the entire community. This has impacted our community. And my family and I decided to share our story to make a difference. So I want to thank all of you just for your time and your support of this. And we're going to make a change. We're going to save a life. And I happen to have a leave with the clerk. I have some mass that it's our informal group. Jack's friends, Jack Small, and they just came together when they came to my house in the basement that day. So we just had some stuff put together that they wanted. So I brought some notes for you because I see we all slept. We're not having this pandemic yet, but it's nice to see many of my friends I haven't seen for a while, so thank you so much for th

e time. Very good. Thank you so much, Rick. And it was great to see you. And I appreciate you sharing the story because by you sharing the story, it takes that stigma away. And we'll remember Jack and his memory and all the work that you and your family are doing. So thank you. Thank you, Councilman Cashman, for sponsoring the proclamation. Our next proclamation this evening is on consent. It's proclamation 993 and its recognizing September 2021 as National Preparedness Month and its been placed on consent. Councilmember Ortega, would you like to offer any comments on this proclamation? Every brief. Thank you for the opportunity. First, I want to thank Amelia. You're a hitter who is with the Office of Emergency Management. As you know, I serve on our. Local Emergency Preparedness Committee that works directly with OEM. And a big part of the work they do is about helping people to be prepared. This is Mrs. Individuals, and this proclamation really highlights the importance of that. On the heels of just seeing what has happened down in

Louisiana, once again from a natural disaster to what we've seen happen in our own state with the forest fires and then the flooding and mudslides that we've seen. Helping people be educated about what you need to know so that you're not waiting for the emergency responders. When something happens, it's going to assist everybody in the process of making sure that people's lives are saved. So I just want to thank Amelia for the opportunity to once again bring this forward and to just encourage you all if you have never taken advantage of the training that they offer. It's it's incredible. And it helps, again, people to just know what to do when something does occur. And it's not you know, it's not always a matter of if. It's a matter of when something may happen. And being prepared to save you and your family's lives is really what this all boils down to. So thank you very much. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Ortega. We're going to go ahead and move forward in our agenda. Madam Secretary, please read the bills for introduction. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Sawyer. Councilmember Hines. Thank you. Council president, I, too, have expressed reservations. It was very recent and I said that it's only fair for me to give notice before I start voting now. So I'm just going to give you notice one more time. And I do have reservations about subverting the charge of council. Thank you, Council President. Thank you, Councilmember Hines. See no one else in the queue. Madam Secretary, please. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Resolutions 21, dash 10031004 and 1005. Please. Sawyer Nope. Torres, I. Black I. CdeBaca I. Clark I. Flynn I. Herndon I. Find cashmere. I can eat. I. Ortega, i. Sandoval, i. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. One 912 Eyes. 12 Eyes Council Resolutions 10031004 and 1005 have passed. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. Coun

cilmember CdeBaca, go ahead with your comments on Resolutions 1008 and 1009, please. Thank you. Pursuant to Council Rule 3.7, I'm requesting. Adoption of Council Resolutions 20 1-1008 and 20 1-1009. Be postponed. For one week to. Monday, September 27. Our office is currently in the process of scheduling a one on one. And as you know, with our budget hearings this week, it blocked off a lot of our schedule. And so just trying to get some. More information on this to. Not take up too much time on the floor. All right. Thank you. And a reminder to folks, no motion is required. And Council Resolutions 1008 and 1009 will be back before City Council for consideration on Monday, September 27. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. Council Member Canete Will you please put Council Resolution 985 on the floor for adoption? Yes, I move that council resolution 20 1-0985 be adopted. Thank you. We need. We've got our mover. I need a second, please. Thank you. Councilmember Torres, your motion to postpone. I move that adoption of Council Resolution 20 1-985 be postponed to Monday, September 27th, 2021. All right, thank you. And we have that moved and seconded as well. Comments by members of Council on the Postponement. Councilmember Torres. Thank you, Madam President. Just requesting a one week delay. Our meeting with the individual who's applying for reappointment. To this board. Is set for this Friday, so I wanted the opportunity. To meet with her before. We voted on her reappointment. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Madam Secretary, roll call on the postponement. Torres. I black. I see tobacco i. Clark I. Flynn I. Herndon, i. High. Cashman, i. Can. Each. I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. 13 Eyes. 13 Eyes. Adoption of Council Resolution 20 1-0985 has been postponed to Monday, September 27. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Herndon. Please go ahead with your comments on Council Bill 942, please. Thank you, Madam President. This is just another step in the evolution of what has been formally known. Formally known as, as I said, 8315. He's got facts, the former Saturday speeches, a number of different names and just a. Business that had been long overdue. To be shut down or shut down in 2017, city acquired it through an RFP, and now we're moving forward with mercy housing to have affordable housing along with early childhood education. And the purpose of this. The bill before us. Was to be able to for the city to authorize 15 up to 15 million of private activity bonds so that we can fund this. And this was thoroughly discussed in committee. Thank you to those on the committee for finding that I was not a voting member, but I just wanted to briefly talk about how excited I am about this, because once again, 82 units, 30 to 70% AMI and I recognize that numbers don't always and my numbers don

't get. But more importantly and I'll explain those in a second, three and four bedrooms as we talk about supporting those that our greatest need also needs to have more of those a larger size. So

we do have four bedrooms for those 30%. Ami if you are a six person household, that's up to \$36,000 up to as I talk about it. So we certainly, uh, I was wanting to thank all of the parties that have been a part of that. The next thing I'm looking forward to is the ribbon cutting, which I believe they said would be February of 2023 , while I'm hopefully still on council. So I'm just excited about this moving forward. Thank you to everybody has been a part of this cannot wait to see this moving forward and I certainly hope my colleagues vote in support. Thank you, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Herndon. And we're going to go ahead and move on to the next item. Madam Secretary, please put that on our screens. And Councilmember Canete, will you please put Council Bill nine, six, seven on the floor for final passage. Yes, I move that council bill 20 1-0967 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Council Member State Abarca. Your motion to postpone. I move that final consideration of Council Bill 20 1-967 be postponed until Monday, September 27, 2021. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council on the postponement. Council member Sayed Abarca. Same reason. As before, just trying to make some space on the calendar. For the budget hearings and we were unable. To accommodate. So trying to. Get some more information on this one. All right. Thank you. Next up in the queue, we have Councilmember Ortega. Is anyone here from Denver Human Services? I'm assuming that's the agency that these funds are from. Can you tell me if these are part of the mill levy funds and what the process was to identify this particular group? Are these dollars that were that came through Rocky Mountain Human Services or these dollars that came directly through Denver Human Services. Thank you for the question. My name is Crystal Porter. I am the IDEAS Program Manager with Denver Human Services. I oversee the mill levy funds dedicated to serving folks with intellectual and developmental disabilities. To answer your question, I can talk about the process as well, but I want to make it really clear these are funds from the Denver Human Services side of funding, so it's not pulling from or Rocky Mountain Human Services contract. The process by which we went to identify this organization has actually been going on for the last couple of years. When we first started our advisory council back in early January 2019, one of the things that they wanted to do immediately was look at how our funds could support folks with A.D.D., with mental health support needs as well. And so through their research and conversations that they brought back to the advisory council meetings, which are public facing, the

y ended up identifying this model which has been implemented in other places across the nation. So the Center for Research Services is part of the university system of New Hampshire. The director of the Center for START Services within that university system is Dr. Joan Beasley. She is actually the author of The Model and created it back in 1988, I believe. So she's still involved with the model and has been helping it get a model out into other areas throughout our nation. And so Denver is looking to follow in those footsteps. There was a state pilot that was done back in 2016, 2008, 2019, I believe. And for various reasons, the state didn't move forward with funding that model statewide, but that one of the programs is still active in Larimer County and has been very successful in that area. Can you tell me if this will include any of our local providers other than this particular group coming in and doing the work? Absolutely. So this contract is actually with the Center for Services to train. Although the name again. Center for START Services with the University System of New Hampshire. They are going to train a local provider to provide this service and implement it here in Denver. That's why the contract is for three years, because it takes three years for a program to become certified under the model. And so we've already identified a local provider through competitive procurement, and that provider is Rocky Mountain Human Services. And that contract came through this council last week on consent. Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Next up, we have Councilmember Kenny. Thank you, councilman. President, since this is a motion to delay. I just wanted to ask whether there were any hard deadlines or impacts of a one week delay that we should know about before we vote on that. There are not any hard deadlines in particular. We are hoping to start services in the beginning of October because we really want to get hiring going so that we can start serving clients that really need this model. Got it. But we don't lose any funding if we delay a week. Noel Okay, thank you. That's all. All right. Thank you. Councilmember Kinney, Councilmember Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. This. This is a companion to a contract that we already issued last week with Rocky on Human Services. In fact, this is the intergovernmental agreement by which Universal University System of New Hampshire trains the people that we've already hired to do this. Is that correct? That

is correct. Okay. So what you just responded to comes from can each that is not it is not a timing issue to delay this a week or because yet you want to get started in October. How is that how does that jibe? No items have been called out. Madam Secretary, would you please put the first item on our screens? Councilmember Hines, will you please put Council Resolution 1046 on the floor for adoption. Of the Council Resolution 21 Dash 1046 be adopted. Thank

you. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council on Council Resolution 1046. Council Member Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. This is another on call contract from the airport, so just called it out so I could vote. No, thanks. All right. Thank you. See no one else in the queue. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Resolution 21, dash 1046. Sawyer No. Torres. I. Black I. CdeBaca I. Clark, I. Flynn I. Herndon. Hines, I. Cashman. I can change. I. Ortega, I. Sandoval, i. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. One 812 Eyes. 12 Eyes. Council Resolution 1046 has passed. That concludes the items to be called out. All bills for introduction are ordered published. Council members remember this is a consent or block vote and you will need to vote I. Otherwise, this is your last chance to call out an item for a separate vote. Councilmember Hines, will you please put the resolutions for adoption and the bills on final consideration for final passage on the floor? I move that resolutions be adopted and bills on final consideration be placed on final consideration and do pass in a block for the following items. 20 1-100 820 1-100 920 1-104 321. Dash 104 421. Dash 104 721. Dash 1048. 20 1-1049. 21 0985. 2120 1-1017. 20 1-1018. 20 1-103 220 1-103 320 1-103 921. Dash 1050 21. Dash 105 920 1091 421. Dash 101 421. Dash 101 521. Dash 102 320 1-102 420 1-102 620 1-102 820 1-103 121. Dash 1035. 20 1-1037. 20 1-103 820 1-1051 anyone? Dash 099 720 1-0967. All right. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Madam Secretary, roll call. But I. See tobacco. I talk. Hi. Flynn. Hi. Herndon. Hi. Hi. Cashman. Hi. Kenny Ortega. Sandoval. Hi. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 13 Eyes. 13 Eyes. The resolutions have been adopted and the bills have been placed upon final consideration and do pass. Our pre results announcement tonight there will be a required public hearing on Council Bill 20 1-0849 changing the zoning classification for 5350 leet stale drive in Washington, Virginia bail and a required public hearing on Council Bill 20 1-0881 changing Respectfully pass. Thank you. All right. Thank you. All right. Moving on to our second proclamation this evening. Councilmember Canete, will you please read proclamation 21-1, one, four, two. Thank you. Council President Proclamation 20 1-1142 is in opposition to Initiative 304 and the immediate cuts to residents services and programs for children, mental health, homelessness and more it would inflict on Denver. Whereas in July 2021, a signature gathering effort that would become known as Initiative 304 was deemed sufficient by the Denver clerk and recorder after the campaign paid signature gatherers from a source of unknown origins to collect Denver voter signatures. And. WHEREAS, Initiative three or four was placed on Denver's November 2021 ballot without any attempt by the proponents to work with th

e mayor, city councilor, community members and does not address any tax or policy concerns that have been identified by Denver's elected leaders , nonprofit groups or citizen organizations. And. WHEREAS, Initiative three or four is unnecessary and will harm Denver by forcing the city to immediately reduce its sales tax rate from 4.81% to 4.5%, which, depending on how the ordinances impact on marijuana taxes is interpreted, would translate to an immediate cut of 4.7 million to \$8 million to the current 2021 budget before the end of the year. An annual cuts of up to 80 million to city residents and community services in 2022 and beyond. And. WHEREAS, Local governments in Colorado have limited revenue options to fund residents services, primarily sales and property taxes. And Denver has worked to limit the disparate impact of the sales tax on low income residents by exempting food, fuel, medicine and feminine hygiene products and sales taxes and paid in part by visitors, unlike the property tax. And. Whereas, Initiative 304 will force cuts to essential residents services such as road repairs, park maintenance, mental health, homeless services and fire protection. At a time when Denver is doing everything possible to recover from the pandemic and the scale of these cuts could be the equivalent of having to cut 390 uniformed police, sheriff or firefighters, the entire Denver Public Library budget, or all the city funding dedicated to current and future parks. And. Whereas, Denver voters have previously approved funding for the Denver Preschool Program, Denver Prosperity Fund for College Scholarships, Homelessness Resolution Fund, and other dedicated funds for mental health, climate and healthy foods to address our city's

highest priority needs and initiative three or four will also force unnecessary and dangerous cuts to each of these programs, disingenuously undermining the will of voters and harming youth, vulnerable residents and climate protection at a time when needs are at their greatest. So now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council of the City and County of Denver, Section one, that the Council of the City and County of Denver opposes. Initiative 304 on Denver's November 2021 ballot and urges voters to reject the harmful cuts three or four would make to essential residents services and critical programs previously approved by Denver voters and Section two that the Clerk of the city and county of Denver shall affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation. Thank you. Council member communicate your motion to adopt. Thank you. Council Member. Council President. I move that proclamation 21 dash 11 four to be adopted. All right. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council Councilmember Kenny. Thank you. Council President. We have in the initiative process the opportunity for individuals to put things on the ballot. And all we have in front of us is the plain language of those measures. What t

hey really intended isn't always obvious, and in many cases we have to do our best to educate voters on the worst and most actual outcomes that those can have in our process. The Department of Finance is charged with the responsibility of analyzing ordinances and giving the city's position to the clerk's office. What we commonly think about is the blue book, where they describe the fiscal outcomes. These outcomes that I have described are from that fiscal analysis and they are serious. Is it possible that there could be litigation, that there could be different interpretations? Absolutely. That is always a risk with proclamations, but is our obligation to analyze, provide our best analysis. And in this case, we have multiple sales taxes in the city. This initiative refers to a sales tax. It doesn't clarify what it means about marijuana or what it means about special taxes, but it addresses very solidly the core funding mechanism used to support government. The same group that funded this has also funded measures that are like TABOR to cut income tax rate. They've been behind measures that also cut the property tax. You start to see a trend here, which is about preventing government from any of the tools that we might need. So what. Happens. If three or four passes? Right. We have immediate cuts to the 2021 budget. Right. As people are needing more. Right. As the question from residents is, can you take better care of my parks? Can you improve my streets? Can you make them safer? Can you provide more multimodal options? The people of Denver are expecting us to keep up with the change, with the demands, and with the services that they need for a good quality of life. And these taxes are the way that that is paid for. Taxes are never easy, but they do provide those services that residents demand. So this proclamation is also important to think about as a whole with the other items on the ballot. We already voted to refer a group living ordinance to the to the laws of Denver that that option sorry, that ordinance expanded housing options and it is subject to repeal. I did not bring a proclamation forward on that because the council has already voted 11 votes made that the law. But you have to think about these three ballot measures together to F takes away housing options right immediately in three quarters of our city takes away the option to share housing costs. 304 Cuts the sales tax, which is a partial source, funding our affordable housing fund. It cuts homeless taxes, it cuts mental health taxes. All the things we talk about is preventing and intervening with homelessness. So you've got one ballot measure to cut housing options. You've got another ballot measure that cuts funding to housing and homelessness and other services that are essential. And then you've got 303, which makes the city massively liable for not being able to act faster to address homelessness. You have to think about together, why would someone support why would the

same funding source support all three of those measures? Because it's not about making things better in Denver. If it were about making things better, you might do one of those, but you wouldn't cut the funding. You wouldn't cut the housing options. But when you cut the very funding, we need to reduce homelessness. At the same time, you make us more liable for homelessness. Clearly, something else is at work, and that's why these proclamations are here tonight is to really shine light on that. So the voters of Denver have some of that information to think about what is really happening and how these pieces interact before they vote on the ballot . So with that, I again respectfully ask for my colleagues support to oppose. It's always tricky. We're voting yes tonight to take a position in opposition to measure three or four. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Koinange. Next up, we have Councilmember Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank Councilwoman Kinney for bringing both of these forward and for that eloquent explanation of what

impact this would have on our city, on our citizens, on our city budget. At a time when we have so many people that are suffering in our community and are in desperate need of many of these programs and resources that that funding. And and so I just appreciate her effort in bringing these forward and also in being part of the circuit, going out to neighborhood associations and other groups to talk with them about the impact that this will have on our city and our communities. So with that, I will be supporting this tonight as well. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Next up, we've got Councilmember Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. With reference back to some of the remarks by Councilwoman Coinage, my reading of the initiative is that it clearly would entail the marijuana tax. I know the staff is still analyzing that, but I want to point out that also on our ballot is a measure asking voters to increase our marijuana sales tax so the same voters may be increasing the marijuana sales tax above its current level of whatever it is total 11% or some such to the bring the local level down to no greater than 4.5%. I don't know how the lawyers or the courts will reconcile. If voters pass both of them because they ask for two contradictory things. The other thing I liked, a few other things I like to point out is that the initiators of three or three and three or four have presented us with measures that are at odds with each other, because clearly, as the prior proclamation pointed out, three or three would require to comply, although I believe compliance is nearly impossible with 303, which is why I supported the proclamation. To comply with 303 would require a significantly large increase in our spending on resources, on police, on alternative services, on mental health workers, on cleanup crews. At the same time, the other measure reduces those resources. And so it's asking us to increase on one hand t

he level of service, but to decrease the resources we have available for that. I would also point out that there are seven, as the councilwoman said earlier, voter approved initiatives that would be extremely cumbersome to reduce were three or four to pass. We would have to take that on. It would be our duty. But it's not easy to do. And I don't know that it could be accomplished before the requirement to adopt a balanced budget by by the end of this year, within the first ten years of passage of a voter initiative, which all seven of these special sales taxes were. It requires a supermajority of the council and a public hearing on each of the seven measures. The general sales tax that supports all of the services of the Councilwoman and Councilwoman Commissioners in this case pointed out police, fire, library, parks, streets, you name it, funded by the general fund, would face significant shortfall and it would be very difficult to replace. And my fear is that it would establish a much better case in favor of something that I oppose, which is going to be discussed in the city within the next year. And that's charging a fee for residential trash collection or pay as you throw. I have very good arguments against that, which I'm not going to go into here, but I believe that passing this would increase the pressure to do exactly that. And I would oppose doing that as a as a way to replace the revenue that would be lost in order to maintain trash services, solid waste services. As well-intentioned as this is, I believe it's another case of something we faced with the Green Roofs Initiative, which was so I'm looking for the right adjective written with such difficulty to implement that we had to completely rewrite it before it could be we could put a substitute in its place. We had to wait at least six months to do that because you can't amend a citizen initiative within the first six months and then for the ten years after that, only after a public hearing and a supermajority vote. So for all those reasons, Madam President and Councilwoman, I'm going to vote I on this proclamation. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. Next up, we've got Councilmember Clark. Thank you, Madam President. You know, I think that one of the biggest testimonials coming tonight is that I'm going to speak right after Kevin. Councilman Flynn on some things that I vehemently disagree with him. And we will get into that another night. But I'm going to agree with him on where I'm going to vote on this. And I think that that's where we're really looking at, you know, good governance. And this initiative, three or four, is a complete and total nightmare nightmare for Denver. This initiative is deceptive. It's anti-democratic. It's backed, as you heard, by groups that saddled our communities with TABOR or something that we've been unwinding locally and statewide for years. It's been put forward by groups that do not at all represent Denver voters and Denver values and have now

resorted to trying to lie and deceive and trick Denver voters into something that erodes at the very foundation of what they have stated that they value at the ballot box. We already have a system where we can't sit up here and increase the sales tax rate. If there is something that we are hearing day in and day out, that our constituents, that the citizens of Denver value and want us to fund and

spend money on. The best we can do is put that proposal in front of voters to determine if what we're hearing if is in line with what they value. And time and time again, Denver voters have said yes, have said no upon occasion to those proposals. They've been able to make those choices. And this by trying to lie and deceive. And Trick is attempting to undo that and say, oh, I. Disagree with Denver voters and Denver values. And so maybe if I can write something that sounds good on the surface, then I'll trick you into saying, no, you didn't really value all of those things that you at the ballot box told us to raise funds through this funding mechanism and spend on. And I think for that reason it's very dangerous. So this hurts our cultural and our arts institutions. This hurts our college affordability program. This hurts our housing programs and the services that we need for those experiencing homelessness, all of the services to get them to a place where we don't have these encampments in our neighborhoods. This harms our substance abuse and mental health programs. This devastates our parks. And this sets us back when we have taken a step that sets us apart from cities across the globe, in our Denver voters standing up and saying, we need to combat climate change. We need to do it now. We need to do it locally. That is something that we value and we care about and we are no longer willing to sit by and do nothing. And this. This tears all of that apart. And so even if I will disagree on some of the details of policies that we are going to debate up here later with some of my colleagues, I stand 100% in agreement with them that this initiative is a nightmare for Denver. It is anti democracy. It it it negates the voice of Denver voters where they have their voice to speak by trying to trick and deceive. And I will definitely be supporting this proclamation and opposition of this initiative tonight. And I thank my colleague, Councilwoman Kennedy, for bringing this word. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Clark. Up next, we've got Councilmember Hines. Thank you, council president. In this October season of tricking trick or treat, I would say that I hope that we can have Halloween be a few days later as an Election Day in November because this initiative is all trick and no treat. I hope you remember that, voters. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Hines, and I appreciate my colleagues chiming in as well. And really what this does is it rolls back all of the work that voters in the city and county of Denver have have done ove

r the years to make sure that we have the funds available for those essential residential services. And so I appreciate my colleagues speaking out in opposition of this initiative. 304 And I wholeheartedly support that opposition as well. Now is not the time to roll back the money and the services that we have available. It's time to implement those and build on that success. And so happy to support it. Madam Secretary, roll call. Can I? Ortega. Sawyer. I black. I see tobacco. I. Clark, i. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Kind. Cashman. I Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 11 Eyes. 11 Eyes Proclamation 20 1-114 to has been adopted and we are not going to have any proclamation acceptance and so we are going to go ahead and move forward on the agenda. Councilmember Black, will you please read Proclamation 20 1-1185, please. No items have been called out under pending. No items have been called out. Madam Secretary, please put the first item on our screens. Councilmember Sawyer, will you please put Council Resolution 1084 on the floor for adoption and. The solution 20 1-108 or be adopted. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded comments by members of Council on Council Resolution 1084. Councilmember Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. This is an on call contract. And as you know, I have a lot of concerns about agency use of on call contracts for particularly for many millions of dollars and over an extended number of years. So just call it out so that I can vote no. Had a great conversation with tech services earlier today about potentially making some changes so that we as counsel get some reporting on these kinds of on call contracts from tech services so that we maintain oversight of the money while still allowing the city to function like it should. So hopefully those conversations are coming back. Thanks. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Sawyer. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Resolution 1084. Sandoval. Hi. Sawyer. Torres. Black eye. Clark. Eye for an. Eye. Herndon. I know Cashman. I can teach Ortega. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close of Iranian. Announce the results one day. Ten eyes. Ten eyes. Council Resolution 1084 has passed. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screen. Councilmember Steuer. Go ahead with your questions on resolution one 1 to 7, please. No items have been called out under bills for final consideration. Council member Sophia has called out council bills 1056 and 1058 for a vote. Under pending, no items have been called out. Madam Secretary, please put the first item on our screens. Council Member Taras, will you please put Council Resolution 1016 on the floor for adoption and move that. Council Resolution 20 1-1016 be

adopted. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council on Council Resolution 1016. Council Member Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. I called this out item out this evening so I can vote no. I appreciate the contract

would make it more convenient to apply for a concealed carry permit in Denver and assist with freeing up staff time. But I don't actually believe that we. Should be making it easier. For people to carry concealed weapons in our city. The way it works right now, an applicant has to come down here twice every five years to get a concealed carry. I don't think that's an unreasonable request. Given the extraordinary. Amount of gun violence we're seeing in our community. So I'm going to vote. No, thanks. Thanks, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember. So you're not seeing anybody else in the queue? Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Resolution 1016. Sandoval. I. Sawyer. No. Torres. No. Black. Hi, Clark. I. Flynn I. Herndon, I. Find. All right. Cashman. I can. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, please close the voting and announce the results. Two nays. Nine I's. Nine I's. Council Resolution 1016 has passed. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. Council Pro Tem Taus, will you please put Council Resolution 1193 on the floor for adoption? I move that council. Ies Council Bill 20 1-1019 has passed. Councilmember Torres, will you please put Council Bill 1021 on the floor for final passage? I move that. Council bill 20 1-1021 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Council Bill 1021 is open. May we please have the staff report? Yes. Getting in council. Brad Johnson, a senior city planner with CPD. I have before you today is a rezoning request for 1360 Bridge Street from as as you did as in you three. This is in Council District six. In the Virginia Village neighborhood. Again, the request is for suburban multi-unit. Three. That's a maximum height of three stories in the in the zone district. Allowed building homes are suburban house, duplex, rowhouse and apartment building farms and the request is to allow for additional diversity of housing opportunities on the site. Just a little more zoomed in shot here. We can see the site within the context of this block and the ones immediately surrounding. Currently on the site is a single unit home. The lot itself is just a bit over a quarter acre, a decent sized lot. This thing. Zoning, as I said, was assumed. And then you see kind of a variety of zoning surrounding it on the face that it's on itself. You see a few lots of study in place in the directly to the south as in the three, which is what's requested here in the north end of the block, there is property that's zoned as as in five. So allowing five stories that there. Existing land uses in the area. There's the variety of single unit and multi-unit. And then, of course, you guys would be familiar with the sea. That's right. Immediately to the west there. That's the big gray area that's stands for vacant. So you guys would be aware of that redevelopment that is potentially coming our way here soon. Uh, existing context. This is just a shot of the ex

isting single unit home on the side. And then let me go clockwise here at the top, you see the a two story multi-unit structure there that's at north end of this block phase. The next picture below is on the opposite side of the block. So the properties, few properties there, single unit homes that face Clement Street. The one below that is those those group of three single unit homes directly to the north of the subject site. Continuing the picture at the bottom center is part of that. See that rezoning also that's a vacant parking lot this you know, fence up right now. And then, of course, again, to the to the west is the city outside itself and most of it being vacant. But, of course, there's a communications tower and a small building there associated with that site. We followed the required process for Mapp amendment, which brought us to the City Council public hearing tonight. Know, these are the alternatives that are present in the area. We haven't received any letters of support or opposition from Arnaud's. We did receive one letter of opposition from a member of the public with some concerns about the compatibility or incompatibility potentially of the building parties that would be allowed under this SMU three zoning with with the kind of single unit character perhaps to the West and further to the South or excuse me, to the east and to the south. So now to get into the criteria, we'll start with consistency with adopted plans, we've got Plan 2040 and Blueprint Denver. We found that this rezoning would meet any number numerous goals and objectives of current plan 2040, just a handful of which are listed here. In terms of blueprint. Denver Future neighborhood context is suburban, and what's being proposed here is suburban, multi-unit zoned districts. We did find the rezoning be consistent with a future neighborhood context. Feature place type is low medium, which calls for this kind of mix of of low and mid-scale multi-unit residential developments, small scale multi-unit buildings is a phrase that's used there, and

specifically calls out that those buildings should generally be three stories or less and height. So this kind of SMU three zoning is meant to allow just that type of sort of small to mid-scale multi-unit developments. We did find the rezoning to be consistent with future play style. The future street type is local and designated, and this particular street type allows for a wide variety of different land uses and farms next to it. So certainly no issue with inconsistency there. The growth strategy for this site is all other areas of the city meaning it's meant to, or this designation of property around the city is meant to accommodate 10% of new employment and 20% of new housing through 2040. And certainly by rezoning this property to allow for small scale multi-unit development. We do increase incrementally there the amount of units that we can facilitate on the site. So we did find it to be consistent with the growth strat

egy in that regard. We also found the reasoning to that it would result in uniform district regulations and that would further the public health, safety and welfare of the community through implementation of our adopted plans. The justifying circumstances. There are a couple. One is the city adopted plan, the blueprint in particular with the little medium place type that I mentioned. It's really tailor made for this type of zone district. And then also just touched on the sea outside that. That's a very transformative project that's headed to that area and is immediately across the street from the sites. And certainly changing conditions is something to consider there as well. Terms of a justifying circumstance. We also found this rezoning to be consistent with neighborhood context, zoned district purpose and specific intent. So with that, based on the criteria for review and the Denver zoning code, the staff does recommend approval of application 2020 1i-000 35. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Brad, for the staff report this evening. We have two individuals signed up to speak on this public hearing. Our first speaker is Phil Loper in chambers. Hello. I'm Phil, Oprah. I'm the owner of this property. I just wanted to introduce myself. Let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your. Time and. Consideration. All right. Thank you. Our next speaker is Jesse Perez, and I believe he'll be joining us online. Yes. Good evening. Members of council, those watching at home. My name is Justin Paris and I'm representing for Black Star Institute for Self Defense Positive Active Command for Social Change, as well as the Party of Colorado and Frontline Black News. And I'll be the next mayor in 2023. I'm in favor of the rezoning tonight. I just have a few questions I would like to know. Was there a parking study done on this property? On the site in question, a traffic study done. If there is going to be house built here, what is the amount level going to be for the housing? How many units if there is going to be residential housing placed here? And what's going to happen with the sea dot sites. So please answer the question. I would raise those questions. I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council Bill 1021. Councilman Cashman. Thank you, Madam President. Yeah. I'd like to ask the property owner to step up. Mr.. What are you planning? Well, right now I'm kind of considering a few options, one of which is to front back townhouse development. I split the lot into four units total. I also am considering a six unit townhouse concept. Okay. Thank you, sir. Sounds like that's well within the zoning you're asking for. That's for sure. That's all I've got. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. And we've got Councilman Flynn up next. Thank you, Madam President. I want to follow up on that. Mr. Lopez, please. Over here in the packet, it has two duplex units, a lot

split on North Side and South Side and two front back duplexes with two attached garages behind. And that's the one that neighbors were shown. You're saying now that that's not what you're going to build or what you may not build? Right now, there's there's no definite plan moving forward. The two duplex option is still on the table, but I'm also considering something with more density. A six unit townhouse option. Mm hmm. This rezoning would allow apartment forms. Are you considering apartment forms? I am also considering apartment forms. Really? Honestly, nothing is off the. Table at this point. Mm hmm. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. Next up, we've got Councilmember Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. With this rezoning, if this were to be rezoning to the north of the zone district, it's a protected zone district. Correct. This is different or. I'm sorry, Red. Sorry. Sorry. Red room? Yes. That district immediately to the north would be a protest protected district as the city. So remind me on a protected zone district if you use the apartment form. There has to be a type of setback because it's a protected zone district so the site can be there. The apartment form would have to be tiered correct on this from the north side because it's a protected zone district. On the side, along

the side, that side on that line, there is that kind of requirement. I can find it for you if you want the specifics. That would be great if you could remind me what the site interior set back would have to be with a protected zone district to the north of its. You know, just give me 1/2 here. So there's. Okay. So. So it's 25 from the Lott line in SMU, three for his side, interior zone, light line set back. 25 feet, correct? That's for anything above 27 feet. 27. And you're my knees. Is 3 a.m.. Three over 27 feet. It does. It allows 40. That's what I thought. Okay. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Sandoval. Counsel Pro Tem Torrance. Got your rate before you had it, huh? Yeah, you did. My question is actually for Mr. Looper. The parking lot to your south. What is that? Is that used for any purpose? That's going to be part of the former secret headquarters redevelopment. That's owned by a separate developer. It also owns the property across the street from my property. Okay. Have they talked to you about assembling? Knows about. Buying your property and assembling. Them? No. No. I haven't had any contact with them. I sent them a letter as part of my outreach, but didn't hear anything from. Okay. But the zoning that you're seeking is the same as the lot. It's the same as the lot. Yeah, that's. That's directly adjacent to. My property, to the south. Okay. All right. Thank you. All right. Thank you, counsel. Pro Tem Torres. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 1021 Council Member Cashman. Yeah, thank you, Madam President. I do believe this rezoning application m

eets the criteria that we're expected to judge it by. As has been said many times, we see that performers see that property across the street. The control group has, after on its third attempt, was successful in getting four tax credits to build 150 units of affordable housing , which will be in the southeast corner of that site. And I believe part of it may be on that parking lot, but whether or not that's the case, that parking lot is owned as Mr. Loper requests for his property. Expectations are that the affordable component of the fixed redo, which they're calling the dock, as a matter of fact, moving forward, that should begin, uh, ground clearing and permits, I believe, middle of next year. So with that said, I, you know, we've got multifamily, a few sites up from this property, multifamily immediately adjacent. So I would see no reason to deny this application. I hope my colleagues will join me. Thank you. Councilmember Cashman And I agree this meets all of the rezoning criteria and happy to support this this evening as well. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 1021. Sandoval. No. Cashman. I can eat I. Sawyer. I. Torres. I black. I Clark. I Flynn. High. Herndon. Hines. All right. Madam President. Hi, Madam Secretary. Close the voting and announce the results. One day, ten eyes. Ten Eyes Council Bill 21, dash 1021 has passed. Thank you, Brad, for the staff report. We're going to go ahead and move on here now to the mayor's proposed 2022 budget. 11 I's 11 I's Council Bill 20 1-1020 has passed. Thank you, Andrew, and the community members who joined us. Councilmember Black, will you please put Council Bill 1052 on the floor for final passage? Yes, Madam President. But I one your final. Well, thank you. I think you make listen. I'll get you that up until. I move that bill. 20 1-105 to be placed on the floor. All right. We're going to place that on final consideration and do pass. It's been moved and seconded. The required public hearing for Council Bill 1052 is open. And I see we have Livvy here. Yes. Hi, Libby. Go ahead. Arthur. Thank you. Libby Adams with community planning and Development. And I'll be presenting the MAP Amendment for 600 South Canosa Court. So this application is located in Council District seven and Councilmember Clarke's district in the Asmara Park neighborhood. The property is located at the southeast corner of South Canosa Court and Center Avenue, and the applicant is requesting to rezone from urban or from urban edge single unit rd one or sorry X to urban single urban ed single unit d1x to allow an accessory dwelling unit. So as stated previously, this property is zoned ESU d x as is all of the surrounding area, and that allows for the urban house and suburban house primary building forms. The site is currently occupied by a single unit home. And again, you can see this is a largely single unit area. And this slide shows the the very residential nature of this area. A postcard notifying neighboring property owne

rs was sent out within 200 feet of the site on July eight and then on September 1st. This went to planning board where they unanimously recommended approval on the consent agenda. And then we have received one letter in support from a neighboring property owner. The Denver zoning code has five review criteria that must be met for a rezoning to be approved. The first criterion is consistency with adaptive plans, and there are three adopted plans that are applicable to this site. So this rezoning meets the equity and climate goals and the comprehensive plan because it will create a greater mix of housing options in this largely single unit area and promote infill

development where there are already services in place . And Blueprint. Denver The future neighborhood context is urban edge. So these areas are a mix of urban and suburban contexts, but they're mostly single and two unit residential uses. And then Blue Print identifies this property as the low residential place type. So these are mostly single unit uses and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. And then both Canosa Court and Center Avenue are local streets, which are mostly characterized by residential uses consistent with the request. The Growth Area Strategy and blueprint. Denver is all other areas of the city. This is where we anticipate to see 10% of new jobs and 20% of new housing by 2040. So allowing an accessory dwelling unit would be consistent with this housing growth as it would allow for a limited increase in density. And then blueprint also includes specific policy recommendations. So land use and built form housing Policy four recommends allowing adus in all residential neighborhoods, especially on individual sites such as this one. And then the Asthma Park neighborhood perimeter plan is also applicable to this area, and that talks a lot about maintaining the existing single and two unit zoning in the area. This says are one and our two since this this plan was when the old code was in place. But this rezoning would still maintain that single unit character because ESU, D1 one X is a district within our single unit within the Denver zoning code. Staff also finds it meets the next two criteria. It will result in uniformity of district regulations, and it will further the public health, safety and welfare by implementing our adopted plans and providing a new housing unit in a largely single unit area. And then there's also a justifying circumstance in the new guidance and blueprint Denver allowing accessory dwelling units throughout all of our residential areas. And then lastly, the rezoning is consistent with the urban edge neighborhood context. The purpose of the residential districts and then the specific intent of the ESU, D1 zoned district. So finding all of your criteria have been met. Staff recommends approval, and that concludes my presentation. All right. Very good. Thank you, Libby. We have two individuals signed up to speak this evening on this rezoning. Both are

joining us online. And we're going to go ahead and start with Andrew Grant. Hello, counsel. My name is Andrew Grant. I live at 600 South Quarter and I wanted to make myself available for any questions that you have regarding my request. All right, great. Thank you, Andrew, for joining us. Our second speaker for this rezoning hearing is Jesse Perez joining us online as well. Yes, good evening. Members of council, those watching at home just to listen to some of my present for black summer for self defense positive asking myself the same. This was a unity party line black nose. And I'll be there next November 20, 23. I'm in favor of this rezoning tonight. In regards to the EU. I support the support the City Council at large in 2019. I still continue to support them in 2021. The ministry dwelling units all over the city, all over every single district. So any time that there is a rezoning for accessory dwelling unit, I'm in favor of it. So I'm in favor of this one as well. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council Bill 1052. All right. It doesn't look like we have any questions by members of council. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 105 to Council Member Clark. Thank you, Madam President. I just want to say thank you, Louis, for the great presentation for all the work on this. This, I think, clearly meets the criteria as demonstrated in the report, and I will be supporting it. Also just point out that there's a lot of interest in this in our park in Valverde, and somebody has helped launch a process with some informational meetings going on right now to see if this is something that would be appropriate to do. Neighborhood Wide. So stay tuned for both of those neighborhoods as they go through the process of looking at that. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Council Member Clarke, and happy to support this one tonight as well. Not seen any other comments by our colleagues. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 1052, please. Ortega. I. I. Clark. I. Flynn. All right. Herndon. HINES. All right. Cashmere. I can eat. I. Sawyer, I. Torres, I. Black. I see the. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 12 US. 12 I's Council Build 20 1-105 to has passed. Thank you, Libby, and our speakers who joined us. Councilmember Black, will you please put council Bill 1071 on the floor for final passage? 12 Eyes. Council Resolutions 21 dash 1148 and 21 Dash 1149 have been adopted. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. Council Member Can each go ahead with your comments, please? On Council Bill 21, Dash 1291. Thank you. Council President This is a little bill, but it has a very big story behind it. And it's historic because it is actually creating the first dedicated revenue stream or the fund to receive a dedicated revenue stream for transportation and mobility in our city. You know, in the in the day, we

thought that transportation funding came from the federal government, maybe from the state. But increasingly, as we know, unfortunately, many of these obligations have been eroded at the federal and state level and they have left it to us at the local level to meet the needs. And we also now understand we need more than just roads. Right. We heard a lot of testimony tonight about the need for multi-modal safety infrastructure that supports those who roll, those who walk, as well as those who drive. And so we are doing something tonight that was the product of a lot of collaboration. In particular, my colleagues, Councilwoman Black and Councilman Clark, were in long conversations with the administration trying to be collaborative partners and thinking about how we could be transformational in mobility. So this fund will gather an estimated \$9 million or so in its first year. That's not quite transformational at the outset, but we have now a first, which is saying that a stream of funding coming into the city will be dedicated on its way out for mobility and safety. And so that's why it's important. And it's then upon all of us, again, to continue to collaborate, to make sure that we grow that fund. So the source for this fund is parking revenue, and it's not all the parking revenue in the city, it's just the increment. It's the new amount that we're adding. We need to maintain the general funding. We need to maintain all the things that the city does every day. But the increment will be dedicated to this and we need to keep thinking about what are other ways we can grow our mobility investment to be able to make a dent in the safety and the efficiency of our city. So I again, just want to thank the administration in particular. We went through several leaders of Dottie during the time that's the Department of Transportation Infrastructure with you, several directors at the time that the conversation started. Till today, we have the support of the Budget Management Office figuring this out and moving a little bit from a long held position that they had to evolve and understand the benefits to the city of taking this step. And, you know, all of the frontline staff who helped to estimate figure it out. And I think, you know, overall, while I called out several of my colleagues who were kind of in the discussions with the administration, I think overall, this body in year after year has prioritized mobility spending in our budget agendas. And I think that overall council support helped to make this winnable by knowing how important it was to this body. So it's a little step but a big day and I'm pretty excited about it. So, you know, I we're already in the consent agenda. I don't have to urge anyone to vote. Yes, but I'm really excited. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Canete. Next up, we've got Councilmember Hines. Thank you, council president. And thank you, Councilmember Kennedy, for your comments. We all deserve t

he freedom to get from A to B safely, no matter how we choose to get there. And that's a value statement that I've said many times as a candidate and as an elected official. I've tried to live my value whenever possible, including using my car as little as possible for most of the time. In COVID, I sold my car and had no car and was able still to get around and do all the essential things that I needed. So this is a move in the right direction. There are certainly other creative ways that we can think that are more transformative. I've mentioned to Dori many times, so this isn't a surprise for them. But another thing that we could consider is redesigning our transportation budget for the mode of transportation and we want people to take as opposed to the transit mode that people take now. So that's what Oakland does. And there are certainly other. For us to be transformative and Vision Zero is going in the wrong direction. And I disagree that we should extend the timeline past to 2030. In fact, I think that any loss of life is preventable. So thank you. Thank you, counselor. President. Thank you, Councilmember. Sorry about that. And thank you, Councilmember Hines, and happy to support this this evening. Appreciate the comments on it. Madam Secretary, we're going to go ahead and move to the next item that's been called out for comments. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Council member Sayed Abarca, will you please put Council Bill 20 1-1371 on the floor for final passage? Yes, I move that council bill 20 1-1371 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Okay. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded the required public hearing for Council Bill 20 1-1371 is open. May we have the staff report? And I believe we have Libby. Kaiser from Community Planning and Development. Presenting this evening. Go ahead, Libby. Yes, sorry it took a second just to be. Promoted as a panelist and as an aside as well. I've been having some Internet issues tonight, so if I get cut off. Stacey and Zack do have my presentation and I'll try. To hop back on on my phone. All right. Sounds good, LIBBY All right, so I will pull up my presentation. Real good. Yes. Okay, great. So good evening. I am Libby

Kizer of CPD. And we're looking at a rezoning request for 8890 East Lowry Boulevard. The property is in Council District five, represented by Councilwoman Amanda Sawyer. And it's near the east side. Of the Lowry Field neighborhood. The property is located south of the Roundabout at Lowry Boulevard and Yosemite Way. The property is approximately 7.2 acres and includes a private baseball field owned by the high school. And a surface parking lot is also on site. The property is currently zoned R four with waivers, which allows a church, park, school or theater.

trical studio less than 37 feet tall. The applicant is proposing to rezone to the suburban mixed use of five storey district, which would allow a variety of residential, civic, commercial and industrial uses and the general storefront. Drive thru services and drive thru restaurant building forms. The existing zoning, which allows very limited development on the site, is a holdover from former Chapter 59. Adjacent zone districts include B three and oh one, which are also former Chapter 59. Surrounding districts from the current code include open space as well as community corridor, multi-unit and mixed use of three and five stories. The site is subject to the Loughery design guidelines, which define development expectations beyond the zoning code and address site circulation and parking, architecture, signage, lighting and landscaping. It's important to note that while the assignment x five zone district allows building heights up to five storeys or 70 feet, the design guidelines generally limit building heights to four storeys in the commercial context, which applies to multi-family and commercial developments. This means the rezoning would allow a maximum building height of 50 feet, which is 13 feet taller or one storey more than what is currently allowed. The Lowry Design Review Committee is responsible for ensuring these guidelines are met. As the site is larger than five acres, staff conducted a large development review. To determine if a large development framework was warranted. Typically, a framework plan is needed if an adopted plan calls for it, and or if future development will require establishing, extending, expanding or otherwise changing the arterial or collector street grid. An existing regional stormwater system or accessible park open space while the site is over five acres. Staff determined a large development framework was not required as the existing adopted plan. The Lowery Reuse Plan already specifies land use, urban design and transportation goals for the area. In addition, infrastructure needs for the area are mostly constructed, including the transportation network, open space system, water and wastewater lines and stormwater facilities. Furthermore, site specific issues will be adequately resolved through other regulatory processes, including site development plan review, and the applicant has conducted a community information meeting and additional public outreach, as would be required with the large development framework process. For context, regarding the immediate vicinity of the site, the areas land use is a mix of public, quasi public, open space office, industrial, multi-unit and single unit use as the top photo shows the of the property, which is a fenced off field. The middle photo shows the 55 acre Great Lawn Park to the north and the bottom photo shows additional open space to the south. A three storey office building exist to the northeast across Yosemite Street with the Big Bear Ice Arena, which is estimated

to be approximately six feet tall and a three story physical rehabilitation center to the southwest along Lowry Boulevard. Throughout the rezoning process, application notifications have been provided according to code requirements. To date, staff has received three letters from the Lowry United Neighborhoods R.A. documenting their evolving position regarding the rezoning. One initially supported the rezoning contingent on the applicant providing at least 10% of the units at 80% of the area median income as well as enhancements to the trail along Westerly Creek, west of the subject property and a permanent easement for public use of the trail while the applicant drafted a good neighbor agreement. Documenting these commitments. Lunt declined to sign the agreement based on additional public outreach and limited capacity to enforce the agreement once current position is neutral. Staff has also received comments from approximately 54 individuals expressing concerns that the rezoning allowing a taller building is too intense for the area. Redevelopment of the baseball field would reduce open space and obstruct views, and there will be impacts upon the transportation network. In addition, 16 individuals and or organizations have advocated for the rezoning as it will facilitate the provision of senior housing in the Lowry community and will enable the high school to complete capital improvements and provide scholarships and additional learning opportunities to its students. All comments have been provided to City Council. Although a good neighbor agreement wasn't executed. The applicant and the Department of Housing Stability have finalized a voluntary housing agreement that ensures 10% of the senior housing units will be

provided to residents earning no more than 80% of the area median income. The applicant also intends to identify trail improvements and dedicate a trail easement during the site development plan process. Moving on to the Denver zoning code criteria, it must be found that the requested MAP amendment is consistent with these five criteria. As a reminder, staff only evaluates the proposed zone district and not a specific development in regard to criteria one. There are three adopted plans that apply to the requested rezoning, including Comprehensive Plan 2040 Blueprint, Denver and the Lowry Reuse Plan, as stated in the staff report. The rezoning is consistent with several goals in the comprehensive plan, particularly as they relate to providing more housing choices for seniors to age in place and promoting infill development where infrastructure and services already exist. The proposed rezoning is also consistent with the suburban neighborhood context defined in Blueprint Denver as the proposed S.M. X District facilitates commercial development along main corridors near residential areas. As for the future place type, the subject property is designated as other park and open space which are privately owned parks and open spaces, and as

such, their use could change in the future. Blueprint Denver says that when larger open spaces are proposed to change, this should include a community visioning process. However, staff felt a community visioning process wasn't worn on this site because it's a smaller site, and the Lowry reuse plan already envisioned appropriate land uses for the community. When contemplating the consistency of the rezoning with Blueprint, Denver staff consider the surrounding future place types, including community center along Lowry Boulevard and campus to the north. Community Center typically provides a mix of uses in larger and smaller scale buildings, with a height up to five stories. While the campus place type tends to be dominated by single institutional uses and are often multistory. In this context, the SE mixed five district is a good fit for the subject property. The rezoning request is also consistent with the future street types defined in Blueprint. Denver as Lowry Boulevard is a mixed use arterial and Yosemite is a residential arterial. Mixed use arterials support a varied mix of uses, including retail office, residential and restaurants and buildings are typically multistory. Meanwhile, residential arterials support primarily residential uses, but may also include schools, civic uses, parks, small retail nodes and other similar uses. The proposed SM X5 district allowing a mix of uses, including residential, is consistent with these street descriptions as it is intended to be applied to areas or intersections served primarily by collector or arterial streets. Looking at Blueprint Denver's growth strategy, the city generally directs growth to key centers, corridors and high density residential areas that align with transportation options. Nevertheless, limited growth is desired in all other areas of the city specifically 10% of jobs and 20% of housing by 2048. They propose, as a mixed five zone district, is appropriate in this growth area as it will facilitate housing for those at least 55 years old, including an assisted living and memory care facility that will provide jobs. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning helps implement the blueprints on a policy related to converting former Chapter 59 zone districts to the current Denver zoning code. The proposed rezoning is also consistent with the Lowry reuse plan, which designates the subject property with a mix of three land use categories including residential education, campus and community service, retirement housing and managed care facilities such as those proposed for within the residential category according to the plan. The intent is to allow flexibility to respond to market demand within a range of acceptable land uses. New construction is envisioned in addition to reuse of existing structures. The rezoning is also consistent with criteria two, three and five, as stated in the staff report, in regard to criteria for the fact the property retained the former Chapter 59 zoning after the city adopt

ed the current Denver zoning code in 2010 is the most applicable justifying circumstance for this rezoning. In conclusion, CPD recommends approval of the rezoning request. Thank you, Libby. Appreciate the staff report tonight. Council has received 38 written comments on Council Bill 20 1-1371. There are no submitted comments in favor of the application and 38 submitted comments in opposition of the application. All members of Council that are present have certified that they have read each of the submitted written comments. Do any members need more time in order to read all of the written testimony that was submitted? Seen none. Council Secretary. Let the record reflect that all written testimony both in favor and in opposition of Council Bill 20 1-1371 has been read by each member of council and all written testimony will be submitted to the official record of the hearing this evening. We have 27 individuals signed up to speak and we're going to go ahead

and get started. Our first speaker this evening is Matt Overman. And we'll go ahead and have a timer that will show you the last 30 seconds that you have available. Please go ahead, Matt. And you guys hear me? Yes. And we ask that you introduce yourself for the public record. Great. Hi, my name is Matt Norman. I'm with United Properties. We are the applicant and developer for the site. We spent the past year here plus working on plans for this site and working with the community's key stakeholders. Want to extend a thank you to the community for the time they spent in collaborating with us. They've really helped us make this a better project than it was on day one and special thanks to the city of Denver staff, specifically Libby Kiser with planning and Brad winding with hosts for the time they spent working with us on this project. A couple of key points I want to make as it relates to plans for our site. First, we're very excited to provide to what our knowledge is the first age restricted, affordable rental units in Denver, with 10% of those units as affordable units at the 80% rate. This site was actually exempt from providing any affordable housing or paying linkage fees due to previous agreements that were in place for Lowry as it relates to affordable housing. But we wanted to go above and beyond, and we heard from the Lowry community that it was also important to them that we had an affordable option with this development. Secondly, I want to talk about how we're going to be improving the open space experience based on, again, community feedback. We will be adding a public trail easement along the west side of the site, along an existing path that's there but is on private land. We're also adding site improvements to improve that trail experience along eventually creek. This will protect the trail system connectivity between the north and south side of Lowry Boulevard in perpetuity. Important to note that this site's not public open space. It's private open space, the field not open to t

he public. And it was never part of Lowry long term plans that this remain private open space. Third we know there's a lot of existing concerns with traffic and pedestrian activity along Yosemite and the roundabout that have been a focus of the neighborhood neighborhood for several years, more specifically , the speed with which some vehicles travel through that area. These problems are not a volume problem. They're not significantly impacted with this added development. And Yosemite and Lowry, we're really designed to take these additional traffic flows. So the problems that exist here, our existing issues. With that being said, we do want this to be a safe situation for the community as well as our residents. We've held meetings specifically with Dottie in East Park on this topic to discuss these issues. We'll continue to do so and we do want to be part of the solution and taking action on what needed improvements there . Lastly, just wanted to say what a great use this senior living will be for this site. This use applies to so many of the criteria that are set forth in Blueprint Denver and the other plans and those criteria about the they talk about senior living are in place for good reasons on a high level. Colorado has the second fastest growing population of people over over 60 in the nation. So the need and demand for these types of residential and commercial developments is growing at a rapid pace. Most importantly, you know, our communities give senior citizens a place they can really thrive in their later years in life that provides a community of people at the same stage of life. And this is really a unique age in place, offering people who live in Lowry and Denver can stay in their community long term. With that, we respect respectfully ask the City Council, approve our application tonight. Thanks for your time and will be available for questions. And. Q Our next speaker this evening is Marcus partner. Good evening, council members. This is Mark. As partner. I am here for questions. I am in support. I certainly can provide some additional background on the community outreach, but I am here for questions. Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next speaker is Monti force. I believe you're unmuted, Monty. Go ahead, please. Yes. This is my fourth. I'm the executive director for the Lowry Redevelopment Authority, and I'm here only this evening, not in support of or against. Just to answer questions about maybe some of the historical background that might be necessary or questions that might come up. Thank you. Our next speaker is Phil Workman. Hi. Good evening. So, Workman 130 Rampart Way, Suite 225. I'm a Lowry resident of 18 years. Also a proud matchbox parent. Match up is a. Or your high school that has a diverse population of students throughout the entire city, every council district in the city and county of Denver. We conducted a community outreach for the proposed rezoning where we conducted over 35 community meetings and many more

individual meetings with neighbors and stakeholders. These include small group meetings as well. Specifically, one East Park neighborhood. Larry Business Alliance. Larry Design Review

Committee. Larry Redevelopment Authority. Although we are still dealing with COVID, we have some of the meetings in person and a majority via Zoom. Those virtual meetings were also made available for review by the community. We utilize social media, physical posting of the property, certified mail and social media, and a combination of certified mail and fliers as well, and a combination of all of those. And I will admit, sometimes that is still even that is an imperfect side. One of the basic tenants of our outreach strategy or outreach strategy has always been to listen and to respond to the concerns of the community as best as we can, and also to enable a process for open communication, not only during the rezoning, but throughout the entire development process in response to the concerns we heard throughout this process. We have addressed community concerns regarding affordable housing, parking, trail accessibility and collaboratively working with the Lowery community and existing issues with traffic and safety. And in response to these, we might we are looking to memorialize these agreements, and there will be some discussion here and the future of how we are going about to memorialize those agreements and those things that we have heard as concerns of the community as part of this process. Every step of this process has been done in a thoughtful matter with the community in mind from the formulation of the RFP by the Archdiocese and selection of United Properties to the library design review process to the community outreach process and responses. And with your support this evening, we look forward to move to the next process, we have already said, for the Foundation for Ongoing Community Engagement. Thank you very much for your time and we would appreciate your support this evening. Thank you. Our next speaker is Kaylee Robinson. I am just. Here to answer questions. Would you mind introducing yourself for the public record? Keely Robinson Norris. Design 1101. To be an extreme. All right. Great. Thank you. Our next speaker is Dana Hoffman. Hi. Good evening, counsel. This is Dana Hoffman. I'm with the Denver Department of Transportation Infrastructure. I'm on the community design team. I'm just here to answer some questions that may come up around transportation projects in the area. Thanks. All right. Thank you. Our next speaker is Marco CAVANAUGH. US. And I believe Marco is joining us via telephone this evening. If I'm not mistaken, our producers have Marco's phone number that they can look for. Or Marco, if you want to hit Star nine to raise your hand, we can get you moved in. Right. And doesn't look like I'm seeing Marcus in the queue right now. And so we're going to go ahead and move on here. Next, we have Norman Schwab. Norman, please go ahead. I am Norm

an Schwab. I reside at three, two, three Altman way in Denver. I speak on behalf of 80 East Park residents who signed and submitted public hearing testimony on January six. My comments are drawn from that letter. We are opposed to the zone. It s2fm you five. We ask the city council one to postpone the recent decision until the developer in residence can resolve the intensity of use, location of uses, buildings and design compatibility to remand the case to city staff to consider the less intensive SMU three zone. Given that a floodplain designation, high water table and utility easement constrained development on portions of the site and because surrounding land uses, the existing zoned designations are less than ten, including height and three removed the good neighbor agreement referred to in the Zone Report from the record. The developer put this forward, but the Lowry United Neighborhoods Board has not agreed to it. The height allowed by the reason would lead to extremely intensive use of the developable portions of the site. The high water table prevents underground parking. Recent developments along Lowry Boulevard is three stories in height. Single family homes along Yosemite way are two stories. Zoning along Lowry Boulevard and nearby is a mix of SW in U five, SMU three and other zones. Most of the zoning limits heights to three stories. East Park residents particularly oppose a large four story parking garage putting up against the neighborhood on Yosemite Way and the Sports Boulevard entrance to the regionally significant Lowry Sports Complex Park. What other large park in Denver has a four story parking garage at one of its major entrances. Are there any other four story parking garages in Lowry? We believe the answer to both questions is no. The parking garage would create a dead zone for pedestrians and bicyclists on the existing Yosemite sidewalk, an important connector to valued open space and recreation. It is not compatible with Lowry plans and design guidelines to minimize the impact of parking on neighboring properties. Lowry has been planned as a walkable, well-designed, pedestrian community. Recent multifamily developments in Lowry have ramped housing units around parking or put it underneath residential units. That is not so here. The location and visibility of the parking garage is problematic. The developer has said that it cannot be located elsewhere on the site. Please postpone a decision on this rezoning and remand it to staff for further

review. Thank you, Norman. Our next speaker this evening is we're going to go back to Marco Cabana. Where was Cabana was. Go ahead, Marco, please. And you're going to have to unmute yourself. Good evening. This is Marco Cabaniss with Duty Transportation and engineering supervisor for the Transportation Review Team. So we work in partnership with CPD and and arrange for for the concept plan to get around through the department so that it gets all the, the eyes on it that we want to do a

thorough traffic and transportation review. So I'm here to answer questions tonight. All right. Very good. Thank you, Marco. And we're going to go ahead and move back to our list. Paul Brandus. Good evening, city council members and happy New Year. My name is Paul Venice. As an introduction, I served on Denver's Expanding Housing Affordability Committee, as well as the Board of Lorrie United Neighborhoods. R.A. But to be clear, I am here not to represent either organization. My opinions are my own. My family has lived in Murray for six years. We live about one mile away from the site in question. The affordable housing crisis is extremely important issue for me. Our family actually moved to Denver from Boulder six years ago, partly due to skyrocketing cost of living in Boulder. I believe that the unaffordable housing prices in Boulder are that mostly due to restrictions that the municipality has placed on new development. Denver's population has exploded. Murray needs to contribute to this solution with new housing units that this development will provide. Murray also needs a commitment to long term affordable housing for our community that the free markets otherwise wouldn't provide. I'm proud to live in Murray Plan community, where the development of income restricted housing has been a cornerstone of our legacy. Mandates for affordable housing are part of the origin story of Lowry, as they were core provisions in the sale of the Air Force base to allocate homeless housing units back in 1994. When I first heard about this development here in Lowry, a group of us raised the issue of ensuring that provisions would be made for allowing low income housing units. The developers are receptive to feedback and have worked with hosts to negotiate the affordable unit agreement that you see today. For that reason, I am here to speak in support of the zoning request and believe that it meets all criteria as the developer shared their plans for the property. Many voices of opposition to the rezoning and project have come forward, mostly from immediate neighbors who are concerned about traffic views and density. While we may want to point blame to the developer for the developer for not appeasing nearby neighbors, I believe that the root cause of the opposition is due to a broken zoning application process that does not require site plans to be submitted in conjunction with zoning applications. The reality is that no one here actually knows the design of the site that will be ultimately built. This is a result of the system of the city has in place, not the fault of the developers. That said, the one unique thing to us here in Lori that lets me sleep at night is the fact that we do have a unique ability to control the design of the site design plans. The Lowry Community Master Association is our home and has a Larry Design Review Committee that is comprised of community members, architects and landscape architects to utilize a four phase process to evaluate

proposed plans. I believe that the Larry Design Review Committee will hold the developer to the high standards that they have held all developers to, and that Larry's voice will be protected and amplified through the Audi RC as it relates to traffic concerns. My understanding of recent studies show that traffic speeds and pedestrian volume volumes that did not warrant additional interventions. I do urge you to continue to monitor the traffic condition of the site. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity for us to make a small dent in the affordable housing crisis and approve this zoning request. Best wishes to you and your loved ones. See you next time. Thank you, Paul. Our next speaker this evening is Ryan Padilla. Hello? Can you hear me? Yes. Oh, thank you for your time. I'm here to speak against the rezoning to a mixed five. I personally believe the the site does not lend itself to a high density use. The sewer easement that runs through the property makes it very difficult for the site design to be flexible. The floodplain issues on the property in the high groundwater table, if you develop it at a high density, it's going to lead to a large parking garage being required. And having a four storey parking garage in front of a park is an eyesore for the neighbors. It's going to. It's I agree with what someone said earlier about the dead space being created along that sidewalk along Yosemite way. And I believe the pedestrian safety. I live at 500 Yosemite way and I have to walk across the roundabout to the bus stop. And going in and having traffic coming in and out of the new complex is going to be very dangerous, especially in the winter. I just having a four storey development on that site is not a good idea. I'd urge the Council to

reconsider a lower density development due to the site constraints that will not involve a massive parking garage right in our neighborhood. I think that will be a for my time. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Morgan Spencer. Hold on one sec. Sorry. Okay. Hi, I'm Morgan Censor. I am a library resident and I am speaking in support of the rezoning. I have two children. In preschool here in LA and I enjoy the opportunity to take advantage. Of all of the carefully planned. And balanced parks, open space and everything the library reads about the Library Master Association provides. I think that this proposed development. Is perfect to use without putting in more multi-unit apartment buildings. I wish this resident was residents was open ten years ago for my grandmother who is looking for senior residences and had to go down the Highlands Ranch. And as I continue to grow my family here in Lowry, I think about my parents and having them close by and just having this sort of opportunity in this neighborhood, I think would bring a lot of wonderful experiences and not monetary wealth, but wealth to the neighborhood. So I thank you for your time and supporting this rezoning effort. Thank you. Our next speak

er is Megan Brady. Hi. My name's Megan Brady. I'm a resident of the East Park neighborhood in Lowry here. I live just across the street from the proposed development on Yosemite Way, and I am here to oppose it for a variety of reasons. I know Norman and Ryan touched on this earlier with the high water table preventing parking beneath the property for residents, which is not in line with the surrounding design of the Lowry neighborhood. As somebody who will be looking at this every day directly at the parking garage, this is a huge concern for me because this is not why I moved to the area. I think this will also significantly decreased property values on our side of the neighborhood. The sewer easement in the middle prevents the property from being able to put the parking in the middle to wrap the building around the residences around. So again, just limiting the options they have there and in the floodplain on the side of the creek prevents them from building too close to that side of the property, which means this development will be right up against Yosemite Way. Adding this number of residents to the neighborhood will significantly increase the density of cars and pedestrians throughout the area, which I think will increase the danger and hazards of an already hazardous intersection due to speed and density. So I am again asking the Council to oppose this rezoning request. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Jarrett Lehrer Way. All right, I. Can you hear me? Yes. I thank you. I wanted to share there a way. 1300 south to the streets. I am. I actually work for the Denver Archdiocese. And this is a project that I've been working on for a bishop bishop matchup of high school. I wanted to thank the council and committee members and the public for allowing me to speak this evening. We started this process nearly two years ago where we met with the CMA and other stakeholders in the community and asked them questions on what would be a good benefit for the community. Because we the the baseball field is underutilized. We only use it for practices in the spring. It's very expensive and some games and games for the Loughery baseball team, but it's very expensive to maintain. And the school, which is going on 15 plus years old now, needs significant upgrades in its infrastructure. So we decided to pursue a rezoning and selling of this property through an RFP process based on the feedback that we received from and Mary and the stakeholders and the community prior to ever engaging any developers. We had ten developers who submitted on this project and we chose the United Development Team due to their their concept of providing senior housing for the community. Because a market study shows there is actually a need for senior housing and living and aging in place and in this community. We thought that it would be the least impactful to the community based on low cars and traffic counts. It would also provide jobs because there will be some support wit

h the development's senior assisted living as well as, you know, living, independent living. And we also felt there was a great need for Bishop Match Path High School. With the money generated, we could do the much needed infrastructure improvements and provide scholarship opportunities to our students. I think Phil had said this before, but knowing we had 200 plus students that come from all over the Denver metro area, but also in every district in the city of Denver, it's a very diverse student body. We also have almost nearly half the students are on some type of scholarship or assistance. So this money would be greatly needed for this for this, for the needs of match both. And I think this is a great addition to the neighborhood having worked in and around the Lowry neighborhood on different development projects for over 20 years . Thank you for your time and I thank you for your consideration. And I hope that you support this this redevelopment, this rezoning

request. Thank you. Our next speaker is Chad Crean. Hello. My name is Chad Crane and I live at 470 Yosemite Way. I'm opposed to the rezoning of the area, to the zoning that they are requesting. I agree with Norman that it should be looked at as possibly the lower zoning, where it would limit the density of what could be built on this site for the reasons, again, that have been mentioned, the flood water plane, the amount of density that will bring more traffic, although people seem to say it won't we that live on the street can say with very honest and true opinion that it will bring more. And I have some concerns about the safety for people that will be at the park and people that will be living at this center with having a structure on this large on this spot and site. I think that I do commend that they are looking to do this for senior living opposed to other multi-unit housing or apartments, but I feel that it should be postponed. On making this vote or change until there is better clarification of exactly how this site will be laid out, especially to with the garage site being four stories. Again, as people mentioned, there is nothing else in Lowry that is four storeys high for a garage site for this kind of use. If we're going to have something here, let's make it something that blends in with the neighborhood and the surrounding area a little bit better. So thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker has been ro henninger. Monroe. You'll have to go ahead and unmute yourself. Monroe HENNINGER. Go ahead, please. Are you there, General? Yes. Can you hear me? Yes. Go ahead, please. I'm sorry. My name is Monroe Manager. I live at seven, six, nine, eight East seven Drive and Lowry in the North Lowry Development. I've been there for over 20 plus years. I'm in support of the rezoning of this for a couple of reasons. First, firstly, right now it's a private ballpark. So none of the Lowry residents have access to any of the land or the land surrounding it. My understanding is that with add

itional trails added to the neighborhoods surrounding there, that. We will have. Additional places where the whole community can enjoy some of the open space there. Thirdly, as you know, a son in law who's had a. Father in law in. A nursing home and had to travel great distances every day to get there. And a lot of the residents and Lowry having parents that are reaching the age where a nursing home would be necessary. I believe that having a closest is important. And so I'm in full support of this. I hope you do, too. Thank you very much. And you. Our next speaker is Stephanie Crane. Everybody hear me okay? Yes, go ahead. All right. Good evening, council members, and thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Stephanie Crane and I'm a 12 year resident of East Park. I live it for seven years now anyway. And I will be able to see this new development from my front porch. So it's very near and dear. But tonight, I want to focus on the density of this development. In a letter that was dated May 19th, 2021, the developer requested that the LaRouche Design Review Committee approve a variance allowing our buildings to exceed the 45 foot height restriction by up to five feet, to give them the flexibility with the final dimension and design of their buildings. I think it's important to note that this now a 50 foot building height that they're requesting, would not include mechanical screening. A building of this height does not fit into the landscape of the East Park neighborhood. This parcel of land is currently a baseball field, as many have said. To the far end of the large sports park at Fairmont, and Lowry is a one story office building that houses the Colorado Department of Public Health with ample surface parking lot. It would seem out of place to have a 50 foot building as you enter into another residential neighborhood and park. In addition, a building of this magnitude designed to butt up against the sidewalk would provide little to no snowmelt, causing an increase of icy road conditions at an already unsafe roundabout and adjacent sidewalk that's used daily by pedestrians, runners and cyclists. The developer has also asked for an increase in parking spaces a lot in one and a half spaces per unit for the adult. I'm sorry, the active adult rental and 0.8 spaces for assisted living and memory care. But to me that seems odd that this development would need these additional spaces, given that they have repeatedly stated that many of their senior residents have either downsized to one car and rely on public transportation, or that the memory care residents are not allowed to drive or even own cars. So the current parcel of land already has a significant amount of surface, lot space and mature trees that will now be removed to accommodate this large four storey above ground parking garage. We are told that this development will be between 260 and 300 units. Seems like the largest Colorado project for assisted living and memory care. I

guess my question is why does this have to be so massive given what we know about the parcel of land? We know that there are constraints doing the flood plains, high water table, sewer easement. Our biggest concern is this four storey above ground parking structure that will sit right along

Yosemite Sports Boulevard. All other parking structures in Florida seem to be two stories within a commercial area of the neighborhood, and they're either underground or wrapped. And this doesn't seem to be the case for this particular structure. We do understand that loan land zoning changes occur and we're not against this particular development, but it is extremely severe and it doesn't fit within the current landscape of the community. So I'm just asking you to please reconsider what you plan on. Allotted for each speaker. We're going to go ahead and move on to our next speaker. Leo Nyholm. Okay. I have to go. Good evening. My name is Jarrell Nyholm. I live at 8031 East Bay Avenue. I've been a resident for a little over five years. Thank you for your time. And I would like to express my support for the project. As an architect and a resident. I am fully in support of a variety of types of residential and uses. Excuse me, in the neighborhood. And I believe that the senior living is needed. And I think it's perfectly located because it's close to transportation and it's close to parks. And in addition to that, I fully trust, I think it was Paul that mentioned the Larry Design Review Committee, and I fully trust their professional standards as residents or as additional opportunity for input. And I believe that that particular process hopefully will address the concerns of some of the residents have. That's all I had. Thank you again for your time. I appreciate it. Have a good night. Thank you. Our next speaker is Julie Zimmerman. Okay. It looked like we had Julie in the queue. Well, there we go, Julie. Julie Zimmerman, we'll have to have you go ahead and meet Julie. Sorry. Can you hear us? I'm sure I can hear you, Julie. Go ahead. Please. Thank you so much. Thank you very much for having us. Meaning we appreciate all of you. I live at 520 Yosemite way. We are the second home in from Yosemite and fifth avenue. So we were the second home essentially built in this part of Larry East Park. And we live across the street directly from this new build as it we very much oppose the development of this. And I would like to show that primarily people who are in support of this do not live in East Park. As far as open space, there is one block of open space I think is very important that the city council understand that it is one block basically that they are seeing. The developer says that they will make this wonderful place. It's not a huge area. It's a block. You can come and look at it within by you. It's beautiful, but it's not a big space. I think it's an area in which they are willing to acquire some development, productivity and money to do this. As

far as a senior community, there was one closed at Lowry Boulevard, which was replaced recently with, I think, alas, I don't know how you say it, Alice or Glass or whatever in that multi unit rental property is. So it seems to me very much this is about money. Finally, as far as community outreach, primarily they reach out to people within 200 feet of this building. We are the second closest home to this property that is being proposed to be built up by Matt and his associates. And we received a flier, as they say, but due to work, we're unable to make that meeting. But they did not. They, despite what they say, there has not been a big outreach as far as traffic and the decrease in travel between those 55 and up. I will be 55 on Saturday and I have a 13 year old, so I travel plenty and I have parents who are approaching 80 who live in East Park as well, not with us than in a different single home unit. And they travel all the time, including picking up our children because we both work as far as multi residential to the woman who commented on this is a good use. There are 300 plus units scheduled to be on this. So thank you to you as a preschool teacher. I so appreciate you. I can't even tell you how grateful I am, but this is not a good use of a property directly across from our home. As far as match clubs we agree, we support Match Local. We have a son who went to Regis. We agree in the tradition of that type of education. But I will tell you that other people can purchase can purchase this property. Truly, that's the time we have a lot of outreach. Speaker We're going to go ahead and move on to our next speaker, Greg Ryan. Hi. Good evening. This is Greg Ryan. I'm in support of this rezoning. I've lived in Lowry for a little over five years now. I moved here in 2016. I first lived off of Lowry Boulevard for about four years, and then earlier this year moved a few blocks north at 1028 Tamarack Street. So still a little bit further north. You know, I appreciate the opportunity to live in the city and county of Denver's place is great, really. You know, there's a lot a lot of good stuff going on here. There's a diversity of housing mix in Lowry, and I like that. You know, I formerly lived in like a condo and now I'm in a more of a single family home. So, you know, I do appreciate the diversity housing mix and the addition of a senior living residence is perfect for the mix of Lowry and kind of the southeast Denver neighborhood or, you know, just part of the city . So I hope you can join me in supporting this project. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Scott Zimmerman. I know that. We can, but we might need you to mute another device there. Scott, I think we've got an echo. Go ahead and try it again. Sorry about

that. There you go. All right. Is that better? Yes. Okay. So I also live at 520 Yosemite Way. And I just wanted to echo a lot of the points that have been made in terms of opposition to this project. I would reiterate that there was

a previous senior living facility to the west of where we live and to this proposed development that failed and went under. And we also currently have one senior living development called Brookdale, which is in the Lowry Central area. So I'm not entirely sure why we need a second facility. I think that I would reiterate that a lot of the people that are really for this don't live here and will not have to see this every day as they drive by it, or just look out their front porch to see this kind of monstrosity of a four storey parking building. I think that the development plan is a little bit disingenuous when they talk about specifically Matt Warman community outreach because we received one flier over the course of two years and other people have talked about social media and other community notifications, but a lot of the notifications were through the LC or the Lewellyn and other redevelopment properties which we have no stake in or ability to receive notification. I think that this is an ill conceived project and I think it's being kind of rammed down our throat. We understand the plight of Matchbox, but there are other people who will be willing to purchase this property for other mixed use development that doesn't result in the current plan. I have not seen any reference to the Dotti study on traffic, so I can't really comment on that. And I was actually quite surprised that they said it's not a really big deal because I witnessed this traffic every day. And I think that the overwhelming sense of the community is that we have not been included in this, irrespective of the developer's notifications or at least attempted notification. We didn't really hear about this whole thing until I think, Oh, there was a flier in May and then we had a meeting back, I believe, in December, and that was the extent of their notification. So as you can tell, I'm not in support of this. All right. Thank you, Scott. Our next speaker this evening is David Andrews, and I believe David is joining us via phone. And we're going to go ahead and get a manicure. Oh, go ahead. Go ahead, David. My name is David Andrews. I'm a resident of Lourey and I want to support this project and the proposed estimates. Five reason. First, because it provides jobs which are so needed these days it sits on arterials, so its traffic impacts should be de minimis. Despite other assertions. It's consistent with the reuse plan with Blueprint Denver. It provides affordable units. And as a former employee of the Lowry Redevelopment Authority, I can tell you that this was always private, open space and never in the calculus to remain open space throughout the master planning. In addition, there's the old CRC, which is going to ensure that what, however the site plan moves forward, it is responsible and fits within the context. In short, I support the project. Thank you for your time this evening. And cue our next speakers, Jesse Paris. Yes. Good evening, members of Council. Yes. Yes. My na

me is Justin Paris. The number of positive for black stocks and more for self defense positive Mexican mafia social change as well as the Unity Party of Colorado and the East Denver Residents Council front frontline black males and I'll be the next November 2023. This rezoning is very alarming. It actually hearkens back to the Dennard rezoning. I haven't seen this much opposition since then. 54 letters of opposition, 38 letters in opposition presented to this council. Oh, so much to go on with this. 300 plus units at 80%. Am I the. And am I level \$68,592 as of 2019? We have a housing crisis, an affordable housing crisis, and this is not going to help with that. I'm all for housing for seniors. I'm all for allowing seniors to age in place. Those are wonderful things. But this rezoning, I don't think is going to get the mark. I really don't. Like previous speakers have already stated this just on a flood plain on a water table, 10% of the units are going to be affordable at 80% AM-I I'm still trying to figure out how that's affordable, but that's based off the hood guidelines. Yeah, it's just all around. But I wouldn't be surprised if you pass this tonight, seeing as you passed the marble rezoning a few months back. So I wouldn't be surprised, but I would recommend that's not passed. And go back to the drawing board with this. I had a few questions in regards to this rezoning. Has there been a traffic study done because of pretty previous speakers have stated that this sits around a roundabout several roundabouts. I'm aware of only one RTD bus route that services this area now would be the six. Has there been a parking study done on the standards? It's going to be a four story garage space here. There's no way for there to be underground parking because it's on a floodplain. Um, how many units? One of the speakers said it was going to be 300 plus units. What are going to be the size of the units? Are they going to be one or two bedrooms? This is going to be assisted living or is this going to be independent senior living? If somebody could

please answer those questions, I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you. Thank you. Next up, we have Cathy Head. Hi. Can you hear me? Yes, go ahead. I'm Cassie Head and I'm co-chair of our United Neighborhood Line. Thanks for giving us a chance to speak tonight. I want to summarize kind of our involvement in this project from. The time that we were originally. Contacted by the developers. And we're not. Taking a stand either pro or an opposition at this point. Lower United Neighborhoods has been in discussion with the senior housing development team, including Matt Oberman. And Phil Workman. We were originally contacted. And sat in on our project presentation in March of 2021. And followed by three meetings with the One committee. One urged that active. Living apartments include units for lower income residents, including public access. Along. It. Along the east side of Westerly Creek. Benches and trees for that

path and that a publicly Accessible pickleball court be. Considered. The senior housing team has agreed to the 10% low income. Units to the project. The lower income rentals are to be codified in agreement with Host. An easement along the path phone can be held by Lowry Community Master Association or the City of Denver. On October 21st, one hosted a town hall presentation. Via Zoom for the Lowry Community. Community current. Concerns expressed during. The October 21st presentation included vehicular site. Access. Pedestrian safety and traffic. At Lowry Boulevard. Just some of the traffic circle and along a summary loss of greenspace preservation of existing mature trees. Building height Lowry design guidelines limit to a. Height of 45 feet. And potential parking conflicts. Along Sports Boulevard through two follow up meetings on December 2nd and December 7th, which included city staff. It was determined that the pedestrian safety and traffic. Issues will be addressed through the. Ongoing monitoring by JT. And Site Plan Review. Once the city receives a development package, the Lone Board determined after the October 21st community meeting that. It does not have the capacity. To seek a sufficiently representative vote from. The R.A. community to either express or withhold support for this rezoning. The board also determined that rather than executing agenda. The provision of lower income housing and the path right of way can be achieved through host agreement and an easement with the City. Of Denver. Or the LACMA. One appreciates the conversations prepared with United Properties team as well as multiple conversations with city staff. And submits this. As a record of these interactions. Thank you. Thank you for your time. Thanks. Thank you. Our next speaker is Christopher Schenk. Good evening. Can you hear me? Yes. Excellent. My name is Christopher Shank. I reside at 460 Yosemite Way. I'm eight houses down from the proposed project and. I think most of what has been said tonight is very spot on from those who strongly oppose this project going forward. I don't think anyone here is arguing the merits of the project. I think we all think this is a wonderful idea and it's a very good idea. However, this is a horrible place for it to happen. I'd like to reiterate the point from earlier. Speakers of those who speak in favor are not the people who will be directly impacted by this on a daily basis. They are not the people who drive by here every day. They are not people who walk their children to the park every day. They are not the children who walk their pets in this area every day. And I would go so far. As to say that most people. Who have spoke in favor. Have a financial. Issue with either gaining from the property itself or scholarships through the school. We're being told here the traffic will not increase or if it will, it won't be that much. I would really like to know how the addition of 300 extra residents plus their families, plus their frie

nds, plus the employees who will be at the site, will not add traffic and safety issues to an already unsafe area. I myself have been involved in two fender benders in that roundabout at Yosemite and Lowry Boulevard. I think that this is not irresponsible use of this site and it is not consistent with the neighborhood nor the neighborhood of East Park. I have to iterate again that we as a neighborhood do not feel that there was sufficient community outreach, despite what the developments development the proposed developers have said. Those of us who live on Yosemite, very few of us had any idea this was happening until the rezoning meeting. We're talking about public health, safety and welfare, and I cannot see how increased traffic in this area with no plan that's in place is going to support that. So I'd like to say that I am strongly opposed to this process. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is Steve Zigler. Go ahead. You hear me? Okay? Yes. Okay. Great. My name is Steve Ziegler, and we've been Larry since 2004. My wife and I have three kids, and we also own a business, a radio and a space, actually right across the street from Ashcroft High School. This is not going to impact us financially, positively or negatively simply. And if we to grapple with the concerns of the traffic and its impact on our neighborhood. Thank you,

Councilwoman Sawyer, for working with me and our neighbors on those issues. Much like the East Park neighborhood, our house borders preexisting traffic concerns. Super, super frustrating. It's certainly gotten worse over the years. That being said, this property is not open space. It's its property that's going to be developed. And I feel like what's being proposed is perhaps the most advantageous use for our community outside some sort of police substation. But I. I would like to see this pass. We are for it. I'm supportive of senior living, and I think it's a good mix. Overall in Lowry Southeast Denver. I do trust and believe in the Lowry Redevelopment Authority and everything that things will come to an agreeable solution. So I hope you join me in supporting this project. Thank you. In. Q And our last speaker this evening is Blair Licht and Phil. Go ahead, Blair. Yes, go ahead. My name is Larry, looking out of the addresses for 10/17 Street Street. 2210 Colorado Street across the. Street. Claire, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but for some reason, your audio is really garbled. I wanted to see if if you try again. I know you don't have your camera on, but go ahead. Okay. Dr.. A little bit. We'll go ahead and try it again. Go ahead. Okay. Is that better? Yes, I think so. Okay. I would like to make reference to that certain letter from me on behalf. Of the applicant to the. Members of Council dated January 1st, 2022, and to ensure that my letters entered into the record for tonight's public hearing. The letter outlines in detail how the applicant's request for rezoning. Of the subject property meets and exceeds each of th

e criteria for approval of rezoning. As established by the code. By way of an update to the aforementioned letter, I wanted to let Council know that the applicant. And current owner of the. Property. Bishop Bishop. High. School, have agreed on material terms for a community commitment agreement between those two parties which obligate the allocated use for things. First, to enter into the agreement to provide affordable housing in favor of the city of Denver, obligating the applicant to make 10% of the residential units and the active. Adult building available. To private residents. 80% or less of area median income. Second to work with neighbors, the city and body to strategise. With respect to. Mitigation measures intended to alleviate or remedy existing traffic conditions on the Assembly and Barry Boulevard. Third, to provide a public open space easement in favor of the city. On. Over and through the existing Westerly Creek Trail. On the. Property, which easement will include an application of. The property owner. To. Improve, provide and maintain benches and other amenities along that trail. And finally, to pursue. Opportunities. For publicly available recreational. Programing. On the property subject to city approved. Otherwise, I'm here tonight to answer questions about any of the agreements the applicant has entered into or has agreed to enter into with. Respect to. The application. Thank you in advance. Thank you. I'd like to thank all the members of the community who joined us tonight for the public hearing. That concludes our speakers. We're going to move to questions from members of Council on Council Bill 21, DASH 1371. Council Member Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. I really want to just first thank the community members for coming out and speaking on this issue. It was really helpful to identify a number of the questions that I have for tonight. So to start, I want to ask about the current zoning on the property. So Libya, I think maybe this is a question for you in terms of or possibly if Monti force is still on, I believe it might be a question, a historical question for the LRA, the LRA Redevelopment Authority, but wondering how so? So first, Monti, when what year exactly was the the Lourey community and all of that property conveyed from the U.S. Air Force to the city of number? And Monty, if you go ahead and reintroduce yourself for the public record before you respond. This is Monty Force. I'm the executive director for the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. My address is 130 Rampart Way. Denver 80230. And again, I'm not justifying for or against in just offering any. Historical perspective that I can help with, and I might be fuzzy on some of the facts. It's been a while since this property was conveyed. The property from the Air Force to the Redevelopment Authority for implementation into the master plan was done over a number of years, starting all the way back to 1994. So great. No, that's great. So so in general, what I was a

sking was, you know, when did when was the Library Redevelopment Authority, I guess instituted and what? And so my follow up question to that is, what was the property zoned as back then when in its original form? When the property came to Denver from the Air Force, there was it wasn't zoned. All of the zoning had all the property had to be zoned into Denver. Oh, okay. Great. Thank you. So so I guess follow up question to that and maybe I'm not sure if you're the person to ask about this or not, then the current zoning on the property is ah four. So when the property was conveyed from the Air Force, was there a discussion about what the, what the zoning was going to

be. Because we're zoned city council resolved all but 20% of the city in 2010 into the new zoning code, and this property stayed in the old zoning code in the Chapter 59 zoning code. So I'm wondering, was that a specific decision that was made at that time of conveyance? No. The Air Force, first of all, wasn't involved in the zoning process ever. And often times we tailored zoning to meet the intended uses that we were selling the property for. So the words Bishop match above may have come to us. I don't recall the details exactly asking to put in a ball field. So then we looked for zoning through our zoning consultants to come up with his own district. That would satisfy that need. Okay. That's good to know. Thank you. So. So the current zoning on the property is ah, for which allows for today a senior living facility to be built on the site. So I'm I guess a little I'm trying to unwind them. The issue of is that is that the waivers that that then ensure that it that we have to go through this rezoning. I guess I'm I'm trying to get the background on that. I think I'm probably the wrong person to answer that question. I think. Differently. Yeah. That's what I'm happy to answer. That's okay. This is Marcus Park near 4700 East Sixth Avenue. I am a consultant to the applicant. Mr. Foresman is correct that oftentimes when LRA did transfers, they would put a deed restriction on the property and then find the appropriate zone district. So, Councilwoman, this is zoned for today. I'm looking at the ordinance in front of me. It's a 1998 zoning on this subject property, as Libby mentioned, at the very beginning. It allowed, again to reflect that this was transferred to an educational use. We waived out, which is traditionally how we did things in the early days of Lowry. We waived out all of those other uses except for those educational things. So a church, a school or a theatrical studio could still be on the site. And as Libby said, at less than 37 feet tall today. So that could happen today. There are restrictions on that. And Councilwoman, you are correct in the existing are for an old chapter 59. Senior housing is a permitted use and a house assisted living facility is a use by special review. So that has always been contemplated. I would also mention just quickly that in that Lowe

ry reuse plan, as you saw and was noted in the presentation, it also showed that senior housing is allowed in that Lowry reuse plan always envisioned for this use at that site. Okay. Great. Thank you. I really appreciate that. So the so I guess follow up question to that for Libby. You mentioned that blueprint. Denver has identified this parcel as a future use open space. Is that correct? That is the current future place type. But the plan acknowledges that that applies to large, private, open spaces that are likely to turn over due to their private nature. Got it. Okay. And then is anyone from Parks and Rec here? I would love to just ensure that, you know, is Parks and Rec going? Is there a plan? Or would Parks and Rec be willing to purchase this land for open space for the city of Denver? Yes. We do have a representative here, Kathleen, but Becky should be on. If we can promote her. Kathleen, if you could just hit the raise hand button, maybe so that they can find you in the ten and ten these lists. That'd be great. Thank you. All right. There you go, Councilwoman Kathleen. Hey, Kathleen, thanks so much for being here. Really appreciate it. I just want to reiterate my question in case for some reason, you were not able to hear it while you were getting switched over. This would be a lot easier to do in person, I think. But just want to confirm, is the is Parks and Rec willing to purchase this land for open space use for the city and county of Denver? Kathleen Levesque with Denver Parks and Recreation and Denver Parks and Recreation has not had any conversations with the property owner about purchasing this land and does not have any intent to purchase it. Okay, great. Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. So then let's so open space. Matt, maybe you can answer this question for me. It seems like we have sort of a discussion ruins here or a disagreement between the Lowry reuse plan and Blueprint. Denver. What is Blueprint Denver? I guess what was your sort of take on that in the application? Thank you for the question, Councilwoman Sawyer. Um, I, I guess I would reiterate what Libby said on how it is designated for private space and future use, that it can be turned over for private development. I think we're we're very we're very much in line with many of the criteria and blueprint. Denver, you know, as it relates to the context of of other surrounding designations there, if you look at the future place and street types in the future neighborhood context, they call out for community center suburban neighborhood context. I mean, those are all good fits for for what we're planning here and for this senior living use. Okay. Great. And Matt, while I've got you, I just want to also confirm. So you do you have a signed agreement with host that you will dedicate 10% of the of the spaces or the units to affordable at 80% am I. Yes, we signed it. Host doesn't sign it unless the reason becomes formalized. But yes. And Brad, I hope Brad's on. He co

uld speak to that as well. Host If you would like to see. It, looks like Brad just raised his hand. Perfect. Thank you. Yeah. And while we're waiting, Brad. Yeah, I think we're waiting for. Going to get him in here. There we go. Hey, Brad, thanks for being here. Just wanted to confirm with hosts that that agreement is signed, sealed and delivered. Confirms we have it executed by the winner in our contracting system for authorization on our side if and when the rezoning is approved. Okay, great. Thank you so much. And can you please just introduce yourself for the record? Sorry. Hi, everyone. Brad wanted staff for housing stability or host the city and county of Denver. Perfect. Thank you so much. Really appreciate that. Okay, so there were a few issues that were identified. There was the sort of disagreement between Blueprint and the Lowery reuse plan with regards to the future use type. Libbi, when when blueprint when there is a neighborhood plan because there are many neighborhoods in the city of Denver where there is no neighborhood plan. What does Blueprint say about which one controls the neighborhood plan or blueprint? The neighborhood plan typically controls. Okay. So in this case, then that does that mean that the Lowery redevelopment plan, as put in place when all of those parcels were transferred over, is the controlling document that we should be looking at here. Correct? Yeah. Usually with our analysis. Whenever there's a neighborhood plan. Like, for instance, if blueprints on Bruce's five stories are appropriate and a neighborhood plan says three stories is appropriate. Usually we would go with the. Three stories that's in the neighborhood plan. So typically we defer to that smaller area plan that had kind of more targeted input from the public. Then Blueprint Steinberg, which was a citywide process. Okay, great. I appreciate that. I just want to you know, as I'm going through the criteria that we are, the five criteria that we're required to look at, I want to make sure that I understand, you know, whether this is consistent with the adopted plans, because we have two adopted plans that are potentially not in line with each other. Right. Okay, great. So the so the neighborhood plan is what's going to what's going to guide us there and the neighborhood plan. Can you just refresh my memory on what the neighborhood plan says for this this parcel? The neighborhood plan calls for a mix of uses and that include residential education, campus and community service. And within that residential category, retirement housing and managed care. Facilities are specifically listed. Okay. Great. Thank you. Really appreciate that. And then the the open space section. This may be another question for you. So you can you explain to me the easement and what's happening? Tell me more specifics about what's happening there. Sure. So a couple of things. So there's an existing trail that goes along the west side of the site along Westerly Creek. Unfortunate

ly, that trail is on private land. The land that we are, we are purchasing. It's been used as a public trail. I don't know for how long, but it's so it's being used that way. So one of one of the ask through the community outreach was, can you can you put a public trail easement over this, which will protect effectively forever protect this trail to actually be a true public trail. And it provides great connectivity there between a bunch of the trail system that's on the South and a bunch that's on the north. So we will be doing that as part of this. And the bounds of that easement and exactly where it falls will all be flushed out through the process that we go through with the city there. And then in addition to that, through the again, through the community feedback, we're going to be enhancing that trail experience. You know, no specifics really on what that would be. We've talked about at adventure that trees but you know making that a better trail experience there along Westerly Creek that will now be a public trail . Okay. And then I believe someone mentioned briefly pickleball courts. What is what's that? Yeah. So that was another thing. Through the feedback, they requested that we tried to put a publicly accessible pickleball court there, which we do plan to do if we do run into any. Issues there. With with noise issues, that that is our just our one concern. We would figure out something, something else to put there. That was it was less noisy but was a publicly accessible recreational activity. So that was something that was asked of us and that we will be doing with this development. Okay, great. I appreciate that. And then so that is I appreciate that you have stated your commitment here at the rezoning hearing on the public record. Is there signed paperwork on that? There is not currently, as I think Blair's Blair stated, we are doing a community commitment agreement that we're now working through with Matchbox. You know, the history there of the Jena was spoken about by a few folks. And, you know, we we drafted that in plan with Lorne at one point. And unfortunately for us, we we just found out recently here that that, you know, wasn't that they were not capable of of reviewing and executing that. So we did reach out to a couple other entities. LOWRY Redevelopment Authority, the. Lowry Community Master Association, you know, looking to find another party to do a put on that agreement. Unfortunately, those folks also didn't

have the ability to do that. So we are drafting an agreement that will show that with Matchbox, who is the seller of our site, and we'll be there in the community long term. And so the other, you know, but the other mechanisms that are in place there, as you mentioned, the critical piece, the affordable housing, right. We have the agreement with host and the trail easement, the trail improvements. Those can be handled through the process as well as the publicly accessible recreation ac

tivities that we'll put on the site. We can handle that all through the process. The Denver. Okay. Great. Thank you. And the parking lot. So we heard a lot of comment from the public about the parking lot. Can you talk me through that? Yes, sure. I mean, the site plan is something that is definitely still in flux, having been through the SDB process yet and in an effort to be open with the community and get feedback, you know, we're showing them some very early plans of what we have planned for the site. And I think in the most recent one we showed, we have shown a four storey above ground structure or above ground, part of the structure at the corner of Sports Boulevard and Yosemite. That plan, while it is still in flux, it has not been done in a vacuum. Folks here have mentioned the Lowry Design Review Committee. We've been through several conversations and iterations of that site plan with them, working with them to see what their thoughts were on best ideas for where to locate an above ground structure here. So I think it's a little bit premature on the conversation there. You know, I will say, I know people are concerned about looking at a parking structure, you know, that will be screened again. LOWRY So lucky in that they have these gatekeepers that protect the architecture of. LOWRY And, you know, these further steps will take in the process. They'll be there to enforce the Lowry design review guidelines that have dictated everything that's been built there. Lowry. Okay. Great. Really appreciate that. And I will just say, as an aside, I think there was a speaker earlier who mentioned the way the process works. And I want to just make sure that it's clear for all of the residents and the public what we're talking about here. So the rezoning process happens first and then the site development review process happens second. And so as council, we can only look at the criteria that we're allowed to look at in terms of rezoning. But it's good to get an idea of some of the feedback that the community has had for you and some thoughts about that. And it's good to know that the design review board in Lowrey has very specific requirements and that you're in conversation with them as well. Okay. So then I want to ask a question of, I guess, one of the representatives from Dotty about the traffic. This is an area that my office has spent a significant amount of time with the police department and with Daddy working on. And so I know that there was a community meeting. I was not there because as a quasi judicial role that I have in this rezoning to vote yes or no, I can't be there to hear the discussion. So curious if I can get a report on the conversation and what may have come out of that in terms of potential mitigation of the issues? All right. We've got Dana Hofmann ready to answer that question, Councilwoman. Hi. Deena Hoffman again. Department of Transportation Infrastructure. I'm the community desi

gner for this area. Councilman Sawyer, I can speak to that meeting. So we did have a meeting with the East Park community. It was hosted by LUHN. And the intent of that meeting, just for the record, is to talk through existing transportation issues, not issues very specific to the potential impacts of this rezoning and redevelopment. In terms of the meeting content, so some of it was just hearing concerns from a community about transportation in the surrounding area. I would summarize that as primarily speeding safety issues within the traffic circle there at Yosemite and other traffic circles and excuse me, roundabouts there and the other roundabouts in the area. And then also some requests for additional crossing treatments. Dottie has looked into some of these concerns prior to that meeting and also subsequent to that meeting and some of the concerns we've heard more recently brought up by this development. One of the changes that will be coming as a result of that additional analysis are some safety improvements at the roundabout there, and those will primarily be done with signage and striping, and it will better clarify essentially which lane assignment cars will be entering into making sure that folks are traveling at an appropriate speed as they enter into the roundabouts. I have the draft work order available, which I can share with council if you'd like. There are just minor modifications being made to that before it's approved and it goes out. So that's probably the most significant change that's being made at this point in response to community concerns. We are going to look at some additional crossing treatments. There are none that are approved at this point. I hope that helps. Yeah, that was great. Thank you. Really appreciate that

information. And, you know, oftentimes when we have a development like this, the developer makes a commitment to do a traffic study during the site development review plan and potentially even make some upgrades or enhancements to the roadways, the travel ways outside of but adjacent to the development. Has anything like that happened here, Dana? Do you know or maybe Matt, maybe you can speak to that. Yeah. Dana, go. Ahead. I guess I'll go ahead, Dana. But we'll make sure to hear from both of you. So, Dana. Matt may want to speak to this and Marco also could speak to this as well. So we don't have any specific commitments from the developer, although, you know, we've definitely heard interest and doing best interests for the neighbors. What I am aware of is that some a traffic study would be conducted once the development was ongoing. Some specific requirements we've asked for if that traffic study was done. So so Marco could speak in more detail about what they would have to look at moving forward. But there aren't any commitments at this time. Okay. Great. Matt, did you want to jump in? Thanks, Dana. Did you want to jump in and fill out some some of that information further? Sure.

I mean, I'll just reiterate that we want to be part of the solution here and we want it to be safe for our residents as well as the community. Right. So certainly we were doing a full traffic study through the typical process here in Denver for through the ACP and the civil design. And it's expanding the scope of that to collect some more data points to help Doddy come up with ideas or solutions here. I mean, we're definitely open to doing that and we want to be a part of the solution here and see how our development could help alleviate some of these concerns. Okay, great. And so is there have you committed to I guess it's hard without a good neighbor agreement based on the inability of any one particular organization within Lowry to have the I guess, the ability to do a good neighbor agreement. Have you committed to that in some other way, or what does that look like? Not at this time other than obviously, you know, we're here saying it now on public record that we want to be a part of the solution. And and, you know, we're going to be long term members of this community. So we want to be a part of that. We spoke to the Matchbox that we're working on. So that's an avenue we could potentially take there. But I guess that's yeah, we're still working through that. So. Okay, great. Appreciate it. I've got a few other questions, but I know that there are a couple of other council members with their hands up in the queue. So I'm going to step back and let them answer their questions. And then if my questions are not answered based on the things that they ask, I will pop back into the queue. Thanks, Madam President. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Sawyer. We're going to go ahead and go to Councilmember Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I'll be brief. I just have one question. I need a clarification. Libby, can you tell me, reading through the staff report on this five story, three story, the existing zoning allows three stories. The request is for a five story zoning, but the Lowry design guidelines limited two apparently to four stories. And so I'm a little concerned why we selected the SMU five rather than the SMU three with waivers to four stories, rather than just giving a blanket entitlement to five stories. When we did Loreto Heights, we did SMU three along federal, but with a waiver to allow up to five stories. And so why what is the mechanism in the rezoning that we're being asked to vote on tonight that would guarantee that it will not be five stories, but it will be, in fact, limited to 50 feet. I appreciate the question. It is a rather convoluted story with what's existing and what's allowed with the some X viruses. LOWRY But the Lowry Design Review Committee will be reviewing this in tandem with the site development plan process. And so any development within this area is going to have to meet the design guidelines and go through that review process, which would limit the building to four stories

slash 50 feet. So that is the mechanism. Okay. Is there a mechanism within the Lowry? That's that's all the way on the other end of town. I don't get out that far all that often. So I'm just curious, is there anything in the Lowry design guidelines process that allows it to be changed down the road? In other words, that we're letting loose. We're being asked to let loose an entitlement for five storeys, 70 feet. Could those design guidelines change down the road as early as this design review on this project prints, for instance? And that is a really good question. I do know that they did have a older version of design guidelines, and the one that they have now is only a couple of years old. And some of their terminology and some of the ways that they're addressing things have changed. But I don't know how much like they're. The design guidelines themselves and height limitations have changed. Okay, so I understand, you know, things change. Times change. This was 1994. Could Marcus Parker maybe address that? That Marcus, you were there at the time.

Can you tell us what is the process with the design guidelines and how can they be revised or would they be revised within the life of this project? Absolutely. And Councilman, I just want to stay on record again that all the RC we've actually already started and going through that process and LOWRY And so this site actually going through it is already capped at that 45 feet that we talked about. It's interesting, Councilman. It kind of is somewhat out of order the way it happens there. But we actually and that's why the community knows a lot, if you will, about the suggested parking garage and so forth, is because there is this process. So, Councilman, we have gone through there as to your question. There may be a way somebody mentioned that you didn't get a variance for some of the structures on the roof, but all across. LOWRY There is a height limitation. And, Councilman, that has been true. The only thing I read, though, is that existing buildings like the hangar immediately to the west of us is 67 feet. So the big bear ice arena, which is right there, is actually something that's higher than that. We certainly will not get there. So, Councilman, we will stay at that 45 feet. Okay. Thank you. I think the hangars were there long before ABC, long before the people were there. That's right. Thanks. Thank you, ma'am. That's all I have. All right. Thank you. Councilman Flynn. Marcus, for the public record, would you please introduce yourself? Absolutely. Marcus Park, near 4700 East Sixth Avenue, consultant to the developer. All right, great. And prior to you, we had Libby Kiser, our community planning and development planner. And so thank you, Councilmember Flynn. We're going to move to Council Member Sandoval. We're going to have to have you a new councilwoman. For some reason, we're not hearing your audio. Okay. We're going to go ahead and see if you can work on that or if we need to have yo

u leave the meeting, councilman, and bounce back in. We can certainly do that. Councilman Cashman, do you want to go ahead and go ahead with your questions? Yes, thank you. Just one quick question. Whether it's from Marcus or the developer, if there's someone there. That can answer. I'm just wondering, a lot has been made people concerned about the view of the parking garage. We see a lot. Of developments. Now and now a days where the parking garage is wrapped by the residences. Is that an option? Has it been. Considered? Just wondering. Yeah. Councilman. All this joker. Marcus Falkner consultancy. The Development. We have started that process. As I mentioned, the DRC. We will have to go through the full step and want those neighbors, particularly the neighbors immediately across the street to be involved in that. So, Councilman, we did show some massing and I think, frankly, that's what shows brought those comments forward. I think that massing we will go through that architectural review and talk about screening all of that. I would note that someone who's been involved in Lowery a long time, councilman, this is a wonderful thing that we're dealing with, is actually parking structures immediately across the street. It's a very large parking field. And that really leads to kind of something that I don't think is the type of context that we want to develop today. So we are working through those challenges. Councilman, I guarantee you those neighbors will be involved. Lowery has a great process that that LDR. So, yes, sir, there are some slight limitations on that, that low water table. But we will work through those issues with the neighbors and find the proper screening. All right. Thank you, Marcus. Appreciate it. All right. Thank you, Councilman Cashman. Next up, we have Councilmember Sandoval. Can you hear me now? Yes. Okay. I had to tell the woman the technical difficulties. The matrix is in the computer. So I don't know who this question will go to, but when Larry was built out, how much affordable, affordable housing was developed with this master plan? So, Councilman, I'll defer to Marni Fauci if he is still on. One thing I will note if he's maybe getting promoted is that we were subject to the original Ice Age ordinance, so we had inclusionary housing throughout the site. We greatly exceeded LRA, greatly receded that 10% limitation. So, Councilman, there was an agreement for all of Lowry, including Boulevard one, which is the last phase that was developed on the west side of Quebec. So this subject property, if you will, Councilwoman, was already subject to that agreement, to a preexisting agreement. The neighbor said that's not enough. We frankly agreed with them. We said we wanted to go further. And we believe this is the first senior housing deal that actually has a deed. Restricted affordable housing agreement in place with host. So you're saying what I hear you said was like 10%. So 10% of housing. So including single uni

t homes, single family homes, 10% of apartments. Because I know Central Park had like a specific master plan where they had a portable housing developer. Who was your affordable housing developer? Councilman, I'm sorry again, if I'm blind and don't know if money force can answer it. So

you let me jump in. Monte is on so we might take it over. And Monte, if you want to introduce yourself for the public record. Marty Faust. I'm the executive director for the Lowry Redevelopment Authority. And the. Affordable housing for all of Lowry was entered into? Well, first of all, there was the I show. We negotiated a 200 units of for sale units. It was in that plan. But overall, affordable housing amounts to about 800 units in Lowry between rental housing for formerly homeless and for sale units. Okay. And that was that. Thank you, Marty. And that was throughout the redevelopment of the whole entire project, is that correct? Right. Yeah. Yes. Okay. And then who is your affordable housing developer? Is it same as the developer who built everything? And then were they restricted? Or can you explain that process a little bit? It's a fairly complicated but the um we the for sale housing was developed by a land trust. It was not deed restricted. It was a land trust, the Colorado community land trust to develop those properties with help from the Lowry Redevelopment Authority as to affordable housing for the formerly homeless. That was done through the Colorado Coalition for the Homeless and some other force or for rent developers as well as we required certain developers when they were developing property to include affordable rentals in the program. It goes to multiple developers. Okay, I hear you. I got that. Thank you. And then a comment was just made. And inform us who are as familiar with the whole Lowry development. It was said that during the site development plan that there would be participation by the public. That doesn't happen in northwest Denver. If a project gets rezoning and a site development plan goes through the process. It's between the community planning and development development services more specifically and all of the processes that go through a site development plan. So for those who are watching this, Lowry have a different site development plan that people can actually participate in. Who answered this in part. And that is the Lowry Community Master Association has oversight of the Lowry Design Review Committee, and I'm sure that they post their meetings and projects on the website as they're going through the process. It'd be better directed actually to the Lowry Community Master Association because they actually now control the design review, that is the community design controls to review it. So I understand her design review process. I'm just I'm just confused on how it keeps being said that the public who are on here, who have talked in opposition can be part of this site development plan is I just don't understand where there's

a trigger that would have public participation in the State Department then. Can someone on the team help me understand. That. It's all in the what I site I can. Sorry Matt. If you jumped in Marcus partner again, what I cited was exactly what Marnie Faust just mentioned, the elder C Lowry Design Review Committee. Those are public meetings, Councilwoman, that are posted for members of the public to be able to attend. And they have a process that goes through that. There's public comments that would be allowed, Councilwoman. And I'm sorry, I don't know if it's at the beginning of the end of the meeting. That is a process, one of the processes that we've already started going through, and they had a public posted meeting and where they allowed that to happen. And we will continue to go through that process. For the Site Development Fund. And so when you do the site development, spend the whole entire site development spend, so the traffic, the water, wastewater, all of the things that have to be checked off on the site development spend that's posted through this. RC Yeah, I think their purview is a little less right councilman than the whole councilwoman and the whole ACP, but all of the elements that are within their purview will be available. I think what we're offering to do and we have done throughout, is to continue to communicate with those neighbors. So, Councilman, we're happy to to share some of those details, give updates at the age of the RC process. Lowry is known, as you say, for a little bit of a different process where that is a much more open and involved process that will go through on the site plan. Okay. Thank you. And Libya, I have a question for you. So although this is been asked for five story entitlement, did I hear correctly that this whole area has a height cap at 45 feet, which I think is under five stories. So even though they're going asking for an entitlement of five stories, they can't build five stories. Is that is that what I'm understanding? It is correct. Yeah. Sorry that that's confusing. But per the DRC process. They had their design guidelines that max height at four stories. And I do believe that the applicant's team is actually pursuing 50 feet instead of the 45 feet. That's typical, but that is still significantly less than the 70 feet that would be allowed with the five storey s-max. Okay. That's I think that's a that's a valid point for this hearing, is that although they're asking for more entitlement, that there's already a cap at 45 feet, can one someone from the development team. Is it are you going to 50 feet? Is that including all of the equipment on top of the building, the back and the

elevator shaft? Or are you going 50 feet plus the age back and elevator shaft? Yes, this is metformin with native properties, but we're certainly not far enough along the design process to know exactly what the heights will be. But let me add some clarity on the 50 feet. So we did go through a height variance process

, a public process with the DRC to go from 45 to 50. And the reason for that is you really can't even fit a four storey building with a flat roof and 45 feet. So we made that case to them as well as it allows us to do more articulate architectural articulation along the roofline. Right. Going up and down, you know, things that make it look like not one big massive block. So that was really the reason for the 50 feet as it relates to mechanical screening, mechanical penthouses. Yes, that is outside of the 50 feet. That's how they've written the Lowry design review code. But you know, those the goal is right to set those back into the middle of the roof. And and you'd have to be standing a pretty good distance away to see those. But those are not within that 50 foot 50 foot restriction. Okay. I have one question for you. One last question for you. I keep hearing public comment about the water table. Have you or has your team done study that indicates the water tables higher over in this neck of the woods than it is in other places in Denver. I can't speak to how it compares to other places in Denver. But, yes, we do have a relatively high ground water table here. You are right next to Western Leigh Creek there. Right. So I think that's part of it. I'm not a geotech expert, but yes, we do have some areas on that site that seem to be higher than we might typically see in Denver. Okay. Thank you, Madam President, first of all, for my questions. Thank you, Councilmember Sandoval. And we're going to go ahead and move to Councilmember Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. Some of my questions have been asked, but I did want to ask a couple that have not been asked. I heard some reference to other senior living, one that I don't know if it existed and then went away or they had applied for the zoning to do it and it never happened. But Marcus, I see you on there. How many senior living projects are on the Lowrey property? Yes, Councilwoman. So just for clarification, there was a senior housing development that was just about the equivalent of four or five, maybe six blocks to the west of the site that went away because, councilwoman, that was a facility that came from the Air Force, had very aged facilities. And interestingly enough, when that went away, it became a very intense multi-family development. So that became a much more intense multifamily use. There is councilwoman and existing senior center right out of callback that has a facility there. Matt and his team are experts in this. They did a very detailed analysis, market analysis of the site, and there was a remarkable need for senior housing. It's actually reflected in the equity analysis in an ad that went through the zoning and really looked at this was very much needed. So we would believe that this is actually a very beneficial use and a very needed use at this site. So the market analysis wasn't just of the Lowry community. It was of the broader age population that needs a

ffordable or needs senior housing, but includes the 10% that's in it. Okay. That's correct, Councilwoman. Okay. And then I wanted to get. The. Lowry folks back on. Because I had a question about the. So the design review process that you talked about with Councilwoman Sandoval. So that was that was to ensure that all the new buildings coming in met that criteria. But for the ones that were assumed because some of these properties were of gifted, if you will, to some of those nonprofits. Correct. Monte, are you on? We do have to go. Ahead on muted now. Okay. Okay. So so the properties that were gifted to nonprofits and this was back when Councilwoman Polly Flowback was the councilwoman of this district. And I remember her and Cathy Reynolds going to Washington and asking for \$5 million to assist because there were more nonprofits that had. Basically applied for some of those existing buildings. And Marcus just talked about one of them that just went away. Right. But. Some of those nonprofits were given money to go do their projects elsewhere as opposed to on the the Lowry property. But for those that did remain. Did they have to go through or if they do upgrades in the future, will they have to go through the design review process? Very good memory from those days. Yes. The design review. Just a couple of questions there. But first of all, the design review process holds for any past development that has already occurred and also applies to anybody that is going through the process now for redevelopment of a site. We anticipated that there would be redevelopment of properties or you know, it's been 25 years plus since the original buildings were first done here. So, yes, we anticipated that there would be changes and that there would be a need for continued design oversight on redevelopment of properties. And yes, there were a number of affordable housing

units that were actually created off of Lowry based on the settlement agreement between HUD and numerous parties. Right. Okay. Those are all the questions I have. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Monte. All right. Thank you, Councilman Ortega. Councilwoman Sawyer, we've got your back up. Thanks, Madam President. I think the vast majority of my questions have been answered.

Really appreciate. I feel like there's like so many moving parts here. The history of Lowry is very complicated. And there are, for lack of a better term, a lot of hands in the pot when it comes to anything happening in Lowry, a lot of different oversight and then a lot of different community outreach. So I really appreciate all of those different kind of sectors coming together to explain, you know, what is happening here and some of the complicated challenges that are happening with this rezoning, which is why so many questions have been answered. I'm wondering, I think sort of final question. If Blair is still in the queue somewhere and Blair, if you don't mind raising your hand, if you are if we could upgrade her. I fee

I like I just would like some more clarification. You know, Matt, no offense. You seem like a great guy. United Properties seems great, but I don't trust you. I would like to know a little bit more about an agreement and what that might look like in terms of, you know, there's a lot of there's a lot of really good promises being made. But I would like more certainty the attorney in me needs more certainty than that. So, Blair, if you are back up, would you mind kind of just walking through how that certainty might end up existing? I'd really appreciate it. Thanks. Sure this is Blair lifting files. Attorney for the. Applicant. I missed part of your question while I was being upgraded, so let me know if I don't answer it. But the applicant and much boss have come to a material term agreement. It's not signed, but we have agreed on the material terms of what we're calling a community commitment agreement. And this is sort of in lieu of some of the things that. We have offered to. Put in writing in favor of one. And they have said that they're unable to sign an agreement at this time. And so we've taken the. Same community. Commitments that were intended to go. Into that agreement with one and put it into an agreement with us. Because as everyone, you're not as much by much, but. We'll be retaining the property across the street by the high school. And so there are three primary components to the. Agreement, I would say. The first is obligating us. As the applicant properties to sign the agreement to build affordable. Housing. I think that's in your your pocket and I think you can see that. Both us and. The applicant is signed that. That becomes effective. Upon the rezoning getting. Approved. The second piece is. An acknowledgment by both my. Staff and the applicant that there are some existing traffic conditions that are. Causing some consternation among the neighbors and some concerns about safety and whatnot. There's a commitment. In there for. The developer. To work with the residents of the neighborhood. And members of the community. The city. And Dottie to strategize with respect to mitigation. Measures that are intended to alleviate or remediate those existing traffic conditions. So we don't know exactly. What those are. We do know. What we can. Do to assist or are committed to helping with that process and continuing to engage with the neighborhood. As we do. So. And the third and final piece is an obligation. To grant an. Open space easement to the city over the existing Westerly Creek Trail and to improve that trail to provide benches and other amenities. The easement itself will also obligate the property owner to maintain those the trail, the benches, any other amenities in perpetuity. And then finally, there is an agreement to pursue opportunities for recreational. Programing on the property. You guys have heard us talk about a pickleball court. I think that the applicant is excited about a pickleball court. There's some concerns about.

Noise and. If that isn't the exact public, the available amenities, and we will come up with something else. That works for the community to serve. Those recreational interests. Okay. Great. Thank you. So I have never heard of this before. And do you know, is this the first time that something like this has ever been done? As far as I'm aware. Yes. It really looks like a good neighbor agreement, to be honest with you. But instead of being with an R.A., it's actually with another property owner and with another entity in in the neighborhood. I think Matt had previously mentioned that we had talked to both the FEMA and the LRA to see if they were interested in being a counterparty. Right. All agreements need a party and a counterparty. And they had also said that they were unable to sign it for a variety of reasons. And so because of I don't want to speak for much about. That, because they will continue to be a neighbor. They do have a vested interest in being as a community member and being. Supporting. That. That's a. Concern of. Mine and whatnot. And they have the ability to be a counterparty and. Enter into. This agreement. So I'm not aware that this has been

done before. But it's still an enforceable agreement between two parties. Okay. Great. Thank you. Really appreciate the clarity on that. Thanks so much. Thanks so much, Madam President. That, I think is the end of my question. All right. Well, thank you, Blair. And thank you, Councilman Sawyer. The public hearing is now closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 20 1-1371. Council Member Sawyer. Thank you, Madam President. This is a tough one, I have to say. Again, I want to thank the community for coming out and not just coming out tonight to speak on this, but repeatedly and really engaging with this potential development and making it, you know, truly better. I have always said that if something is going to be developed, it has to provide a community benefit and it has to be something that works for the community or it's not worth doing it. So, you know, for example, I'm also concerned about the traffic circles I drive over in this area all the time. And it's really bad. So I really appreciate Dottie's willingness to engage in this as well and find some solutions during the site process that makes sense for the community and works for the community should this rezoning be approved. So, you know, I've talked about the traffic circles and the concerns there and how the developer has gone above and beyond to be willing. To provide some mitigation. I've talked about, you know, the concern of green space, open space and how that kind of doesn't mesh necessarily. Blueprint number doesn't necessarily mesh. I'm sorry, it's getting late with the Lowry reuse plan, but that the Lowry reuse plan is really the thing that controls here, you know, it's incredibly frustrating that, you know, nothing has been done yet in terms of those rounds.

dabouts. But I'm really excited to hear that there are improvements coming and appreciate all of the work that the Lowry United Neighborhoods Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Group has done with Dottie and with the community on that. So, you know, that's really exciting. And I think, you know, this has gone on really long, so I'll keep it short. You know, this property is going to be developed, right? Matchbox has said that they have goals that they want to achieve. And the way that they as a school can achieve those goals is by selling this property. I looked into it and asked some questions and I know that there were a number of other offers for this property. This was the only one that provided a community benefit at all. All of the other ones were more multi-family residential properties, like the ones that we just talked about a minute ago where there used to be an assisted living facility that closed and then was raised and then a number of multi-family units were built on that land. So I don't want the same thing to happen here. If we can ensure that there is a community benefit that does help, you know, not only in terms of affordability, but in terms of aging in place and in terms of more options. I really am appreciative of that. I also think it's important to note that this developer, not once but twice, was able to say tonight that they are offering something that is doesn't exist in the city and county of Denver right now. So not only with the agreement to formalize the open space easements and the, you know, traffic mitigation, but and the outreach to the community. But also then that this is the first of its kind in terms of providing affordable units specifically to seniors. Our community is struggling with that, and that will only continue and get worse over time because of the number of people who are aging in East Denver and because right now we are seeing that those people are getting lost to Arizona and to Littleton. That's where they go because there's no place for them to age in place in the city and county of Denver that's affordable. And when they're ready to move out of their larger houses for whatever reason, that's the only choice they have. So it is really exciting, I think, to see that I think it's going to, you know, fill a community benefit. And so I'm really, you know, I had to work through the consistency with adopted plans piece. But I think that this is extraordinary what we have been able to get from the community in terms of feedback, what the developer has said that they are willing to do. It's extraordinary. And, you know, given the fact that it's our fourth with waivers right now. So, I mean, tomorrow there could be a four story set of classrooms built on that site. That is, I think, really important to recognize as well. And so, you know, walking through the specific criteria that we are looking at, I am hesitant, but I am supportive of this. So. Thanks, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Sa

wyer. And I don't have anybody else in the queue. And so I'll go ahead and round out the comments that I do believe this meets the rezoning criteria. I want to sincerely thank the community members who came and testified tonight and the robust questions and answer session that we had to really dig into this a bit more. And so I will be supporting this this evening as well. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 21, dash 1371, please. Sawyer, I. Torres. I am black. I see tobacco. I. Clark. I.

Flinn. I. Herndon. I. Paint. I. Cashman. I can eat. Ortega. I Sandoval. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announced results. 12 Eyes, 12 eyes. Counsel build 20 1-1371 has passed again. Thank you to the community members and city staff who stayed with us for that hearing. We're going to go ahead and move on to the next one. Councilmember say to Baca, will you please put council bill 20 1-1372 on the floor for final passage? We're not seeing any other hands raised. And so we're going to go ahead and move on this evening. There are no presentations. There are no communications. There is one proclamation being read this evening. Councilmember Ortega, will you please read Proclamation 22, dash zero zero for one, please. Yes, ma'am. Be happy to do so. Proclamation 20 2-0041. Welcoming the 116th National Western Stock Show, Rodeo and Horse Show to Denver and celebrating opening of the CSU Spur campus as part of the Reimagine National Western Center. Whereas, the 116th National Historic Stock Show, Rodeo and Horse Show opened in Denver on January the eighth. And. WHEREAS, National Western structure celebrates the Western heritage of Denver in Colorado and showcases the diversity of Western culture throughout through the Mexican Rodeo Extra Extravaganza and the MLK Junior African American Heritage Rodeo. And where, as National Restaurant Stock shows, Colorado State University and the city and county of Denver are building a new campus at the National Western Center and have engaged the adjacent Globeville, Elyria, Swansea communities as neighbors and partners and where, as the new National Western Center is taking shape with the opening of the world class Stockyards and Stockyards Event Center, as well as the VTA building, the first of three buildings at the new CSU Spur campus is to be celebrated. And. WHEREAS, the campus will be an international center of excellence in agricultural innovation, education, research and technology and entertainment serving the needs of the urban and rural Colorado. And. WHEREAS, National Restaurant Stock Show, known as the Super Bowl of Livestock Shows, attracts more than 700,000 visitors and more than 40 states and 30 countries and contributes \$120 million to Denver's economy. And. WHEREAS, National Restaurant Stock Show has established a scholarship program for Denver students to educate the next generation of leaders in traditional and emerging fields in agriculture to address local and global issues.

And we're as CSU spur focused on education, innovation, research and service to community has partnered with the schools and nonprofits in the Globeville, in Elyria, Swansea and Neighborhoods to provide educational programing services in partnership, particularly in the areas of food, health and water. Whereas CSU has created the first scholarship for students from Globeville areas once a year to support their education and any CSU system at any CSU system campus. Whereas 2022 will feature over 100 events over the 16 day running, including rodeos for dance animal exhibitions and judging horse shows, children's farmyard and much more. Whereas the National History Stock Show has committed to implement the Public Health Protection Plan approved by the Department of Public Health and Environment. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed by the Council, the city and county of Denver that the 116th National Western Stock Show, Rodeo and Horse Show is welcome to Denver, and residents are encouraged to saddle up and enjoy the entertaining and educational events at the show. The opening of the Beta Building, the CSU campus's first facility is to be celebrated. And number three, that the clerk of the city and county shall a test and affix the seal of the city and county of Denver to this proclamation. And then a copy will be transmitted to the Western Stock Show Association and CSU Spur. Thank you, Councilmember Ortega. Your motion to adopt a move for the adoption of proclamation number 20 20041. Thank you. We've got the motion and the second to move the proclamation to be adopted this evening. Comments by members of Council. Councilmember Ortega. Thank you, Madam President. Typically we do this the week before the stock show actually launches. Somewhere in the communications we we missed that. So wanted to get that on our radar. Obviously, with COVID, you know, large crowds. The precautions have been put into place. And, you know, it was drawn to some of our attention that there was some language in part of the communication from a national western that said it would be lightly enforced. That has been taken out. It's been changed to ensure that the safety of everybody at this event is going to be taken care of. But this is, you know, National Western did not have a an event last year because of COVID. And this year, you know, because there had been more protections. Everybody we were assuming everybody is getting the vaccines so that we're we're all protecting each other. But this event really does bring the urban and the rural communities together. It's a great education opportunity, especially for our kids. I don't know if DPS is taking kids out there this year, but for for many inner city kids, they've never seen farm animals up front where

they can pet some of the small chickens and, you know, some of the the potbelly pigs and other animals that are brought to the event. This really gives our economy a shot in the arm every January when the economy seems to d

ecline somewhat after the holidays. And so, you know, those revenues will stream in to our city coffers and help offset the costs of some of our other services that we provide back to the community. I understand Councilman Herndon will be making an announcement that I don't want to steal his thunder, but I think you'll have something fun to share with us anyway . I just would encourage all of my colleagues to support this tonight. I see Councilman Hines is wearing his cowboy hat. But you know, this this is a fun event. The precautions are being taken. If you have an opportunity to go and take your families, just make sure you mask up and, you know, wash your hands. Use the sanitary products to keep your hand sanitized and. We'll all keep each other safe. So. Just hope you all support this tonight. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Ortega. We've got Councilman Hines. You're next. Thank you, ma'am. I, I, i live. You know, as everyone knows, I live here in district ten, right in the center of the city. And before I forget, I actually got the idea of wearing the hat from Councilmember Black. She she did it first. But I actually grew up in a small town in East Texas or acts outside of a small town in East Texas. And I was kind enough to be invited to attend a national Western. Go to the National Western facility on Friday. And it reminded me a lot of where I grew up and hadn't really thought about the Expo Center and negative negativities, which had the the rodeo and the socks show for for East Texas. But it was a whole lot of fun and brought up a whole lot of memories. So I want to thank the National Center for all you do and and particularly this talk show, because it brought back memories of childhood. Good memories of childhood. So thank you so much. Wonderful. Thank you. Councilmember Hines, Councilmember Herndon. Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank Councilwoman Ortega because I thought about that last week and said, hey, we didn't do the stock show proclamation, so I'm glad that we're able to do it. Sadly, the weather and the cold temperatures didn't allow the parade to happen. But excited and moving forward and not not an announcement, but I am I'm very excited that my son C.J. will be mutton busting in this stock show season in a couple of weekends. And he is more excited than I am. We've been practicing on some pillows here in in the Herndon household. So we're excited to participate and look forward to that. And I want to wish everyone a great stock show season. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you. Councilmember Herndon I wondered what the announcement was going to be and that couldn't be any better of an announcement. What a memory for for both you and him. And so good luck to C.J. on that. I know when they used to when somebody used to win it, you might get some animal like a rabbit or a chicken or something. And I think they just give trophies. So thankfully, you're not going to go home with any additional pets. Councilman Her

ndon, this evening, I am more than happy to support this proclamation as well and will go ahead and follow through with the vote here. Madam Secretary, roll call, please. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Sawyer, I. Torres. I am black. I see tobacco. I. Clark. I. Flynn. He ha. I. Herndon. I. Can, I. Can. I. Can eat. I. Madam President, I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce results. 13 Eyes. 13 Eyes. Proclamation 20 2-00 for one has been adopted. We have 5 minutes for a proclamation acceptance. Councilmember Ortega, we'll go ahead and start that five minute timer. And it looks like we've got both of your speakers there. And so I'll go ahead and let you introduce them. Yeah. So I want to introduce Paul Andrews, who's the CEO of the National Western Stock Show, and then Tony Frank, who is our CSU chancellor. If you walk and if the floor is yours. Well, thank you. Members of council, can you hear us okay? We're both in my office. Okay. All right. Well, first of all, thank you. That is quite a moving proclamation. Uh, on behalf of the board of directors of the Western Stock Show Association. And I sit here next to Tony Frank, the Chancellor issue, but he's also a board member of the nation of Leicester and stock shall be wholeheartedly accept the proclamation. And thank you for your great dedication to the National Western Stock Show and your great dedication to the City of Denver in these trying times over the weekend we had 86,000 people attend in two days for the National Western. I think most of you know that about 60% of our show is outdoors, so we feel very good about what we've done here. Working with Denver Health and the Mass of the Doors, both signage in Spanish and English. And I can tell you from personal witnessing, 99% of the people that come through those doors have a mask on that they brought from their their place. And if they forgot it, we've got one for them. So we feel good about that. And

boy, we're off to a great start. Three nights of PBR bull riding start tonight and the crowds are coming in strong for that. And our rodeo series starts up again here this Thursday night, and our horse shows start up again this Thursday night after the PBR exit. So thank you again for all that you do. And let me now turn to my colleague, Tony Frank, so he can tell you all about the CSU buildings that have the grand opening as well. First of all, thanks to all of you for the proclamation. Thanks very much for your service to the city of Denver. We're proud to have to have been a longtime partner with the stock show literally since the stock show opened. As Paul continues to remind me. The president of CSU used to pay students a quarter to come to the stock show. We no longer pay students to come, but we still love the partnership. We're very proud to be partners in this project. The neighbors of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea have been very welcoming to us, helping us to get on our feet as an anchor institution, and we look forward to being part

ners there with them for a very, very long time. You heard mentioned in the proclamation of the scholarship, which is something we're also very proud of and look forward to expanding. Our Vina building had its ribbon cutting on Friday, its grand opening. It's on Saturday, which is CSU day at the stock show. The Terra and hydro buildings will open later in this year. And we hope you'll all have a chance to come out and see these facilities. We think that over their lifetime, they'll make a big difference for a lot of young men and women paving a pathway to college for the next generation. Thank you so much. Thank you both. Thank you both. Thank you, Councilman Ortega, for sponsoring the proclamation. And Chancellor Frank and Mr. Andrews, we appreciate all of your work on behalf of the stock show and this important event, but then also economic driver for not only our city but the surrounding cities in Colorado and even outside our state. And so thank you very much and good luck to all of the rodeo contestants out there and especially C.J. Herndon. We'll be rooting for that little buster as he does the button bustin. All right. Very good. Thank you, Madam Secretary. 11 Eyes. Council Resolution 22, dash 201 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, please put the next item up on our screens. Councilmember Flynn, go ahead with your comments on resolution 159, please. Thank you, Madam President. I don't want anybody up here on the dais to faint when I say that I am going to vote yes on a contract that includes red light cameras that do not work because they also contain the renewal of our photo radar speeding van program, which I think is essential for safety in our neighborhoods. I think it's disappointing that the agencies have combined the two because, well, just last week we were in a meeting with Dotti and some people from Harvey Park about improvements on Yale Avenue between federal between Irving and Sheridan. And one of the members of the public remarked that the traffic signals along there, the other three at Irving, Lowell and Raleigh, there seem to be more red light running at the one in Lowell. And so I noted for everybody present that that's because the yellow time at the one on Lowell. Is inconsistent with the other two. That's why you don't see red light running at the other two as much as you do at the one at Raleigh. So I think it's disappointing that the city agencies seem intent on perpetuating red light running when we know there's a way to effectively eliminate all but intentional and distracted driving cases of red light running, leaving in place dangerous situations where we've identified intersections with a high level of red light running, leaving in place the traffic engineering shortcoming that induces red light running, which is necessary to make red light cameras profitable. I think borderlines on negligence when there are accidents. We know. For instance, in California, where the state legislature adopted requirements

for cities that use cameras to follow a certain formula for setting the yellow change interval, the timing of the yellow light. We know that cities up and down the state have removed their cameras because they no longer had significant red light running. And I mentioned when we when we postponed these contracts about a year or so ago, the case of Loma Linda, California, where one intersection averaged about 250 violations a month, that one approach on one of their streets and Loma Linda, 250 a month. And when they added a little bit of yellow time to the two, the traffic signal violations went down to six per month. And as I said a year ago, how many folks would like to stand at an intersection in Denver and not see anything but one violation every five days at a red light? But the agencies seem intent on combining and packaging the red light cameras with the what I believe is the positive nature of this contract, which is the photo radar speeding than we are needlessly fining drivers who are caught in our own engineering deficiencies that we are refusing to adequately fix. Since 2008, when this program started, all four of our camera intersections better enforced. And I think this is this is one of the reasons I'm voting for it, by the

way, because this new contract will allow us to remove the cameras from those locations and move them around. But they've been at the same four locations ever since 2008. And all of those are on corridors that serve our underserved and marginalized neighborhoods. Three of the four primarily impact commuters from the West Side, including my district. When they come in on Sixth Avenue and go up Lincoln and they return home on Eighth Avenue through Speer. Three times a day, commuters from my area who work downtown go through these. And then the last one, the fourth one is up in on Northeast Park Hill and Central Park, borderline on Quebec, also both with all these locations. Affecting those neighborhoods. But otherwise, people who might live in southeast Denver or South Denver or central Denver, they might not even know we have red light cameras in them because they don't have the opportunity to go through them. When you look at the data that was provided to me by the department, police department. There has been since we instituted this program. There's been a 92% increase in red light running through violations from 2014 through last year. 92%. The data on accidents is also on crashes is also very ambivalent because there's such a short dataset from before we started the program in 2008. There's very little data just two or three years, and you can see that the number of T-Bone accidents from year to year might be the same as they were before the red light cameras went in. I think it's an abject failure when we know. From the California experience. That setting the yellow time properly and appropriately for the traffic conditions virtually eliminates red light running. As I said, the only saving grace is

s that will be able to, for me in this contract is that we'll be able to finally move them from sixth in Kalamazoo and from eighth and Speer and sixth and Lincoln and 36 and Quebec and put to put them in some other parts of town for a change. Instead of draining the wallets of drivers who otherwise are driving safely but are caught in our engineering shortcomings. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. And see no other speakers in the queue. We'll go ahead and move. Move forward on the agenda. Madam Secretary, would you please put the next item up on our screens? Councilmember Clark, will you please put Bill 328 on the floor for publication? Thank you. I'll do a recap. Under resolutions, council member Flynn has called out Resolutions 348, 349, 350 and 351 for a postponement under bills for introduction. No items have been called out under bills for final consideration. No items have been called out under pending. No items have been called out. Madam Secretary, would you please put the first item up on our screens? Thank you. Councilmember Flynn, please go ahead with your comments on resolutions 348, 349, 350 and 351, please. Thank you. Madam President, these four resolutions would approve amendments to the ground leases for four of the major rental car operations out of DIA. And unfortunately, through whatever process before they land on our desk, the actual instruments themselves, the contract amendments aren't in our folders and so on. Using Rule 3.7 to give the airport or whoever else needs to do this the time to actually get us the contract amendments. Thank you. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Flynn. And there's no motion required. Do any other members of council have comments on these resolutions? Not seen in the comments Council Resolutions 348, 349, 350 and 351 have been postponed and will be back before Council for consideration on Monday, April 18. 13 Eyes Council Bill 20 2-169 has passed. Moving on. Councilmember Sandoval, will you please put Council Bill 22, dash three, four, four on the floor for final passage? Yes, I move that. Council Bill three, four, four be placed and adopted. All right, we'll place three, four, four on final consideration and do pass and we've got a motion and the second thank you. The required public hearing for Council Bill 22, Dash three, four, four is open. And we have Karen here for the staff report. Thank you. Good evening. My name is Karen. I'm a principal planner with Landmark Preservation and Community Planning and Development. And we are here for the designation of three, four, three five Albion Street, which is shown here with the arrow on the property of the overview. This property is located in Council District eight in Northeast Park Hill. You very recently approved a rezoning from a P.O.D. to mx2x. This particular property came in as a certificate of demolition eligibility about a year ago through a facilitated stakeholder process with the property owners, the community,

historic Denver Landmarks staff, a preservation minded buyer was found and Steve Davis has purchased the property. Steve also worked on the Butler House. So that's if you know I'm not on this particular property, you can see on the lower right image this used to be a restaurant and prior to designation the non contributing 2005 addition was removed and so it's now designating the original portion of the structure on the upper left photo. Here is an aerial of the property prior to the

removal of the demolition of the of that of that wing. And then on the right, you see the landmark boundary, which is on sort of the lower half of the property. And so we wanted to show you a site plan of this particular property. Steve Davis, after rezoning is going to do a zonal split to add density to the northern portion of the site. So you can see the white box on the bottom is the landmark portion. And then currently under concept review with development services is the plan for the northern portion of the site to add density. So you'll have the house fence, a driveway, and then you'll have the other units that will be fronting 35th Avenue, whereas this will front Albion Street. As you know, for a property to be designated according to the landmark ordinance, the structure must meet, maintain its integrity, must be 30 years of age or older. The structure needs to meet at least three out of ten criteria, and the OPC needed to consider the structure's historic context. This property meets three of the landmark criteria which we'll go through now. So first, that it has direct association with historic event or with the historical development of the city. This particular property represents the early boom and bust of Denver in the 1890s. This area was developed by John Cook Jr as the North Division of Capital Hill. This was the first house that was built on speculation in this particular subdivision in 1889, and building on speculation was new to the city of Denver at that particular time. Unfortunately for John Cook JR investors did not follow and there weren't really many other houses built in his subdivision. This is a 1905 based map that you're looking at here, and you can see there aren't very many properties that were constructed in the area. The panic of 1893 occurred and the boom abruptly ended. And so this particular property represents the early boom of the 1880s and then the 1893 bust that the city went through. When the silver panic, when the silver was not used anymore. And you had the panic of 1893. It's also significant is really being sort of on this property that straddled the urban and rural area of Denver. This is a 1933 aerial. And you can see even at that point, there weren't very many properties there. And so this represents sort of an area when North Park Hill was really on the edge of Denver. Here are a couple of photos of the family that resided there for the longest tenure, the row family. They ended up using the house as a small family f

arm because in the 1920s there weren't enough houses around it and that was the best use of the property. The amenities in the area were really absent for the first few decades and remained that way until the area eventually developed through the postwar era in the 1950s. And so it has a direct association with the development of the cities from the 1889 through the 1950s, when the row family left the property. It is also significant for its queen, an architectural style. This can be seen in the steeply pitched roof with a cross gable, the dominant front facing gable. Asymmetrical appearance, the two story porch. One of the things that Queen Anne is really known for is its devoid of smooth walls. So you'll see a lot of brickwork, stonework, decorative wood elements, birch boards, spindles on the porch. But the Queen Anne's were rather fussy and didn't want to have smooth wall appearances. And so you can see that these are the character defining features of the Queen Anne style. And then finally, it's significant under the Criterion G for promoting the understanding and appreciation of the urban environment by means of its distinctive physical characteristics and its rarity. So as you look at this building today with the other properties around it, it's primarily surrounded by two revivals from the twenties and thirties, minimal traditionals from the forties and fifties and postwar housing. And then some recent larger scale development. And the stylistic elements that are found in these tend to be more simplified. Whereas you see in the elaborate Queen in, it stands out with its extensive detailing and distinctive characteristics. And then it's also significant for its rarity in Northeast Park Hill, as well as the Greater Park Hill neighborhood. There are very few houses of the same vintage in Northeast Park Hill. There's the McCoy house, which was built in 1889, the same time as the Robinson House. But it's a smaller Victorian cottage to the north and this is a better example of a queen in style. And then within the Greater Park Hill neighborhood, there are only a handful of homes constructed before the 20th century of this style and vintage. And so it's significant for its physical characteristics and its rarity. In terms of integrity. We look at does the property look like what it used to look like? So there are a number of we are all the alterations on this property, but they don't distract from the Queen in styling from the front of the right of way. It maintains its original location. The design materials and workmanship are retained, as is the feeling, setting and association. And then the LPC considered the historic context in the period of significance of this property as is appropriate for properties that are designated. The historic context context match as well with the criteria for which it's designated. It represents the initial planning and expansion of Denver, the speculation and then economic

collapse, the rural area of the nature

of the area in the first several decades. And then the period of significance extends through the ownership of the longest tenured owners, the Rowe family, which sold in 1953. Overall, it is over 30 years of age. The application needs at least three of the criteria. It retains integrity and the OPC considered its historic context. The Landmark Preservation Commission unanimously motion to forward this for your review and CPD staff recommends approval. All right. Thank you for the staff report, Kara. And this evening, we have five individuals signed up to speak. Our first speaker is in person in chambers. And it's Steven Davis. I'm the buyer. My wife and I, Jan, are buying this. Property. I do a lot of work in historic districts and I've worked on many landmarks. And the Bazaar House, as you heard up in the Highlands area. Actually, it's also known for Amanda Sandoval announced her candidacy for the city council. True. True. Anyway, in this process of working with this talk Denver to find or they would find homes that they wanted me to buy they would send me out there to try to wrestle away a contract or with a guy or gal. And so I've had two failures in getting that accomplished. Those homes were ultimately demolished. So it's a it's an unfortunate thing. But on this particular home, for whatever reason, the seller decided to sell or the guy who had under contract and there was a good, you know, sort of exciting thing. And so I'm very happy to kind of pursue getting this home restored and brought back to its original glory. It's a it's a nice house. The councilman from District eight had a chance to go through it and see it prior to rehabilitation. So he knows what they look like and he has quite a bit of challenges. So I look forward to. Restoring the Robeson House as a new Denver landmark if the city council is able to approve the landmark designation. Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next speaker is David Hagan, joining us virtually. Do we still have David Hagan with us? Okay. It looks like we've lost David Hagan and so we'll go ahead and move on. Michael Flowers. Michael Flowers. I work with Historic Denver, which is located at 1420 North Street in the old Emerson School. We are a 523 nonprofit dedicated to preserving Denver's unique identity cultural landmarks as workplaces. We fully support this designation of the Robinson House as a landmark staff discuss. The House helps tell the history of Denver's development, and it's one of the oldest extant houses in Northeast Parkhill. Robinson House also helps tell the story of the neighborhood from the late 19th century to now, and many still affectionately know it is. Kate's restaurant has been a fixture on the spot since 1889, and despite things changing around it with Steve's plan to rehabilitate the House. It will have a vibrant. Future in the neighborhood, but not always the history in Portland. It's also been valued by the community as well. The raw materials first came to our attent

ion through our 50 Actions 50 Places campaign, which we asked the Denver community to help us identify the next 50 places to take a preservation action for the celebration of our 50th anniversary. Not long after receiving that nomination, the former owner of the property applied for a certificate of demolition eligibility. Community members came together to sign a notice of intent to designate. And through that process, the mediation was started to delay the issuance of the CDE. And during that time Steve was able to purchase the home and he's developed a plan to rehabilitate the home. But the townhomes on the north side of the property, that density and also landmarked the property. So as I said before, we fully support this this landmark designation. And I hope you will, too. Thank you. Thank you. Our next speaker is joining us via Zoom, Tess Dougherty. Do we have tests with us? Okay. We're trying to get you to accept the promotion test since we have you signed up. Well, given another try here. Still no acceptance. Okay. We'll go ahead and move on to our last speaker this evening, Jesse Paris. Okay. Go ahead, please, with your comments, Jesse. Jesse, you can go ahead with your comments. It's looking like from our end the just season muted. So we'll. Try it once more. Go ahead, Jesse. Are we having an issue with Zoom or anything? All right. Well, we have just in the queue, but I'm not. Hearing from him. Okay. We're going to go ahead and move on then. That concludes our speakers this evening for this required public hearing. Questions from members of Council on Council Bill 22, Dash 344 Council Member CdeBaca Thank you. Not questions. Just a thank you for saving this little house. This is the house I drive by almost every day, and I have hoped that somebody would see the beauty in it. And I also hope that you guys will add to the history that the first museum for black girls was in that building right in the last year or two. And hopefully they blow up and do all the cool things that they're doing across the country. Charlie Billingsley is awesome and fully expect her to go down in history and you guys will have been the first place where she exhibited the museum for Black Girls. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember

CdeBaca. And not seeing anyone else in the queue will close the public hearing. And any comments from members of Council on Council Bill 22, Dash three, four, four. And thank you, Councilmember CdeBaca, for sharing that history. And Councilmember Herndon, do you have any comments? Thank you, Madam President. Just I urge my colleagues to support this. I think the criteria has been met. I was in this when it was a restaurant, however long ago it was. And I do appreciate historic Denver and all the parties who came together to save this and be able to do the rezoning so that we can still designate the building and still allow for gentle density to happen on that parcel as well just to the north. So thank you all and I look forward to seei

ng it when it's complete. And thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Herndon. Councilmember Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. I just want to give a shout out to the Davises for being such thoughtful, historic preservationists. I know my predecessor called on you a lot. I know I've called on you a lot. So any time we see these diamonds in a rough, I know that I can call on you and you can go out there and use all the skills that you had working on all the projects in Denver. The Bosley House is my favorite. I see Jan walking by my house every day and then I want to go walk by United House. So just want to thank you and thank you for the partnership with Historic Denver and also just want to call out the process that when we opened up the historic ordinance, you know, there was a lot of concern of what would happen with that historic ordinance and adding this mediation and this pause to be able to get the applicant and other people at the table to talk, which is part of democracy, is talking about what our intentions are, have actually come with good results. So just want to thank everyone for their work. Those are not easy conversations. I've been in them as a council aide and as a council member when you're talking about property and property rights and values. So just want to say that thank you to everyone who had a great outcome because this could ended in a different way, which we all know too well in northwest Denver. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Sandoval. And likewise, I think that this meets all of the criteria. I'm very happy to support it and see it once it's restored in all its glory. And so thank you to the property owners for doing that well and Karen for her untiring patience and work on preservation in our city. We really appreciate that. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 20 2-344. Herndon. I High Cashman can each i. Ortega Sandoval. I. Sawyer I. Torres I. Black I. CdeBaca clerk i. Flynn. All right. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, to close the voting and announce the results. 13 Eyes. 13 Eyes Council Bill 22, Dash 344 has passed. Thank you to the applicants and the members of the community who joined us this evening for our required public hearings, our pre adjournment announcement on Monday, May 16, the Council will hold a required public hearing on Council Bill 22, Dash three, four or five, changing the zoning classification for 6972 North Argon Street and 19300 East 72nd Avenue in DIA, and a required public hearing on Council Bill 22, Dash three five to amend in the far northeast area plan necessary for greenfield site to accommodate market demands since the plan's adoption. We have three public hearings tonight for those participating in person when called upon. Please come to the podium on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down for those participating virtually when called upon. Please wait until our meeting. Host Promote you to speaker w

hen you are permitted your screen will ask permission to allow us to promote you. Please accept the promotion. Once you accept the promotion, your screen will flash and say, reconnecting to meeting. Please don't leave the meeting. You will be reconnected and will need to turn on your camera. If you have one and your microphone, you will see your time counting down at the bottom of your screen. Once you finish speaking, you will change back to participant mode and your screen will flash one more time. All speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residence and if you feel comfortable doing so, their home address. If you've signed up to answer questions, only state your name and note that you are available for questions of council's speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yielding of time. If translation is needed, you will be given an additional 3 minutes for your comments to be interpreted. We will alternate between in-person and virtual for efficiency by calling in-person participants and then alternating to virtual participants. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Council Member Sandoval Will you please put Council Bill 20 2-168 on the floor for final passage? I move that bill. 0168 be placed upon

final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It has been moved and. Seconded. Here. You look. Here. There we go. A moved and seconded. Thank you. Council Secretary. The required public hearing for Council Bill 20 2-168 is open. May we please have the staff report? Good afternoon, members of the City Council. My name is Fran Beneficial and senior city planner with Planning Services and today I am going to present an overview of the MAP Amendment four 4116 North the Gator Street. The subject property is located in Council District one with Councilwoman Amanda Sandoval. And it is located in the Sunnyside neighborhood. The property owner is proposing to rezone the property to a district with a smaller minimum lot size to be able to build a detached EU. Well, annotated EU is currently allowed under the existing Sony and Hitachi to you is not allowed because the it's is smaller than the minimum 5500 square feet required in the U.S. you see one on district. Spuriously mentioned the properties currently in the urban single unit C one zone district and as you can see on the map. The properties are completely surrounded by other properties. Also shown us you see one. The Kremlin use of the site is single unit residential and it is surrounded by other single unit uses with some two unit multi-unit uses nearby. This slide here shows a couple of images of the existing area with the site of the proposed rezoning on the bottom left and an image that shows the residential character of the neighborhood. Now speaking

to the process. Information on notice of the application was sent on December eight, 2021. Planning Board recommended approval and consent agenda on February 2nd. Attached is staff report. You can see a letter of support from Sunnyside, United Neighborhood Inc. Sunny that was provided by the applicant. The R.A. agrees that you will be a great enhancement to the Sunnyside neighborhood. To date, stuff has not received any other letters of support or opposition for any from any other notes or by the public. Now let's take a look at the Denver zoning code. Either of you criteria. The first criterion is consistency with adopted plans. There are three plans applicable to his rezoning Comprehensive Plan 2040 Denver and the Sunnyside Neighborhood Plan. The rezoning is consistent with several of the strategies in comprehensive plan 2040, but I will go just over a couple of them as an example. The MAP Amendment will promote equity by creating a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood, and it will also lead to an environmentally resilient Denver by promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. Now looking at live in Denver. The subject properties map is part of the urban neighborhood context. Future places MAP designates the subject property as low residential place type displaced types have predominantly single and two unit uses, and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. North Street is designated as a local or on designated street type. The growth area in Denver is all other areas of the city. These areas are anticipated to see a 10% employment growth and 20% housing growth by 2040. Lupe in Denver also provides guidance on when it's appropriate to rezone to a southern district with a similar minimum standard size. It's appropriate when a pattern of smaller loads with smaller uses is present in surrounding blocks. Well most of the single unit residential lots contained in the same block and the subject property have a load size consistent with the existing use. You see one district on a 5500 square feet or greater on the block to the west of the subject property. More than 50% of the lots are 4690 square feet more consistent with the U.S. You'd be one swing district. If you take a look at the block to the north of this subject, property, more than half of the single unit residential lots have a lot smaller than 5500 square feet. The lot sizes contain on the blocks south of the proposed rezoning are more consistent with the U.S. You see one district, an over 5500 square feet, but still have a considerable amount of smaller lots in the middle of the block. With that agrees that there is a pattern of single unit residential smaller lot sizes in the in the area. And the applicant's proposal of a district with a smaller lot size is consistent with the future. Places Map Blueprint Denver Guidance. And the Blueprint Danvers Guidance for applying for residential future place. Blueprint also includes specific

policy recommendations. Housing Policy four focuses on diversifying housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. Now, if you look at the Sunnyside neighborhood plan, it was adopted in 1993 and it is applicable to the subject. Property plan is silent on residential rezoning specifically. However, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the residential land use goal and housing goal that asked to upgrade the housing stock by encouraging long term residency and increasing home ownership , the properties restored to a smaller lot size. The property owner will be allowed to build the 32 new building forming the subject site. The residential character of the Sunnyside will be maintained and the housing stock will be

upgraded and will allow the property owner to age in place. Encouraging long term residency. Stuff also finds that the requested signing meets the next two criteria. The rezoning will result in uniformity of district regulations and will further the public health, safety and welfare primarily through implementation of Adopted plans. As discussed above. According to Blueprint Denver, it is appropriate to respond to a district with a smaller load size than the current district. If a pattern of similar loads with similar uses exists in the surrounding blocks, it is also specifically recommended the city diversify housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. This plan was adopted after the date of the approval of the existing zone district. Therefore, these are appropriate, justified circumstances for the proposed rezoning. Lastly, the proposal, Tony, is consistent with the urban neighborhood context residential districts and the US up one stone district. With that stuff recommends approval based on finding or review criteria has been met. Thank you, Fran, for the great staff report. And this evening, we have one individual signed up to speak on this required public hearing. Jesse Perez. Go ahead, please. Jesse, you just have to anew earn. Okay. I'm unmuted. Yes, my name is just Mr. Pearce and I'm a presenter for Blackstone at the moment for self defense, positive action command for Social Change, as well as the Unity Party of Colorado, the East Denver Residents Council and Frontline Black News. And I'll be the next November 2023. I'm in favor of this reasoning. Some nights, as is usual on these hearings, I'm in favor of the accessory dwelling units, the. 80 youth. On my support of 80 use when I ran for City Council at large in 2019, and I will continue to support them as mayor in 2023. So I'm in favor of this rezoning tonight. We need to use all over the city in every district. I'm good work. Amanda Sandoval, you got this. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council Bill 22, DASH 168. Not seeing any questions from members of council. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of

Council on Council. Bill 22. Dash 168. Council Member Sandoval. Thank you, Madam President. This neighborhood, along with three other neighborhoods, but specifically the Sunnyside neighborhood, is undergoing a neighborhood planning initiative. And part of that is we are asking and requesting that this idea of these lot sizes be added to the neighborhood plan so that these type of rezonings don't have to come before city council anymore. Once we get a little bit further along, I'm going to start looking at areas of Sunnyside that don't have a current entitlement for accessory dwelling unit and work on that. But I would say three fourths of Sunnyside actually does have accessory dwelling unit zoning. So I appreciate my colleagues supporting this application. It has met all of the criteria and we will be doing as many as much proactive work in District one so that these type of rezonings don't have to come through. And that's the point of a neighborhood planning initiative is to call out issues such as these on lights. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Sandoval. And agree that this meets all of the rezoning criteria and happy to support this this evening as well. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 22, dash 168. Please send the vote. I swear I Torres Black. I see the Barca. Clark. All right. Flynn. I. Herndon, I. Cashman. All right. Can each. I. Will take it. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced results. 13 Eyes. 13 Eyes Council Bill 20 2-168 has passed. Moving along. Councilmember Sandoval, will you please put council bill 22, dash 169 on the floor for final passage. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced the results. 11 Eyes. 11 Eyes Council Bill 20 2-343 has passed. Thank you to the members of the community who spoke. And thank you, Libby. We're going to go ahead and move to our final hearing this evening. Councilmember Kenny, will you please put council bill 22, dash 353 on the floor for final passage. I move that council bill 20 2-0353 to be placed upon final consideration and do passed. Thank you. It has been moved to get a second. Okay. We've got. Thank you, sir. We've got council that Councilwoman Canete was made the motion and Councilmember Cashman seconded it. The required public hearing for Council Bill 22, Dash 353 is open. May we have the staff report? Good evening, Madam President and Council. I'll try to make this quick, because I know we've had a very manic Monday. My name is Valerie O'Hara, senior city planner with CPD, and I will be presenting an ad rezoning for the subject property located at 2264 South William Street. The property is located in Council District six with Councilman Cashman. And is located within the university neighborhood. The subject property is currently 6250 square feet with a zone width of 50 feet. The request is for urban single unit C1 to allow for a detached accessory dwelling unit in the rear of the lot. The site and the surrounding properties to the Nor

thwest and South are all UCC, allowing the Urban House primary building form with a minimum zone lot of 5500 square feet. To the east, the zoning is classified. You are h38a multi-unit district that allows up to two and a half storey row house building form as well as urban house detached accessory, dwelling unit duplex and tandem house building forms. And then campus IU oh three, which is the University of Denver campus is to the east as well. Evans Avenue is just north of the site and with Iliff Avenue is located directly south. How would you? The site is single unit residential and surrounded by single two and multi-unit existing residential land uses in the neighborhood. East of the property is mainly public, quasi public again due to the campus and commercial retail is found north of the site along Evans Avenue. The subject property is mid-block with alley access is located adjacent to South William Street. There is an existing primary single unit structure and detached accessory structure currently on the lot. The bottom photo shows the single unit residence directly across the street for added context, and the top photo is a photo of the alleyway. In terms of process. This MAP amendment went to the planning board on Wednesday, March 16th, where the item was recommended approval on the consent agenda. The rezoning was moved forward to final hearing of city council by Land Use Transportation Infrastructure Committee on Consent on March 29th and is being heard today. Staff received input from the University Neighbors Neighborhood Association, R.A., through a position statement that is in opposition to the rezoning. They expressed concerns around approving adus or rezonings prior to completion of the Adus in Denver Text Amendment Project and upcoming change to the Board of Adjustment. A resident email was also received after Luti stating support for the proposed rezoning. The Denver zoning code has five review criteria. The first is consensus consistency with adopted plan, starting with comprehensive plan 2040. Staff found this rezoning to be consistent with several strategies shown from the plan 2040. The first is equitable, affordable and inclusive. Goal one Strategy Increase development of housing units close to transit and mixed use developments. Equitable, affordable inclusive goals. Strategy Goal two. Strategy eight Create a mix of housing options, a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood for all individuals and families. Oh, I apologize. Environmentally resilient goal eight Strategy to promote infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place and then environmental resilient. Goal eight. Strategy B Encourage mixed use communities where residents can live, work and play in their own neighborhoods. Blueprint. Denver identifies this property and this area as urban context. And Residential low, which consists of predominantly single and two unit uses on smaller lots and allows for accessory dwelling uni

ts to be thoughtfully and appropriately integrated where compatible. South William Street is a designated local street classification. For criteria two and three staff found that this rezoning is consistent with adopted plans. The proposed rezoning will result in uniform application of zoned district building form, use and design regulations, and it will further public health, safety and welfare through implementing adopted plans and facilitating increased housing density. Four criteria. Number four, staff found that the proposed rezoning is justified through a city adopted plan. Criteria five And finally, the context zone, district purpose and intent of USC one are all appropriate for this particular location giving, given the surrounding area, the adopted plan guidance and the location of the sites. Given the finding that our review criteria have been met. CPD Recommends City Council Approve Application 2020 1i00170. Based on the finding, all review criteria have been met. Just a note that approval of a rezoning is not approval of a proposed specific development project. Thank you. And I'll take any questions you might have. All right. Thank you, Val, for the presentation. We have one individual signed up to speak this evening. Jesse Paris. Yes. Get even with the council. May I be her? Yes. Yes. My name is just the last person I'm representing for Blackstar at the moment for self defense, positive, massive, massive social change, as well as the Unity Party of Colorado, the East Denver Residence Council for a long black nose. And I'll be the next November 2023. And I resigned in District eight in Christopher Herndon's district. I am in favor of this rezoning tonight, as I stated at the first hearing. I supported Eddie Hughes when I ran for City Council at large in 2019. I'll continue to support them in 2023 as I run for mayor of Denver. So, yes, it meets all five of the criteria. I'm supportive of this wholeheartedly. We need to use all over this city. I support any meals and other attainable housing forms of every district in the city. So with that being said, meets all five of the criteria. So I'm in full support. Again, Sam, on your council for clearing the chamber earlier, you need to repeal the urban camping ban this decade and don't miss the ends. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council. Bill 22. Dash 353. Not seen any. The public hearing is closed. Comments of comments by members of

Council on Council Bill 20 2-353. Council Member Cashman. Yeah. Thank you, Madam President. I do think this application meets the legal criteria and we'll be supporting it this evening. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Cashman. And I do agree with you that it does meet all of the rezoning criteria and will be supporting it as well. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 22, dash 353, please. Cashman. I can h i Ortega. Sandoval. I swear. I. Torres, I. Black I. CdeBaca, I. Clark. All right.

Flynn. Hi. Madam President. I, Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 11 Eyes. 11 Eyes Council Bill 22, Dash 353 has passed. Thank you so much, Val. We mean, we have three public hearings tonight for those who are participating in person. When called upon, please come to the podium and on the presentation monitor. On the wall you will see your time counting down for those participating virtually when called upon. Please wait until our meeting. Host Promote you to speaker. When you are promoted your screen will ask permission to allow us to promote you. Please accept the promotion. Once you accept promotion, your screen will flash and say Reconnecting to meeting. Please don't leave the meeting. You will be reconnected and will need to turn on your camera. If you have one and your microphone, you will see your time counting down at the bottom of your screen. Once you finish speaking, you will change back to participant mode and see your screen flash one more time. All speakers should begin their remarks by telling the council their names and cities of residence and if they feel comfortable doing so. Their Home Address. If you signed up to answer questions, only state your name and note that you are available for questions of council. Speakers will have 3 minutes. There is no yielding of time. If translation is needed, you will be given an additional 3 minutes for your comments to be interpreted. Speakers must stay on the topic of the hearing and must direct their comments to the council members. Please refrain from profane or obscene speech. Direct your comments to council as a whole and please refrain from individual or personal attacks. Council Members, Will you please put Council Bill 20 2-034 to on the floor for final passage? I move that council bill 22.034 to be placed upon final consideration and do pass. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded the required public hearing for Council Bill 20 2-0342 is open, but we have a staff report. Good afternoon, members of City Council. My name is Frank and senior city planner with Community Planning and Development. And tonight we have three funny to use for you. So I'm going to be presenting first an overview of the MAP Amendment of 1286 South Gilpin Street. It is located in Council District six. In the Washington Park neighborhood. So the request is to rezone to a district that will allow for any to you at the rear of the property. All other form and new standards will remain the same. The property is currently in the urban single unit season district, which is located which in this location would allow for the Urban House building form in a minimum so lot size of 5500 square feet. And as you can see on the map, the property is mostly surrounded by other properties. Also zoned U.S., you see with some open space, public parks, zoning to the west and some it has a school to the south. The existing land use of the site is single unit residential and while there is other single unit

uses to the north and east, Washington Park is directly to the west. The Denver South High School campus is located across Louisiana Avenue to the south of the property. This slide here shows that this object property is located in a residential area and gives you an idea of the residential neighborhood where it's located. Now speaking to a process. Informational notice of the application was sent on January 4th, 2022. Planning Board recommended approval unanimously in March 16th. Meeting today, staff has received one letter of support and two letters of opposition from the same community member. The first letter expresses support to youth, given that they can allow for an increase in gentle density and help with the housing crisis by adding more homes in neighborhoods like Washington Park. The two letters of opposition speak of traffic impacts and concerns with parking in the area. Now moving on to the Denver zoning code review criteria, it must be found the requested MAP amendment is consistent with the five criteria. The first criterion is consistency with adopted plans. There are two plans applicable to his rezoning. We have comprehensive plan 2040 and Blueprint Denver. A stated in the staff report. The reasoning is consistent with several goals in the comprehensive plan 2040. This MAP amendment will promote equity by creating a greater mix of housing options in every neighborhood, and it will lead to an environmentally resilient Denver by promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. Now looking at blueprint Denver the subject properties mapped as part of the urban neighborhood context. And the future places designated as low residential place type

displaced types have predominantly single and two unit uses, and accessory dwelling units are appropriate. While Luciano Avenue is designated as a residential collector, featured Street Market Street type Gilpin Street is designated as a local street, which is mostly characterized by residential uses. The growth area in bloom in Denver is all other areas of the city. These areas are anticipated to see 10% employment growth and 20% housing growth by 2040. Blueprint also includes specific policy recommendations. Housing policy number four focuses on diversifying housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. Stuff also finds the requested signing meets the next two criteria. The rezoning will result in uniformity of district regulations and will further the public health, safety and welfare primarily through the implementation of adopted plans. The justified circumstance for this rezoning is a seductive plan. Since the approval of the existing U.S., you see some district the city has approved has adopted the comprehensive plan and blueprint, Denver stated throughout this presentation. The proposed rezoning meets the intent of both plans. Overall, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the urban neighborhood

context residential district and the U.S. U.S. one zone district. With that stuff recommends approval based on finding or review criteria has been met. Thank you, friend, for the staff report. We have one individual signed up to speak this evening. Jesse Paris. Jesse, we're going to need you to accept the promotion. Please. Oh, I see you there. Go ahead, please. May I be heard? Yes. Yes. My name is just a Pearson. I'm present for Blackstone at the moment for self defense as the best in command and social change, as well as the Unity Party of Colorado, the Denver Residence Council on Black. No, and I'll be the next November 2023. I reside in District eight. I'm in favor of, um, as you know, a large 2019, if any, support from as mayor in 2023 and. It meets all five of the criteria. So there's nothing I can say. It's the change of mind on this. Good God. Good job, Carson. You can stay with us. You don't have to go. This is a lecture season. All those watching me sweep the council almost every night. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions from members of Council on Council Bill 20 2-0342. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council on Council Bill 20 2-0342. Councilman Cashman Yeah, thank you, Madam President. And I do believe this application clearly meets the zoning criteria. I have had discussions with it with a number of White Park East residents that are very anxious for the ADA Committee to complete its work so that we can begin looking at a more focused method of bringing Adus into our individual neighborhoods as nuanced as possible. But under our current guidance, I do believe that meets the criteria. It's an interesting site. The if you remember the picture of the home, it's right on Louisiana Avenue across from South High. The yard is elevated, but the garage itself sits down at street level and enters and exits immediately off of Louisiana. And while we don't deal with particular site plans at this point, I would be a liar if I didn't say it would be a heck of a place for a teacher at South High to be able to find a place to live at some point and walk across the street to work in the morning. So with that, I would just ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this application. Thank you. Councilmember Cashman and I concur. Does meet all of the rezoning criteria and I'm happy to support it this evening. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Bill 22, dash zero three for two. CdeBaca. Cashman. Can you? Sandoval. Sawyer. I. Torres. I. Black eye. Clark. All right. Flynn. All right. Thanks. All right. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. Ten Eyes. Ten Eyes Cancer build 20 2-0342 has passed. We're going to move on to our next hearing. Thank you, friend. Council member Sawyer, would you please put Council Bill 20 2-0354 on the floor for final passage. Council Member State Abarca has called out bills 589 and 594, a vote under bills for final consideration. No it

ems have been called out under pending. Councilmember Herndon has called out bills force for 71 and 475 for a vote. Madam Secretary, would you please put the first item up on our screens? Thank you. Councilmember Haines, would you please go ahead with your comments on Resolution 588, please? Right. Thank you. Council President. This resolution is about. About arts. About art, specifically in our city. And and even more specifically around the Denver Public Library's Central Branch and the Denver Museum. As as many of us know, we we care about the art here in the city of Denver. And I feel very excited and honored to have been to participated in this art selection process. It was it was as a result of pulling funds from both of those construction projects, from the Denver Museum and the Denver Public Library's Central Central Renovation. And and thanks to those to those two development processes, we have 700 more than \$725,000 to dedicate to art that

will be installed in three different locations. The artist Paul Castillo will install the art in three different locations all around those two big renovations. So nearly three quarters of \$1,000,000 just for art. That's pretty amazing. But what's even more amazing is our commitment to arts here in the city of Denver and the Denver metro area. But we have a national model for art. 1% of all large developments are reserved for art installation. We also have the science, scientific and Cultural Facilities District. That's a seven county tax district that provides funding for art and culture in the Denver metro area. As far as I understand, this is unparalleled. There is nothing like this anywhere else in the nation. And we get a lot of, you know, people who visit our city from other cities. We are ambassadors on your behalf to other cities in the nation. And when I talk about the AfCFTA, we almost universally get jealous comments on behalf of the this kind of funding . So and then finally, we also have a community that is heavily engaged in the arts and who give generously of their time and treasure. So so this is how we could have the CFD. This is how we could dedicate 1% of funding development of development projects to the arts. And even then on top of that, we have and we have our community that that gives. So much to art here in our city and our metro area. I want to thank arts and venues for you, for your work, and including Michael Childers and Director Brunetti. And that's all I have. Thank you. Council president. All right. Thank you, Councilmember Hines. Madam Secretary, would you please put the next item up on our screen? Councilmember Ortega, what would you like us to do with Council Resolutions 557 and 558 this evening? Thank you. I'll do a recap here. Under Resolutions, Council member Sawyer has called out Resolution 706 for a vote under bills for introduction. Council member Ngige has called out Bill 709 for comments under Bill's for final consideration. No it

ems have been called out under pending. No items have been called out. Madam Secretary, would you please put the first item on our screens? Thank you. Councilmember Cashman, will you please put resolution 706 on the floor for adoption? I move the council resolution 20 2-0706 be adopted. Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council Council Member Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. I just wanted to call this out for a vote. It's an airport contract that's on call. For those of you in the audience who are wondering what that means, I regularly call out on call contracts for agencies that do not have a solid reporting structure on how they use the money that has been called out. I believe that my constituents wants us to have better oversight of the dollars that are being spent in our community. And so every usually every week I call out at least one on call contract that's coming through. There's a second one that's coming through that's from the Department of Transportation and Infrastructure. I have not called that one out because Dottie has gone ahead and made some significant changes in partnership with Jezebel, which is everything's an acronym in the city, ah, which is our small business section of our economic development department. And they have made some really good changes to their reporting structure, but none of the other agencies have followed suit at this point. So I'll continue to call these out until hopefully some change. Has been has. Been created around here, I think. Thank you. Councilmember Sawyer. Madam Secretary, roll call on Council Resolution 20 20706. CdeBaca. I. Torres. I. SAWYER No black eye. Clark All right. Flynn. I. Herndon. I. Hines I. Cashman. I can h. I. Ortega. I. Sandoval. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, closed the voting and announced the results one day. 12 hours. 12 ays Council Resolution 20 2-706 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, would you please put the next item on our screens? And wanted to let members in the chambers here know that we've opened up our overflow meeting room. It's directly as you walk out these doors, I believe we're using for 32. Thank you, Madam President. I move that council resolution 22, dash 084 to be adopted. Has been moved and seconded. Comments by members of Council. Councilman Flynn. Thank you, Madam President. I just call this out so that I can vote no. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Roll call on Council Resolution 22, dash 0842. Flynn may. Gilmore. I. Herndon. I. Hindsight. Cashman. Kenny Ortega no. Sandoval. I. Sawyer I. Black I. See tobacco. Clark, I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. Tunisia. Lebanese Council Resolution 22 zero 42 has been adopted. Madam Secretary, please put the next item on our screens. Councilmember Flynn, will you please put Bill 791 on the floor for publication? 12 hours. Council Bill 20 2-0477 has passed. Councilmember Flynn, will you please put council bil

I 20 2-0585 on the floor for final passage? Yes, Madam President, I move the council bill 20 2-0585 be placed upon final consideration and do pass. It has been moved and seconded the required

public hearing for Council Bill 20 2-0585 is open. May we have the staff report? Good afternoon, city council members. My name is Rob Hege. I'm an associate city planner with CPD and Planning Services. Today I'm going to give a brief overview and present the staff recommendation for the MAP Amendment request at 1170 North Holly Street. Subject property is located in Council District five in the Montclair neighborhood. The applicant is requesting a rezone from urban edge single unit D to Urban Edge Single Unit d1x. The Zone District allows for an accessory dwelling unit to be built on the property, but otherwise all form and use standards would remain the same. Subject property is currently zoned esu d x. And as you can see on this map, the surrounding area and immediately adjacent, the property is also zoned as ADX, the current land use of the specific property as a single unit residential. And the majority of the properties in the surrounding area are also single unit residential. The slide shows the character of the civic property in the surrounding area. The photos in the bottom left and top right show the separate property fronts on Holly 12th and Ivanhoe Street. The photo in the top left is a characteristic view of the residential character and the surrounding area. All information. Letters were sent and public notices were posted. Planning board voted unanimously to forward a recommendation of approval on the May 4th. Planning Board hearing. To date, staff has not received any public comment specific to this rezoning request. The Denver zoning code has five review criteria used for evaluating rezoning proposals. The first criteria requires consistency with adopted plan guidance, including Comprehensive Plan 2040 Blueprint, Denver and the East Area Plan. This Map Amendment bill will promote equity by creating a greater mix of housing options in this neighborhood, which is predominantly single unit residential. And it will lead and lead to an environmentally resilient Denver by promoting infill development where infrastructure and services are already in place. Subject property is within the urban edge future neighborhood context as identified by Blueprint Denver, which is predominantly residential and typically low scale single and two unit uses with some multi-unit residential embedded. Blueprint. Denver also identifies this property as low residential future place type, which is predominantly single unit two unit uses and it says Blueprint. Denver states that accessory dwelling units are appropriate where compatible. Future Growth Strategy and blueprint. Denver is all other areas of the city. These areas are anticipated to see 10% of new employment growth in 20% of housing growth by 2040. Blueprint. Denver also has specific housing specific policy gui

dance and the land use built form housing policy for focuses on diversifying housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas. The East Area Area plan that was adopted in 2020 also includes the separate property. The plan includes three policies applicable to the subject property and the proposed rezoning request. The Area wide policy. L six ensure that that ensures that East Area neighborhoods are inclusive places by thoughtfully integrating compatibly designed missing middle housing and accessory dwelling units in appropriate locations. And then there are also two policies specific to the Montclair neighborhood that promote the integration of ADA use where compatible. Staff also finds that this reasoning request meets the next two criteria in the Denver zoning code. And that the rezoning will result in uniformity of district regulations and will further the public health, safety, welfare, primarily through its implementation of adaptive plans, but also by finding additional housing units that are comparatively integrated into the surrounding neighborhood. The justifying circumstance for this rezoning is bound to be the city adopted plan. Since the approval of the existing ESU de Zone District, the city has adopted comprehensive plan 2040 Blueprint Denver in the East Area Plan stated through this presentation, the proposed rezoning ESU de one x meets the intent of these plans which has specific which have specific guidance stating that to use our appropriate. Lastly, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the urban edge neighborhood context, residential districts and ESU. D1 X zoned district purpose intent statements. And finding that all of these five criteria are met. Staff recommends approval of this rezoning request. Have it answering your questions. Thank you. Thank you. We have four individuals signed up to speak this evening. Our first is in chambers, Bruce O'Donnell. Thank you, Madam President. And congratulations. Members of Council. I'll be very quick. I'm here. Unavailable to answer any questions on this rezoning request at 1170 North Hawley. I concur with the staff report and especially in the East Area plan, finding this an appropriate location for you. And I ask that council vote to rezone 1170 North Hallway from East X to ESU d1x and I'm available to answer questions if you have any. Thank you. Thank you. Can you say your name? I'm sorry. Bruce O'Donnell. 386 Northumberland Street, Denver. Thank you, Bruce. Our next speaker is online, Michael Circo. Yes, ma'am. Thank you so much. Can you hear

me? Yes. We can hear you. Oh, thank you again. I apologize for that. We we are looking for an avenue primarily to allow for our family to grow in place and also assist in allowing multi-generational living. My mother and father both live in town, and part of this was our goal to have them be able to age in place with us and help raise our kids and see their grandkids a little bit more. Outsid

e of that, we our main goal was to also allow us some affordability with the home and opening it up to allow more of our family members to come in. I request that the City Council vote to approve CCB two to dash all 585 the rezoning of 1170 North Hawley Street from ESU de X to ESU one. And I'm available to answer any questions. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Think, think, think, think. Our next speaker is Geoff Baker joining us online. My name is Jeff Baker. I live at 2422 Tampa Street. As you know, Denver is in need of more housing and aid to provide this. This result in request is consistent with adopt a plan such as Blueprint Denver. Therefore, I request the City Council approve the rezoning of 1170 North Hawley from ESU d x to ESU d1x. Thank you so much. Thank you. And our final speaker is online, Jesse Paris. Yes. Good evening. Member of the council. Yes. Yes. My name is Harris and I'm represented for Blackstar at the moment for self defense, positive action, command for Social Change, as well as the Unity Party of Colorado. The Heath Number of Residents Council, Frontline, Black Middle and I will be the next Mayor of Denver in 2023. I'm in favor of this rezoning tonight. As previous speakers have already stated, we are in a affordability crisis. So any time the city has an opportunity to provide more housing stock or add to our housing, I'm a supporter of it. So I support this new rezoning. It meets all five of the criteria. That's all I have to say. Thank you. Thank you. That concludes our speakers questions for members of Council and Council. Bill 20 2-0585. Seeing none. The public hearing is closed. Comments by members of Council and Council Bill 22, dash 0585. Councilmember Sawyer. Thanks, Madam President. No comments. I'm in support of this. That meets all of the criteria. And the reason no one came to talk about it is because we spent three years on the East Area Plan getting community feedback and talking about it. So I'm in support of this and hope the rest of the councilmembers will agree with me on my assessment of all of our criteria. And also, just as a note, I will say, you know, it used to be that all of our 82 rezoning requests came through an East Colfax, and then we re zoned that neighborhood in partnership with Councilman Herndon to do that. And I think we will probably focus on Montclair next based on the number of of 80 rezoning requests that have come through. So that's it for me. Thank. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Roll call on Council Bill 20 20585. Sawyer I. Black I. CdeBaca I. Clark I. Flynn I. Herndon. I. Hines High. Cashman Can each i. Ortega Sandoval. I. Madam President. I. Madam Secretary, close the voting and announce the results. 12 days. 12 days. Cancel the 22 days. 0585 has passed. Councilmember Flynn, will you please put Council Bill 20 2-0586 on the floor for final passage?