

Blueprint Denver: Public Comments on Public Review Draft 1

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
How are proposed development plans reviewed and amended to ensure that new developments pay their fair share of the costs of implementing the DenverRight plans?	Document Usability	Email
Move equity chapter earlier in plan to prioritize equity and to frame the implementation of Blueprint.	Document Usability	Equity training
Change all references to chapter titles to be consistent with name and number -- example "Chapter 1, Introduction"	Document Usability	Internal
Add water layer to appropriate maps -- should be on legend but not as a future place. Could be on the legend as "other" category along with the open space/parks added in row 17 above	Document Usability	Internal
On each of the maps, can the water bodies be more visible?	Document Usability	Internal
The policy language in the draft is soft. Please replace with language that is clear for legal and decision-making purposes	Document Usability	Letter
Regarding Blueprint and Comp Plan: (1) Merge the documents into one planning document that brings together the six elements of the Comprehensive Plan with the six parallel sections of Blueprint. Incorporate all goals, objectives, and strategies into a single document. (2) Alternatively, create two documents that are more distinct companion plans. Bring all goals and policies into the Comprehensive Plan, and have Blueprint be the companion action plan with the implementation strategies all in one volume. (I believe this approach would recapture the original intent of the Blueprint process.)	Document Usability	Letter
Connect strategies to the CIP and assign responsibility to agency/dept. add needed cooperation and timelines	Document Usability	Letter
connect strategies to annual budget process and indicate how strategies will be funded	Document Usability	Letter
provide indicators and targets for each strategy and describe process for evaluating and reporting on implementation progress	Document Usability	Letter
include a reassessment strategy for evaluating and revising strategies	Document Usability	Letter
P 255 – what is the point of photo? It doesn't really show anything about a corridor – just one building along a corridor and the reflection in the glass is confusing. Delete and replace with another photo. One suggestion would be for someone to stand on the 4th floor outdoor patio of the Art Hotel and take a photo looking either direction on Broadway.	Document Usability	Letter
(4) Page 221 references "pro Ultra-urban green infrastructure" but, we don't know what this means. There is a definition for "green infrastructure" that includes a reference to urban heat island effect mitigation and reduced energy demands yet nothing is mentioned about "preserving passive solar access, which would be a cost-effective measure to prevent the increase of heating costs for Denver residents.	Document Usability	Letter
There is a lot of information in both of these sections, and a variety of components, some of which seem to overlap (e.g., Community Themes and the Why Now in the Introduction could also be in the Vision section, and the Community Themes component seems to overlap with the Community Values component), which make for a confusing read. In the Vision section, there are individual subsections entitled Blueprint for an Inclusive City, Community Values, Vision Elements, Goals, Measuring our Success, Growth in Denver and Growth Strategy. There is a tremendous number of words in each of these subsections, and a lack of a hierarchy or overarching set of priorities that tie them together or rank them. This makes for a very confusing introduction and sets a similar tone for the rest of the Draft. We encourage the authors to simplify, consolidate and clarify the Introduction and Vision sections so that a clear set of priorities and values emerges.	Document Usability	Letter
There are a variety of maps in the Draft concerned with on aspects of development and demographics, current and future physical and social characteristics, and policy objectives – everything from Places to Growth Strategy to Equity to Street Types to Neighborhood Contexts. In addition, there are numerous categories within many of the maps, which can be overwhelming to comprehend. Almost all of these maps have a remarkable amount of specificity to them, which can imply a level of precision and coordination that may be misleading and can easily be viewed as determinative (as the 2002 Areas of Change and Areas of Stability came to be viewed). There will undoubtedly be conflicts between the recommendations in these maps – what is the rationale for resolving them when they occur? We encourage the staff and consultants to consider first adding language that clearly states the purpose for each map and how fixed or aspirational it strives to be.	Document Usability	Letter
We commend the Task Force, staff and consultants for highlighting this issue. However, the section lacks clarity and vision for how to address equity. Within the lack of clarity comes uncertainty in how to prioritize and implement the many important goals and policy recommendations contained throughout the document, especially when in some circumstances conflicting priorities may arise over the next 20 years. The purpose of the Equitable Planning Section needs to be tied back to our previous comments about establishing hierarchy and priorities, and some approach to resolving conflicts.	Document Usability	Letter
a. Complete Neighborhoods should include a Fourth element: Access to Opportunity, as defined in Chapter 4 on Equity. A complete neighborhood is one that provides the services and amenities people need for an equitable quality of life. This should be a fourth layer in the Complete Neighborhood framework.	Document Usability	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>We appreciate that certain areas of the City can accommodate more growth than others. However, as the Plan notes, each area of Denver will need to do its part to accommodate growth. We would strongly encourage staff to bolster this language to ensure that all neighborhoods add some density to meet the projections outlined in the Growth Strategy map. One recommendation is to include language that stresses the importance of using the Growth Strategy map to guide the neighborhood planning initiative process. Small area plans must require that each neighborhood plan reflect an increase in density to match the goals reflected in the Growth Strategy Map. For emphasis this should be added as a bullet to the “Minimum Content” for NPI Plans. Ensuring that certain neighborhoods do not opt out of density goals/projections is key to creating equity and protecting neighborhoods which may be more vulnerable to densification and ultimately, gentrification.</p> <p>If the City is serious about tackling our chronic housing shortage of 32,000 units, then we need to ensure that Blueprint Denver includes language that promotes a diverse mix of additional housing options across Denver.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>1. Measuring Housing and Job Diversity Map (Page 113). Our impression is that the data used to create this map may need to be revisited. Based on the data currently used the map appears to indicate that there is greater job and housing diversity in the Denver Country Club and East Washington Park than there is in the Five Points neighborhood, which is not the case. It may be that the plan has failed to take into account access to affordable housing in different neighborhoods, of which Five Points has the largest number in the City of Denver, or access to transitional and temporary housing for the homeless, of which Five Points also has the highest number of any neighborhood in the City. In terms of access to jobs Five Points also has far more industry and jobs than either the Denver Country Club or East Washington Park. So, logically, a map showing diversity of housing and job opportunities should reflect this reality. The fact that the map provided does not indicate this is a sign to us that the data used may not be the appropriate data for measuring housing and job diversity. Please review the input data and ensure that access to affordable housing / transitional and temporary housing and access to jobs is actually being measured. This is very important since the maps will be used to direct change in communities and the way the maps are currently depicting the city it would appear that the Denver Country Club does not need any additional affordable housing.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>☒ The color coding of the overall plan is challenging. Using shades of the same color to indicate different zones/areas makes it hard to distinguish one level from another.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>Housing diversity map difficult to read; can't distinguish nuances of shading</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>Maps with overlays would be useful.</p> <p>Trying to look at and digest what is in store for our neighborhood required accessing many maps in many plans, without a good way to overlay all the different designations of areas, streets, transportation modes, etc. from all the plans. We would advocate that the city create a platform where an area of the city could be accessed and then various maps overlaid as a reviewer/user desires.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>Provide active links to referenced plans.</p> <p>Similarly, the plans reference countless other plans, guidelines, documents and regulations throughout. Accessing these is cumbersome and pretty nearly impossible for the average reviewer/user. We would advocate the City invest in creating active links to referenced sources.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>We appreciate the commitment to ‘A Living Plan’. Specifically, we support the 10 core metrics that the plan establishes and commits to study regularly both in the short term and long term horizon of the plan. We further support the annual evaluation that Community Planning and Development (CPD) commits to that allows for a point in time understanding of outcomes related to the goals, policies and strategies in the plan. We also importantly commend the regular updates to the key equity concept measurements and maps as these items are likely to change quickly.</p>	Document Usability	letter
<p>3) We understand, and appreciate, the plan's inclusion of small area plans as an important part of the planning process and implementation. We are concerned that neighborhoods, such as ours, do not have small area plans and are not scheduled to be part of that process for some time. We want to ensure that the absence of a small area plan does not become an excuse not to consult neighborhoods when major development is proposed, for example when the bulk of the Medical Depot property or the industrial zone in the northeast portion of Clayton is redeveloped. The Medical Depot was included in an adjacent small area plan, so we are concerned that that plan might be seen as 'governing' future redevelopment, despite it having been developed largely without input from the Clayton community.</p> <p>We also would like to ensure that neighborhoods without small area plans are not in anyway disadvantaged or left out of larger City initiatives because of the absence of a small area plan.</p>	Document Usability	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
P250 – The Places map calls out several neighborhood names that are significantly different than those called out in existing smaller area plans (e.g., Downtown Area Plan, NE Downtown Neighborhoods Plan, Golden Triangle Plan, CPV-Auraria Plan). How can this be resolved?	Document Usability	Letter
In general, some of the imagery within the current document does not match well with the description of what could potentially be allowed – or does not even seem to be relevant to the descriptions. This could be misleading to many	Document Usability	Letter
Chapter 1 (Applying Blueprint to Rezonings). We do not know what "interpretation of neighborhood context or future places with 'limited flexibility, especially at the edges'" is intended to convey. For example, are WWP residents living along Lincoln and Sherman to anticipate that because they are near the Broadway and Alameda transit stations the City will approve or even initiate rezonings for greater density? Once a final Blueprint Denver plan is adopted, residents must be able to rely with confidence on the designations in the Plan (including the maps) without having to be constantly concerned about rezonings, whether applicant or legislatively driven. This is particularly important to WWPNA, among other reasons, because the Broadway Corridor is forecast for significant growth. Predictability in the Blueprint Denver plan is a key element for everyone. In particular, WWPNA residents need and deserve assurances that allowing growth along our exterior borders won't serve as pretext for rezonings within our neighborhood, including erosion at the edges of our borders. Thus, we disagree with any suggestion that rezonings at the "edges" of the Future Places Map would be acceptable and ask that this language be deleted from Page 16, Chapter 1.	Document Usability	Letter
Blueprint Denver calls for periodic review of progress on goals. We strongly encourage this and would like to be involved in those reviews. We also suggest the creation of work plan, there are many goals within this plan, and without a near and long term plan, we believe the goals will not be efficiently and effectively implemented.	Document Usability	Letter
Thirdly, there is a map on page 809 of the 2002 Blueprint Denver that highlights discrepancies between then-current land-use characteristics and then-existing zoning. – it may make sense to provide a similar map of conflicts between now existing land use patterns and the current Draft's recommendations.	Document Usability	Letter
References are missing as to the role of an adopted neighborhood plan or plans for West Highland. Blueprint Denver needs to clearly state that future rezonings or future new development should follow neighborhood plans, and where one is missing, rezonings should be postponed until one is in place and has been adopted, so as to guide desirable change.	Document Usability	Letter
The role of public input and RNO input into the approval process for any future rezoning or incentivizing of increased density, height (if ever appropriate anywhere in West Highland) is vague or missing. The role of such input must be specified and strengthened in the Blueprint Denver language.	Document Usability	Letter
Some neighbors expressed concern that the plan leaves too much up to interpretation, and generally provides stronger language related to maximizing density and weaker assurances about equitable housing, avoiding displacement, and preserving neighborhood context.	Document Usability	Letter
The plan is very ambitious in its attempt to be comprehensive. There should be clear language up front that the plan is intended to be a guide and not a prescriptive plan. There needs to be flexibility along all the boundary lines identified in the maps and this should be stated clearly. If certain opportunities lie just outside a designated zone, then City Staff and Neighborhood stakeholders should not presume that it is prohibited because it is being proposed "across the street" from the designated zone in Blue Print.	Document Usability	Letter
Increasing Predictability: Portions of the Plan, particularly Chapter 4, make development less predictable for property owners, neighborhoods and the City. Over the past several years, Denver has worked to create a more predictable development process. Improving predictability should continue to be a priority as it benefits all parties involved. Addressing equity, displacement, access to opportunity and housing is integral to building a great city. However, the key equity concepts in Chapter 4 create levels of uncertainty that may negatively impact property owners, neighborhoods and the City. While the Plan provides a snapshot of these issues, there is limited and conflicting information regarding how this chapter will interface with land use policy. The Chapter 4 summary states "This chapter offers three important equity concepts to help city leaders better understand the needs of a particular area when making decisions about land use, mobility and more." However, the chapter also notes measurements cannot be "effectively applied to individual rezonings," but it does not explicitly say they shall not be applied. As written, the Plan leaves the door open for city leaders to consider the measurements on individual rezonings even though they cannot be effectively applied. Simply put, if the measurements cannot be effectively applied, the Plan should clearly state that they "shall not" be applied. While this point may seem obvious, it's critical that this language be clarified to ensure predictability. Additionally, language in Chapter 1 states that key equity concepts "are not intended to be part of the evaluation for smaller rezonings" but "should be used to evaluate large area rezoning." However, the Plan provides no definition for a small or a large-scale rezoning. Without clear definitions, key equity concepts will be applied on a case by case basis, leaving property owners, neighbors and the City with a lack of clarity and consistency. The Plan must include more specific definitions for small-scale and large-scale rezonings.	Document Usability	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>On page 101, it states “The City will update the measurements and maps every one to two years so that decisions are guided by current snapshots in time.” While we understand the City’s thought process here, we have significant concerns that the frequency of these updates will create uncertainty and impair a property owner’s ability to plan for the future. Again, the lack of explicit language as to when the concepts can and will be used adds to this uncertainty. The key equity concepts and their corresponding maps provide important information to improve our city. Addressing equity should be a top priority, but injecting equity concepts into a plan without clarifying how’ll they’ll used is likely to create confusion and false expectations. We must also recognize that rezonings alone cannot solve our City’s equity issues. These are complex, multi-faceted challenges which must be addressed by a diverse set of stakeholders. We would suggest broadening the Plan language to recognize that changes in land use policy should not serve as the silver bullet to address equity. While we appreciate challenges associated with custom zoning, we are concerned about language that would further limit the use of site-specific, customized zoning tools. Although the Plan states there is a lack of transparency and predictability, in many cases, custom zoning can be more transparent and predictable to the benefit of a neighborhood.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>4. Incentivizing Affordability and Desired Outcomes. As the plan is currently written, there are many potential “requirements” that add cost and could have a negative, cumulative Impact on the development, of affordable and middle-income housing. Unfortunately, as demonstrated below, the Plan recommends a long list of potential requirements, rather than incentives, for those seeking to invest in our City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Incentivize or require the most efficient development of land, especially in areas with high transit connectivity. (Page 47) o Create new regulations to encourage the reuse of existing buildings. This could include requirements to salvage or reuse building materials after a structure is demolished or allowing flexibility in uses or density when an existing structure is reused and maintained.(Page 47) o Develop regulations for new mid- and large-scale commercial and residential buildings requiring waste management plans that include recycling of concrete, wood, metal, and cardboard. (Page 49) o Develop a comprehensive green building program including both required and incentive elements. Recruit expertise within the green building industry to help support this program.(Page 49) o Explore requiring electrical vehicle charging stations for new commercial/mixed use development. (Page 49) o Study and implement tools to require and/or incentivize the development of family-friendly housing. This could include bonuses for large units (those with three or more bedrooms) in multifamily developments. (Page 57) o Require strong street-level active use standards for local centers and corridors. (Page 75) o Study and implement stronger street-level active use requirement for community and regional centers and community corridors. Tools could include regulations on floor-to-floor heights for the first story to facilitate conversion to commercial uses and reconsideration of appropriate street-level uses. (Page 75) o In downtown and urban center contexts, consider extending active use and transparency requirements above the street level to additional street-facing stories to create a more active street frontage. (Page 75) o Revise zoning code to provide better site design requirements for pedestrians, particularly internal circulation within large, multi-building developments. (Page 75) o Develop water-wise irrigation and landscaping standards for single- and two-unit residential districts. For new infill development, require trees to be planted on-site. (Page77) o Revised standards could include requirements or incentives to improve and/or add landscaping for existing development, such as large surface parking lots. (Page 77) o Adopt policies that require Transportation Demand Management programs for developments to maximize use of alternative modes and to reduce new vehicle trips on Denver’s streets. (Page 80) o Evaluate the need to increase requirements for publicly accessible outdoor space for mid- and large-scale developments in centers, corridors and districts. (Page 90) o Develop tree planting and water-wise irrigation requirements for new development on private property. (Page 90) o Study and implement requirements to preserve existing green infrastructure, including trees, within the right-of-way. This could include regulations to replace green infrastructure.(Page 92) o Include water conservation requirements for landscaping for new developments, such as irrigation standards that incorporate water budgeting and hydrozone analysis. Promote efficient water use for landscaping. (Page 92) <p>Our objection is not necessarily regarding the individual merit of each proposed requirements, but rather their cumulative impact. Existing City requirements, such as the green roofs ordinance and the linkage fee, already place a significant financial burden on those seeking to invest in our City. While we understand that the Plan alone does not impose these requirements, it does provide direction and justification for the City to do so. We may not know today how many of these will be imposed, but we do know that many of these requirements would increase the cost of creating additional housing units in our City. To ensure we do not drive away investment in our communities, we strongly suggest the City incentivize rather than require the items listed above. Requiring a laundry list of financial burdens does not fit with the “business friendly and entrepreneurial” value which is helping to guide this Plan.</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>4. Pg. 34 and 35 Implementation – these Denver draft plans are essentially a rewrite of the 2010 Denver Zoning Code – implemented by a series of Text Amendments. Has CPD created an outline of what Text Amendments will be issued and when? How long will this process take? How often will Text Amendments be published for review and comment and City Council approval? □</p>	Document Usability	Letter
<p>Maps are great! Easy to read and understand</p>	Document Usability	Office Hours
<p>The layout of text over graphics is difficult to read. Had to skip over a few sections.</p>	Document Usability	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Also, the overall structure is extremely confusing and hard to follow. I would suggest an intro section that clearly and succinctly lays out the intent of each section and how the sections (or chapters) are meant to nest together. Without this it is a lot of information without a clear understanding of how it is meant to guide.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Page 124: I like the graph but would be helpful what S, E, U, etc. are. Maybe a key below could be helpful	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I like the graph but would be helpful what S, E, U, etc. are. Maybe a key below could be helpful	Document Usability	On-line Survey
It's hard to navigate the document and know what chapter or section you are in. Even more difficult without a centralized table of contents.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Definitely need some better chapter break pages that don't have so much clutter on them. Really difficult to understand where you are in the document and	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Please please do not compromise on any of this. It is a beautiful plan.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
This is impossible to read. How on earth do you expect us to give you good feedback? another city ICLEA agenda 21 snow job. I don't believe we ever voted on that.....	Document Usability	On-line Survey
The plan is certainly comprehensive and supported by charts/maps that make it easy to follow.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
The presentation of the plan is easy to follow and covers	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Looks cartoon-ish and won't be taken seriously	Document Usability	On-line Survey
The clear breakdown of style and types.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
It is less broad and ambiguous than a lot of comprehensive plans. It will be easier to apply/ enforce because of how clear and specific goals are.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I agree with the priorities and strategies outlined in plan but I don't agree with how they have been executed.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
It is a BEAUTIFUL plan - love the design. kudos to whoever put it together!!	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Loved the design! Very sleek looking!! The quality is amazing.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Citizens need more time to study.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I would like to see more specific target dates.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Chapter 6 is well organized and straightforward, it makes it easy to understand how the various places, corridors, contexts, etc.... fit together to create a plan for parcels in Denver.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
placetypes are very self-explanatory multimodal maps are very clear and helpful	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I like that there are Lots of photos	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Is a thoughtful expansion of the ideas and objectives outlined in the current zoning code.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
clearly and concisely set out	Document Usability	On-line Survey
clear and concise	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I like how each topic is laid out	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I would have liked to see more emphasis on possibilities for each section of town. I'm especially concerned about SW Denver. All charts for me were too Macro	Document Usability	On-line Survey
It looks like a marketing campaign. Impossible to know exactly what it means for each individual place. VERY SLICK, not very informative.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
A break down on zones within Denver. What is expected and what each zones mission/vision is	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I like some of the strategies and priorities, but think there needs to be more concrete mandates, as opposed to loose guidelines that can be selectively ignored at City Council during contentious rezoning issues. Also, have some specific issues with the map designations for my neighborhood that I pinned on it.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
As usual, it looks like appearances are more important than reality. Do you really think the average person in Denver will be able to effectively sort through all this to figure out just what you are proposing for his part of the city?	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I think we should be more aggressive in the decentivising of single automobile use and strive for a less than 50% target in 2040	Document Usability	On-line Survey
Doesn't seem enforceable or very usable to the general public. One sections says "incentivize or require the most efficient development". Which begs the question, what defines "the most efficient" and who gets to make that judgement call? If a project is being processed a one planning director is replaced by a new one who has a different interpretation of "most efficient" does the project have to change course mid-stream to comply with the new interpretation?	Document Usability	On-line Survey
I REALLY hope that the city allows the NPI process to inform the larger vision for the city. What you can't allow is for one NPI area that is homogenous middle class and of one race to say that they don't want growth. That's called racism. Denver is better than that.	Document Usability	On-line Survey
We recognize that this is a plan that sets a vision for the next twenty years. However, we call for the City to develop annual action plans that describe the concrete actions that will be taken by the City to achieve this plan. As it stands, we believe the plan is too aspirational and may not be actionable without discussions of resources and policy action.	Document Usability	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
2. The didactic characteristics of the draft plan are welcome. The plan is easy to use and is self-explanatory if used correctly; additionally the subdivision of the plan into seven sections is congruent and easy to follow.	Document Usability	Planning Board
3. The plan has a frequent ambiguity as it relates to the question of whether the plan is aspirational or descriptive. Some of the maps seem to indicate that the plan is descriptive of the current urban conditions and not necessarily an aspiration for change (see related comments 6, 9 and 10, below)	Document Usability	Planning Board
Equity Map Legends (verbage) "less and more" would be better than "least and most"	Document Usability	Planning Board
add a note to the places maps that this isn't a land use map that is intended to show a different land use for each parcel. Need to see the text of the plan.	Document Usability	Planning Board
growth strategy map needs more color differentiated. When we put the maps online, the area you are on should pop up as a label, instead of having to go to the legend	Document Usability	Planning Board
The policy numbers repeat, can there be a way to make them more unique	Document Usability	Task Force
include NPI mapping areas in Blueprint (around page 39) that reinforces the living document idea.	Document Usability	Task Force
Be more explicit about how NPI and other small area planning can update the maps. add text to places, street types, context map that it will evolve through small area plans.	Document Usability	Task Force
Consider providing more details about the inputs of the places map, especially that adopted small area plans was a key input.	Document Usability	Task Force
Change the name of "Access to Opportunity" -- it is really measuring to access to amenities, but it is also measuring socio-economic indicators. Access to Opportunity insinuates access to (economic) opportunity, jobs.	Equity	City Council
1. Be clear about the emphasis on equity-There should be a greater emphasis on equity made clear throughout the document, including a clear definition. There is a specific equity section but calling out equity in continuing review and measurement of success is necessary. It is important to name what is expected to be measured. ☒	Equity	Equity training
4. Racial Equity responsibility and accountability must be made clear-Who is ultimately responsible for ensuring accountability for racial equity? Blueprint Denver is not clear, and someone must ultimately be responsible and accountable for ensuring that there is a continuous focus on outcomes, and that further racial disparities and inequities are not being created in the implementation of Blueprint. Identify who is responsible and accountable for implementation from the City staff side.	Equity	Equity training
5. Community engagement and access must be institutionalized and maintained-There is no mechanism built into Blueprint to ensure that community involvement is on-going. a. There should be an Equity Section in the Comprehensive Plan. b. The process must be institutionalized, involving community leaders, a continuing community task force or some mechanism that is sustaining. c. Accountability and power sharing must be part of the discussion. d. The "Equitable Planning" section (Chapter Four) should be moved up to the front of Blueprint Denver, before the recommendations. e. Neighborhood involvement must be built into the process; in addressing zoning, design standards, etc. f. Recognize that Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNO's) do not always speak for or function as originally intended for significant populations of a particular neighborhood.	Equity	Equity training
6. Overall awareness and statement regarding gentrification There should be a statement recognizing that the possible outcome of displacement is inherent in many of the recommendations, e.g., a neighborhood shouldn't have to choose between safety and sidewalks and gentrification.	Equity	Equity training
7. Using an Equity Lens is critical for policy-makers, decision-makers, and implementers-To ensure disparities are not maintained or exacerbated, an equity lens and awareness of possible unintended consequences to specific communities or populations is critical. a. Mechanisms for evaluation must be built into the process. b. Metrics and measurement of outcomes must be built into the process. c. There must be flexibility to allow for equity – it may take more time or resources. d. Create baseline information to know if/how disparities occur, e.g., safety, health. e. Policies must consider and call-out efforts to address or mitigate gentrification/displacement.	Equity	Equity training

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>8. Build Equity into processes. Equity cannot be an add-on or afterthought. It must be built into any process, evaluation or policy/program implementation from the beginning.</p> <p>a. Application/permit processes in CPD/Development Services should be evaluated and adjusted to include equity</p> <p>b. Priorities – Community needs and initial assumptions about priorities (why, who was involved in deciding, are historical issues considered, etc.) must be transparent.</p> <p>c. Burdens – financial responsibilities, placement, specific geographies, etc.</p> <p>d. Checks and balances – identify and address unintended consequences; cannot be unwilling to change course.</p> <p>e. Collaboration – Ensure and expand the ability and willingness of all city departments to break down silos and work collectively. Collaboration occurs:</p> <p>i. Across agencies, departments, divisions, function areas, etc.</p> <p>ii. Across plans</p> <p>iii. Across recommendations within plans – who is looking at the various recommendations holistically?</p> <p>f. Expectations of staff – knowledge and understanding of equity principles, expertise with technical applications, and ability to engage with community</p>	Equity	Equity training
Add language at the beginning of the implementation section that is clear about the importance of equitable approaches and more equitable neighborhood engagement in ALL implementation efforts -- applies to all recommendations	Equity	Equity training
Can a permit applicant be asked how they are meeting the City's equity goals?	Equity	Equity training
Affordable housing must be in transit areas	Equity	Focus Group
Mixed income housing and affordable (lower income) housing where density is high need access to parks and open space	Equity	Focus Group
Need a variety of affordable (lower income) housing options for couples and families in centers and corridors	Equity	Focus Group
Walking, bikes and rental scooters are great but what options will be available to Denver's large aging population?	Equity	Focus Group
Bring back bus stops by DHA building and have them running on weekends and late night	Equity	Focus Group
Access to opportunity map misses K-12 education—a major driver of housing choice and determinant of market prices--and access to job training and skills enhancements. Quality education seems missing from analysis. Area of more control than obesity or life expectancy.	Equity	Letter
The plan doesn't identify how community input will continue to inform the city plans. We recommend that citizen and community groups be supported to work closely with the city on these plans. People categorized as vulnerable populations should be given opportunities for participation.	Equity	letter
To add clarity, this (Equity)section should recognize the long history and patterns of residential segregation and disinvestment that has occurred in Denver that has created vast disparities in access to opportunity. The authors should then highlight methods and tools for careful reinvestment in areas with the least access to opportunity as this is needed to support our most vulnerable communities.	Equity	Letter
b. There are no metrics related to Goal # 1: Such as a decrease in the number of cost burdened households; the % of new affordable to new market rate housing created in growth areas, or the % change in number of low/mod income households living in Denver. There are also displacement metrics that could be tracked.	Equity	Letter
Growth Strategy needs to include intentional planning and interventions in low growth neighborhoods to ensure that involuntary displacement is not an unintended consequence. Need a benchmark and targets for current racial / social economic make up of those neighborhoods and strategies to ensure stability and resiliency.	Equity	Letter
a. Implementation opening section – Investments section should also call for identifying dedicated funding for affordable housing development and anti-displacement interventions that are not subject to annual appropriations and are of a scale to meet the challenges. (i.e. sufficient to make an impact on the % of Cost Burdened House Holds in Denver)	Equity	Letter
We like the focus on Equity in the Blueprint Denver draft. To balance the pressures of growth and gentrification that will persist in this and future economic cycles, the benefits of a growing city must be accessible to all of our residents.	Equity	Letter
A concern that has come up in the advisory board working sessions is that bicycle infrastructure has come to be seen as a sign of gentrification. Equity is a major component of this plan and this should be addressed. Though this issue may be rooted in misinformation and fear, it is no less valid. Because of this, underserved residents do not see the benefits of bicycling as a healthy and affordable mobility option.	Equity	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Chapter 4 of the new Blueprint focuses on what the City terms "Equitable Planning." We have reviewed Appendix C, which purports to explain the methodology behind the assessments being made in this Chapter. The City provides no justification for its selection of the ranges and criteria chosen in Appendix C to produce the corresponding maps in Blueprint. The Key Equity Concepts are vague. The plan guidance provided for using this criteria is vague. There is no definition for what is considered a "small-scale" rezoning. It further recommends that all future rezoning applicants be subject to a yet-to-be-determined modification to the rezoning process requiring commitments with respect to housing affordability and involuntary displacement, without regard to the fact that Blueprint itself acknowledges that there are areas within the city where such considerations are minimal. Including these criteria in a citywide plan like Blueprint opens the City to potential "takings" litigation by mandating the use of blanket concepts unrelated to the customary acceptable land use policies (i.e. prohibiting undesirable uses by schools or increasing public safety) into Denver's rezoning process to seek exactions from landowners without directly connecting and quantifying the exaction based on the impact of actual development of land. The impact of the future development is typically not known until much later in the development process. Protecting vulnerable populations and ensuring a variety of economic opportunity throughout the City is a laudable goal, but Blueprint is the incorrect place for attempting to implement that goal.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>62 Chapter 4 (Equitable Planning). Under "How to use key concepts" (Page 101), the second bullet speaks of rezonings and regulatory changes to achieve equity. Among other things, a problematic aspect of this theme is the inherent reality that building new to accommodate "equity" sets up demolitions of smaller, affordable, existing housing stock, resulting in the disruption of long-term residents. Elsewhere, the document speaks to "highest and best use", which in our decades of experience, suggests demolition rather than the more sustainable effort to reuse existing buildings. There is little in this document that discourages demolition. We suggest that a recommendation be added that mandates a property owner pull a foundation permit before a demolition permit is issued in established neighborhoods to ensure that the proposed project is "shovel-ready" before destroying the existing fabric leaving a gaping hole on a street and in the community. See vacant lot at 611 S. Downing Street as an example.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>On the map "Measuring Access to Opportunity" (Page 105), we believe the entirety of both the WWP and Speer areas should be depicted at the "most access" end of the spectrum. This neighborhood has easy access to libraries, mass transit and major highways (I-25, 6th Avenue), a plethora of grocery stores (Safeway, Natural Grocers, Whole Foods and Sprouts), parks (including Washington Park), several schools, hospitals (Denver Health, Porter Hospital and Swedish all within two miles), jobs, basic goods and services, and entertainment. Thus, we already have the quality-of-life amenities and opportunities for health and education contemplated for a complete neighborhood on Page 102. An accurate depiction of our collective community would demonstrate there is no need here for the rezonings and text amendments contemplated in this Chapter.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>(b) On the map "Measuring Housing and Job Diversity" (Page 112), the areas in the Speer part of our neighborhood most altered by the 1950s zoning code changes are depicted toward the "most diverse" end of the map's spectrum, whereas the areas in the western portion of the Speer area, where the 100-130 year-old housing stock predominate, this area is marked as "least diverse". Yet, the Speer area already comprises a mix of housing styles and densities ranging from single-unit, two-unit in a single-family form, duplexes, triplexes, terrace rowhomes, small scale multi-unit, and the half dozen plus high-rise, high-density units (with more under construction). We believe this map, if not revised for the Speer part of our neighborhood, will result in a "dis-respecting (of) the existing context of that area" catalogued exhaustively for the 2010 zoning code revamp to ensure "right zoning". Furthermore, there are thousands of people in the WWP and Speer parts of our community who work from home, and this trend is ever-increasing. How is this accounted for when considering the variety of jobs and wages in the area or the ratio of jobs to households that has placed much of our neighborhood, especially in Speer, toward the least diverse end of the spectrum?</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Equitable outreach in planning and recruiting diverse staff makes sense.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Affordability requirements and incentives were raised many times. Also some comments about not having policy incentivize development or redevelopment when the residents and/or local businesses won't be able to stay. Slowing the pace and providing supportive services to residents and businesses. The plan needs clearer goals for affordability and how to mitigate the fast loss of affordability that is hurting neighborhoods and displacing west Denver residents.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>33) If 'access to opportunity' and 'vulnerability' maps are supposed to make it easier to live or stay in my neighborhood they didn't really do anything with those in the recommendations. Why not use those maps to help identify where affordable housing needs to be required and where small businesses won't move but go away all together; those need to be protected.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>CHAPTER 2 metrics 41) There is a lack of metrics for housing outcomes. There are many accessible metrics that can be used and this will also tie in with vulnerable neighborhoods. 42) The plan needs clearer goals for affordability and how to mitigate the fast loss of affordability that is hurting neighborhoods and displacing west Denver residents. 2</p>	Equity	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>a. Access To Opportunity</p> <p>i. The statement that today light rail lines are the only access points to high capacity transit is not correct. Many low income households use RTD's major bus line corridors (Colfax, Federal, Sheridan, Broadway, etc.) as affordable, accessible public transit. Blue Print Denver should gather data from RTD about the highest used bus lines and promote access to opportunity along those corridors and areas walkable to those corridors. This will help to prioritize city investments and public-private partnerships to increase access in neighborhoods with low Opportunity index score.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>ii. If the Neighborhood Equity Index does not include income as a metric, then the Access to Opportunity map should place include income measures. Households with lower income have fewer options to get access amenities than households with higher incomes.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>b. Vulnerability to Displacement and Housing and Jobs Diversity</p> <p>i. These two sections identify metrics/indices of both equity factors, but offer no recommendations or policy priorities. At a minimum, BluePrint should commit the City to further study and to developing a Plan of Action in both areas.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>ii. Both Vulnerability and Diversity maps rely primarily on historical data. Particularly in the area of Displacement, it is important to capture data that is predictive of things to come, not what has already happened. For example, capturing the rate of change in home prices (as opposed to current home prices) is a good indicator of a neighborhood where displacement is happening versus a neighborhood where gentrification has already occurred. Intervention programs can still have an impact when displacement is starting to happen, not once low income residents have already been displaced.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Measuring Housing and Jobs Diversity (Page 112)</p> <p>The Gateway Area especially along Pena Boulevard between 56th and the Aurora border is shown as an area of most diversity especially related to jobs. Given the vacant land especially along Pena Boulevard, this map does not represent the current conditions.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Ironically the maps shown for "Measuring Vulnerability to Displacement" directly correlates to the map for "Measuring Access to Opportunity" and "Housing and Jobs Diversity". Seems as if we are failing areas that may need more resources in addition to rezoning in comparison to other parts of the city. (page 52-58).</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Focusing Growth Equitably: Directing growth to existing areas of high and medium transit capacity is a wise strategy that supports Denver residents moving away from their reliance on automobiles. However, the Plan should also consider directing growth to other appropriate areas of the City to encourage additional transportation options. Currently, Denver has limited areas which are serviced by medium to high frequency transit. In order to attract additional transit options, we must broaden our horizons and direct additional density toward the City's major transit corridors. Instead of prioritizing growth towards areas with transit access, we should also look at densifying areas that have the potential to be transit hubs in the future. To this end, we are concerned that the Growth Strategy and Places maps do not designate areas with existing or planned high-frequency transit as high or even moderate growth areas. For 2 instance, in the Denver Moves: Transit Plan, Colorado Boulevard is designated as a High-Capacity Transit Corridor. However, in the Growth Strategy and Places maps, significant portions of Colorado Boulevard, particularly in the Hilltop and Park Hill areas, receive the lowest future growth designation, while the neighborhoods directly across the corridor have higher densities. This does not seem to promote the idea that all neighborhoods have a responsibility to absorb some increased density. It is important that these maps accurately reflect where growth is called for in the Plan. In order to promote density where there is greater access to transit, we recommend that the maps be revised to reflect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At least 4 units be allowed along any corridor with the exception of parkways. ● Similar density be mapped on either side of these corridors. ● Up to 4 units be mapped within ½ mile of light rail corridors. 	Equity	Letter
<p>17. Pg. 108 and 109 – Globeville and Elyria Swansea most vulnerable to displacement, the I-70 expansion has displaced businesses and residents and further displacement will occur with the National Western Center Complex developments. When will the City stop treating them as 'throw-away' neighborhoods? □</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Vulnerability to displacement. UNNA area needs to have a neighborhood plan to address displacement vulnerabilities. Suggest/request CCD to prioritize the creation of a neighborhood plan. Many of the construction/development projects have already happened without a plan, while the E. side of University managed to put a plan into place.</p>	Equity	Letter
<p>Unfortunately, this seems like a complete afterthought and something that will have little to no impact on anything the city does. Great, you've map the issues... now what. You need to think about your affordable housing strategy, linkage policies, etc. There really isn't anything to comment on here because this chapter has essentially no content.</p>	Equity	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Make sure the plan includes recommendations specifically tailored to the unusual and diverse needs of W Colfax residents. Denver should be asking more detailed questions about this neighborhood. The special religious infrastructure and cultural concerns including - security of religious institutions, child-safety, privacy, housing for large-families, parking for minivans and private community busses (for transportation to Jewish day-schools) - can be supported by the plan rather than ignored.	Equity	On-line Survey
Make it more substantive.	Equity	On-line Survey
"Equity" is an ill-defined concept, and as presented in the plan, fails to recognize the social and economic benefits of continuing to support single-family neighborhoods of housing that is "unaffordable" housing to part of the economic population. As I have stated in responding to other survey questions, there is social and economic benefit to the city in having stable single-family housing that encourages young families with children to live in the city, and older empty-nesters or single persons to stay within the city. Especially given the maintenance and restoration costs associated with older single-family housing stock, upper-income homeowners have the means and usually the incentive to preserve and improve such homes. I would amend Chapter 4 to recognize this as a viable and worthwhile goal for parts of the city.	Equity	On-line Survey
I like details about the different divisions and visions within each one.	Equity	On-line Survey
I like the recognition of the need for equitable change.	Equity	On-line Survey
This was a critical chapter for me. I appreciate the focus on access to opportunities, displacement vulnerability, and diversity of jobs and housing. Earlier in this survey I indicated several transit areas that should have increased growth. Those transit areas in West Denver, however, are also very vulnerable to being displaced. I still think growth in these areas is needed, but anti-displacement measures and affordable housing measures are needed. Additionally, the neighborhoods need to feel empowered, and that change can happen but they are actively involved in that change (thinking about East LA Community Corporation's community-based work around the Gold Line, change/growth, and TOD in Boyle Heights/East LA).	Equity	On-line Survey
I like that this plan is specifically addressing "vulnerability to displacement". I have heard from people at RNO meetings talking about folks who were renting small affordable homes south of Colfax are not being displaced as those homes are scraped and replaced with more expensive multi-unit homes, where the rents are high, despite being multi-unit.	Equity	On-line Survey
This chapter does a great job at identifying all of the concerns and issues the city is dealing with	Equity	On-line Survey
I like How will areas where people have been or are being displaced be addressed and repaired?	Equity	On-line Survey
I like that developers understand that people may be displaced and that we need to work on equity	Equity	On-line Survey
I would like the plan to expand on the concept of who is vulnerable to displacement. I have heard from some of the older folks in my neighborhood, who have lived here for 30+ years, that they may be motivated to sell their homes and move somewhere else, because they don't like the type of change that, in their minds, the city is mandating for their neighborhood against their wishes.	Equity	On-line Survey
How will areas where people have been or are being displaced be addressed and repaired? More (aggressive) discussion and feedback on how to keep up on infrastructure repair and development during development. How will certain (lower income) areas not get left behind?	Equity	On-line Survey
It suggest that people won't be displaced but people in our neighborhood have already been displaced because of developers purchasing existing viable housing families and scraping them to replace with ugly multi-family units.	Equity	On-line Survey
This is our Jewish Community of 4 generations. Denver has plenty of other areas to add density to. We have schools and synagogues here and need one family homes for our people. They have large families. Already, due to the extremely high prices we are having trouble growing the community. Our young families can't find houses.	Equity	On-line Survey
This plan will help many lower income residents remain in the neighborhoods they are in and love.	Equity	On-line Survey
Dedicates a whole chapter to a key issue in Denver	Equity	On-line Survey
The equity concepts and maps are effective in showing areas of vulnerability and could effectively guide implementation and coordination among city departments.	Equity	On-line Survey
Preserving Denver neighborhoods and avoiding displacement. The gradual loss of Denver's neighborhood character is apparent in areas being overtaken by new development. Specifically, on West Colfax - where me, my mom, my wife and her parents were born, raised and are raising our family along with and other original-Denver families dating back to the 19th century. This community is growing and values the urban location where synagogue is easily walkable for all residents on Sabbath. The Jewish lifestyle is why it this populace hasn't relocated over time - It can't move away from the vital institutions it invested in over many years.	Equity	On-line Survey
It's good to explicitly talk and think about equity.	Equity	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Well put together and thought out. We are growing and our regulations need to grow and adapt. The thought put into this plan is fantastic	Equity	On-line Survey
The fact that you want to preserve the character of Our neighborhood. We have lively one family homes and we want to keep them. We need them for our Jewish Community. We have been here for 4 generations. We CANNOT be displaced not moved into apartments. Our families are large. We need to be able to park on our streets. Please do not use this community for Urban density. We have too much invested here. It cannot happen. Thank you.	Equity	On-line Survey
The idea of a government entity trying to restrict "gentrification" has never made sense to me. Trying to dictate who moves in or out of a neighborhood seems to me and exercise in futility.	Equity	On-line Survey
Maps don't really highlight key areas. Need more classes/categories to pinpoint most vulnerable of the vulnerable populations, and least access of the low opportunity populations. Need to prioritize somehow	Equity	On-line Survey
The idea of adding in the 'equity' map feels like a significant stretch as to the right use of a land use plan. I strongly disagree with including these maps and suggest that they be removed in their entirety.	Equity	On-line Survey
I am afraid that these large-scale maps create the opportunity for blanket re-zonings without consideration for the small intricacies of individual neighborhoods. The previous strategy of identifying areas of change and areas of stability seemed to guide zoning in a more intricate way. There needs to be a balance between zooming out too much and zooming in too much.	Equity	On-line Survey
Since there's been so much displacement in Elyria, Swansea and Globeville due to the widening of I-70, it's a little late to starting addressing displacement there. I find it disingenuous of the city to talk about retaining affordable housing when so much is being torn down.	Equity	On-line Survey
As mentioned in my previous comments, the diverse community here is being destroyed and its inhabitants are being displaced.	Equity	On-line Survey
I still sense a socioeconomic division that potentially limits areas traditionally of limited means.	Equity	On-line Survey
<p>reinforcement of the confusing and miss-used principle that development in a neighborhood leads to rising cost of living, displacement, where the real problem is lack of housing supply to meet demand, which development is a symptom of, and denser development can help mitigate.</p> <p>If one rightly worries about the displacement of poorer residents by wealthier residents, why are we not allowing, encouraging or even mandating denser development in wealthier neighborhoods, where residents are not as vulnerable to displacement. With greater and broader room for development to meet housing demand, there will be less pressure on vulnerable areas by the wealthier resident to cause displacement, and investments by the city in these under-resourced areas can actually go to our working class neighbors.</p>	Equity	On-line Survey
I'd love to see more about the methods planning would use to help keep the poor neighborhoods less desirable to prevent involuntary displacement. Method like down zoning they can use to erode the property owners equity and destroy the hope for long term financial gain of longtime residents. Methods that can keep the neighborhoods the same so residents won't have any way to move out of those neighborhoods into nicer neighborhoods. Economic development should goals for these areas, creating neighborhood centers and parks that add value to everyone living there. Most of all, creating affordable housing options through increased density can help make neighborhoods more accessible to a broader range of incomes.	Equity	On-line Survey
I appreciate the specific recommendations in Chapter 3 that include equity	Equity	On-line Survey
I support the recommendation that speaks to incentivizing the development of affordable housing through additional height and density in neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement, including Sloan's Lake	Equity	On-line Survey
<p>The plan also calls for large rezoning along West Colfax. This, by definition, would displace the existing Jewish community - indeed it has already begun doing so. Jewish Schools and Kosher Dining is located in east Denver and we rely on busing and automotive transportation to access it.</p> <p>In addition, we do not use vehicles on Saturdays, so a geographically small community is vital to our continuity (we walk to the synagogue). Automotive transit and the availability of parking are vital for our survival and are not adequately addressed in the Plan.</p>	Equity	On-line Survey
inclusiveness	Equity	On-line Survey
<p>The priorities and strategies all sound amazing but few of these Land Use, Mobility, or Quality of Life infrastructure recommendations were executed in the Villa Park neighborhood. Its like it was neglected and all of these great ideas went out the window.</p> <p>All neighborhoods should be given the same opportunities. By encouraging more density on one side of a lightrail station (West Colfax) but not on the other side (Villa Park) you are not equally distributing equity to the neighborhoods. High, Medium and Low intensity should be implemented in a radial form (not linear) from a transit and/or mixed use corridor. For example, High and Medium intensity should be focused within a 1/4 - 1/2 mile radius of a lightrail station on all sides. Not just to the north (West Colfax) or to the south (Villa Park). Transit oriented development should not be biased toward north or south...</p>	Equity	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Community gardens in parks and by rec centers would create opportunities for those who want to produce health food but don't have the space, knowledge or ability	Equity	On-line Survey
The section on equity is an important addition to the plan. It would be advisable to include some goals, policies and strategies to achieve greater diversity and equity.	Equity	Planning Board
concerned that access to opportunity doesn't include access to job opportunities. Also, be sensitive to calling areas low in opportunity can be sensitive, especially since they have higher concentrations of communities of color. Look to Minneapolis for examples of how to talk about "lower opportunity" areas. call it something different. People assume this means access to economic opportunity	Equity	Planning Board
The plan should say "complete and equitable neighborhoods" wherever we say "complete neighborhood"	Equity	Planning Board
Not sure about change of language from Incentivize to require. Potential for unintended consequence - much more scarce resoure. Truly value deep dive	Equity	Task Force
Dont think BP should be to solve affordable housing, The role of BP should inform a different conversation. Wants to be cautious about the fact that we were not tasked to solve affordable housing.	Equity	Task Force
Supportive of BP's equity conversation as a process and having additional voices at the table.	Equity	Task Force
Supportive of additional verbage in BP document or stronger language to make sure it does not get lost in future interpretation. Think we should be using the word "require" as it relates to Density.	Equity	Task Force
Housing Policy 6 - does not say anything about providing density/affordable housing in wealthy areas. We need to be clear that affordable housing should be in ALL areas of Denver.	Equity	Task Force
How to balance equity concepts with each other and goals?	Equity	Task Force
Predictability is very important to neighborhoods and property owners. the equity chapter is great and new but it would be helpful to take a large piece of land and provide to the public how all these different maps would apply. it would be interesting from a property owners perspective what the remedies to the equity maps would be on a parcel level, what it all means to them	Equity	Task Force
I've been researching ADU's as an option for me to build to move into as my primary residence. However, what I have found is the bulk-plane requirements make it difficult/impossible to build on a 3000 sq ft lot - even though the zoning allows for it. I feel it would be beneficial if all ADU zoning was similar to Curtis Park where a full 2 stories are allowed and there is no bulk-plane requirements.	Housing	Email
I feel that more ADU's in Denver would have the following positive effects on the neighborhoods1) Provide affordable rental properties 2) Maintain charter of the neighborhood by preserving existing primary structures 3) Allow people like myself to down-size, provide housing for elderly parents, or collage age children 4) Make alleys safer and cleaner	Housing	Email
I am concerned that Denver seems to believe that continued building of expensive condos and rentals is the answer to our future. There is a glut of luxury rentals that are un-affordable to the boatload of service workers required for the city. Those salaries don't afford big ticket rentals. The matchstick apartments going up overnight are a fire hazard. So these less affordable options look like matchstick ant farms so how is that helpful in that they'll be in deep downgrade by 2040? Live, work, play in a 4 mile radius is wrong for Denver. No parks, inadequate real shopping retail and food outlets but oh so ample marijuana shops, no water, no fire, no police, no openspace other than street medians is ludicrous. Are we to be living in a fog of dope to remain oblivious to this shoddy unsmart planning? Transportation may or may not catch up to needs by 2040. ☹️	Housing	Email
To whom it may concern, I would like to submit my comment to the city of Denver for consideration during the latest blueprint process. Specifically I am writing to address accessory dwelling units. I live in an area in Whittier that has probably 15 ADUs within a 5 block radius. Everyone in the neighborhood seems to be impressed with how people are living so splendidly in what was previously a ramshackle garage or trashed backyard. It brings more density to the neighborhood, which makes the neighborhood feel more like an urban area, which helps the density return to what it historically was here when Denver's famous streetcars roamed. Many young people are able to move here and enjoy the amenities with well-established in historic neighborhood, while still affordably being so close to what makes Denver great. Meanwhile older landowners are able to afford rising property taxes now that they have some rental income. I am seeing the benefits in my neighborhood and it is exciting every time I see a new ADU being built. New companies are forming to fulfill this demand, investment is being made into the neighborhood, and parking is being provided as well which always helps. I see almost no downsides to allowing the rest of Denver the ability to build ADUs and help the market solve our affordability crisis. Denver has a chance to join other progressive cities around the country in utilizing this amazing new opportunity to make our cities more equitable, affordable and diverse. Onward. ☺️	Housing	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I live at 1754 N. Olive St, 80220 in Park Hill. It is zoned E-SU-Dx and currently NOT zoned for ADUs. Please consider allowing ADUs and or tiny homes to be built on properties such as mine in the new Denverright plan; my hope is to rent a room or two to Johnson and Wales University students.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work,</p>	Housing	Email
<p>Dears Blue Print Denver, It is a pleasure and a need to send you this short email, at a time when ADU construction has been seen as a dangerous threat to community and safe neighborhoods. I strongly believe ADUs promote a more diverse in age and income neighborhood, and add architectural and aesthetically values to backyards, often seen as spaces where only the trash can can pass by. Alleys can also become a source of income as well as active urban spaces. It is a safe place for kids to play, and in some cases, it could be a great area for the community to plant and grow together. If a block backyard is surrounded by small units, where singles, seniors or even small families can stay, that will increase the porosity of the block itself, and will build a more active neighborhood. A couple of years ago three world renown scholars (Richard Sennett, Jane Jacobs and Rick Burnett) published The Quito Papers, a new manifesto for the 21st century urbanism. In that paper the authors suggested that porosity should be a new approach to build our cities. I strongly believe that activating, promoting, supporting and encouraging ADUs construction is a good and positive way to support that porosity, and thus build our path to our urban future. ☑</p>	Housing	Email
<p>Love ADUs and what they could do for Denver. Let's get this stuff going. We've spent enough time debating...it's time to start executing.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>I am a professional architect working and living in Denver. I am writing in strong approval of the Accessory Dwelling Unit recommendations laid out within Blueprint Denver draft review. I would also like to advocate for a timely adoption and implementation of the draft so that we can begin including more diverse and affordable housing measures into Denver's fabric as soon as possible.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>Please allow ADU's in Denver. It's what we need!</p>	Housing	Email
<p>I am a professional architectural designer working and living in Denver. I am writing to give my support for all of the Accessory Dwelling Unit recommendations laid out within Blueprint Denver draft review. I would also like to advocate for a rapid adoption and implementation of the draft so that we can begin expanding housing options in Denver's as soon as possible.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>I am a homeowner at the residence of 4894 Beach Court, Denver CO, 80221. I missed the cutoff of the survey as I just found out about it today. I would like to support rezoning for ADU's. I am a single father with a 2.5 year old son. Having the opportunity to build an ADU on my property would allow me to provide a place for my parents to stay to help with child care. Currently, a mortgage and childcare consume 75% percent of my income, so I am not really getting ahead financially. If I could offset daycare with my folks helping, who are retired, it would greatly help, as they cannot afford a second home in Denver. If there is anything I can do to help, or get involved in support of ADU's, let me know.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>Hi, I live at 45th and Vallejo. Just wanted to voice my support (and several neighbors support) for ADUs being allowed throughout the city. I'd love to build one myself! I also support individual rezonings for ADUs.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>After moving into our ADU, I have the distinct orientation of their value and contribution to our City as an urban form and use. Providing density of course, they also provide affordability, offer eyes and safety upon our alleys, and create more interesting spaces universally. With this, I am 100% for the Land Use & Form Recommendations 1-8.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>I would like to voice my support for expanding zoning code to allow ADUs in all lots in Denver.</p>	Housing	Email
<p>Hi there! I live in Denver and wanted to write to voice my support for the push to allow zoning changes to allow ADU's in Denver. As a homeowner, I would love to be able to contribute to solving Denver's housing crisis in a sustainable way (please, no more ugly high-rise "luxury" apartment buildings). My partner and I are middle-class and the ability to be able to generate wealth using an ADU on our property is something that we are extremely interested in—and we've got several friends that feel the same way. I also would like to voice that the three-month review period seems to be sufficient, and that we shouldn't wait to implement this much longer. I love Denver, but this limitation is something that has me constantly wondering in putting my effort into this city is worth it, whereas I could move to somewhere comparable like Portland and not encounter these same kind of limitations. Being on the front end of this trend of ADUs would be valuable for Denver (similar to how we were for marijuana) and I sincerely hope that the barriers to entry be removed soon! ☑</p>	Housing	Email
<p>2.5 Strengthen the language in the Land Use and Built Form - Housing section Both the Design Quality and Green Infrastructure sections have many recommendations that "Require" compliance, whereas there are no "requirements" in the Housing section. The Housing strategies language only suggests to "consider incentives" or "consider incentives or requirements." ☑</p>	Housing	Equity training
<p>Be more inclusive than just enabling "construction" of ADUs. That doesn't include process and permitting on the face.</p>	Housing	Equity training
<p>LUBF - H #3: The intent doesn't match the policy. Recommendation: Incentivize the 'preservation and reuse options for' existing smaller and affordable homes, particularly near transit and in areas.....</p>	Housing	Equity training

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>LUBF - H #2: This reads to EITHER be a density enhancing or affordable units through added density...so it will become high cost housing with higher profits (b/c no land values). Ultimately it needs to promote the creation of affordable housing and BE more specific about the locations where this can happen higher up in the policy or background.</p> <p>What is important about this is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the plan is strong enough to NOT let neighborhoods opt out of this - So why not shoot for affordable 'missing middle' income as a possibility...REQUIRING affordable and attainable. 	Housing	Equity training
<p>LUBF - H #7: THIS needs articulation on the outcome and no ENCOURAGE...but REQUIRE based on the outcomes of the study.</p> <p>POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Expand the supply...of family friendly housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include aging in place needs to be stated. - Include 'family friendly' in the glossary - What are the amenities? And are they conducive to other age groups. 	Housing	Equity training
<p>LUBF - H #6: REQUIRE NOT INCENTIVIZE</p>	Housing	Equity training
<p>LUBF - H #5: Evaluate permitting barriers and resources to help HOMEOWNERS to rezone, and permit for an ADU. Consider scaling existing ADU development programs to other areas with affordability restrictions.</p>	Housing	Equity training
<p>Include halfway houses in the residential zoning options so people who need services, transportation, jobs the most have the same benefit and access</p>	Housing	Focus Group
<p>Affordable housing should be more attainable for those who need it</p>	Housing	Focus Group
<p>Maintain the neighborhood character with ADU development</p>	Housing	Focus Group
<p>Affordable housing should be built in all neighborhoods</p>	Housing	Focus Group
<p>On housing diversity: 1) Adding attached homes does not mean increasing affordability (e.g., row homes and townhomes are very expensive; many single family homes are less expensive). 2) Remove statement that suggests that attached housing only appropriate along collector streets, corridors, centers. Duplexes are well integrated into the middle of my block. Put anywhere we can. 3) Define "preserved" in reference to existing units: preserve price point or structure? 4) Happy about ADU language; is there some way to track who occupies? Offset cost of construction for affordability (recent LA Times article puts costs at \$150,000 to \$300,000).</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>When incentivizing the reuse of existing smaller and affordable homes, remove the reference to transit corridors, as this is a strategy that should be encouraged in all neighborhoods (pg. 54).</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>When expanding ADUs into more zone districts, include reference to attached units (i.e. basement apartments) as well as detached units. Consider allowing such units, or greater flexibility in adding them, when the primary structure is to be retained in order to avoid speculative scrapes and maximum build-outs (pg. 56). The goal should be to add density without (or with less) demolition, as this achieves growth, equity, sustainability and neighborhood character-preservation goals.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>It's also important to note that much of Denver's housing stock is aging, and that even by 2040, a significant portion of it will still be many, many decades old. Aging, deteriorating housing stock is a triple threat to sustainability, environmental health, and housing stability for low-income residents. Thus, Denver should also commit to providing funds and outlining a strategy to lift the quality and safety of its existing housing stock while maintaining its affordability through programs like the lead mitigation, home rehabilitation, and home repair implemented by NDC members and non-profits across the city.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>G) Recommendation No 3 - Housing. We generally support this recommendation and suggest it be expanded beyond those neighborhoods identified as high Vulnerability to Displacement. However, we disagree with any suggestion that would allow additional units to be built in a "Low-SF/SU" zone, which we have asked CPD to create and designate in WWP and part of Speer. There are many other incentives that could be used to preserve existing housing stock that would not have the effect of altering the existing land use pattern in our neighborhoods. We therefore ask that Item A. be revised to eliminate the reference to allowing additional units as incentives.</p>	Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 02, Strategy A-1: Concern with implications of adding density at corner lots along collector streets, Part 1.-The idea of allowing 2 to 4-unit buildings at corner lots along collector streets and along corridors or at centers would have unintended consequences: Incentivizing demolition and replacement of corner structures and those along corridors and at centers would transform the urban form of our city and eliminate the iconic corner lot and commercial node structures that give our neighborhoods their character. We can see examples of this along corridors like West 44th Avenue where the corner houses are being lost to new duplexes under the 2010 Zoning Code. Part 2.- Increasing density needs to follow the local context. What is the process for implementation if the increased density exceeds the current zoning?</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 02, Strategy B: Concern with incentivizing tear-downs.-“Ensuring zoning code standards, such as minimum lot sizes, do not restrict the development of multifamily housing where it is otherwise allowed.” We are concerned that reducing minimum lot sizes would encourage the demolition of existing structures, further weakening preservation of our historic neighborhoods.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing p. 54 6) I like this b/c it could help keep homes from being scraped. 7) #4 and #5 ADU s a. ADUs baby! (supports expanding ADUs) b. Our neighborhood needs more ADU zoning, can it be easier to or reduced zoning fees for ADUs? c. Help with or easier zoning process for high benefit areas (but not transit zones?), large lots, and vulnerable areas d. Can lots next to ADU zoning just rezone easier in the Planning Office? e. Evaluate barriers that exist preventing all homeowners from benefitting f. Identify solutions to help homeowner overcome barriers g. Incentivize ADUs to add affordable units, ADU zoning administratively if restricted affordable h. Limit public improvement requirements to be in scale with improvement value 8) #6 REQUIRE and incentivize affordability? If you do not require affordability you are creating displacement in all of the west side. The numbers don't work for fixed up homes or (market build) ADUs to be rented at a reasonable rate. We know this and they (WDRC) has the numbers to prove it. Our neighborhood has seen a number of houses kick out their renters because they can rent at a much higher rate, or they can sell at a high price. That is two families lost, the ones that were renting and the local family that was saving to buy but now can't afford to (in the neighborhood). (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED 6X AND many more in other forums where the community wants to discuss how they cannot benefit from future investments unless housing affordability is addressed)</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>ADUS: please add a strategy about providing resources (to vulnerable neighborhoods) regarding neighborhood changes that impact property or zoning (hotline, a planner, local service, and help with permitting).</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>INC ZAP's platform calls for improving the quality and affordability of living in Denver. Blueprint Denver has important recommendations throughout for design quality, open space, and affordability, which need to be given high priority for implementation. Though drafters have made clear that they believe legally we cannot require affordable housing, it has become clear through the Equity analysis and Blueprint Taskforce dialogue that it is our wish to include goals, that we write it however necessary to legally to explore opportunities to lobby to achieve affordability throughout the city</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 02 B – What is the point of minimums if they are not to be held? This seems to be a slippery slope and creates concerning loopholes and precedents to disregard the Denver Zoning Code.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Moving toward implementation, coordination with other City departments will be critical. Specifically in order to mitigate displacement in vulnerable neighborhoods, increase access to opportunity, and guide densification AND preservation in low income neighborhoods will require close coordination of policies, programs, strategies, funding priorities with the Office of Economic Development. OED's 5 Year Housing Plan priorities and goals should be referenced more specifically throughout relevant sections of Blueprint Denver.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>i. Housing Goal 2: Missing Middle housing in low-mod neighborhoods should also be targeted as affordable housing, to allow for stability and growth of lower income households in those neighborhoods.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>ii. Housing Goal 8: There should be affordability goals / targets tied to the capture of 80% of housing growth in regional centers, corridors, etc. 25% of new housing should be attainable at 80% and below of AMI.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>C.H.U.N. supports increasing and maintaining affordable housing in all of our neighborhoods.</p>	Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Page 54 – Policy 2. Current zoning code lacks in building forms that would allow 4-8 units per zone lot in residential areas. Please consider a recommendation that would amend the zoning code with additional building forms that would allow for this level of density within half a mile from streets designated as transit priority streets. Please consider eliminating parking requirement for these building forms to allow them to serve as affordable units for individuals who rely on public transportation. This will allow for density of 30-50 units per acre that is necessary to support transit.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Page 56 – Recommendation 5. Please consider revising language to allow Accessory Dwelling Units as use by right in all residential zones.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver - Land Use & Zoning Take a slow, deep breath, close your eyes and recall the best cities you've visited. Did they have areas of differing character that were joined and you could walk through them? Did they have areas of history and eye-pleasing, integrated design? Did they have lively spaces populated by a variety of residents and visitors? I seriously doubt your first thoughts were of Phoenix, Arizona or Los Angeles, California. These cities are characterized by areas of sprawl only adhering to the vision of the developer and not planners of a sustainably world-class city.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Accessory Dwelling Units. The UPCC Board strongly believes that random structures increasing density should be required to undergo careful study for mass, form and impact on adjacent properties. Opportunities for more of this housing type need to be very carefully balanced with the decades-old existing neighborhood context. We support consideration of allowing ADUs for any designated landmark single family residence. We are an historic neighborhood, and want to preserve as many of our significant homes as possible. This would be a helpful incentive for those property owners to designate their homes. new ADUs at a single family Landmark residence shall be one story ; the only variation on this would be if the property has a "carriage house" per zoning code definition - built before 1956 and two stories. This is consistent with our current re-zoning effort to eliminate new two-story structures in the rear of a property. We also support incentives to help prevent the scraping of existing homes, but are reluctant to allow ADUs as an incentive without clearly defined design review and significant neighborhood input. Before any ADUs are allowed , the allowed uses would need to be carefully considered, as well as post-construction monitoring. The agencies charged with enforcement would need to be listed, as well as the ways this follow-up would be guaranteed. We are not opposed to ADUs in those instances where the property across the alley or immediately behind the ADU property is zoned commercial or buildings taller than two stories. In this particular instance we are not opposed to an ADU constructed as a 2nd story to an alley garage</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Our neighborhood is battling a serious concern with density – that all new denser housing product does not accommodate families and is generally unaffordable for any current resident, promoting mass displacement of our long-term neighbors. We ask that the City of Denver consider incentives and/or regulations that encourage or require affordability when greater residential and commercial density are allowed.</p>	Housing	letter
<p>Housing Recommendations: Moving forward, coordination between CPD and other city departments on housing issues will be critical. While we believe the new land-use and zoning guide outlines the optimal distribution of density and development to help mitigate potential adverse effects on affordability the forecasted population increase Denver is poised to absorb by 2014, the very nature of new higher density development along corridors abutting vulnerable neighborhoods may still impact affordability. It is important to note that to truly mitigate involuntary displacement and ensure affordability in these neighborhoods, the physical form-based strategies related to promoting a diversity of housing products will need close coordination with programmatic and policy strategies that are the purview of the office of economic development and other city departments. However, the strategies in this document are a great place to start. Finally, we recommend that the City contemplate creating greater incentives to help affordable housing and community development be developed in high-opportunity areas indicated in the map on page 105.</p>	Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Equity Metrics: We appreciate the commitment to using metrics to hold this plan and the City accountable to their goals. However, given the City’s renewed commitment to equity evidenced in this plan, we suggest, in this document or elsewhere, a specific description of these goals in terms of real numbers. For instance, we know from the Office of Economic Development that about 10% of Denver’s total homeownership and rental housing stock is has been developed affordable or made so through housing vouchers. But, with 90,000 households moving to Denver by 2040, a current shortage of 58,000 affordable/available rental units for low-income households already living here (about 51% of renters are currently housing cost burdened), and a virtual 100% gap of affordable/available for-sale homes for low-moderate income households (2017 5y Housing Action Plan), the City should consider establishing a metric to gauge whether the City meets a higher percentage of housing need between 2019 and 2040 than it did between 2000 and 2019. Given rising costs and everything else stated above, we recommend that 25% of new housing development between now and 2040 is made affordable. Phrased another way: according to 2017 census estimates, there are some 161,920 rental units in Denver. With a 58,000 affordable/available home gap for low-income renters, that’s an overall rental housing cost diversity gap of 35.82%. The question the City of Denver needs to ask itself is if, in 2040, will it have proactively chosen policies that result in increased diversity of Denver’s housing stock so it’s more inclusive of low-income renters, or will it continue losing ground? And, unlike today, will there be enough affordable/available for-sale housing so any of these renters be able to move into homeownership—thereby building generational wealth and freeing up affordable units for renters that are currently overpaying? These are serious questions that the City should answer with the creation of specific goals to show Denver residents where we’re heading as a city.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>1) Clayton has been divided into two areas currently, one which permits ADUs and one which does not. We actively support the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas, uniformly.</p> <p>We are concerned that the permitting process, including, for example, requirements for covenants and party wall agreements, can be complex and expensive and may be a barrier to the widespread adoption of ADUs and may be a barrier to the construction of ADUs as a wealth-building tool for low- and moderate-income homeowners, as envisioned in the plan. We encourage the city to develop ways to streamline the ADU permitting process.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>p 54 – locations of missing middle housing. Why collector streets, why not avenues, adding additional units to existing structures, missing middle into low residential units context? Also, add all areas that have 2 units or allow ADUs.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>p 57 – 06 B – add “and access to transit.”</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>(i) Recommendation No. 2 - Housing. This section suggests the possibility of allowing duplexes, fourplexes, rowhomes and townhomes even in "Low" residential areas. As indicated above, such a recommendation would result in the destruction of the existing land use pattern in our neighborhood, and would inevitably pit residents against developers and investors, who in our experience build to the greatest density to enhance their returns. Together with Community Planning and Development ("CPD") and our councilman, WWPNA residents worked exhaustively from 2008-2010 to ensure that WWP and much of Speer were "right-zoned" for single family use, which through an on-the-ground inventory conducted jointly by WWPNA and CPD was determined to reflect our predominant land use pattern. We put a lot of effort into achieving our current zoning and we want to see it preserved. Within the collective WWPNA boundaries of WWP and Speer, we already have considerable housing diversity. Together with the fact that there are over 5,000 new housing units (including affordable and multi-unit housing) built or in the works in our community or on our exterior borders', we do not think it equitable to our residents to adopt a Plan that would thrust additional density on our community. We believe this neighborhood exhibits characteristics of the "missing middle" as is. As written, this recommendation would significantly and negatively alter our neighborhood character given where some parts of our neighborhood have been reflected on the Housing/Jobs Diversity spectrum and the lack of a "Low" category in a General Urban zone. We ask that Recommendation No. 2 - Housing be revised to clearly limit this to "low-medium" residential areas or to add a "Low-SU" zoning category where ADUs and two-unit+ buildi11g forms are not allowed.</p> <p>While in general we commend the preservation intent reflected in the second bullet point under Item A. of this recommendation, we believe the language as written is overly broad, especially that referencing additional "unit(s)", instead of additional "unit". This ambiguity opens to the door to any number of units that could be added, even in a "low" residential area. This is objectionable and must be corrected.</p>	Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>(k) Recommendations No. 4 and No. 5 - Housing. This Recommendation suggests allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs) throughout all residential areas. This proposal was discussed at length at both WWPNA general membership meetings this year. After robust discussion of the pros and cons of ADUs, residents at both meetings, by a very nearly unanimous vote, rejected this concept. Residents believe that ADUs are inconsistent with SU zoning and that the negative impacts of allowing such uses in our existing SU zones would far outweigh the benefits. And though we understand the intent behind Item D., please keep in mind that the ADUs presently existing in our neighborhood (which generally are two stories) minimize open space, solar access, and privacy of other residents. Moreover, many residents in our community have commented that existing ADUs are often used as short-term rentals, but even when used as long-term rentals, they frequently don't have an owner-occupant in one of the structures as required by the current Code. Thus, this is eroding the benefits of an owner-occupied neighborhood that our residents cherish. We ask that Recommendation No. 4 -Housing be revised to expand ADUs only in "low-medium" residential areas.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>(l) Recommendation No. 6 - Housing. We disagree with the statements in Item B. regarding reductions in parking, regardless of whether the units are affordable. With significant development of late in our community, we know first-hand the adverse impacts on residents due to a lack of sufficient off-street parking. This is a material safety issue, particularly for women and older adults. If you can park only blocks away from your home, you will likely choose another place to live - a woman isn't going to walk two blocks from an on-street parking space to her residence by choice. This is also true for older adults. We don't want to lose residents because they don't feel safe getting to and from their homes.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>(m) Recommendation No. 8 -Housing. This recommendation should be revised to reflect the actual percentages of growth intended for regional and community corridors/centers, high-intensity residential areas, Greenfield residential areas and certain districts each on an individual basis, as depicted on the Growth Strategy Map (Page 30). Grouping these together could have the unintended consequence of promoting more growth in community corridors and centers than intended in the interior of cohesive neighborhoods.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Yes city should assess unique housing such as tiny homes. What about the changing formats of short term rentals (air bnb) and home office?</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>ADU expansion would certainly open neighborhoods to housing variation while maintaining the overall fabric, and in a less imposing way than larger multi family developments, but our neighbors have some concerns. We would like to see proper design and coordination with the existing structure to fit into the neighborhood in an appropriate manner. Smaller scale of ADUs relative to the existing structures is also important. Cook Park is largely one-story homes and does not contain alleys for separate access. We encourage further exploration of ADUs specific to neighborhoods with considerations to size, access, rental lengths, number of occupants etc. and implementations of regulations.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 01:Will changes to city regulations include changes to zoning regulations on unit sizes and allowances for ADUs?-Will changes to city regulations include changes to zoning regulations on unit sizes and allowances for ADUs?</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Housing Policy 06, Strategy A:Concern with incentivizing additional height without following Neighborhood Plans.-Height bonuses city-wide would conflict with adopted Neighborhood Plans. There must be requirements to work within the Neighborhood Context and following the Neighborhood Plan.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 02 – We agree that there is a “missing middle”. We would like to see restrictions to how this goal is applied. We do endorse incentives to re-use existing structures but do not believe that that alone would lead to additional units being “attainable”. How might “income restriction” be enforced?</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 03 -- We would like to specifically endorse this Recommendation and look forward to supporting its implementation.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 05 – While there are many reasons that we support ADU's, we feel that they are not appropriate in some areas within our boundaries. We strongly believe that a mapping exercise is necessary to determine appropriate contexts.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 06 A – This Recommendation needs to take context into consideration.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 06 B – This Recommendation requires the context of transit.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 06 C -- We would like to specifically endorse this Recommendation and look forward to supporting its implementation.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>When asked about the proposal to diversify housing choice through the expansion of accessory dwelling units throughout all residential areas 57% believed that it would not enhance the living experience in Congress Park.</p>	Housing	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>There were comments from the several neighbors about the value of the existing stock of single family homes, and regret that they have been and continue to be replaced with row home, and higher density housing. Therefore, the following Housing related Strategies under the Land Use section are appreciated, and should be extended to consider how the replacement of single story homes, with 2.5-3 story row homes is also ignoring the needs of the senior population.</p> <p>[LH] 03 Incentivize the reuse of existing smaller and affordable homes, particularly near transit and in areas that score high for Vulnerability to Displacement.</p> <p>[LH] 07 Encourage the development of family friendly housing throughout the city</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>The Growth Map defines a goal for % of housing in different map areas, but not a % of affordable housing as a sub-goal. We would request that Blueprint Denver develop more detailed goals that distinguish between housing in general and affordable housing specifically.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing Goals should be reflective of the Housing Priorities and Goals of the City of Denver's new 5 Year Housing Plan.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Housing 4 & 5: Harkness Heights is zoned U-SU-C which does not permit ADU's. Although the neighborhood recognizes and appreciates the value of ADU's in addressing the objectives of this policy for some areas of the city, Harkness Heights has not indicated a desire to change our zoning to accommodate ADU's. A city wide approach to rezoning is inappropriate, and the character, needs, and preferences of each distinct neighborhood must be considered.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>9. Pg. 54, 55 and 56 – Housing Recommendations – where exactly is the City considering allowing ADU's? In specific neighborhoods or zone districts? Is the City proposing allowing ADU's in areas of Park Hill where they are not allowed under the current zoning code? If so, where? RNO's should be included in the conversation about where and how ADU's will be allowed. "Remove barriers to constructing accessory dwelling units and create context-sensitive form standards." What is meant by 'remove barriers' – allow throughout all residential zone districts? □</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Pg.212 – Land Use and Built Form – again with the ADU's and no clear definition of where they will be allowed.</p>	Housing	Letter
<p>Supportive of LUBF housing policy 3. Also, allow two units in all single unit neighborhoods for revitalizing areas - redevelopment</p>	Housing	Office Hours
<p>(page 56) Policy 4, Strategy C – change to “study and implement” instead of “create”</p>	Housing	Office Hours
<p>Supportive of ADU recommendations.</p>	Housing	Office Hours
<p>Supportive of the deconstruction requirements and incentives to preserve existing buildings</p>	Housing	Office Hours
<p>I like incentivizing the preservation of existing structures, maybe allow more flexibility with zoning changes on existing buildings or not requiring ADA or SUDP modifications if existing structures are reused.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I like that will be more inclusive and create space for people who are typically exclude. Having safe and healthy spaces is critical and access to transportation and safe spaces as well . I am in West Denver, I own two homes and I work in the City as well. I would like both my properties to be considered for re- zoning for ADU so that I can create rentals to help the housing market and use it to help my family as well.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>Less restrictions on Airbnb rentals. Implement the plan already!</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I believe we have had plenty of time to review this plan and I would like to see it get moved through as initially planned. We do not need more time to review this. I would like to see a full 2-stories for ADUs rather than the 1.5. People are forced to build a bigger garage than they want so they can get the living space they desire upstairs. The bulk plane is great and it prevents shading the neighbors the 1.5 stories is not necessary.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I like that the City of Denver is looking into the city's future density needs and planning on allowing more ADUs.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>Removing restrictions on lot size for all ADUs is problematic. My lot is 3,000 something square feet. My neighbor just built a 17 foot high garage on the property line, which at some point she wants to convert to an ADU if a future rezoning allows it. If setbacks and lot size minimums are removed, this would allow this unsightly garage to be used to shove more people on to an already puny lot. Also, when you speak about ADUs helping low and moderate income people, it takes money to build them either from the ground up or as a build-out to an existing structure. I know that it states that financial assistance would be needed but the people I see doing it are all from above average income households.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I think that Housing - Policy 4 needs stronger, more defined language. It seems vague and could use language that defines the need for these housing forms more clearly. I would love to build an ADU on my property but need to rezone in order to do so. The current language seems like it could go either way.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>Strengthen language around not allowing ADU's to be used as Short Term Rentals (e.g. change "encourage" to "don't allow")</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>ALLOW ADUs CITY-WIDE!! we are at least a decade behind the other major and more succesful cities...portland, seattle, vancouver, austin...</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I like most things about this chapter. I especially support the language that encourages the development of accessory dwelling units in all neighborhoods. This allows all neighborhoods to all new units and allow more small players to participate and profit from Denver's growth.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>I would like to see further language emphasizing the use of ADUs to increase density while maintaining neighborhood character. I believe that ADUs are preferred over scrape-offs.</p>	Housing	On-line Survey
<p>New construction of ancillary housing should be universal designed to help expand our inventory of accessible housing for people with mobility issues</p>	Housing	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
The idea of allowing ADUs in all residential areas. I would love to rezone my Sunnyside property and LIVE in the ADU. Our block is currently bordered by U-SU-B1 / U-TU-C / and mixed use zones.	Housing	On-line Survey
Permitting ADU's. Denver is in an affordability and inventory housing crisis. Permitting homeowners to build an ADU above their garage is a great rental income resource for owners and a lower cost option for renters whilst increasing the inventory of housing in the City. I live in Congress Park where ADU's are not permitted by code. Current code requires that the back 1/3 of the lot be restricted to 1 story. I have a detached garage and aging parents with moderate incomes. If allowed to build an ADU above my garage, my mother could age in place with us. Further, for my retired neighbors on fixed incomes, if ADU's were permitted, they could live in the ADU and rent out their house (thereby increasing their income, downsizing, keeping their home, and allowing them to stay in a desirable neighborhood near their friends).	Housing	On-line Survey
Restrict high density housing, with out adequate parking.	Housing	On-line Survey
Allow any resident that wants an ADU to build one. It will increase density and help housing costs go down.	Housing	On-line Survey
allow ADU's city-wide...they don't have to be a detached ADU allowance, but at least let people use their basement to aid in the affordable housing crisis	Housing	On-line Survey
The plan's approach to Accessory Dwelling Units assumes a one-size-fits-all approach to allowing additional dwelling units. This is not appropriate in all neighborhoods. The emphasis on "equity" in housing options is a laudable goal, but would undermine historic districts if it permitted inappropriate in-fill housing options. In general, the new plan emphasizes "up-zoning" over "preservation," failing to recognize that not every neighborhood should or can support every type of housing type/income level.	Housing	On-line Survey
My wife and I are huge proponents of allowing more ADU development which stands out in your recommendations. Many of the progressive western cities (Portland, Austin, Bay Area, Vancouver BC) are on the forefront of this movement and we believe it could be a really great part of helping to solve the affordability problems in the city.	Housing	On-line Survey
The allowance of ADUs throughout the City and removing barriers to allow more of these housing types.	Housing	On-line Survey
I support the recommendation in the land Use and Built Form: Housing section that speaks to incentivizing the development of affordable housing and mixed income housing near transit and/or amenities.	Housing	On-line Survey
I like that ADU's are being addressed. I think they are very beneficial for keeping older neighborhoods character and still adding housing. These are also great ways for people to help family and friends with long term house or a good way for people to stay in their current home and earn supplemental income. They could help clean up the alleyways too. I think we need access to better financing and incentives.	Housing	On-line Survey
Also agree that ADUs should be allowed throughout all zone districts. This can help provide needed density with preserving the existing neighborhood feel.	Housing	On-line Survey
The objective of reducing the barrier to constructing ADUs. The development of ADUs is on of the best strategies to increase housing density while saving existing homes. ADUs also have the least impact on existing neighborhood fabric.	Housing	On-line Survey
The strategies allow for equality and recognize the value in preserving Denver's core and long-time residents/neighborhoods while sharing our city with an influx of new residents - often transient populations - to live here for a short time or, hopefully, to settle here.	Housing	On-line Survey
Having ADUs by right throughout Denver. We need more housing and this is a great solution that keeps our neighborhood feel. In many cases it also provides parking.	Housing	On-line Survey
It says the plan will encourage family-friendly housing.	Housing	On-line Survey
support for ADU's in all zones, intent to reduce restrictions and facilitate development	Housing	On-line Survey
ADU's more available	Housing	On-line Survey
I would support recommendations that support development of more affordable housing with greater density and height, especially in neighborhoods like Sloan Lake where displacement is rampant.	Housing	On-line Survey
I support the recommendation that speaks to incentivizing the development of affordable housing through additional height and density in neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement, including Sloan's Lake. We cannot ignore the needs of low income families.	Housing	On-line Survey
I would strongly encourage the city to consider some sort of overlay that is allowed through Blueprint Denver that is mapped throughout the city per recommendation 2C that seeks to incentivize things we want for the city (affordable housing, better design, reduced parking)through additional height.	Housing	On-line Survey
Getting Wastewater on board for affordable housing, by reducing their Sewer fee of about \$4,700 for an ADU. They charge that same amount for new houses, and an ADU is only one kitchen, one bath. It's absurd!	Housing	On-line Survey
I think the tools the city can use to permit increased height and density should be stronger and more	Housing	On-line Survey
The Goals are good. Your strategies are too generic to function as strategies. instead of saying things like "ensure city codes support ..." a strategy should actually call out the codes that you will change and how they ensure that something happens. If you don't do that then it is still just a goal.	Housing	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
You should consider more incentive zoning mechanisms and transfer of development rights mechanisms.	Housing	On-line Survey
Additional height and density should be available as a tool to support affordable housing wherever there is vulnerability to displacement, not only if it is next to public transit, and not only if it is in keeping with the "character and context" of the neighborhood, which could be used as a weapon by the NIMBY crowd	Housing	On-line Survey
On page 58 housing recommendations: I agree we need more affordable options but I think it is important to not over densify the traditional single family streets (i.e Washington Park, Congress Park, etc) should remain Single family residential and maintain the character of the neighborhoods. So the density needs to be very thoughtful. I think certain areas needs to remain single family within the city.	Housing	On-line Survey
Once again, I am "stuck" on the notion of "equity" meaning "equitable distribution of diverse housing . . ." If this means converting single family homes to multiple dwelling units, I strenuously oppose it, because it will chase upper-income neighbors to the suburbs. It is one thing to modify the definition of family units to accommodate LGBTQ families, multi-generational families, and families with foster, adopted, or step-children; it is quite another to allow entrepreneurs to buy up single family homes to convert them essentially into absentee-landlord apartments housing completely unrelated individuals whose only commonality is that they live under one roof.	Housing	On-line Survey
Housing needs to actually be family-friendly! So far we've only seen small units. If we preserve the existing housing, that is the most family friendly you can get.	Housing	On-line Survey
Allow ADU's in Wellshire. There is a trend of buying old houses and scraping them and replacing with huge houses. ADU's would give owners better options to upgrade the use of their lots while keeping the character of the neighborhood. It would also give the option to rent out to lower income people or students	Housing	On-line Survey
Height/density should be tools to support affordable housing development wherever there is displacement, whether or not it's adjacent to transit, and not only if it's supported in neighborhood plans.	Housing	On-line Survey
Additional height and density should be available as a tool to support affordable housing wherever there is vulnerability to displacement, not only if it is next to public transit, and not only if it is in keeping with the "character and context" of the neighborhood, which could be used as a weapon by the NIMBY crowd.	Housing	On-line Survey
I am really happy that the Blueprint Denver plan is incorporating the allowance of ADUs throughout all communities in Denver. This is a huge need and desire for most of us that strongly want to live in the city neighborhoods but either need additional living space for our immediate family, extended family, or even just to provide living spaces for college students, lower income families, etc in all the neighborhoods. I strongly agree with this recommendation and know that it would make a huge difference in my neighborhood if this is approved and becomes accessible to all of us.	Housing	On-line Survey
Totally agree the options for ADUs should be allowed in more parts of the city. The design of these should also be sensitive to their surroundings so your recommendations are spot on! New development should also be scaled to better complement and integrate into the surrounding neighborhood. Drought tolerant landscape and street trees should also be required for new development/scrapes.	Housing	On-line Survey
I am the most interested in allowing ADUs throughout the city. We have a lot of housing issues and I believe this will allow more affordable housing. There are more being built now and it is getting cars off the streets and giving people a place to live. I am moving into one tomorrow and a discounted rate with a year long lease.	Housing	On-line Survey
need to be clear that missing middle is also about income level. Define it (can also include existing smaller homes that are market rate affordable)	Housing	Planning Board
add a policy that we don't want to see commercializing of existing housing stock, especially missing middle housing, so we should explore policies and enforcement to make sure enforcement is happening so people are not	Housing	Planning Board
More clarity on where ADUs can be, not only above garages/off alleys but also in a basement.	Housing	Task Force
We need to have stronger, clear language about providing affordable housing in wealthy areas.	Housing	Task Force
We strongly agree with Blueprint Denver's stated goal of working to preserve existing buildings that are sound, made of solid materials, and which contribute to the character of our neighborhoods. Denver has already lost too much of what makes our city unique and attractive, and strong measures should be taken to discourage demolitions and encourage adaptive reuse. This should apply across most of West Highland and regardless of whether buildings are officially designated as historic or not. The plan is vague, however, on how this will be done, and needs to be considerably strengthened in this area before adoption.	Implementation: Urban Design	Letter
Add a sidebar to small area planning section about our goal for every neighborhood to have a current plan by 2040 (and always have a current one) and show as a metric to measure. Maybe also add a policy about this to LUBFG?	Land Use and Built Form	City Council
LUBG policy 10 -- be more explicit about resourcing better engagement (not just building capacity)	Land Use and Built Form	City Council
LUBG general policy 1: amend strategy B to be clearer that once transit is in place, we should upzone to match as transit investments happen along corridors	Land Use and Built Form	City Council
Add policy to LUBF General regarding large redevelopment areas to encourage planning process and clear requirements for things such as affordable housing, open space and other community benefits	Land Use and Built Form	City Council

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
LUBF-E #3/5 - Preserve high value manufacturing and allow low to transition - preserving industries helps equity. helps to keep a mix of jobs available to residents. Is it possible to allocate collected taxes closer to where they're generated from? environmental concerns and a burden associated when industrial uses about low income residential areas. We need more data from employers about where their employees live.	Land Use and Built Form	Equity training
LUBF -E #6 - Support orgs and districts within centers and corridors to aid attraction and retention of businesses - tweak language so it supports both existing and future orgs. New businesses would benefit from support, but who are they hiring and retaining? People may see areas not in regional centers as areas of disinvestment. Location of regional centers don't benefit areas with high minority populations.	Land Use and Built Form	Equity training
LUBF - G #7: There should be a threshold on the size of the parcel: easier to maybe not rezone if smaller and rezoning (PUD?) if it is larger. "create access and opportunities for Denverites to be.....Be less restrictive on the reuse. Adaptive reuse for greater land use flexibility, including....waivers on permit fees for retrofit of building; parking grandfathered in. Where community use is anticipated (and the uses, bulk standards are very different or not in an adopted plan)...is a PUD warranted, especially where there have been historic or systemic barriers...and therefore less organized input, resistance or support. ACCESS: incorporate access to info, meetings, staff, and representation	Land Use and Built Form	Equity training
Commute times are the worst for people who are restricted on the type of work they can do. Job options and housing options for the underserved are not typically close to each other	Land Use and Built Form	Focus Group
Planning needed for large open spaces/golf courses that go away	Land Use and Built Form	Internal
Embedded utility language-Add new LUBF:General policy/strategy: Accommodate growing infrastructure needs by allowing low-impact, publicly serving utilities to be located in areas to strategically serve the communities. Explore appropriate strategies to mitigate impacts.	Land Use and Built Form	Internal
Suggested edit for LUBF Policy 8, Strategy A: (missing land/landscaping/GI element of a green building program..i.e., SITES Certification): Develop a comprehensive green building program for horizontal and vertical development that includes both required and incentive elements.	Land Use and Built Form	Internal
Page 50, Policy 9, Strategy B: Open space requirements versus systems?	Land Use and Built Form	Internal
Please include a strong commitment to preserve existing Denver's neighborhoods into the future. This is part of Denver's legacy	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
The focus should be on redevelopment of surface parking lots, before considering new rezoning that could threaten existing structures. Use tools, such as land value taxation, to move decades-old parking lots from eyesores to development opportunities	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
This process needs an analysis of existing buildable land - i.e., lands that are vacant and underutilized - before advocating opening up so many of the areas of the city for rezoning. There needs to be clear information first on how much existing land is already available for development, before we undertake tearing down more of current built environment that makes Denver what it is	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
When incentivizing the "most efficient development of land" consider how that may impact existing resources, and when encouraging increased density include preservation as one of the desired outcomes, as the reuse of existing buildings, either stand-alone or in tandem with new construction, can be both an efficient and effective strategy that also supports other plan goals (pg. 44).	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
When encouraging rezoning of vacant or transitioning institutional uses (schools, churches, etc.) include an incentive, such as use or code flexibility, for adaptive reuse of architecturally or culturally significant structures as the preferred type of redevelopment (pg. 48).	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Recommendation No. 1 -General. We see nothing in the Plan document indicating that the Citywill focus first on vacant land downtown to accommodate growth before encroaching on cohesive residential neighborhoods, regardless of whether they sit along arterials, collector streets or near mass transit. This should be our collective goal, and it should be expressly stated here. As it stands, the narrative in the Plan, especially in Chapter 4, makes clear to us that our existing residential patterns are at risk.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(b) Recommendation No. 2 - General. WWPNA objects to the broad-brush statements in this recommendation. We have long supported growth and density at the Broadway and Alameda Stations, but again we do not support this as a pretext to redeveloping the area of WWP east of Broadway or the area north of 1-25 on our southern boundary. Item B does not differentiate between types of corridors or transit stations, and thus it could be misconstrued to promote development in areas where residents do not desire it and where it would not be appropriate. We ask that Item B of Recommendation No. 2 and the introductory language be revised to clarify that maximized development opportunities are to be directed only to the regional centers and corridors and in the high-intensity downtown and urban center contexts areas identified in the Growth Strategy.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(c) Recommendation No. 3 - General. We see nothing in the text acknowledging an ongoing issue many neighborhoods are dealing with relating to a significant number of permitted rezonings. The City continues to allow rezonings, substantially unabated, without" encouraging development and use consistent with the Code. Something should be added to slow down requests for rezoning and encourage people to work within the Code.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
(e) Recommendation No. 7 - General. We see no definition in the Plan of the term "institutional". How and where is this term defined? We have multiple church and commercial sites within the WWPNA boundaries (e.g., across from Lincoln School) that, if rezoned to be denser, would change the single-family character of this neighborhood. Thus, we disagree with this recommendation.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(f) Recommendation No. 8 - General. We have seen no recommendations in the Plan to preserve passive solar access. Many residences in Denver constructed prior to World War II took advantage of passive solar gain by aligning houses east/west, with siting on north side of a parcel. Preserving passive solar access is environmentally responsible and a resource-efficient practice! We ask that preserving passive solar access be added to the Plan.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Blueprint Denver should recommend officially removing this from the Denver Zoning Code. To our knowledge there haven't been regulating plans developed recently. This is a confusing, and poorly-considered part of the zoning code, and no more Regulating Plans should be created.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Blueprint Denver should recommend the principles that guide the revision/replacement of the General Development Plan (GDP) process. We understand there is a growing consensus that the GDP tool needs to be replaced, with the community-centered and city-led neighborhood plan / small area plan process as the sole vision-setting adopted plan process, not developer-led GDPs. As such, it would be helpful if Blueprint Denver provided guidance for this hopefully near-future change. We are aware that Community Planning and Development has already begun this process. If placed in Blueprint it will help guide it through the process, and would be a quick accomplishment on the list.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Our platform INC ZAP called for regular review of these city plans every 8-10 years. Review of Blueprint Denver adopted in 2002 began in 2016, a 14-year gap. The draft plan recommends more regular reviews to track progress on recommendations and measurable outcomes, which is an improvement. Perhaps a recommendation that dedicates funding to ensure that our planning process become more regularly.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Blueprint Denver draft does NOT include any language on updating the Sign Code as part of the Denver Zoning Code. Community Planning and Development is well aware of the need to update the sign code, particularly to address missing illumination levels from all sign types, including newer LED sign technologies that have emerged in regular use since 2002. Delay in updating the sign code is contributing to an urgent situation, with an increasing number of signs causing glare, distraction, and light pollution. Blueprint Denver should recommend a near-term study and replacement of the sign code, with significant community involvement.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 07 – We are concerned about the potential outcomes of this Recommendation. The redevelopment of such sites needs to be done smartly and with local context and consideration for amenities desired by the existing neighborhood. We would like to see that amenities like open spaces, recreation opportunities, community gathering places, etc, are given priority equal (or greater in some cases) to those of housing and commercial development.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 11 A – This Recommendation misses the middle-scale vision that falls between large-scale map amendments and site-by-site rezonings which necessitates overlays and neighborhood plans.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Our neighborhood includes community corridors and centers, but they are in close proximity to low density residential neighborhoods. The following strategy suggests requiring minimum building heights and maximum density in "all" such centers, which is in conflict with strategies that development pay better attention to neighborhood context. LG] 02.A. In all regional centers, urban center community centers and urban center corridors, study and implement requirements or incentives for density. An example of a tool to implement this could include establishing minimum building heights.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
ii. LUBFG - Goal 5: Language and recommendations should be stronger and more specific related to strategies to mitigate displacement. Where City is making public investments, there should be a required minimum % of affordable units and a commitment to replacement of any affordable housing unit/commercial space that is lost.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
LUBFG: Goals 7 and 9: Rezoning of large institutional and small institutional campuses should have similar goals and outcomes, regardless of whether in low/mod or high opportunity neighborhoods. There should be an explicit statement of setting affordable housing and local business opportunities in all such institutional campus redevelopments.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
There is an overreliance on rezoning as a solution. We recommend that rezoning be used very conservatively, i.e., only when there are new issues not previously considered, or where there is a mistake in the Zoning Code. Rezoning should be a last resort, not the first practice that is offered	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Commit to preserve existing neighborhoods that are historically significant that are immediately adjacent to transit corridors. (Not all corridors are equal and historic structures adjacent to many transit corridors are important to preserve to maintain the character and identity of Denver.)	Land Use and Built Form	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Page 36 - Implementation (general comment) - It is concerning that the implementation of Blueprint Denver relies in big part on Neighborhood Planning Initiative that is on 10-14 year schedule starting in December of 2016. That implies that Denver won't have the complete implementation tools in place before 2030 (with the plan goals targeting 2040). Also, the focus on neighborhoods does not allow for more comprehensive implementation strategies along transit corridors. Please consider an implementation strategy that would allow for citywide zoning changes along the transit priority streets proposed in the plan.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
We support the policy recommendations for Land Use and Built Form. Our neighbors continue to be concerned about the addition of slot homes that interfere with the vintage homes, and the high degree of involuntary displacement due to rising home prices. Your policy goals identify these issues. There is support for a design overlay district.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Environmental Health & Sustainability: On a separate topic but in the same spirit of accountability, given a recent 2018 Denver Post report showing that, with 45.5% of its office buildings certified green, Denver dropped from 7th – 9th in its green-building ranking, we feel the City should also make a goal of significantly increasing its green-building percentage by 2040 in pace with Green-Building leaders such as Chicago and San Francisco (currently 69.78% and 64.98% green respectively). As mentioned above in our feedback on design standards, these goals should be well thought out so as not to unduly impact non-profits in the development of affordable housing and community assets. For such developers, an incentives-based approach will go a long way towards ensuring that the greening of Denver's built environment is both universal and equitable.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
P 58 – 08 D why 25%? Is this of City total or regional total? Is this the right number? How was this derived?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
P62 – 01 – same question about job growth, is this of city, and why 30%?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
P 64 – 05A and 06A – how is this different from current conditions? How do we encourage?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(d) Recommendation No. 6 - General. We wholeheartedly support this effort to incentivize the preservation of structures and ask for more direct prohibition of demolition of structures built prior to 1932, regardless of whether the structure is sited in a historic district or is a Denver Landmark. As we review this proposed plan, we are concerned that few specific measures to protect existing character are included except in the wishful expressions in the narrative.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(g) Recommendation No. 9 - General. This recommendation defines large infill sites as 5 to 50 acres. We believe 5 acres is too small to be included in this category and ask that this be revised to mean sites from 10 to 50 acres. Our neighborhood plan as well as the Louisiana-Pearl Station plan contemplates that developments of this magnitude would be outside our borders, not within the interior of our neighborhood. As indicated elsewhere in this letter, WWPNA is already sustaining the impacts of significant growth at the Broadway and Alameda stations and south of 1-25, and we thus believe it is reasonable to protect the interior of our neighborhood from developments on the magnitude this recommendation addresses.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
(h) Recommendation No. 11 - General. This recommendation makes clear to us the importance of assuring that the Plan is specific in its language and mapping and that ambiguities and vagaries are eliminated. Although reducing site-by-site rezonings is necessary, residents also must have confidence that any legislative rezonings and text amendments the City undertakes to implement the Blueprint plan are based expressly on the Future Places and other maps in this Plan. In particular, reading this recommendation in conjunction with Recommendations No. 2 through 4 - Housing, concerns us. Without an express SU category in the "Low" residential category, and without clearly providing that such a category would not permit ADUs or other "bonus" density in this residential zone, we believe a legislative rezoning and accompanying text amendments would allow building in our neighborhood that ultimately would destroy the existing land use patterns here. Experience tells us that if investors and developers are permitted to build duplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses and the like, or add additional rental units in the form of ADUs on their investment properties, they will do so to enhance their returns. This ultimately would push out existing families (who value living in communities with other families) and owner-occupants in favor of more rentals. Our local schools also would suffer, and replacing owner-occupants with tenants who lack a long-term vested interest in our community would weaken the fabric of our neighborhood. While there may be other statements in this draft Blueprint plan suggesting this wouldn't occur, Recommendation No. 11 at a minimum creates uncertainty for our central Denver neighborhoods. We ask that this Recommendation be revised to expressly state that City-led initiatives to rezonings and text amendments must be compatible with the Future Places Map on Page 126 and to the Maps and guidance set forth in Chapter 6 (e.g., Page 212 regarding residential development in the Urban zone).	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
This category (Land Use Built Form General) really jumps around, better flow would make it easier to read	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
It would be great to see a city green building program (like Golden and Boulder) including residential projects.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
It absolutely makes sense to ensure all neighborhoods have access to design quality tools. We believe Landmark Districts are citizen driven- doesn't it make more sense for the city's experts to identify neighborhoods that should be designated? Shouldn't it be based on quantitative historical value not how proud and active neighbors are?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Yes please attempt to retain neighborhood character! This is not easy	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 01, Strategy A:Recommended strategies for growth do not reference the need for following Neighborhood Plans.-Using zoning and land use regulations to encourage higher-density development MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should state: GROWTH MUST FOLLOW NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 01, Strategy B:Recommended strategy for large rezonings along transit corridors does not reference need for following Neighborhood Plans.-Using zoning to encourage higher-density development along transit corridors MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should add: WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, FOLLOWING THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 02, Strategy A:Recommended strategy for incentivizing density does not reference need for following Neighborhood Plans.-Using incentives and requirements to encourage higher-density development MUST be tempered by conformance with adopted Neighborhood Plans. This Strategy should add: WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, FOLLOWING THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 06:How will non-landmarked structures or districts be preserved? Will RNOs be involved?-We agree with this policy to incentivize the preservation of structures that contribute to the established character of an area, even if they are not designated as landmarks or historic districts. The strategies are vague. How will this happen? Do RNOs have input into where incentives are applied? This would be very helpful in preserving what’s left of our neighborhood’s history in non-landmarked areas.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 07:How will sites be defined? Will RNOs be consulted in determining compatibility?-We agree with this policy to facilitate compatible redevelopment of institutional sites within neighborhoods. How will such sites be identified? Will preservation of existing structures be an important component/requirement of redevelopment? Will RNOs and neighbors be consulted in determining what is considered “compatible”?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Land Use and Built Form General Policy 11, Strategy A:Recommended strategy for larger-scale legislative map amendments does not address what the public process would be.-This approach of larger-scale legislative map amendments would be transformational, to the detriment of existing neighborhoods. A carefully considered public process would be needed to ensure a voice for all affected stakeholders. A plan for the public process should be included in this strategy, with reference to following NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form General p. 44</p> <p>1) #1, #2 Clarify how far from transit connectivity? (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED 2X)</p> <p>2) #1, #2 What sort of requirements?</p> <p>3) #1, #2 ADD an additional strategy d. that the city will work with single family homeowners located in these areas to help them understand potential change or requirements.</p> <p>4) #4, #5 We need more information about changes happening around us, because there are many. Please add a strategy about providing resources (to vulnerable neighborhoods) regarding neighborhood changes that impact property or zoning (hotline, a planner, local service, help in permitting) (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED 3X)</p> <p>5) #6 identify ways to help your neighborhood be involved and collaborative in City Govt. – we need a more balanced geographic representation</p>	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
<p>Land Use and Built Form Economics p. 65</p> <p>9) #7 Considerable comments about preserving existing small businesses on Morrison Rd and on South Federal Boulevard.</p> <p>10) On Morrison Rd., local artists are very concerned about being priced out. Slowing down the pace of new construction and promoting local owners investing in their existing buildings is an emerging approach on Morrison Rd. See ULI TAP report for Morrison Rd.</p> <p>11) Please incentivize small businesses that serve the community along Lipan.</p>	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Blueprint Denver calls for the updating of all property to the new zoning code on page 45. Again, we believe this should be done in the near term.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 03 B – We feel that there are appropriate uses for PUD’s and that an over-eagerness to squeeze projects into existing Zoning Districts is problematic. We have seen this within our boundaries several times in recent years. This square-peg/round-hole goal convolutes the code requiring exceptions and variances which can create problematic precedents. Increasing the flexibility of code designations in order to accommodate such projects often creates unanticipated and undesirable loopholes. That said, we would also like to note that PUD’s need to be considered in such a way as would complement the surrounding areas.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 05 B – We would like to specifically endorse this Recommendation and look forward to supporting its implementation.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
General 06 – We would like to strongly endorse this Recommendation. Preservation of existing structures whenever possible is a primary goal expressed by our membership.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 06 A – We would love to see the city consider adding physical markers to identify historically significant structures.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 08 – We would like to strongly endorse this Recommendation and advocate for strong implementation.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 09 – We agree with the need for this Recommendation but have concerns for specific implementation on potential sites within our boundaries.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
General 10 – As local representatives ourselves, we agree with the need for this Recommendation and look forward to supporting its implementation with improved coordination from city government.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Economics 05 C – We would like to see this Recommendation take the support and encouragement of growth of our Tennyson Art District into consideration.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Economics 06 – We agree with the need for this Recommendation as pertaining to means which can help support and maintain existing local businesses.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
As previously stated, the SLCG is concerned that all policies and strategies are made only “sometimes applicable” by the language on Page 16. Additionally, we found some other strategies to provide contradictory guidance. In contrast to other strategies that admit the existing zoning code requires revision to better respect neighborhood context, the following strategy suggests the existing code is largely adequate in this respect, which many disagree with: [LG] 03.B. Limit the use of site-specific, customized zoning tools—such as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and waivers/conditions—to unique and extraordinary circumstances. The zoning code offers a wide variety of zone districts that cover the diverse contexts and places of Denver. Custom zoning tools are most effective when a standard zone district does not exist to implement the adopted plans for an area	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Finally, because our neighborhood has high transit connectivity, the following strategy is seemingly in conflict with preserving the existing stock of single family homes and protecting a population vulnerable to displacement. [LG] 02 Incentivize or require the most efficient development of land, especially in areas with high transit connectivity	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
i. LUBFG - Goal 3: Waivers and Conditions are a good tool that allow developers to negotiate compromise design and development proposals with neighbors and RNO’s. We should not prohibit them or unreasonably restrict them.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
How will this be done and how will RNO's be involved? LUBF:G 6	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
LUBF:G 7 & 9: Strongly agree, and highlight in particular two sites that abut Harknaess Heights: the Safeway anchored site on SW corner of Lowell and 44th Ave, and Mt Saint Vincents Home on Lowell. We hope that St Vincents stays on the site owned by the Sisters of Charity Levenworth for many years. Mt Saint Vincents is a major asset to our community and a great neighbor. It is important that any area plan includes a look at the long range future of these facilities and sites. The lack of a neighborhood plan heightens our concerns with these two sites.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Economic 7: The commercial facilities located at the intersection of Lowell and 44th avenue, designated as a Local Center, are essential to the quality of life of Harkness Heights and other adjacent neighborhoods. Three of the corners are zoned U-MX-2, and the fourth anchored by Safeway is zoned U-MX-3. We feel these zoning designations are appropriate and compatible with the neighboring residential communities. These sites are ripe for development and rumors have circulated that Safeway is closing and selling its faculty. This coupled with Example 3 above increases the urgency for a proactive long term study and plan for this important Local Center which does not seem to receive the importance it deserves in the Places and Growth map. Poorly planned and overly aggressive growth and development of these sites without the context of a proactive neighborhood plan could have a serious negative impact on the quality of life for the neighboring communities.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Pg. 47 – “Incentivize the preservation of structures that contribute to the established character of an area, even if they are not designated as landmarks or historic districts.” Please and thank you! A group of Park Hill residents have organized to save ‘The Hut’ at 1980 Albion by submitting an Application for Historic Designation in response to the property owners’ application for Certificate of Non-Historic Status to allow demolition of the structure.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Pg. 48 – Smaller vacant institutional uses.... Rezoning request at 3411 Albion? Church on northeast corner of Colorado Boulevard and Leetsdale Drive (50 So Colo Blvd.)?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
8. Pg. 49 – Promote environmentally responsible and resource-efficient practices for the design, construction and demolition of buildings. The strategies listed for sustainability goals should be a priority for the City before more demolition is allowed. □	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
10. Pg. 63 – “Preserve high-value manufacturing areas and allow low-value manufacturing areas to transition to higher intensity uses.” Where are these low-value areas? Park Hill adjacent to I-70 is Industrial Mixed-Use. Would this be an area of transition to higher intensity? Are their rules of measurement regarding adjacent residential areas? There needs to be a buffer between high intensity industrial and residential zone districts. Low income housing areas should not be negatively impacted by higher intensity manufacturing.	Land Use and Built Form	Letter
Pg. 65 – 07.D – what is the fate of the Denver Center for the Performing Arts. Does the City plan to overhaul the center? What are the strategies to “Build on Denver’s national and regional entertainment options....”?	Land Use and Built Form	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Add clarifying language to LUBF General Policy 6 C. about if the use flexibility for preservation is intended for single family home preservation or for institutional building preservation	Land Use and Built Form	Office Hours
plan to increase density height of zoning to especially allow more housing in some areas, and the opportunities, need to increase and improve transit, biking, walking infrastructure, access with greater density.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
keeping Denver, Denver keeping residents involved and aware keeping the structures that give neighborhoods character	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Focuses on what is good for business but not neighborhoods	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
a plan to catch up and then steadily increase allowed density and height in all neighborhoods in response to growing population, employment demands in conjunction with sustainable strategies like increase park space, stormwater management metioned in other sections.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
no change to existing regulatinso	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Keep present zoning code.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
stop any change to regulatonsi	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Keep present zoning code.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Revise residential zoning and building forms	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
more details that describes zoning changes	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
I was disappointed by its relative silence about so-called third space. Where are the houses of worship, for example? I was also disappointed by the plan's inability to address the architectural disasters of the past decade.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
I appreciate the concept of city led legislative rezonings to implement plan recommendations.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Recommendation 3 that speaks to a responsive zoning code that is modern and flexible is a goal that I identify with. I took part in the re-write of Chapter 59 and believe that the old pieces of the code should be uniformly adopted into the current zoning code. I recognize this is quite a bit of work, but is worth the time and effort.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
keeping Denver, Denver keeping residents involved and aware keeping the structures that give neighborhoods character	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE put a life cycle requirement for buildings into the code. You have things being built right now that will last for 10 years or so. This should go into the building code, but also into the development code under the green building requirements. The most sustainable building is one that doesn't have to be rebuilt in 10 years.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
It says that development on large infill sites should be coordinated to integrate with existing surroundings. This comes a little too late for St. Anthony, which is totally out of scale with the neighborhood! How can this be avoided in the future?	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
I believe more density is needed in Denver to allow for affordable housing options. It appears there are limited areas that allow for density in the new maps and I worry that this is a mistake and should be reconsidered. Is there a way to consider recommendation 2c more broadly with some sort of process to allow development in any area to opt into this solution of more density/height in exchange for things like affordable housing or design improvements?	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Defend current zoning no exceptions	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
Keep present zoning code.	Land Use and Built Form	On-line Survey
the context map is supposed to help guide context decisions on rezonings in a way we can't now, helping to prevent random urban center zoning in other places. We should add a recommendation to land use general to ensure the DZC is updated to provide the menu of zone districts need to align with the places. Joel also recommends to add language that it may be appropriate to not zone to a neighborhood context if there isn't a good district in the code available under the neighborhood context (otherwise we may need more waivers)	Land Use and Built Form	Planning Board
make sure we have some language about how tools to increase access to the rezoning process	Land Use and Built Form	Planning Board
worried about stronger language on active ground floors. Will lead to too many vacant retail spaces	Land Use and Built Form	Planning Board
more about live/work and people working from home. Current home occupations should be broader – more sales from the home that aren't just from the web	Land Use and Built Form	Planning Board
Mobility recommendation about funding for multimodal -- make clearer that we need sustainable, long-term funding	Mobility	City Council
I applaud the work you're doing with the traffic circles on 35th. Wether the circles are the answer, please keep pushing forward! 35th is way to busy for a residential street and steps like this need to be taken. A request... Please don't forget us to the West of Tennyson. I live at 35th & Yates. It is crazy how fast people get going between Sheridan and Wolf. I joke that I am going to buy a speed bump from Amazon. I sometime will intentionally park my car on the street to make it a bit of a tighter squeeze too. Even moving the 4way stop to Yates would be an improvement.	Mobility	Email

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
My one point of differentiation would be to consider parking maximums. Not that it needs to be either/or but the value add to our City in comparison to a height minimum as noted would be far more impactful to the overall feel of it.	Mobility	Email
MO #5 - Embrace emerging tech - need to spread new tech equitably across the city. How do you push companies to serve certain parts of the city. How do we ensure that new mobility tech doesn't negatively impact existing options? RTD needs to be proactive.	Mobility	Equity training
#4 MO - How will street regs be developed equitably	Mobility	Equity training
MO #9 - Improve safety on Denver's streets - most unsafe streets are in the lower income areas. Streets in Denver need to benefit residents and suburban commuters should be prepared to travel at slower speeds, but not to the effect of directing more traffic to local streets	Mobility	Equity training
Add an equity strategy to Mobility policy # 4 to address prioritizing areas that have been previously neglected	Mobility	Equity training
MO #4 Include equity based strategy to Mobility policy # 4. There is a desire for additional language in the equity section regarding equitable process.	Mobility	Equity training
Explore including equity criteria for variances/waiver for PW rules and regulations related to future design. Applicant could provide narrative on how they are meeting equity goals, alternative compliance. Look at thresholds for values or project type.	Mobility	Equity training
P.78 Mobility intro: "creating attractive, SUSTAINABLE public spaces"	Mobility	Internal
Mobility Policy 10, strategy A: landscaping, stormwater planters, and pedestrian lighting	Mobility	Internal
Key Takeaway: this document, as with others in the Denveright family, places the bulk of the burden for creating a great bicycle network on the 2011 Denver Moves bicycle plan. Though this plan provides some valuable guidance, it is MBAC's belief that it is outdated and should be revised. As all Denveright plans point to this document to provide a vision for bicycling in Denver, it is crucial that this document reflects the City's current needs. The period between 2011 and 2018 has seen unprecedented growth and change in the City and the plan needs to evolve accordingly before exhibits its full potential. An updated bicycle plan should reflect Blueprint and Blueprint should adapt accordingly. The relationship between the two needs to be iterative and flexible.	Mobility	Letter
recommends stating that real problem is the conflict between reliance on cars as a primary mode of transportation and other community needs pg 78	Mobility	Letter
add more details on vision zero goals, policies, and strategies including a metric on achieving zero traffic fatalities and overlap with HIN, need to reduce speeds	Mobility	Letter
provide more detailed examples of how tech promotes safety in MO policy 5. limit speed of AV, use geofencing, traffic signals, automated enforcement	Mobility	Letter
1. Encourage mode-shift — more trips by walking, biking and transit — through efficient land use and infrastructure improvements. A. Implement the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks in Denver Moves plans. ¶ As mentioned previously, the 2011 Denver Moves bicycle plan may no longer adequately reflect the needs of Denver. Prior to making a blanket request for its full build-out, the City should consider revising the document to reflect its current context.	Mobility	Letter
2. Align the impacts of private development with transportation infrastructure and promote development that creates walkable, transit-friendly communities. C. For centers and corridors downtown and in the urban center contexts, where access to transit is high, study and implement maximums for off-street parking in private development to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. ¶ More detail can and should be provided in how bicycle infrastructure interfaces with transit and other mobility options. This should include bicycle parking, maintenance amenities, and more seamless integration of modes.	Mobility	Letter
3. On all streets, prioritize people walking over other modes of transportation. A. Develop access management policies —especially in centers and corridors in the downtown, urban center and general urban contexts — to reduce conflicts between driveways/ garages and pedestrians using the sidewalk. ¶ This is also crucial for cyclists. A large portion of conflicts between cars and bikes happen at driveways and other crossings. Visibility is a large factor that is often absent or diminished.	Mobility	Letter
P82 – overall Mobility Recommendations – there is nothing about discouraging use of the single occupant vehicle as a mode of transport into the downtown core and parking as a land use in the downtown core. How do we dis-incentivize this use or incentivize alternatives to take its place? At the very least, we need to acknowledge that providing the huge percentage of R.O.W. and private land for SOV movement and storage is not equitable and not economically viable as Denver continues to grow.	Mobility	Letter
P82 – 05C – this is weak language – strengthen with - as new technology evolves, remember to prioritize pedestrian. Also, encourage pooled ownership needs stronger language here to discourage extensive private ownership of ZOVs (zero-occupant vehicles) and recognize potentially negative consequences of broad private ownership of ZOVs.	Mobility	Letter
P82 – 06A – use NACTO instead of MUTCD for better guidance	Mobility	Letter
Pg 83 – 08B – do more than fill in gaps, increase and prioritize low stress network	Mobility	Letter
Pg 85 - 11 (background) replace the term ride-share, with ride-hailing or transportation network companies.	Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Blueprint Denver correctly identifies the importance of pedestrians and sidewalks. However, funding of sidewalks is not identified as a strategy, yet it must be. The Pedestrian Master Plan correctly identified the key issue of how funding installation and repair of sidewalks is done as the key problem resulting in our poor sidewalk situation today. Unfortunately, the tactical Denver Moves: Peds and Trails plan does not focus on this overarching issue. It would be very appropriate for a strategic, long-range adopted plan such as Blueprint Denver to identify a goal of finding a more efficient, reliable, and sustainable way to fund and perform sidewalk installation and maintenance. As a long-time INC position represented in earlier position statements and in current ZAP and Transportation Platforms, we strongly request that Blueprint add text in this regard.	Mobility	Letter
Chapter 2: We would love to see a measurement of improving street safety (page 26). For example “By X date the City of Denver will have no traffic fatalities”.	Mobility	Letter
Other safety improvements we would like to see are converting 1 ways to 2 ways, narrowing of lanes in residential neighborhoods with curb extensions and protected bike lanes, pedestrian treatments, adding painted crosswalks, etc. with a priority given to the safety of residential arterials.	Mobility	Letter
We are very supportive of the focus on walking and rolling above other modes as outlined in chapter 3. Could you add more details on page 81 (sub-point 3) on specifics such as adding painted crosswalks, speed tables, and other pedestrian enhancements.	Mobility	Letter
Pg 78 - Direct reference to Denver Moves: Transit. This plan purposefully avoided recommendations for Downtown Denver, one of the areas with the most potential for achieving policies and related performance measures. Consider also referencing Denver Moves: Downtown as well, which will provide planning actions for downtown, parts of the city with the highest boardings and alightings	Mobility	Letter
Pg 86 - Refer to Denver Moves Downtown as it will develop other high priority corridors through downtown.	Mobility	Letter
Disability is missing from the mobility conversation—for example, page 81 uses “walking.” Disability advocates often use “walking and wheeling.” I can walk in areas where I can’t wheel (move around electrical poles that create barriers; including scooters). City needs to express “ownership” of these areas, such as West Colfax and Leetsdale, which are very difficult to wheel along (and the responsibility to address is unclear—CDOT? City	Mobility	Letter
Page 80 – Mobility (general comment). 30% of Denver’s residents do not drive (due to age, disability, income, or choice). Please consider a recommendation that would allocate public right of way to walking, transit, and biking in the proportion that reflects the demographics of Denver.	Mobility	Letter
4. Implement the vision for street types and the layered multimodal network to create complete streets. A. Develop comprehensive street design guidelines based on Blueprint Denver street types to address components such as green infrastructure, street trees, bikeway design, amenity zones and sidewalks. ☑ MBAC fully endorses this concept. It is critical that streets be considered for complete streets treatment, especially as they are being repaved or included in neighborhood planning processes. Not all streets may have dedicated bicycle infrastructure, but all streets should be safe for all modes, with no exception. B.Coordinate across city departments to revise street design standards, rules, and regulations to implement Blueprint Denver street types, modal priorities and a holistic vision for complete streets. ☑ Again, fully endorsed by MBAC. Appropriate and comprehensive guidance will only be possible if all City departments work together and are clear about the vision and methods for implementation.	Mobility	Letter
5. Embrace emerging technologies for mobility and transportation safety. C. As autonomous vehicles become more common, encourage pooled ownership and look for opportunities for new technology to reduce, rather than increase, the number of SOV trips. ☑ This is a very important point. It is MBAC’s view that AV technology is certainly not a panacea for mobility problems and will likely cause more problems than it solves. For this reason, we believe this point should be expanded here and across other plans. In particular relating to bikes, the demand for curb space will be amplified with AV uses. It is crucial that bike infrastructure does not further suffer as a result of this technology.	Mobility	Letter
8. Connect centers and corridors across the city through a variety of modal choices. B. Fill in gaps in the city bike network by implementing projects in Denver Moves: Bicycles. ☑ See comments above. The 2011 Denver Moves Plan should be updated.	Mobility	Letter
9. Improve safety on Denver's streets and collaborate with city departments on safety programs when developing neighborhood plans. B. Advance the goals of the Vision Zero Action Plan in the Neighborhood Planning Initiative (NPI). ☑ MBAC endorses this point fully. However, greater discussion is necessary in this plan to highlight the crucial tenets of safer streets which include physical design, education, and enforcement. This is not mentioned in detail and should be.	Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We are glad to see that the policy supports walkable, transit-friendly communities. Our section of North Federal Boulevard currently suffers from a high percentage of car and pedestrian accidents and is in need of improvements to meet the mobility goals. Although the need is urgent now, the current Denver budget does little to address the goals, specifically for safe transportation, and for our section of North Federal Boulevard. We urge you to make current policy decisions that support the Denveright recommendations.	Mobility	letter
Affordable and accessible transit is a current need for the Regis neighborhoods. If the light rail G line opens, there will be a need for regional transit options including bus or shuttle to get residents to and from transportation hubs. Bus transit will need to be more affordable for our residents, and safety increased for getting to and from the bus routes.	Mobility	letter
We believe that the current characterization in the plan of the West Colfax neighborhood as having low housing and jobs diversity and low concentration of community serving amenities is accurate, and our neighbors are generally interested in promoting a more sustainable neighborhood with amenities and jobs accessible by foot or bike.	Mobility	letter
In the recommendations regarding mobility, recommendations are made to study and implement off-street parking maximums in private development. The specific recommendation should be revised to better indicate that any policy change (i.e. implementing a maximum) would occur only after completion of a study recommending such action. The current wording seems to predetermine that the study will conclude that parking maximums are, in fact, appropriate in any given area. Consideration should also be given to the economic effects that implementation of such a policy would have on the private land within any particular study area.	Mobility	Letter
4) We support the plan's recommendations concerning mobility, particularly for improving pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the city. There are numerous areas in our neighborhood with substandard or non-existent pedestrian infrastructure and we hope the City will work to increase pedestrian access and sidewalk quality throughout Clayton without relying on a system which penalizes middle and low-income homeowners for long-standing municipal infrastructure shortcomings.	Mobility	Letter
P81 – 03B – not necessarily – vitality is more important than sidewalk width in many cases.	Mobility	Letter
P 83 – 07 – more than just affordable, should be easy, frequent and competitive with other modes.	Mobility	Letter
Pg 83 - 08 - add reference to Denver Moves Downtown similar to references about other modal plans.	Mobility	Letter
P 84 – 10A – big statement that needs lots more thought and detail. Too general and vague in its current form.	Mobility	Letter
Pg 85 - 11 (Strategy A) The strategy here should not be to develop policies as this is the purpose of the plan in general. Also, how do we define highest and best use?	Mobility	Letter
P85 12 A – don't evaluate – increase/adjust the price of metered parking.	Mobility	Letter
P85 – 12B – add parking benefit districts	Mobility	Letter
(r) Recommendation No. 3 -Mobility. We strongly agree with this recommendation.	Mobility	Letter
Recommendation No. 9 - Mobility. Coordination is important. To get to Vision Zero, we need to consider where bike routes and buses are encouraged. For example, bike routes on narrower streets (like E. Virginia Avenue), which are heavily traveled at rush hour, could be dangerous for bicyclists.	Mobility	Letter
(t) Recommendation No. 11 - Mobility. This language sets up not having parking in front of your residence. As indicated above, this is a safety issue for women and older adults.	Mobility	Letter
(u) Recommendation No. 13 - Mobility. Many of our well-established central-Denver Urban-Context neighborhoods are built around streets that have been identified as "Medium Capacity" corridors, e.g., Alameda and Mississippi/Louisiana. Commencing in WWP and continuing east through East Washington Park, Corey Merrill, and beyond, these streets traverse through long-standing, well-maintained single-family homes. We do not want this Recommendation misconstrued to suggest rezonings along these streets in these areas. We ask that you clarify in Recommendation 13, Item D. to state that rezonings would be in areas mapped as Community Corridors, not Local Corridors, and along High-Capacity Corridors, not Medium-Capacity Corridors.	Mobility	Letter
Cook Park Neighborhood Assoc. has found there are not readily available, transparent statistics on mobility deaths and injuries. This is incredibly important to planners as well as communities as we analyze different mobility networks and interactions.	Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>2. On Page 86 the Blueprint recommends that transit corridors be identified as places for affordable housing projects and urban growth through rezoning. For the West-Side Jewish Community, carpooling and private school bussing are more affordable and efficient modes of transportation for large families and access to Jewish schools and Kosher services in other neighborhoods. This small population travels along unique routes connecting Jewish services. Because these routes are not shared by the general public, they're not well-served by public transit. Please clarify that the strategy of tying affordable housing and rezoning to transit corridors is intended for neighborhoods & communities where public transit is a highly suitable primary means of transportation.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>Mobility p. 81</p> <p>14) #3 On all streets prioritize people over other modes. Clarify intent or objectives with cars.</p> <p>15) #8 Recommended ADDITION, prioritize neighborhood multimodal connections/routes to centers and corridors from adjacent neighborhoods.</p> <p>16) We need a walkable network around west Denver helping us get to the services that are in other neighborhoods across arterials. We cannot be 'complete' neighborhoods on our own, we need safe connections between our neighborhoods to be a complete area of neighborhoods.</p> <p>17) We need a walkable amenity center, local centers to walk to commercial south of Alameda.</p> <p>18) #10 MISSING: what about neighborhoods that have 3' sidewalks? Is there an alternative solution or strategy that balances cars and pedestrians without all new curbs and sidewalks? (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED 3X)</p> <p>19) #13 Explore secondary transit connections to identify key routes for frequent routes: for bus, Lyft/Uber, or frequent van routes</p> <p>20) MISSING: priority or urgency for improving safety on the HIGH INJURY NETWORK, especially where there is transit or growth target areas (community centers or corridors)</p> <p>a. MISSING: priority or urgency for improving safety in vulnerable communities that have more pedestrian fatalities and injuries</p> <p>b. Recommend speed reductions and speed reducing strategy to prioritize how safety overrides specific street design or other recommended enhancements</p> <p>21) We need alleyway allowance for walking and biking safety.</p> <p>22) BICYCLE PRIORITIES layered with safety concerns</p> <p>a) Should bikes be priority for safety</p> <p>b) Where do they cross?</p> <p>c) How do we make clear visual protected lanes to limit accidents?</p> <p>23) We need more local centers and less community centers. Our streets aren't going to get wider and they are already unsafe for pedestrians. This is also a comment for mobility because we can't have only big corridors and expect pedestrian safety and mobility to improve.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>The Places Map of Blueprint Denver does not prematurely recommend overall higher intensity along the Denver Moves: Transit frequent corridors, leaving it to be revisited with additional planning as and when the frequent transit vision is actually being funded implemented. This represents an important move by Community Planning and Development to truly link land use with creation truly high-quality transportation options, rather than along corridors that have bus service levels that are inadequate to meet the demand of increased density.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>The majority of bus stops within Congress Park boundaries are un-sheltered which further discourages regular bus use.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>A common thread that ran through comments on the survey was safety. Over and over again our respondents cited traffic and speeding concerns in our neighborhood. They request more traffic calming techniques and clearly posted speed signs.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>On page 81 it would be great to mention Vision Zero and discuss a recommendation for lowering speeds across the City to a 25 mph maximum and 20 on all local streets. In order to prioritize walking and rolling, people need to feel safe to cross the street.</p>	Mobility	Letter
<p>i. General comment that the mobility improvement recommendations can have a disparate impact on low and mod income households and communities where the city has historically made few capital improvements to streets, alleys, and sidewalks. If homeowners and investors in these neighborhoods are required to bring them to the same standard as newer communities, such as Union Station or Brighton Blvd, then the cost of those improvements will directly impede the other stated goals of preserving and encouraging affordable housing and locally-owned businesses. We are already seeing these cost-burden impacts in neighborhoods where homeowners are being required to improve sidewalks to new standards as a condition to pulling permits for non-related property improvements.</p>	Mobility	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
ii. Mobility: Expanding programs such as One Denver Pass beyond students, such as to seniors, disabled, and TANF recipients will allow more affordable access to RTD services.	Mobility	Letter
ii. Mobility: Explore programs that possibly subsidize shared-services such as Uber/Lyft.	Mobility	Letter
The plan recommendation for mobility states there should be increased transit access for transit dependent residents by increasing the amount of affordable housing near rail stations and along transit priority corridors. This is a good first step but does not alleviate the cost burden of transit prices. Focus should be more on reduced fare amount for a zip code or area due to proximity of living next to rail stations etc. (page 43).	Mobility	Letter
Chapter 3: We are supportive of the concept of regulation but unsure how that plays out. There was a lot missing as it relates to transportation plans and action items. That was disappointing as Denver has traditionally had car culture and it is essential to Congress Park that the pedestrian be given the priority.	Mobility	Letter
14. Pg. 80 and 81 – Reference Avenida da Liberdade in Lisbon, Portugal – busy boulevard traffic is in the center, pedestrian, cyclists, public transit and local traffic are buffered by a large green space.	Mobility	Letter
Driverless cars may not be a good idea, especially with current technology. Suggest shelving this idea until proven safe.	Mobility	Letter
Page 81: 03: I love this. on all streets prioritize people walking over all modes of transportation. But can you add something with more pedestrian crossings. people need to be able to cross the street safely.	Mobility	On-line Survey
- On page 81 goal 4 no mention of vision zero.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Page 81: point03/ 04: no mention of vision zero. we need to keep pushing to design streets (especially residential arterials that are surround by single family residential) to have painted crosswalks every few blocks, have stop signs, have complete pedestrian treatment (i.e 8th avenue, 6th avenue, josephine, etc). Speeds need to be lowered to a maximum of 25 miles per hour on all residential streets (arterials, collectors, etc)	Mobility	On-line Survey
Need benchmarks-- Need fatalities and injuries to be goal one, front and center; vision zero is the most important public health issue and goal. It needs to be addressed clearly that people dying on the streets will come to an end.	Mobility	On-line Survey
I wish this plan was more specific on how it was going to achieve these goals. For example, what would be nice is if the City integrated some of these criteria officially into the CPD review process for rezoning applications, instead of only reviewing applications based on the 5 criteria, several of which are a bit opaque to the average resident. Otherwise, it is entirely clear where any of these goals and guidelines would be enforced. Is the idea to have this all evaluated by City Council at public rezoning hearings, where the discussion is limited to 3 minute statements? It makes sense to encourage development along "Transit rich areas". However, the issues is that often the adjacent neighborhood is what ends up being burdened with the density, and the infrastructure is not there to handle the increased traffic and parking problems that come with it. For example, just because a property is along N. Sheridan, does not mean that all the density from those properties just goes directly onto the high capacity road. In fact, the opposite is true, because CDOT would rightly not allow a bunch of new cutouts along that road. So, in that case, all the new traffic just flows through the residential neighborhoods. Also, if you look at all the high density apartments built and being built along Colfax in this neighborhood, even though these are close to the Colfax bus lines, and the light rail, these developments have still added a very significant number of new cars to the neighborhoods, and cutting through the residential streets to get between Colfax and 17th. Furthermore, the plan to encourage transit use through reduced parking requirements at these properties has not worked out in practice, because there has been a very significant number of new cars added to the neighborhood, being stored on the adjacent streets next to these high density buildings right off Colfax. So, while the idea of "density next to transit" sounds really good, I think this plan has to take a more specific look at infrastructure of the adjacent local neighborhood, to see what impact that density will have on it, and whether the infrastructure can handle it.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Overall, it seems well thought out. However, serious issues about additional density, parking issues, traffic problems and overall safety to residents need to be reconsidered.	Mobility	On-line Survey
mobility improvements	Mobility	On-line Survey
No mention of reducing parking requirements and innovative approaches to shared parking	Mobility	On-line Survey
Needs more discussion of other modes for the many areas of Denver without transit, especially at nonwork commuting times.	Mobility	On-line Survey
In general I feel that our city is too auto focused. We need to introduce parking maximums for projects and ideally have no parking requirements, which will force people out of their cars and increase walking and transit use. We also need to promote density and loosen zoning restrictions which will lower housing costs and improve connectivity. I am also in support of a design review board to ensure finishes of structures look good.	Mobility	On-line Survey
I wholeheartedly support the inclusion of EV charging as a requirement into all new commercial and multi-family projects.	Mobility	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I think that thoughts should be taken about how these plans increase parking problems, density, and traffic. I feel there are no needs to pack as many people in an area that already has seen massive changes because of density. Please think as much of the people who live in these areas as well as the taxes to the city which perhaps drive these new buildings. Cherry Creek is a prime example of what once was a lovely place to shop and live. It has been devastated by congestion and buildings that block the sun. Can you please think about places where people live rather than the money in the city's pocket. Other places do.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Driverless cars are an abomination. Their advocacy should be removed from Denveright. Denveright's goals can all certainly be accomplished without any tolerance for driverless cars. Driverless cars are de-humanizing, highly reducing of individual freedom, still causers of many accidents, and represent too much state violation of people's individual privacy.	Mobility	On-line Survey
when a big development happens they should pay an impact fee (i.e 9/th and colorado will be impacting traffic throughout major roads of congress park (6/7/8) and no pedestrian improvements are planned on the streets offsite. Conversely, a double turn lane is planned which will only making driving easier and make safety worse).	Mobility	On-line Survey
I like all of the concepts but need to see it implemented. So many problem streets. Many of the same issues outlined here were outlined 30 years ago but without the political will of our public works deparment we will continue to be a car focused city.	Mobility	On-line Survey
The plan states, "Pursue funding mechanisms to raise revenue to fund multimodal infrastructure improvements", such as raising metered parking costs. It is great that the city recognizes that need to raise revenue in a growing city and re-evaluate the parking dynamic that has in the past led to parking craters and cars cruising for free parking.	Mobility	On-line Survey
I like the concept of new regulation. But my general question is how do you make it harder to drive in denver? How do we create regulations that focus first and foremost with the pedestrian and then the driver may be stuck in a little traffic? We need bold regulations to stop this awful trend of everyone driving by themselves in SOV. It is way too easy to get places and park in denver. We have to step up and create regulations that design better streets, especially on single family residential roads. It isn't about "moving cars". Safety should always come first.	Mobility	On-line Survey
page 83: 06. this would be great. as a biker it is very frustrating that car lanes don't get disturbed but bike lanes do when construction is active.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Mobility point #2 - having maximum # of off street parking spaces. I don't think there should be a maximum. My concern is that people won't opt not to own a car but rather find somewhere else to put it which only pushes the issue to surrounding areas. The developer should still be required to promote alternative transportation methods such as easy access bike storage, integrating a bus stop shelter into the project, perhaps dedicating prime spots for car sharing/ride sharing, better design along sidewalks, easier access for residents to get to the sidewalk than to the parking garage.	Mobility	On-line Survey
The mobility strategies are really weak. You know what needs to happen. IMPACT FEES.	Mobility	On-line Survey
On page 41 under mobility that is great to say but how will you do it. I think the focus on urban design and mobility is there should be new requirements for pedestrian crossings, stop signs, limited speeds across the city but primarily on residential areas. No street that has single family residential uses should have a speed over 25 miles/hour.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Page 81: point 04. Public works cannot be in charge of this design. It needs to be lead but CPD so there is less of a focus on "moving cars".	Mobility	On-line Survey
I love the transportation plan featuring walking, biking and public transit. For too many years we have focused transport around cars and that needs to change. We need denser development. I agree that all lots should be allowed to construct ADUs and that minimum lot size should not prohibit the development of multi-unit development. The zoning code needs to be updated.	Mobility	On-line Survey
Urge that maximum effort is placed on transportation infrastructure. We all know how bad traffic is in our city, but many approaches can be taken to ease pollution and frustration. Basics, light timing lights on major roads to provide continuous flow. Example, Colorado Blvd. and Colfax forces cars to stop at almost every light. Transportation infrastructure and action must occur before additional residential and commercial sites attract more people. Public transportation plans look good, but are not enough to mitigate issues even of today.	Mobility	On-line Survey
- on page 26 I would love to see a measurement of improving street safety. Example "by X date we should have no low density (single family) residential arterial roads". (i.e. 8th, parts of 6th, Josephine, York, Logan, etc street). Traffic should be incentivized to go to non single family lined streets or higher density streets.	Mobility	On-line Survey
For the most pert I like the goals and strategies but am concerned about the execution	Mobility	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
7. Section 3, the implementation of the plan, is a significant improvement. In this new draft, the implementation strategies demonstrate a focused approach; they spell out specific policies and strategies. However, we are including some minor observations. a. Amendments to the zoning code to ensure equitable approaches to housing options need to be more specific. b.Strategies to ensure that neighborhoods have access to design quality tools need to include practical ways to provide assistance with the participation of architects not affiliated with the projects. Protocols must be in place to avoid a design review turning into design by committee. c. The document recognizes mode shift and walkability properly; however, the document needs to delineate strategies to protect walkability from trendy mobility technologies that conflict with pedestrians.	Mobility	Planning Board
Mobility policy 4 doesn't address speeding, lane widths, or other VZ principles.	Mobility	Task Force
The Blueprint should call for a new citywide bike plan to be completed in the next three years.	Mobility	Task Force
Mobility policy 9 "improve safety..." --> Vision Zero is missing here as well.	Mobility	Task Force
Public Works plans should also update BP Denver	Mobility	Task Force
Would it help to include other words pertaining to mobility? Like "roll"	Mobility	Task Force
What about strategic issues that need more specific direction? Incomplete sidewalk networks. Is Blueprint Denver going further with thoughts on complete streets policy?	Mobility	Task Force
It may be good to add that all small area plans will update Blueprint maps.	Mobility	Task Force
Revisit language about autonomous vehicles and other future modes as they can have negative impacts	Mobility	Task Force
Downtown descriptions are not specific enough. Waiting on Denver Moves Downtown. Overall lack of detail in the downtown section.	Mobility	Task Force
Northeast Downtown Neighborhood Plan has more specific street types. Can these be used in BP? Also, downtown arterials should have low speed limits and so should residential arterials	Mobility	Task Force
How do we find the balance between too much multimodal speak and not enough? We need to anticipate future changes (ex. ballot question to create new mobility department)	Mobility	Task Force
Curb space management is very important, especially from RTD's perspective. Ex. 18th Street bulb outs and islands	Mobility	Task Force
Streetscape design - is the city going to require streetscpe standards? we all want better ROW outcomes but how to we organize oursevles and our rules and regs to get there. coadoption of rules and regs?	Mobility	Task Force
Add a recommendation that the city should adopt a complete streets policy	Modal Priority	City Council
Different modes of transportation are good, walking is good but how do you transport goods? Groceries, families, etc?	Modal Priority	Focus Group
Include Access-a-ride in transit reocmmendations for affordability	Modal Priority	Focus Group
Incentivize carpool options because not everyone can afford bus fees but carpooling in "group living" situtiaons (like DHa) is common	Modal Priority	Focus Group
recommends clarifying priorities for the overall transportation system - prioritize safest, healthiest and space efficient modes, lower priority for cars pg 150	Modal Priority	Letter
Dockless mobility (including scooters and bikes) became a focus over the course of writing this plan. Their presence is likely not temporary and they need to be considered in this document as major mobility options for the City.	Modal Priority	Letter
Vision Zero gets mentioned several times across the document. It is MBAC's belief that the commentary does not go far enough. The nexus of land use and mobility – as represented by this plan – is the ideal setting to provide further guidance on how to reduce accidents and fatalities. Consider a larger, more comprehensive discussion of these goals and how they are implemented.	Modal Priority	Letter
Bicycle Priority – Pages 157- 159 ◻MBAC appreciates the inclusion of Bicycle Priority and the thoughtful discussion of tradeoffs necessary to improve the bicycle network. These trade offs are real and require a strong commitment to the goals established here and elsewhere, especially in the face of intense vocal opposition, which is certainly expected. ◻ Vision Zero is a crucial part of this discussion and MBAC appreciates its inclusion, however, this needs more rigorous discussion as part of any street re-design or multi-modal application. Please consider providing more guidance in how infrastructure design can play a major role in safety and avoiding accidents and death.	Modal Priority	Letter
more clearly state an intention to reduce Denver resident's reliance on cars	Modal Priority	Letter
Pg 162-163 Seems to create transit priority streets on the majority of the downtown grid. How has this been determined because it was not determined through Denver Moves Transit?	Modal Priority	Letter
In general – in the absence of much detail or discussion the Downtown streets item need a lot more thought or reference to Denver Moves:Downtown.	Modal Priority	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Blueprint Denver needs to adopt and re-assert the intention in the Pedestrian Master Plan to preserve flagstone sidewalks in areas where that is important to the historic character. This has been long called for in INC's Sidewalk Position Statement brought forth by the ZAP committee to the delegation, and was re-adopted by INC in 2015.	Modal Priority	Letter
Pedestrian Enhancements should be reflected throughout the Gateway area.	Modal Priority	Letter
More thought should be placed on pedestrian enhancements in the regional including connections to the 56th Avenue and Pena Boulevard Open space, 56th/64th Avenue and Tower and connections from the Montebello neighborhood to the 40th Avenue station using the enhancements on the open channel in the Avion development.	Modal Priority	Letter
New sidewalks should be reflected where development is currently occurring throughout the Gateway.	Modal Priority	Letter
Pedestrian enhancements should be considered in the Pena Next station area as well as along Tower at 64th Avenue.	Modal Priority	Letter
Bicycle connections should be considered along with the pedestrian enhancements suggested above. Connections to the 40th Avenue transit station should be considered.	Modal Priority	Letter
As a sustainable neighborhood, we are very concerned about the growth of automobile traffic in our neighborhood associated with greater density. We applaud the Blueprint vision for better pedestrian and bike infrastructure throughout the West Colfax neighborhood, and we look forward to supporting those efforts. We ask that the vision incorporate focused efforts to improve pedestrian infrastructure along Colfax Avenue and Sheridan Boulevard. We would like to engage in further conversation to promote consistent development along Sheridan Boulevard in particular. Further, we would like consideration of better connections between the Perry and Sheridan light rail stations to Colfax Avenue to encourage greater use of light rail and the Lakewood Gulch.	Modal Priority	letter
Pedestrian Enhanced Areas (page 155)The map on page 155 shows areas of the city that are recommended for consideration of additional pedestrian enhancements. At the side of the map there is a statement that thismap will be updated and further defined with the completion of small area plans. Five Points already has a recent, adopted small area plan called the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan. In that document we have identified the pedestrian priority streets for our community andthese are not reflected on the map. Please update the map to show the pedestrian prioritystreets in Five Points that are identified in the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan. These streets include, 21st Street, 24th Street, 27th Street, 31st Street, Welton Street,Curtis Street and Larimer Street.	Modal Priority	Letter
Transit Priority Map (page 163)The Transit priority streets map on page 163 shows California Street and StoutStreet listed as Transit Priority Streets in Curtis Park. While this is the current bus route through Curtis Park it does not accurately reflect future planning for transit in Five Points, as already documented in the recent and adopted Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan community vision. The vision for transit in Five Points includes linking the Welton light rail line to the A Line commuter rail station at 38th and Blake via Downing Street, in conjunction with converting Welton to two-way with streetcar or streetcar-like operations. It also makes more sense to place greater transit emphasis along the two-way portion of Larimer Street, which has had explosive grown and desperately needs transit, than to leave the bus routes on the current residential streets of Stout and California which provide no additional access to services, businesses, and retail than that which is already provided by the light rail line on Welton. Please consider moving the future transit priority street from Stout and California to the mixed-use corridors of Welton and Larimer, and adding Downing from 30th to 38th as an additional transit priority street.	Modal Priority	Letter
MODAL PRIORITY MAP:There are missing and incorrect designations in several locations in the Highland Neighborhood-There are gaps and missed connections in several locations, and there are incorrect designations that push cyclists onto unsafe streets and that miss transit connections. Our goal is to create consistent corridors for all modes of travel that align with current and future paths that will strengthen Highland's connections to surrounding neighborhoods and the entire metro area. SEE HUNI MODAL PRIORITY MAP and specific descriptions of street types requiring modifications that follow:	Modal Priority	Letter
Modal Priority Map:Some mode designations are incomplete, so connections are needed.-We found discontinuous mode designations and missing connections. Here are the changes we request: Fill in the gaps where West 32nd Avenue is discontinuous along the south side of Highland Park, west of Federal (in West Highland), and where it is missing a block between approximately Decatur and Eliot Streets east of Federal; Fill in the gap on 16th Street between Boulder and Central AND show connection over the Highland Bridge over I-25 to the Platte River Trail and beyond. SEE HUNI MODAL PRIORITY MAP.	Modal Priority	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Modal Priority Map:The Pedestrian/Bike path between Inca (and on to the Fox Street Commuter Rail Station) and Mile High Stadium has missing sections.-There is a mostly-completed ped/bike path from the Fox Street Commuter Rail Station to Mile High Stadium along the west side of I-25. We request that the map be updated to show the completed section between 20th Street and Inca Street as a continuous ped/bike route, and continuing northward into Sunnyside along Inca Street AND we request that the missing section at the top of the Speer/I-25 interchange connecting between the Speer/Zuni intersection and 15th Street. This should also continue south of Speer along Zuni Street in Jefferson Park. The path along the west bank of the South Platte River should also be shown as a Ped/Bike path. SEE HUNI MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Modal Priority Map:Zuni Street shows Ped/Bike designation between West 32nd Avenue and Speer Boulevard. This is not a designated bike route and it is not a safe street for bicyclists. There is also transit present south of 29th Avenue.-Zuni Street shows Ped/Bike designation between West 32nd Avenue and Speer Boulevard. This is not a designated bike route and it is not a safe street for bicyclists. There is also transit present south of 29th Avenue. We believe this street should be highlighted for pedestrian use between 32nd and 29th, and combined pedestrian and transit south of 29th. We request that the designation between 32nd and 29th Avenues be changed from Ped/Bike to Pedestrian Only, and that the designation between 29th and Speer be changed from Ped/Bike to Pedestrian/Transit. SEE HUNI MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Modal Priority Map:The 20th Street bridge over I-25 and the South Platte River is shown as a bike only bridge. This bridge also serves pedestrians and transit.-The 20th Street bridge over I-25 and the South Platte River serves pedestrians, cyclists, and transit, connecting to downtown and, in the case of pedestrians and cyclists, to the Platte River trails and Platte Street pedestrian route. We request that the map be changed to show the multi-modal nature of this bridge. SEE HUNI MODAL PRIORITY MAP.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>32nd Avenue west of Tennyson is not noted as a Bike & Pedestrian priority street. It should be. This road forms part of a frequently used bike corridor for bikers headed to Golden. Also, pedestrians rely on 32nd Avenue being walkable, in order to reach bus stops on both 32nd Avenue and on Sheridan Boulevard.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>56th Ave does not have any data regarding being a potential Multi Modal Network street (page 85).</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>The 2011 Denver Moves plan establishes a vision in which every resident lives within 1/4 of mile of a high ease of use cycling facility. This plan does not indicate that this is being achieved through its preferred build-out scenario. Please consider this as a major priority for the cycling community and provide exhibits indicating it has been met.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>This plan mentions the idea of reducing speed limits throughout the city. MBAC endorses that concept completely. Speed is a large factor in safe cycling (and walking and driving) and this is a great opportunity to advocate for safer speeds.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>We appreciate the plan's inclusion of bicycles. Denver has not leveraged this mobility option fully and this plan will help address that</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>The 2011 Denver Moves plan establishes a vision in which every resident lives within 1/4 of mile of a high ease of use cycling facility. This plan does not indicate that this is being achieved through its preferred build-out scenario. Please consider this as a major priority for the cycling community and provide exhibits indicating it has been met.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Blueprint is a technical document and largely focuses on infrastructure as it relates to bicycling. Many changes can be made in education, enforcement and outreach programming as essential to acceptance, managing change, and utilization. The City should consider this as an opportunity to include these elements and have them codified and accepted by Council and other entities in the City.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>We appreciate the plan's inclusion of bicycles. Denver has not leveraged this mobility option fully and this plan will help address that.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Strongly endorses Goals,metrics, growth strategy, street types, policies and strategies that support people friendly streets</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver is of critical importance to the success of the City in its quality of life, focus for investment, responsibility for equity, and direction for growth and change. This plan's focus on aligning the direction of land use with the City's mobility system provides its greatest value and presents its greatest challenge. MBAC appreciates the goals of developing "high-quality mobility options that prioritize walking, biking and transit and connect people of all ages and abilities to their daily needs" as well as promoting "a healthy community with equitable access to healthy living for all residents". Largely, MBAC believes that the plan establishes a realistic and focused vision to guide the City and its decision making. Certain elements, however, could use added attention.</p>	Modal Priority	Letter
<p>Regis University sits on a transit corridor (Federal Boulevard) while surrounded by both urban and urban-edge neighborhoods. We would like to see these neighborhoods remain active, pedestrian-friendly places with good multimodal connectivity.</p>	Modal Priority	letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
On the Multimodal Network map, the context of Urban Center provided for the Fox Street corridor north of the 38th Avenue/Park Avenue interchange is designated as a "Pedestrian & Bike" priority corridor. This does not seem to correctly fit with the fact that Fox Street is the City's desired transit/vehicular corridor for the approximately 100 acres on the east side of the 41 st and Fox RTD station.	Modal Priority	Letter
(3) providing additional pedestrian protections to enhance walkability. For convenience, references to chapters below coincide with the chapters in the updated Blueprint Denver draft. References to the Denver Moves: Transit and Denver Moves: Pedestrian and Trails plans are separately identified in Sections 10 and 11 below. Please note that as we've not yet been able to review and comment on the City's draft Comprehensive Plan 2040, we will reserve our comments on that document until the second draft is released in January.	Modal Priority	Letter
Is all this covered in Denver Moves? It would be good to refer to Denver Moves and specifically how the plans overlap/interact	Modal Priority	Letter
We support pedestrian enhancement along Evans, Colorado and near Florida/Holly intx as shown on the Pedestrian Enhanced map. We need further enhancements continuing along main streets such as Holly, Florida and Monaco for a more "complete network". We need improved pedestrian and bike access from our neighborhood to nearby trails and parks (Cherry Creek trail, Cook Park, Garland Park, Highline Canal). We have narrow attached sidewalks along busy corridors, many of which are interrupted by telephone poles and other obstacles. This is unacceptable for wheelchairs and unpleasant for all pedestrians.	Modal Priority	Letter
Rather confusing map trying to show all different modes with lines	Modal Priority	Letter
32) Many in Athmar bike down Exposition to Lipan to the Platt River trail, this connection needs to be safer.	Modal Priority	Letter
The map only shows one transit priority street, Green Valley Ranch Boulevard/48th Avenue. Additional transit priorities should include Tower Road and connections to the Pena Next Station and 64th and Tower interchange. Appropriate changes to Denver Moves should be considered.	Modal Priority	Letter
Pedestrian enhanced sidewalks are the priority in the design of all streets. Certain streets can be further enhanced to create vibrant public spaces and encourage walking. Huge disparity for District 11 in comparison to other parts of the city (page 78-79).	Modal Priority	Letter
Congress Park would like to maintain the walkability of streets such as 7th and 12th and improve the safety of interior streets 8th, Josephine, 13th, 14th as well as our neighborhood boundary streets. The same safety issues we are outlining today were outlined in our 1995 neighborhood plan and very little has changed. Please help us actually implement these safety improvement changes that are very needed and desired. Congress Park wants to preserve the walkability that brought us all to the neighborhood in the first place.	Modal Priority	Letter
education of bikers and drivers	Modal Priority	Office Hours
consistency of bike infrastructure to reduce conflicts	Modal Priority	Office Hours
complete bike network without gaps	Modal Priority	Office Hours
Parking in Cap Hill (Loading zones available for parking after hours, extending parking zones, diagonal parking on wider streets)	Modal Priority	Office Hours
better protected bike lanes -- and better commitment to implement them	Modal Priority	Office Hours
Concerns with safety of bike lanes on Florida from Holly to Colorado	Modal Priority	Office Hours
Concerns with safety of bike lanes in SE Denver	Modal Priority	Office Hours
supportive of transit improvements such as more brt routes	Modal Priority	Office Hours
- On page 80/81 goal 3 I love this but how will it be implemented? Can you add something about residential arterials (i.e. 8th avenue between colorado and josephine) should have higher design requirements, esp given new development since it is fully surrounded by low density all single family homes. The road is not in context with surroundings. If fully residential it should have crosswalks every 3-4 blocks, lights every 3-4 blocks, narrow lanes, etc.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Make all street design have a hierarchy of pedestrian first, then bike/scooter/transit, and then finally private automobile.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
- I want to continue to make driver harder for people. We live in a big boy city. Parking and driving should not be easy.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
The transportation side has no implementation. Our streets are our problems and we need an innovative public works group to actually make change vs "move cars quickly and safely". It needs to be about the person first. I think all residential arterials or residential neighborhoods need to be overseen by another department. Public works is only looking out for the driver.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
There does not seem to be a Strategic Parking Plan in Blue Print Denver. Creating an effective plan within the Neighborhood Planning Initiative can support equitable access in every neighborhood. Denver needs to create Parking Benefit Districts (PBD) within Business Improvement Districts and/or RNOs. The PBD can set an occupancy rate goal of 85% occupancy, charging market rate prices to park in residential neighborhoods for nonresidents. The cost of permits for nonresidents can pay for daytime permits to cover the cost of permits for residents. The city can use the revenue generated as an incentive for the BID that money will go towards improving sidewalks, trees, intersections and street calming. Additionally, remove minimum parking requirements for new development by unbundling parking and housing, allowing renters to decide if they want to pay for parking spaces. Let developers pay in-lieu fees to lower the cost of new development and reduce the burden on eventual renters from paying for parking that they may not use. Parking requirements currently impose a tax on buildings to impose driving, preventing developers from rehabilitating land for commercial development. Do not have off-street parking be more expensive than curb parking, it reduces use of garages whose purposes is to prevent cruising for parking at the curb. Increase the number of parking meter alternatives, such as daytime permits, hang tags, pay and display multispace meters, pay-by-space meters, personal in-vehicle, pay by phone (manufacturers can pay to install meters, then recover the cost from the resulting revenue until the city owns them free and clear) Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT).	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Again, driverless cars are an abomination and shouldn't be tolerated by Blueprint Denver, let alone encouraged by Blueprint Denver, as they are, now.		
By developing transit on adjacent streets, one could vary transportation access to corridors without reducing potential car access.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
the emphasis on alternative transportation methods such as bikes and buses	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I love the primary focus on pedestrians and the general emphasis on bikes and public transportation. It is needed! I also like the idea of local centers where people can shop and move around within their neighborhood without having to go too far. I would love if this network promoted small community oriented businesses.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Seperation of traffic use	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I worry this will cause backups for auto traffic	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
(I like chapter 5's) emphasis on biking	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
(I like) the Transit, biking and pedestrian designation on Broadway along its length to make such an investment have the greatest long-term benefit.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I love the focus on pedestrians and public transportation.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Great start to defining key corridors.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I like the emphasis on improving Denver's multimodal infrastructure.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Having a full grid of mobility options will be amazing once it actually happens.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
more areas for safe biking from East side to downtown. 23rd ave added a bike lane from Colorado to ALMOST Monaco...but then the road is unsafe, potholes, no lane, etc. from Monaco to Quebec. if this was fixed you then have Stapleton bikelanes and parks that could be used safely.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
make sure all transit priority corridors also were appropriate for ped and biking priority or make sure there is a plan for a biking priority street paralleling major transit corridors.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Would love to see more emphasis on multi-modal transportation in West Denver that connects easily to downtown. As an example, the Lakewood Gulch Trail is great connection to downtown, but difficult for folks south of 6th Ave to reach safely.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I love the mass transit plans.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I like the prioritizing of walking and biking over automobile use	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I've lived in Denver since 1974, when I was 8 years old. The growth since then has been excessive. I shouldn't have to give up my driving to the extent envisioned by Denveright, as it is my right. Climate change can better be addressed in other ways.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I'm an Uber Driver, and, while that should and I suppose is considered in reducing Denverites' driving, realize that lane reduction and car driving restrictions also affect Uber drivers negatively.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I agree with the priorities and strategies outlined in this chapter but I don't agree with how they have been executed.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I like that you are thinking about this.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Page 153: I agree. How do you have public works implement more crosswalks and slow cars down on residential arterials? look at 8th between Colorado and Joesphine. It has a huge opportunity to improve safety but instead a double turn lane is planned to make 8th worse. A lot of these are nice ideas but really need to be implemented in our neighborhoods. Traffic and car speeds are drastically hurting the character of the neighborhoods.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Page 159: yes - please make biking a priority. more bike lanes and better bike lanes along with driver education. can you add more bike lanes through Congress Park? More E/W connections via bike.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I applaud the emphasis on multi-modal transportation and connectivity among neighborhoods. RTD has in the last decade cut back transportation options and service in Capitol Hill. RTD completely eliminated the Number 2 bus route that ran from downtown through Capitol Hill and over to Cherry Creek; "repurposed" the Number 12 as a bus that runs only north and south and not to downtown, and most recently removed numerous bus stops along such lines as the Number 6 and Number 10, not only inconveniencing able-bodied users of mass transit, but impairing the ability of the elderly and disabled to reach a bus stop.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
As one who walks more than four miles round-trip to downtown from Capitol Hill on workdays, I have also experienced the degradation in pedestrian safety from failure of Denver's transportation engineers to create safe crossings, lighting and signage designed to protect and facilitate pedestrians, and the like.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
Slower speeds on all streets	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
yes - please make biking a priority. more bike lanes and better bike lanes along with driver education. can you add more bike lanes through congress park? More E/W connections via bike.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I've heard, in past contexts, and the map supports the idea, that car accessibility to the following streets may be reduced: Colfax east of Broadway, Leetsdale east of Colorado, Broadway south of Colfax, and Evans west of University. Car accessibility/number of lanes, mustn't be reduced in any of these key corridors, even if transit and pedestrian improvement options occur. Remember, your car accessibility reductions also impact a good alternative to individual driving, Uber drivers, like me. There are better ways to combat climate change than to reduce individual car trips.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
The Montbello neighborhood is finally being recognized as an area that needs sidewalk improvement.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
That people walking are prioritized over other modes of transportation. That it recognizes the importance of having higher intensity growth in walkable, mixed-use centers and along transit corridors. Recognizing the need to reduce the number of commuters who travel alone in vehicles. The recommendation to implement the Vision Zero Action Plan.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
I agree. How do you have public works implement more crosswalks and slow cars down on residential arterials? look at 8th between Colorado and joesphine. It has a huge opportunity to improve safety but instead a double turn lane is planned to make 8th worse. A lot of these are nice ideas but really need to be implemented in our neighborhoods. Traffic and car speeds are drastically hurting the character of the neighborhoods.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
The goal of safety, moving people, and creating attractive public spaces are not competing needs - all three of these are completely feasible, but NOT if cars are still the primary mode of transportation. Cars must be deprioritized for Denver to grow sustainably and for people to be safe and thriving.	Modal Priority	On-line Survey
doesn't agree with is the statement that pedestrians should be prioritized on all streets. make it clearer that "prioritize" doesn't mean that a street like Colorado Blvd would remove lanes for 40' wide sidewalks	Modal Priority	Planning Board
Can the document expand the definition of bike lanes to encapsulate other forms of mobility, like scooters and e-skateboards?	Modal Priority	Task Force
Blueprint is our opportunity to select pedestrian enhanced areas that bolster VZ and data-driven countermeasures. This is another opportunity to put pedestrian safety at the fore, and the existing language falls short.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Building off that, can Blueprint call for the application of traffic calming measures?	Modal Priority	Task Force
Transportation along corridors is addressed, but not crossings - this is most problematic when looking at the bicycle priority network. No crossing treatments are addressed. Similar issue for ped enhanced areas (see below)	Modal Priority	Task Force
The High Injury Network is still missing from the draft. Can this be included in the network maps and much better integrated into the policy recommendations?	Modal Priority	Task Force
High capacity transit is listed many times in the doc, but not high frequency transit. We've discussed the importance of HFT, and the Denveright Transit plan bolsters this tenet, as well. I would like to see references to transit be centered on HFT rather than HCT.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Understanding that there has not been a separate bicycle mobility analysis done, I worry that corridors from Denver Moves have been incorporated but without actually checking to make sure that "high ease of use" facilities connect to community corridors	Modal Priority	Task Force
Where is bike parking in the plan? It's completely missing.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Discussion of complete networks (p 151) is where Vision Zero should shine! Please include.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Pedestrian enhanced areas - p 153 - here's where I want to see engineering treatments listed and supported - like no Right Turn on Red, leading pedestrian intervals, separated signal phases, etc.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Similarly, here's our opportunity to bolster the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing guidelines by lowering minimum thresholds in pedestrian enhanced areas.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Regarding the bike network: while I support and advocate for high-ease-of-use facilities, the City should also support true low-volume, low-speed bicycle-priority streets like neighborhood bikeways. Bikeways are a low-cost and highly effective tool to build a bike network, and they're missing from Blueprint.	Modal Priority	Task Force
This ties back to the problem of only using the "high ease of use" network instead of a thoughtful bike network for the next 20 years.	Modal Priority	Task Force

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
p 161 - language for transit priority is good and strong enough to make me believe we will have transit priority streets. Same is not true for bike/ped priority sections which are less bold in their vision, and do not call for modal prioritization on those corridors.	Modal Priority	Task Force
Driverless technology -- good additions, but still too weak. Discussion of autonomous, but not of connected vehicles, nor vehicle-to-everything technology	Modal Priority	Task Force
Outreach Narrative should have more detail and be enhanced	Other/General	City Council
Here is my comment: When I look through this draft I see my neighborhood as not adhering to urban edge attributes....We are taking on urban attributes that our infrastructure cannot handle, and it is lessening the quality of life in the neighborhood. Also as the plan relates to the being economically equitable we have fallen short by allowing and encouraging excessive demolition. Citywide we expect the taxpayers to supplement development with concepts like using TIF dollars, and our partners in development have taken unfair advantage of us in this respect. The economy has been ruined thus far with implementation of the 2010 plan. It is shameful and insulting that police, firefighters, teachers and the like are now candidates for affordable housing. This plan offers more of the same; it has been a free for all, and in that respect and the Department of Regulatory Agencies should be providing more oversight to the fraud going on in the real estate sector which include scams, predatory lending, and overvaluations of homes. Those kinds of partners should be enlisted by DenverRight to help decipher what is realistic. I think we are leaving future generations with our tax burden which is illegal for state and local governments to do. This plan is not realistic as to how any of this will be paid for with a population count that will soon decrease with the passing of the baby boomer generation and the tightening of immigration laws. ☹	Other/General	Email
Acknowledge the important role that high quality schools/ Denver Public Schools play in complete neighborhoods	Other/General	Email
Why only specifically reference "developers". There is a connotation with this word that probably isn't intended	Other/General	Equity training
What does the word "amenity" mean?	Other/General	Equity training
p 122, QOLI Green Infrastructure suggested edit: Green infrastructure includes a network of parks, open spaces, floodplains, drainageways, landscaped areas, and street trees, as well as man-made, engineered systems. Green infrastructure provides a number of environmental, economic and social benefits and is vital to the overall health our city.	Other/General	Internal
p.122 Mobility Green Infrastructure: This text is very similar to page 123. Can we replace and focus more on the benefits. Suggested edit: Green infrastructure uses natural living systems to provide a number of citywide benefits including improved air and water quality, reduced flooding risk, urban heat mitigation, climate resiliency, improved public health, and more pleasant environments for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Other/General	Internal
p.135 High Medium QOLI-variety of forms and scales on redeveloped site.	Other/General	Internal
Typo on page 142, Industrial QOLI "Planting" no planing	Other/General	Internal
p 144, Amenity Zone Type: suggested edit: trees, planters, or other green infrastructure and hardscaping such as...	Other/General	Internal
p.129 Text for new renderings (if used) forthcoming.	Other/General	Internal
p.136 new rendering proposed to include structural green infrastructure	Other/General	Internal
p 150 - we also have a green streets layer on GIS	Other/General	Internal
Review draft for consistency with zoning code references. This includes: parking reductions when in proximity to an enhanced transit corridor defined in Blueprint Denver; Primary and side street designations; Intent statements (e.g. for MS zone districts); Unit Orientation to a street; Use limitations for eating and drinking outdoor areas related to Blueprint street classifications; Criteria for approving a regulating plan	Other/General	Internal
Enhance engagement narrative - more about the "why" we did what we did, not just what we did.	Other/General	Internal
p 150 - could trails along gulches, creeks and river form the 'natural network' and be a separate network layer?	Other/General	Internal
For second metric on page 26: What about accesss to green space?	Other/General	Internal
The plan is well done - thorough, professional, and with a lot of community involvement. We look forward to engaging more specifically in the Neighborhood Planning Initiative. There are so many interacting plans mentioned, a graphic that explains how they interact would be helpful. (which guides which, regulatory abilities of each). The obvious connections are the other Denverright plans, but additional mentioned include 2018 Housing an Inclusive Denver, Vision Zero, Safe Routes to School, Imagine 2020 City's Cultural Plan, 2010 Zoning Code, Discover Denver surveying, Denver Food Vision	Other/General	Letter
Beth Jacob High School of Denver was established here on the West Side in January 1968. We are located at 5100 West 14th Ave., and our dormitory facility and faculty housing are located on an entire square block from W. 13th on the north to the gully on the south and from Zenobia on the east to Sheridan on the west. We are a Hebrew high school for girls offering both religious and general studies with college preparatory programs. Over the past half century we have attracted girls not only from Denver but from all over the United States and some foreign countries.	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>We have waited a long time for the city to plan for the revitalization and renewal of our West Side neighborhood by clearing out the blight and encouraging gentrification. This, we hoped, would create a better environment for student enrollment to grow and for our Jewish community to attract new families. When the St. Anthony project started several years ago we were excited that our time has come. However, now, that all that is being built is multi-unit construction bringing in great density housing we are quite disappointed. The needs of our Jewish community is family housing with 3 or 4 bedrooms and none of this is taking place. In fact the opposite is occurring, which does not provide benefit to our community. Houses that would be available are now being scraped and replaced with multi-unit facilities. Also, the construction activities currently in effect and the subsequent increase of dense housing will continue to create parking problems around the neighborhood and pedestrian street crossing difficulties.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>We know that the city has a plan for property usage of the various neighborhoods, but regrettably has failed to see the usage needs of our very special and stable community. For the future of our community, we beseech your consideration in halting the spreading of the multi-unit construction and at least preserving those homes that might be available for family housing in the future. We hope that you will do what is possible to assist a community that has been one of the most stable elements in preserving the West Side's integrity and avoiding its deterioration in the years to come. To summarize, our need is for the expansion of zoning for single family housing here on the West Side.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>The Zera Abraham community has been located in the Sloan's Lake/West Colfax area for over 130 years. We opened our doors at the west bank of the Platte River in 1887, later located on Conejos and King, and now, since 1960, at 1560 Winona Court. While our location has changed within the West Colfax area, the flavor and clientele of the synagogue community have not. Our local library, Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales Branch at Irving Street and Colfax Avenue, celebrates our presence in this area by housing a multimedia exhibit on the Westside's Jewish roots.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>The community is close knit and is one which counts "family" among its most important values and components of stability. The average family size is 8 members who generally live in 3-4 bedroom homes. Clearly, 1-2 bedroom condos or single lot four-plex buildings cannot possibly meet our needs. Our community has stabilized the west Colfax corridor for over 100 years. While the neighborhood has only recently gentrified, the stabilizing factor while the area had been distressed has always been our synagogue community. While we are excited to experience the St. Anthony redevelopment and the new construction in our area, it also brings very difficult challenges.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Parking has become a serious issue. No longer can it be taken for granted that one will be able to park near his house when arriving home from work, as now, with the many large projects recently built, there are many more cars than street parking available. This in turn encourages parking up to each intersection, whereby the parked vehicles now block visibility for vehicular traffic. One cannot easily see crossing traffic and stop signs. Aside for hazard for the driver, this also creates very frightening danger for the pedestrian, and impedes the ease of crossing the streets.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>We are a community of Sabbath observers. We do not use vehicles on the Saturdays or on major Jewish Holidays. Our pedestrian traffic, including very young children, is especially heavy on those days. During the weekdays the pedestrian traffic is somewhat lighter, yet still much higher than average with community members walking to and from services at the synagogue from the predawn hours till well into the evening. Crossing 17th Avenue or Colfax Avenue is exceptionally difficult. This challenge is compounded in our most heavily traversed intersections, along Colfax Avenue, between Tennyson Street and Sheridan Avenue, where this is only one traffic signal and no stop signs.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Zera Abraham Congregation and Denver's West Side Jewish Community established, and continue to thrive in, portions of the Sloan's Lake and West Colfax neighborhoods of Denver. This unique community resides primarily within the Eruv Boundary - a community boundary recognized by Denver ordinance extending from 17th Ave to the Dry Gulch and from Perry St. to Sheridan Blvd. This area is also home to institutions and infrastructure serving the community's cultural & religious needs.</p>	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The community appreciates Denver’s involving us in city-wide and neighborhood-specific planning processes including the Denverright and Blueprint Denver plans currently being developed. While the community is open to some growth, the growth we’re currently experiencing is too dramatic a change from the local-scale, low-density neighborhood we’ve always known. Between re-zonings near West Colfax Ave, transit oriented development adjacent to the light-rail stations, and the Saint Anthony redevelopment – the small neighborhood we know & love is shrinking each day. Taking a signal from the current development trend, the Blueprint Denver draft-plan identifies our neighborhood as a significant growth area in its vision for Denver’s future. We are asking that Denver take a cue from the neighborhood’s more cautious reaction to development and the negative impacts already resulting. Uncontained growth will bring regional-uses into our insular community increasing traffic on streets where young children are learning to ride their bikes. It will build on the backyards in which our kids play and it will continue to deplete the inventory of beautiful brick single-family and duplex homes so integral to a community of large families. Because we don’t use cars, transit or elevators on the Sabbath & Holidays, vertical development will not accommodate our children and seniors and we cannot relocate beyond easy walking-distance from our institutions. Current Denver policy incentivizes developing micro-units in our neighborhood. These small units do not provide family-friendly housing and long-time homeowners are being replaced with transplants residing temporarily in a neighborhood they aren’t invested in and may not care to preserve its future. We therefore recommend gradual, measured growth that protects the housing and institutions of the existing community relies upon. With this in mind, the following are specific feedback and requested changes to the draft-plan that would go a long way to preserve our neighborhood and community:</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver shares many of our goals and concerns and does not want to see the community displaced. This letter should provide Denver with our vision of how that can be achieved alongside continued, but reasonable, urban growth. We welcome continued discussion regarding these recommendations, requests & ideas.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>LUN also renews its objection to not being given the chance to participate in a Legislative Rezoning from the Old Code to the New Code, and interprets from the preliminary language in the proposed Blueprint Plan that custom zoning will be eliminated. However, we fail to see that this will be done in a legislative rezoning process as promised in the passage of the 2010 New Zoning Code.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>The Sloan’s Lake Citizen Group (SLCG) RNO, which just celebrated its 40th anniversary, and represents the area from Federal to Sheridan and from W 10th Ave. to W. 29th Ave., would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Denverright city planning endeavor. There are many aspects of the plan that affect our neighborhood and the ability to comment on all of them is beyond our group’s limited resources and capacity. To that, please consider the following comments as representing our limited review of that which most significantly impacts our neighborhoods quality of life and sense of community. To start, our neighborhood would like to express a sincere appreciation to the City of Denver for going to such great efforts and lengths to make our city great and aspire to reach for more as the Denverright Planning effort moves into the future. In addition, our neighborhood would like to express appreciation and support for all the those who work in the line of public service. To that, we have discussed the various drafts of the Denverright plans at our monthly General Assembly meetings. Councilman Espinoza has been at attendance for some of these meetings and joined in the discussion. We hope that the following public input will help inform the next draft, and look forward to seeing those edits.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>§ Focus on values, then rules: Engage community, especially those who are underserved. In the SLCG neighborhood, those most vulnerable are our Youth and Senior populations, and historically significant Jewish Community. To both move forward without a major re-write, but also adapt to our community’s needs, the SLCG requests that Denverright Plans include mechanisms that create opportunity for updates few years. An example is Seattle’s new Transportation Plan that updates the “playbook every six months, so it’s strategies can evolve with circumstances, but the principles and values remain a constant.”</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>§ Define big-picture success clearly: Through defining values, success can be defined. The SLCG recognizes that neighborhood safety, and the health & wellness of our vulnerable populations are measurements of success. We request that regulators weigh the gains of success (ex.: more efficient bus rapid transit) with the negative outcomes (ex.: increased pollution, cut-thru traffic, decreased safety) which can embody the balance of embracing technology while accepting safety checks and environment monitoring.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>§ Make regulations about people. The establishment of shared values should help planners and policy makers understand the pain points for their community. Those pain points might be a sign that the rules or processes are out of date or disconnected from daily concerns.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>§ Prioritize problem-solving: The relevance of regulations can dwindle, creating compliance for its own sake. So while staying focused on the problems that Denverright is trying to address, allow for regulators to know how well these regulations are solving problems, and allow for priorities to change.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Test, learn, repeat. The SLCG supports the City of Denver experimenting with pilots, pop ups, innovation zones, or tactical urbanism to help deliver new services.</p>	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
The SLCG recognizes that the various plans in Denveright include numerous goals & objectives that express a lack of financing, and thus a need for funding. Here are some perspectives that SLCG supports to reinvent our community’s fiscal position and may create greater reinvestment: Align public investment strategies with the organization of private and civic capital. (Treat items like longer-term infrastructure investments as business investments.); Improve basic operations through better technology and increased accountability. (Align budgets with outcomes, not as a compliance system.); Improve public asset management to maximize civic financial health. (This may involve more public-private type partnerships.); Transparency increases asset value and invest. (Dashboards can offer real accountability.)	Other/General	Letter
Neighbors are concerned that developers unfairly profit from and take advantage of taxpayers funded affordable housing subsidies, like TIF dollars, and use affordable housing as leverage for additional market rate density and building height.	Other/General	Letter
add “How do I use this plan?” if I am a resident...a developer...etc. Also guidance for “What if my neighborhood doesn’t have an NPI? How can I use this plan in place of an NPI?”	Other/General	Letter
C.H.U.N. believes much of the language in the drafts of Blueprint Denver is too vague and broad and should be strengthened to be more clear and directive. Also, there should be interim accountability dates to ensure meaningful and measurable progress.	Other/General	Letter
We suggest an annual report card, dashboard or benchmarking report on citywide progress towards the objectives, and detailing progress at Council District and/or citywide progress towards the objectives, and detailing progress at Council District and/or neighborhood levels.	Other/General	Letter
we urge the city to strengthen the implementation of Blueprint Denver by creating more clarity on how different departments within the city will coordinate to advance the plan’s recommendations—a coordination that we think has been lacking. (For example, how will the annual allocation of CIP funds, affordable housing funds, and infrastructure bond programs align with Blueprint Denver?) The implementation structure must be built into the infrastructure of multiple city agencies and be sustained through multiple administrations for the next 20 years.	Other/General	Letter
Page 27 - tie mobility goals to 2030 timeline set in the mobility action plan (mode share goals by 2030 (add a metric)	Other/General	Letter
Typo on pg. 11 (in chart legend) “African American”	Other/General	Letter
P65 – typo – Cheery should be Cherry in second para.	Other/General	Letter
Our platform calls for neighborhood / small area plans every 15 years for every neighborhood, which Has been initiated with the Neighborhood Planning Initiative (NPI). Blueprint Denver will be the first document adopted by City Council to capture this NPI intent and keeps the city focused on this important goal. Therefore, the Blueprint Denver language should be extended to capture the iterative “every neighborhood every 15 years” goal, and should explicitly recommend sufficient ongoing funding for NPI so this vital community planning process continues to be appropriately resourced.	Other/General	Letter
The Growth Strategy section provides a good overview about how growth has occurred in the last 25 years and lays out some reasonable parameters regarding general growth strategy for the future, with a major focus on where that growth should occur. However, it is missing some context. On the one hand, Denver’s steady and rapid growth over the last 160 years has been a hallmark of its evolution. On the other hand, Denver has experienced periodic severe economic downturns (early 1970s, late 1980s, and more recently 2008-2011); thus, growth is not a foregone conclusion. In addition, despite the tremendous growth in recent decades, Denver overall and especially in the core remains less dense than it was pre-World War II. In order to achieve the many quality of life goals in the plan, creating more walkable and livable neighborhoods requires continued growth and densification. Much of the text in the draft seems to take growth for granted, and at times appears to focus on the negative consequences of growth. We believe that the Draft needs to take a more balanced view of growth, acknowledging there are positive as well as negative aspects to it The plan should emphasize not just where we want growth and how to manage it, but how we must encourage growth and leverage it to improve our city and the lives of the people who live, work, and visit in Denver.. A balanced view of growth needs to be reiterated throughout the Draft.	Other/General	Letter
There are several references to the role of the private sector throughout the document. The private sector role needs to be clarified and strengthened in at least two aspects. For example, the Vision Elements section notes that “business-friendly and entrepreneurial” is a community value informing the plan. We strongly agree with this as a value and welcome its inclusion in the Plan and we encourage that this value is reiterated and better reflected throughout the Draft.	Other/General	Letter
Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods (C.H.U.N.) is comprised of many neighborhoods which are historic and have fine architecture, scale and design and the organization wishes to protect and celebrate those qualities in the future. There is too little mention in the plans of historic districts, historic structures, and historic parkways.	Other/General	Letter
fix mistake with shade of green on map not aligning with regional park on legend p 132-33	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
add new district for "significantly privately-owned and public open space" pg 132-33 and add new icon for new district on 262-63. add detailed description of new district in section 6.7	Other/General	Letter
Make sure landmark preservation/designation (i.e. Chapter 30) tools are referred to where appropriate, and that existing landmarks/districts are acknowledged (pg. 34). This should include a reference to these tools on page 16 when discussing rezonings.	Other/General	Letter
We like the focus on complete streets and agree that all residents should have access to quality, affordable mobility options. Promoting more affordable housing near transit is needed to advance equity and access to opportunity.	Other/General	Letter
Timing concerns with a SAP which is outdated. We understand the NCI initiatives that are intended to craft non-existent and review and revise existing SAPs. UPCC is fortunate to have a SAP, however it is now outdated. We understand the emphasis with NCI will be to work in areas that don't have SAPs, therefore we are concerned that our SAP not be used to inform efforts moving forward without the chance for some input or review until such time as we have an updated plan.	Other/General	Letter
Blueprint Denver establishes a framework to plan and implement complete neighborhoods. We are unclear how these plans will be implemented and who will be involved. As a university, we want to participate in the planning process for implementing complete neighborhood goals in our immediate vicinity. We believe our campus has the potential to contribute significantly to the Blueprint Denver vision as a community center environment.	Other/General	letter
Finally, we commend the City's process in developing Blueprint Denver. In our view, it was an extremely thorough process bringing in a diverse group of stakeholders which is reflected in the draft. We particularly appreciate the City's outreach to those who often are most affected by this sort of plan, but do not have a voice when it is developed. We recommend strong coordination between Blueprint Denver and the City's five-year Housing an Inclusive Denver plan to maximize opportunities to create and preserve affordable housing.	Other/General	letter
In short, we strongly support this document and encourage City Council to approve it—with our chief feedback being that the creation of specific goals like those outlined above will help the City truly track its progress towards the sustainable, equitable, and inclusive city it so eloquently outlines.	Other/General	Letter
Would like context/places map comments to be appropriately translated to growth map	Other/General	Letter
(2) the Blueprint plan's failure to explicitly focus growth in areas downtown where vacant land can accommodate it before promoting growth in our south-central Denver neighborhoods;	Other/General	Letter
Incentivizing the preservation of structures that contribute to the established character of an area is extremely important. Our city is losing character quickly and we need your help preserving it. We see Cook Park as vulnerable to scrapes and large builds that have really hurt the fabric in other areas so far. Please prioritize this.	Other/General	Letter
Park Hill Neighborhood has been eliminated. Your proposed Blueprint plan shows three neighborhoods: South Park Hill, North Park Hill, and Northeast Park Hill. Park Hill considers itself to be and is reflected in the current Blueprint and our neighborhood plan as one neighborhood. In fact, our status as one neighborhood is a result of Park Hill's historic efforts to come together and embrace our diversity during the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. Should the proposed Denveright Blueprint document be approved, you will have erased our neighborhood and divided us. This is unacceptable to our community.	Other/General	Letter
we note that approval of the Denveright documents by City Council will drive decisions with significant impact on our community for years to come. There should be no rush. We believe that the vote to implement Denveright should be a topic of discussion for those seeking office in the 2019 Municipal election, and the proposal should be submitted to the Council seated in the summer of 2019. We ask that Denveright not be submitted to Council for a vote until August, 2019.	Other/General	Letter
38) Federal Boulevard is a Parkway, how do we make it more of a parkway and not just a community corridor for cars?	Other/General	Letter
NPI page 39		
39) The elements of a complete neighborhood is missing AFFORDABILITY to allow new immigrant families and working class families to live in our neighborhood...otherwise our neighborhoods will lose their diversity. We like that about west Denver, that is one of the things that make it unique. This plan is trying to make all the neighborhoods bland and well off. We don't want that and I want to tell the Planners to use this plan to prevent that from happening.		
40) Anything in the plan to track how neighborhoods are changing and if that should impact more specific implementation?	Other/General	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>INC ZAP Platform contains the first call for Denver to be able to amend adopted area plans when changes in the community vision need to be captured, and particularly when new and unanticipated large changes occur (e.g. when an institutional use leaves an area). The ability to amend plans is often the most appropriate path in such cases, with full and inclusive community involvement, rather than developer-led GDPs attempting to set the vision. CPD has responded to INC's request with a new practice of amending neighborhood & small area plans, including 38th/Blake and the Downtown area plan. It is good to see this practice officially recognized and recommended in the draft BP text (pg. 37) and extending to the ability to amend Blueprint Denver itself (pg. 35).</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>In addition, there is not enough attention paid to the concepts of predictability and clarity for private sector development and investment. Over the past several years, Denver has worked to provide a more predictable development framework in Denver and we believe that the desire for predictability and clarity in development continues to be a priority as it benefits all involved in the process. We recognize that this needs to be balanced against other objectives and values enumerated in the Draft, and encourage that this balance be addressed more clearly in the Draft.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Reiterating some of our earlier comments, there are many excellent ideas and aspirations in the Draft – perhaps too many. We strongly urge the authors to simplify and clarify the text wherever possible, and to add appropriate emphasis and structure so that the overarching values and priorities shine through the many necessary recommendations and observations.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Language in the plan as it stands may incentivize scraping of existing buildings that make up the character of our historic neighborhood. This would be highly undesirable, and we ask that you revise it (especially, the idea of adding density at corner lots along collector streets has the potential to cause significant loss of historic homes in West Highland, as does the suggested future large rezonings along transit corridors, like 38th Avenue).</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>We appreciate a number of the policies and strategies laid out in the draft comprehensive and Blueprint Denver plan. Below, we will highlight a number of them which we felt would address some of the concerns we discussed in the previous section related to displacement of existing population and the incongruous nature of new development. However, because this neighborhood is inaccurately (see Transit discussion) deemed 'transit rich', there are also a number of conflicting policies and strategies that only exacerbate concerns. Furthermore, we are extremely concerned that policies and strategies are made only 'sometimes applicable' (Pg. 16) and generally only in cases of large scale, legislative rezoning. We feel that this language needs to be corrected, or otherwise the plan will be completely ineffective in addressing the land use problems affecting our neighborhood, and may just exacerbate them.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>The concept of complete neighborhoods, and strong and authentic neighborhoods resonated positively with the local population. We would like to see development bring amenities that benefit existing residents, instead of only burdening them with more density. The following are examples of strategies identified to be in concert with this desire: [SAN] 2.1.D Encourage quality infill development that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and offers opportunities for increased amenities. [SAN] 2.3.D Expand resources to preserve and enhance neighborhood culture [SAN] 2.4.A Support and grow neighborhood-serving businesses. [SAN] 2.7.B Embrace existing communities and their cultural assets.</p> <p>Members of the local Jewish community expressed a desire to attract more amenities to the neighborhood that would serve their community, and are interested in how these strategies could help grow their community in the future.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>There is no neighborhood plan for all of Berkely Statistical Neighborhood including Harkness Heights. We understand that the areas in Northwest Denver west of Federal are not scheduled for new neighborhood plans for at least 10 years. Without such a neighborhood plan there is no comprehensive planning vision and to quote Blueprint Denver, page 38: "Defining the appropriate role and scope of NPI area plans, as detailed in this section, is critical to the future implementation of Blueprint Denver."</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>One theme that is becoming increasingly important to residents that wasn't directly outlined is safety - safety from crime, safety from traffic, safety from pollutants, etc. As the city grows we are seeing more conflicts in Congress Park with above issues</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>2. Pg. 27 – 2040 Target of 100% of City surveyed by Discover Denver/established pattern book – Excellent, if this means we are pursuing the goal of contextual development and neighborhoods do not have to pursue Conservation Overlay District to save the character and fabric of their neighborhoods. However, that is 22 years from now and the neighborhoods will be destroyed by then based on current development and trends. □</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Pg. 35 – Annual evaluation – we request that RNO's be included in this process and not just presented with CPD reports on progress and implementation.</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>There is a distinct lack of consistency and cohesiveness among the plans. It does not seem that the various committees have coordinated their information and ideas prior to public review. Suggest that there be serious review of overall plan and direction occur before the next steps are taken toward implementation</p>	Other/General	Letter
<p>Concern about support roads while I-70 is under construction</p>	Other/General	Office Hours

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I like nothing	Other/General	On-line Survey
Where are the solutions?	Other/General	On-line Survey
nothing	Other/General	On-line Survey
n/a	Other/General	On-line Survey
Nothing.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Our neighborhood, City Park South	Other/General	On-line Survey
See prior comments	Other/General	On-line Survey
Ditto	Other/General	On-line Survey
I live in Southwest Denver, right on the border of Sheridan, Englewood, Littleton and Lakewood. I feel we are a forgotten part of Denver. We may not be quite as old as some of the other neighborhoods but we are aging and in need of attention. Heavy on our minds is the redevelopment of Loretto Heights. This is a very rare and important landmark in this community. I would ask that all efforts be made to ensure the preservation of the Chapel and nun cemetery. We are limited in this part of town to open space. We have very limited open space and parking still available. It is crucial that this campus be developed in a responsible way that and enhances instead of consumes the community surrounding it. Please make sure to hold the developer accountable. Make sure that they follow through on promises made.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I would change nothing	Other/General	On-line Survey
Ditto	Other/General	On-line Survey
This chapter gives a clear outline of	Other/General	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 6? detail	Other/General	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 6? detail	Other/General	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 6? Everything.	Other/General	On-line Survey
We do like	Other/General	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 6? Not much	Other/General	On-line Survey
it all sounds good but it will be a terrible place to live	Other/General	On-line Survey
I'm perturbed by the dearth of waste diversion information	Other/General	On-line Survey
Scrap it.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like the idea of having it reviewed regularly, and updated in terms of the equity concepts. I like the push for updating all the neighborhood plans, because I know ours is currently out of date, and has many recommendations that have been overcome by events. I like the idea of complete neighborhoods. I like that the plan recognizes that unfettered redevelopment and rezoning in some of these neighborhoods is displacing some residents. I like that the plan recognizes the importance of maintaining affordable, small, single family homes, because not everyone wants to live in studio apartments. However, all the small homes on the east side of Sloan's lake got scraped and turned into slot homes, and the same thing is happening now south of Colfax. I like that the plan is talking about preserving character / unique architecture / etc... but like a lot of stuff, it is not saying how it would accomplish this.	Other/General	On-line Survey
What do you like about chapter 3: nothing	Other/General	On-line Survey
What	Other/General	On-line Survey
It is all in theory in the end so many changes will be made and the quality of life will sink	Other/General	On-line Survey
Citizens need more time to understand it and the city needs to do more outreach to explain it. It looks more like a bread basket for consultants than an integrated plan for neighborhoods that considers health and environment. It looks like typical Hancock ...all fluff and no real planning. Goodies for the cronies and donors not much for the neighborhoods.	Other/General	On-line Survey
In general I'm on board with the overall vision for the city but I am generally wary of the overregulation that tends to follow these visions. As they say the road to hell is paved with new zoning codes... or something like that.	Other/General	On-line Survey
it will help big business and developers if you live here for the same price move downtown on the 16th street mall it will not be a place for families	Other/General	On-line Survey
Who are you to decide and impose your view of what a neighborhood is on others? What arrogance!!	Other/General	On-line Survey
Not much	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like nothing about Chapter 2	Other/General	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Imposition of your view on mine.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Regarding the Growth Map	Other/General	On-line Survey
Please see above.	Other/General	On-line Survey
More time for citizen study and input	Other/General	On-line Survey
citizens need more time to study before it goes to city Council	Other/General	On-line Survey
Highlights the thorough community outreach	Other/General	On-line Survey
This a pretty basic and match almost every comp plan you see across the country.	Other/General	On-line Survey
like the idea of small areas plans, IF AND ONLY IF there is outreach beyond established RNO's for input. I live in the bounds of Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods, of which I have been a member for nearly 40 years, and I appreciate what it does with limited resources. But its "empire" is so far-flung, and its active leadership stretched so thin, that it is simply unable to speak with authority to the needs and desires of neighbors in each of its micro-neighborhoods.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Denver talks a lot about community but does a community become something less when people just are out to make a buck off his or her property at the expense of the block and adjacent neighbors?	Other/General	On-line Survey
great to see an update	Other/General	On-line Survey
There a lot of	Other/General	On-line Survey
I love the attention to parks, transit, and equity.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like that it is discussing important issues about balancing growth with avoiding displacement and adhering to existing neighborhood context. I appreciate that it is talking about updates to the zoning code to provide more specific protections for new development not violating exiting neighborhood character.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like that it provides a high level look at the citywide guidance.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I am pleased that careful thought went into developing the plans.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I appreciated the detail of the plan.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like that there is a plan and that it will provide certainty of what the surrounding area will be like over time.	Other/General	On-line Survey
It's a great initiative to (re-)design a beautiful new Denver! Thank you!	Other/General	On-line Survey
- The Option for this kind of participation from home. and after hours. - The work and consideration put in here by many people.	Other/General	On-line Survey
It's important to continue to plan.	Other/General	On-line Survey
The lofty goals of heterogeneous but harmonious neighborhoods which maintain their own identities.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Seems thoroughly researched and effective	Other/General	On-line Survey
That you are looking toward the future and that you are aware of the issues that would be created by building an 8 story building in an area that is zoned for a maximum of 5 stories. More importantly, that you are seeking feedback from residents of the affected neighborhoods.	Other/General	On-line Survey
We appreciate that you are looking into the future and are aware of the problems that can result from overbuilding and rezoning in an area that has a definite neighborhood feel and history. More importantly, we appreciate that you are reaching out to local residents and their feelings about increasing zoning from 5 stories, which is more than almost all the buildings in the neighborhood to an arbitrary number of 8 stories.	Other/General	On-line Survey
very detail	Other/General	On-line Survey
I am supportive of a plan that forward thinking.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Generally thorough thought process; appreciate the focus on more greenery---downtown in particular is one big cement pad needing more plants, trees and flowers. Appreciate concerns about group housing and definitions of households. More bike lanes and walking areas.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Appreciate the inclusion of the people that choose to actually live here. The recognition that quality of life carries value. The blend and diversity of various socio-economic groups builds a stronger civic base. If the City drives out the higher end of that base due to mis-management of density we all lose.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Not much	Other/General	On-line Survey
A very impressive forward looking plan for our city!	Other/General	On-line Survey
The process - the plan is being put out for comment and review.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Thank you for all your hard work.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Thank you for the work put in this.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I am happy to see planning for our future.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Stop wasting time and money. Present code should be retained.	Other/General	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We have the opportunity to participate in long range planning. Denver is grown way past what is was 10,20 years ago. If it had not been for planners and pioneers we would have lost many of the buildings, sites and places of Denver that bring people to this city.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like you are asking for fdbk and creating a comprehensive plan that involves housing and transportation.	Other/General	On-line Survey
It looks like a marketing campaign. Impossible to know exactly what it means for each individual place. VERY SLICK, not very informative.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I wish it were more specific for those neighborhoods that do not have a small area plan to refer to.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Try to limit the permitting on multi family - and try to keep the current demographic of the community- or what's left of it	Other/General	On-line Survey
You go into process and explain how Blueprint Denver connects to the zoning code, which plans don't always do. Also I like the emphasis on recycling construction materials after demolition. I also like the emphasis on design	Other/General	On-line Survey
I wish the city would listen to the words in the plan! The chapter talks about integrating large infill sites to integrate with their surroundings, creating incentives for family-friendly housing, preserving structures that contribute to the established character of an area, including underrepresented community members in the process, mitigating displacement of residents by accommodating them in new major housing projects, etc. These are all being ignored as our community is being radically changed, single family homes with large families are being replaced by micro units or 4-plexes where those families can not live, older structures are all being scraped, etc.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Mostly the implementation to make sure Denver doesn't just 'talk the talk' recommendations needs to be acted on.	Other/General	On-line Survey
RNO's voices need stronger priorities. (Recent issues have resulted in RNO's being given token attention and developers winning almost every time that there has been a dispute.)	Other/General	On-line Survey
Allow re-zoning for all homes. At least consider rezoning	Other/General	On-line Survey
I support Chapter 5's emphasis on pedestrian safety and comfort.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Attention to detail was on point. Neighborhoods aren't just characterized by land use, which I think comprehensive plans often focus on and silo from other issues. I'm glad to see the complete neighborhoods concept tying together land use, mobility (huge right now with the growing pains Denver is experiencing), and access to parks and social spaces.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Again, specific balance within neighborhoods must be achieved with specific proposals.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Recommendation for proximity of food, transit, arts for all neighborhoods. Walking distance is important.	Other/General	On-line Survey
The key to a vibrant, diverse and walkable city is transit networks. I'm a huge proponent of increasing non-car related forms of transportation.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I appreciate that Chapter 5	Other/General	On-line Survey
The general ideas are fine.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I agree with the priorities and strategies outlined in this chapter	Other/General	On-line Survey
Great steps in the right direction.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like The clear breakdown of areas and types	Other/General	On-line Survey
I like the vision for the city.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I agree with the priorities and strategies outlined in this chapter but I don't agree with how they have been executed.	Other/General	On-line Survey
I think Denver does a good job in the zoning code of using neighborhoods as a starting point.	Other/General	On-line Survey
However, you are reinforcing the mono-centric development pattern. You need to look at a finer grain pattern of poly-centric nodes. Yes, this means up-zoning some single family residential areas, which some vocal people might not like but with the right design standards, the right code, the right policies in place you can really achieve something great. The only way you will get complete communities is by changing the communities that aren't complete right now.... They may work for well to do people but they don't work for everyone.	Other/General	On-line Survey
Goals are great, specifics need refining	Other/General	On-line Survey
Would add additional information on the impact growth would have on the surrounding neighborhoods and the home values.	Other/General	On-line Survey
As a resident of the Villa Park neighborhood I was encouraged by the Blueprint vision and goals to: 1. Improve housing diversity IN ALL NEIGHBORHOODS (P.18) 2. Create equitable ACCESS to places, services and amenities (P.20) 3. Make my neighborhood complete, unique, DIVERSE and economically strong (p.22) 4. Make it connected, safe and ACCESSIBLE (p.22) 5. Focus high intensity growth NEAR mixed-use centers and TRANSIT corridors (p.24) 5. Focus on strategic infill locations linked with strong TRANSPORTATION options (p.28) 6. Housing options are met with a WIDE RANGE of options (p.28)	Other/General	On-line Survey
Add a general policy or sidebar about implementation: as we implement the entire plan, we will be focusing on all three equity components. We need something more specific to show how we are addressing equity in implementation, especially displacement. This might help to address people asking what are we really doing to address equity/displacement concerns.	Other/General	Planning Board

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We don't have something like a reinvestment area (which now applies to AOS) to capture the fact that even low residential areas in low growth areas may have a site with significant redevelopment that is appropriate. We have used the reinvestment area on several map amendments where AOS SF is mapped. Do we have the same level of flexibility in the new Blueprint to allow things to evolve over time? How much does this relate to our approach to updating the map every other year?	Other/General	Planning Board
1. The draft plan demonstrates a heightened level of planning by continuing to evolve the 2000 Blueprint Denver An Integrated Land Use and Transportation Plan from a plan to balance and coordinate land uses with transportation, and therefore expect as a corollary the enhancement of quality of life. Albeit the concept of directing growth to Areas of Change and preserving stable neighborhoods in Areas of Stability was an appropriate approach in 2000, the implementation of it became obsolete when applied to rezoning criteria.	Other/General	Planning Board
5. The measures of success (pages 26-27) are welcome. The 2040 target for design-focused standards should be at least 50 percent. There is a missing measure of success: percent affordability.	Other/General	Planning Board
need more about "walk and roll" and capturing those who can't walk. Change verbage to include "roll" whenever there is "walk"	Other/General	Planning Board
The plan should provide a clearer distinction between existing and future state - like for neighborhood context -- are these capturing existing or providing a vision for the future?	Other/General	Task Force
Remove all references to apartment and change to multi-unit	Other/General	Task Force
Climate Goal- there is a 2040 target in the climate action plan that we should be using	Other/General	Task Force
Climate Stuff- there is some tense issues with the climate discussion, "something could happen", no it is happening now. Can the plan have an appendix that highlights the recommendations that contribute to being sustainable in the face of climate change?	Other/General	Task Force
Complete neighborhood metrics- the metric isnt human centered enough....there should be access to healthy foods, parks, schools, other elements in there	Other/General	Task Force
Organizational success for the implementation of the plan- there will need to be both organizational resources and serious \$ to respond to the implementation of the document	Other/General	Task Force
how will other departments buy into the implementation of Blueprint after the plan is adopted? Beyond just the project managment/team strucutre for the creation of the plans, the same needs to be in place for the implementation of the plan	Other/General	Task Force
Can we integrate Historic Preservation better into the NPI process?	Other/General	Task Force
Thinks the word "Vulnerable communiteis" or "Vulnerable populations" is not a good term. Reword more equitably	Other/General	Task Force
Accuracy of maps - how the growth map interacts with other maps and other plans. Test the maps! Also making sure the maps are updated with the "living document" approach. What is the timeline of the maps?	Other/General	Task Force
NPI talks about the initial 10 years of process, but there should be mention of the iterations of NPI once the city is fully covered. Particularly in relation to transportation infrastructure improvements and land use guidance- clarify how updates will relate to that. Will it be NPI plans? Corridor specific plans?	Other/General	Task Force
Where are the data points related to persons with disability? Just saying Mobility is not specific enough. Need to automatically think about adaptability instead of assuming able bodied	Other/General	Task Force
implementation- the plan is very tied to the build out of the transit system, when a development comes in the door that relies on the enhanced transit being there, what happens? The pace of private development outpaces public transit build out	Other/General	Task Force
Maps and granularity is both good and bad for a citywide plan. How do we prevent the "black and white" view of maps like Ares of Stability and Areas of Change	Other/General	Task Force
Is it too ambitious? Seems like a land quality plan instead of a land use plan. Some people MUST use a car to get around. Recognize that mobility is a broad world. Plan should be clear about the benefits of all of this!	Other/General	Task Force
Make sure the plan is readable to someone who doesn't know planning.	Other/General	Task Force
What is the implementation for the plan? Who is the accountable department and how do they know they are?	Other/General	Task Force
Blueprint p 27 shows a target of 80% housing growth and 90% employment growth in areas of growth, but I noticed the legend %s don't add up to this (should be fixed).	Overall Vision	Email
3. Be aware of the impact of focusing on "Centers" and "Corridors" There is a focus on increasing economic development and creating ease of access to transit in "Centers" and "Corridors". Several areas identified as having the least access to opportunity will not be served by this focus.	Overall Vision	Equity training
Address infill and redevelopment on brownfield/greyfield sites in need of repurposing, before more upzoning. Upzoning creates a stress on existing neighborhoods and structures. Focusing on vacant and underutilized sites lessens that stress	Overall Vision	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We believe the draft plan, and these recommendations, would benefit by being more firmly grounded in a discussion of the city’s strengths and context. The draft lacks a narrative introduction that could acknowledge the history and foundational characteristics of Denver from its character as a brick city, its robust park and parkway system, its threads of green space and tree-lined streets, its “big-sky” and strong sun, its diverse network of neighborhoods, its tradition of adaptive reuse, and the value of the historic streetcar districts, as examples. Grounding the plan this way would also demonstrate that we seek not only to create new “complete” places, but to sustain the places that are at the core of what Denverites love about our city.	Overall Vision	Letter
Furthermore, at the first task force meeting we asked for an analysis of existing growth capacity, and continue to believe that the plan would benefit from a more robust analysis of what level of growth (i.e. housing units) the city can foster today. What is the capacity of vacant lots and vacant or underutilized buildings? This would set a clearer baseline for the plan and demonstrate where the greatest opportunities exist.	Overall Vision	Letter
We also believe the descriptions of the vision elements (pages 22-25) should be clearer, especially related to heritage, culture and preservation. For example, the Strong & Authentic Neighborhoods element has subtext that aligns more with the element about Economically Diverse & Vibrant. This vision element should instead emphasize neighborhoods that have strong cultural and social ties, are rooted, enduring and reflective of Denver’s diverse history. Likewise, in the Community Values section most of the values are worded with confident language, but the value related to heritage is vague, written as “Sense of History & Cultural Heritage.” This value should be made as strong as the others. Consider rephrasing to “Rich with History & Culture.”	Overall Vision	Letter
Chapter 1 - Introduction in General. We observed nothing about preservation (historic or otherwise) under the Community Values section of the Blueprint plan, yet our neighbors have voiced repeatedly to us that preservation of character is vital to quality of life in our community. While we like the stated goal of preserving "historic assets and cultural heritage" (Pages 24-25), this is not the same as neighborhood character. We see there is a section on Design Quality that includes traditional preservation techniques, which we applaud. However, we strongly believe including in the Community Values narrative a goal of preserving neighborhood character is important and consistent with the desires we've heard for years not just from residents within the WWPNA boundaries, but also other residents in the south-central part of Denver.	Overall Vision	Letter
The Blueprint plan discusses “Community Values” but fails to add the value of having access to healthy food options. The plan states “Access to Amenities and Service” which is a statement that is too vague for an inclusive city. A bolder statement around food access should be made. (page 14).	Overall Vision	Letter
Blueprint Denver is of critical importance to the success of the City in its quality of life, focus for investment, responsibility for equity, and direction for growth and change. This plan’s focus on aligning the direction of land use with the City’s mobility system provides its greatest value and presents its greatest challenge. MBAC appreciates the goals of developing “high-quality mobility options that prioritize walking, biking and transit and connect people of all ages and abilities to their daily needs” as well as promoting “a healthy community with equitable access to healthy living for all residents”. Largely, MBAC believes that the plan establishes a realistic and focused vision to guide the City and its decision making. Certain elements, however, could use added attention.	Overall Vision	Letter
On behalf of Historic Denver’s Board of Trustees we want to commend you for including a Vision Element that values strong and authentic neighborhoods, with goals that include attention to enhancing character, fostering good urban design, and promoting enduring design while accommodating growth and increasing equity. Specifically, we appreciated the recommendations to: Develop a preservation plan, continue the citywide survey of historic resources (Discover Denver), encourage designation and conservation-district efforts, and incentivize preservation, even of non-designated buildings ☐ Encourage methods to add density without demolition, and revise the residential zoning standards to encourage the retention of smaller, attainable homes and to more closely reflect the context of particular neighborhoods (pg. 70) ☐ Make design-quality tools more accessible to all neighborhoods, regardless of their resources (pg. 68) ☐ Preserve and enhance the City’s historic parkways and boulevards and tree-lined streets (pg. 92)	Overall Vision	Letter
Goals dashboard on page 26 and 27. Suggest adjusting for goals that are in city’s control (no healthy weight and life expectancy goals. Instead, use access to parks/recreation). Also, Goal 2: no guarantee that the jobs or retail I can access are what I need.	Overall Vision	Letter
We strongly agree with the plan’s premise that all of Denver is an area of change and all neighborhoods share responsibility in accommodating and shaping growth. We strongly support moving away from Blueprint’s prior “areas of change or stability” typologies that became a polarizing, unrealistic and inequitable framework and a roadmap that encouraged the gentrification of many neighborhoods.	Overall Vision	Letter
The importance of addressing climate change integrally within all these plans. As Climate Change has been and will be increasingly impacting our lives in all we do, addressing this is a priority first, underlying every aspect of our life as residents of Denver. While climate impact and sustainability is mentioned throughout, it must inform priorities, strategies and initiatives moving forward. With increased population density and construction there will be an increased carbon impact. We hope the city will strengthen its emphasis on the primary need to address Climate Change to help inform each other topic.	Overall Vision	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
To decrease costs and ensure more affordable housing may be built in Denver, HFHMD is very supportive of increasing housing density. While increasing density in certain places, such as allowing duplexes or townhouses on corners in single-family neighborhoods, is a welcome proposal, we have significant concerns that Blueprint does not encourage enough density and would welcome changes to the maps that allow for more density citywide.	Overall Vision	Letter
We are writing today in support of the proposed Blueprint Denver update. The robust community engagement process, the commitment to using equity (specifically access to opportunity, vulnerability to displacement, and housing & job diversity) as an essential measuring tool for the success of its initiatives, and the extensive research that staff undertook are all well evidenced in the text of this document. The targeting of development along high and medium use transit corridors, transit centers, regional centers, and residential centers near downtown is a marked improvement to the previous Blueprint Denver document and its focus on “areas of stability and areas of opportunity”.	Overall Vision	Letter
1. Preliminary Comments. During 2018, WWPNA held two general membership meetings (one in April, the second in mid-October) where the Denveright plan was discussed at length among residents. In particular, the meetings focused on the update to Blueprint Denver and elements of the Denver Moves: Transit and Pedestrian plans, as we understand these are the pivotal land use and transportation plans that will impact our community for the next several decades. At each meeting, residents overwhelming expressed their continued support of our neighborhood plan to preserve the character of our neighborhood and the quality of life they enjoy. At both meetings, residents asked that we communicate comments to you intended to preserve the existing zoning that WWPNA residents worked very hard to achieve through the original Blueprint Denver and the 2010 Denver Zoning Code update. While we understand some communities may not have given significant thought in the current Blueprint Denver plan to accommodating future growth, this was not the case for our community. As it relates to WWPNA, the vision of Blueprint Denver is as relevant today as it was when it was adopted early in the 2pt Century.	Overall Vision	Letter
We also noted in our review of Chapter 1: (a) on Page 29 there is a quote about children as the indicator species, yet there are no measures related to children; (b) there is no statement that proposed rezonings should have quality of life as an important, if not the most important criteria to be considered; and (c) there is no mention of the crucial role of libraries in community building. Studies demonstrate the importance of libraries, but libraries appear to have been omitted from the consideration of "complete neighborhoods" (Page 212).	Overall Vision	Letter
Chapter 2 - Growth Strategy and Map. WWPNA concurs with this map.	Overall Vision	Letter
Focusing development along transit corridors and around centers makes sense. Similarly middle housing and affordable housing near these. The Growth map is very legible and clear.	Overall Vision	Letter
3. Page 121 Land Use and Built Form states that ‘the scale of a place impacts the draw to the area. For example, regional centers will attract people from all over Denver and the greater region, whereas local centers primarily serve residents from the adjacent neighborhood.’ We recommend that the majority of the neighborhood maintain its local character and scale.	Overall Vision	Letter
Our Platform called for review and update of the Comprehensive Plan and Blueprint Denver, which is being done. Though the timing of the Comprehensive Plan, not coming before the development of the other plans. This of course being a diversion from previous planning efforts. After meeting staff regarding the Comprehensive Plan, we were informed as to the reason for this methodology, but we ask will updating smaller plans and adding them to the comp plan become the new norm rather than a more comprehensive process? We believe that the community should be involved in this decision making process.	Overall Vision	Letter
Berkeley Regis United Neighbors (“BRUN”) is a registered neighborhood organization with the city of Denver. The RNO’s boundaries are Federal Blvd to the east, Sheridan Blvd to the west, 38th Ave to the south, and 52nd Ave to the north. Our community in Northwest Denver is experiencing unprecedented growth. While many elements of the Denveright plan are truly laudatory and merit our support, in our neighborhood we have experienced the consequences of a growth that does not conform to the goals of the livable city narrative. While we have devoted many hours of volunteer energy to delve into the thousand-plus pages involved in these documents, we feel that they deserve more of our attention than we have had the capacity for in the time provided. We appreciate the extra 30 days provided to us, but regret that it was not sufficient for us to be as thorough as we would have liked. If there is any opportunity for additional time, we are eager for it. We are already anticipating the energy we will apply to reviewing the next Draft when it is released. Our number one concern after reviewing the Blueprint Denver Draft is that our corner of Denver does not at this time include a Neighborhood Plan and there are no plans by the City of Denver to prepare one. Without a Neighborhood Plan, we know that the guidance created in this project will have a very powerful influence on future development here and we are extremely concerned about the lack of vision continuing to leave our neighborhood vulnerable.	Overall Vision	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The Draft's Places and Growth mapping elements within our boundaries are all based upon the current Denver Zoning Map and its existing conditions. This appears to lack anticipation of the impact on our neighborhood of the Draft's Recommendations for development and transit both within our boundaries and across the City. We are especially concerned about the Draft's impact on our commercial centers and corridors. We question the Draft's directives regarding "bleed" as far as how adjacent blocks can build precedent for unintended growth by using grandfathered nonconforming development to defend new out-of-code development. This is particularly worrisome without a Neighborhood Plan to reign in such use of "precedent". This plans leans too far toward the notion that densification is an end in itself; one that justifies the means, with few guarantees that neighborhood qualities will be preserved. This mindset has proven detrimental to the quality of our neighborhood in the past. An important component of growth is neighborhood input. Neighborhood plans, small area plans, and corridor studies are essential frameworks to guide city growth that will capture opportunities while preserving neighborhood quality. These are tools that can integrate the needs of the future city – tools that integrate growing needs for open space, connected pedestrian and "many modal" environments, neighborhood preservation and enhancement, with opportunities for new development, growth and revitalization. While the City speaks of planning as an essential component of the vision for the city of the future, we do not see evidence or intention to commit the resources necessary to complete the aforementioned local planning studies in a timely manner to address those needs.</p>	Overall Vision	Letter
<p>Celebrating Our Successes: While it is important to recognize where the City can do better, we must also ensure we do not lose sight of Denver's strengths. The City alone cannot provide the housing, commercial and retail space which current and future Denver residents will require. Without balance, we risk discouraging private sector investment which is critical to adequately meet the needs of current and future residents. We appreciate and support the Plan's recognition of the very real challenges facing Denver. However, we are concerned that ignoring the benefits spurred by growth and development will lead to an imbalance in how we confront the issues in the future. There is much we have accomplished by working together. The City is thriving, and we must not downplay or ignore the role growth and private investment have played in Denver's success. Our unemployment rate is below the national and state average and our general fund continues to grow, allowing for additional funds to tackle critical issues such as affordable housing. Page 22 notes that "business-friendly and entrepreneurial" are community values that inform the Plan. While we strongly agree with these values and welcome their inclusion in the Plan, they're not frequently reflected. We would encourage CPD and the consultant team to ensure that these values are reflected throughout the document and in the Neighborhood Planning Initiative process.</p>	Overall Vision	Letter
<p>Congress Park is very supportive of many of the initiatives outlined in Blueprint Denver. The themes such as urban design, climate, and pedestrian focused streets are very exciting to see highlighted and Congress Park hopes to see those themes put into action.</p>	Overall Vision	Letter
<p>3. Pg. 31 Growth Areas – most of Greater Park Hill neighborhood is shown as 'All other areas of the city' with a growth factor of 10% new jobs and 20% new households. What is CPD strategy to increase business and households in our neighborhood? □</p>	Overall Vision	Letter
<p>concerns on water resources as we grow, need to be preparing to be proactive on water to make it through future drought conditions</p>	Overall Vision	Office Hours
<p>supportive of directly growth to key areas of the city, interested in seeing Denver become more prominent internationally</p>	Overall Vision	Office Hours
<p>There needs to be more of a focus on "safety" as a major goal. Safe streets, safe pedestrian walking/biking, safety from crime, etc. I feel like that should be a goal in itself.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>On page 24: goal 3 - no mention of vision zero or safety.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>On page 26. same thing - no metric on street safety/vision zero.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>- On page 25: I think there should be an overarching goal of safety. Specifically street safety and vision zero should be mentioned.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>It is good to have a basic plan for the future and work consistently toward that plan.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>I'm pretty shocked and amazed to see a Climate Action Plan in 2018 that has only one mention of "green building" (which is already a fairly</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>I love the themes of urban design, equity and water and climate. Love to discussion of pedestrian focused streets. Now how do you get public works on board and have them stop planning our city around moving cars?</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>The draft plan that has been developed through countless hours of meetings and consideration of input from the communities involved reflects my goals for the city and its future development. I agree with the larger concepts proposed and support the city in this effort.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>Overall I like our approach and the thought/vision behind it.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>I like the Neighborhood Planning Initiative and the focus on equity, urban design, and climate.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>I agree with most of it.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>I like the concept of complete neighborhoods.</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
<p>Very vague. Other than band-aids there no big changes. Where are we putting these people??</p>	Overall Vision	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
an acknowledgment of continued population growth, loss of affordability, diversity, and opportunity as housing costs go up, and with this the need for increased height and density.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
well thought out	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Seems to build upon the "areas of change" concept. And clearly defines areas in which the City will grow alot vs. a little.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I like the statements about "no one neighborhood should be disproportionately burdened by the region's growth" and respecting neighborhood context.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I like the vision for increasing the convenience of multimodal transportation options in conjunction with intense land use at corridors and centers.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 2? Nothing	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Reduce the rate of growth	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
This gives a clear, visual outline of how Denver envisions change and growth throughout the city in the coming years.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
it will become over crowded and anything put in place to slow that down will be bypassed by someone who can influence some zoning official		
this area will have an average of 2-3 years living here no one will take any pride of ownership and it will look it	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Less involvement, look elsewhere for your growth, expand outward, not upward!!!!	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
A recognition of a need to grow denser, higher with transit, amenities to match.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
In the Introduction, the emphasis in bullet point two which uses the term "common sense approach" relative to growth rather than emphasizing growth at all costs. Also recognition of the need for input from the community and the need to ensure quality of life for residence. In How to Use Blueprint Denver the focus on Developers using the Blueprint to plan their development with quality for residence, not as a planning tool for manipulating the system for their benefit only. The Guide Rezoning and Regulations emphasizes street types when making these decisions. Again, developers should not use this as a baseline guide for how to get around the needs of the community when they plan their developments and try to influence city decision makes to meet their own financial goals. The remainder of the document emphasizes the needs of the community over the financial needs of developers or the financial benefits to the city (in the form of increase tax revenue) at the cost of quality of life for those living in communities that developers feel are targets for increased density.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I like the values.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Directing growth to specific areas that can support growth and will be least impacted by it. The goal of maintaining diversity and the concern for the displacement of residents.		
Protecting the character of established neighborhoods from significant change from new construction.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
The overall plan to grow Denver.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I think existing demographic info should come earlier in the plan (Chapter 1) to set the stage for metrics in Chapter 2. For example it would be interesting to see how many people both live and work in Denver vs. only work in Denver but live elsewhere or live in Denver and work outside the city.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
The narrative in chapter 2 sounds encouraging but it DOES NOT manifest itself on the Growth Strategy map on Page 30.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I would like to see more ambitious goals.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
On page 26 the neighborhood equity index is very confusing. I have read it multiple times and no idea on what it is saying. It is so overly complicated is is almost unusable as a goal. I would Scrap that or put a new more simplified indicator in there.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
It's hard to say; I both equally disagree with the priorities & strategies outlined in this chapter, & how they have been executed (see my specific comments)	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I can't decide if I more disagree with the priorities and strategies or their execution.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Nice goals. Now support them with policy and action.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
I also like increasing density along transit zones.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Good to have aspirations and state them	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Sensitive to the great potential for Denver as a world class city.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Well done giving Attention to the need for increasing density as one gets closer to the city center.		
I own a commercial building on 15th Street, a main arterial, and have been very encouraged by the increasing density, the lifeblood of any great city.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Reduce the vision of growth.	Overall Vision	On-line Survey
Growth strategy map and description: neighborhoods will naturally assume that the 20% of households in all other areas could disproportionately go to them. Can we add something to be clear that the 20% should be spread across the city, and needs to be, and that we don't want certain neighborhoods -- especially vulnerable ones -- taking on too much of a dispoportation share	Overall Vision	Planning Board

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
4. The elements of the vision (pages 22-23) are also clear. The typical elements of a vision for a land use and transportation plan are included, neighborhood character, connectivity, sustainability and economic diversity. We welcome in particular the inclusion or equity and affordability as a vision element. This is a first step to address some of the inequities that are starting to surface because of unprecedented investment and development without much regard for gentrification and homelessness.	Overall Vision	Planning Board
P. 27 - Under "measuring our success" - can we include the Vision Zero metric here (reducing serious injuries and fatalities by 2030)	Overall Vision	Task Force
how will the metrics actually be used in the to guide the investments that need to be made	Overall Vision	Task Force
There should be a metric about affordable housing specifically tracking where govt/city subsidised housing is being built across the city not just housing types either	Overall Vision	Task Force
This plan is coming at a period of high economic growth, a lot of emphasis on the negative aspects of growth. Be more positive about growth! Maybe Guide our future growth, instead of assuming.	Overall Vision	Task Force
Goals and Measuring our Success - Piton(?) Foundation has data about affordable housing for neighborhoods - we need better data to show how we are meeting those goals. Add a measure of deed restricted component?	Overall Vision	Task Force
As I muddle through the 1000+ pages I would like to share an observation. First, this obviously encompasses a huge and impressive effort. That being said, I am surprised that I have found a number of typos, extraneous words, and fragmented sentences. It appears that some sentences have been cut off (maybe didn't fit in a text box as drawn?) Each of these not only causes the reader a visual and mental hiccup, but also makes me wonder what it is that is missing (or is it just a part of something that didn't get fully deleted?) I wish there had been a bit more complete final proofreading, as these things should have been corrected before the draft was issued to the public. I am still working through it all, but also am wondering why in the LOW category of residential land use forms for suburban, urban edge and urban it doesn't say the heights are 1 to 2.5 stories. I think that the current 2 to 2.5 stories isn't accurate to many Denver neighborhoods.	Places Descriptions	Email
HEIGHTS: Revise language in centers/corridors relating to height guidance, ensuring consistency. For example: Text in Urban context should be more general stating up to 5 stories. Consider adding general disclaimer on every page related to heights stating the purpose of heights is to provide a general sense of scale, not meant to set an exact minimum height or maximum. Consider adding the transition language in centers to the corridors as well. Add language on when lower end of the heights range may be appropriate - existing context. Disclaimer language: Sense of scale, varies throughout the city. Not an exact min or max [add to rezoning spread and each context]. Further guidance about adjacencies and context. Where more height is appropriate, but also where less is needed. How can we be more specific about appropriate places for additional density. Is that additional above the specified range or taller than the specified range?	Places Descriptions	Internal
Revise Suburban Res High language to include more mixed use	Places Descriptions	Internal
p 267, QOLI for Heavy Production - We should be prioritizing green infrastructure in these areas due to their proximity to the river and to mitigate pollution generated from industrial activities.	Places Descriptions	Internal
Embedded utility language-Add reference in Complete Neighborhoods	Places Descriptions	Internal
Places map and street type map: add note at bottom of map that says please see the Street Type and Place descriptions in the last chapter to understand the map.	Places Descriptions	Internal
Consider revising organization of Districts "context" (people confused by concept of district)	Places Descriptions	Internal
p192, QOLI for Community Center - This is a bit repetitive throughout document, but that could be ok.	Places Descriptions	Internal
Naming of "residential areas" in downtown and urban center context. Confusion that these areas are actually mixed use. Should we change the name to something like "mixed use residential"?	Places Descriptions	Internal
Corridors (pg. 130) Bicycle connectivity and amenities (such as parking and maintenance) are noticeably absent from this description of a corridor. Consider inclusion	Places Descriptions	Letter
move PHGC from urban edge to district on context map 148-49 and change QofL definition of districts to read "a range of parks and quasi-public and private outdoor spaces with flexible open space and hardscaped plazas. Varies greatly by place and use.	Places Descriptions	Letter
P247 second para – The Downtown context is highly accessible but NOT easily navigated - there are many modal conflicts, lots of one-way streets, grid shifts between Downtown and the rest of the city, and high volumes of traffic on many streets. This discrepancy between accessibility and navigability needs to be mentioned, with the idea that Downtown streets need significant additional study and modifications to safely accommodate all users and provide legibility/ease of navigation for all modes.	Places Descriptions	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
P 249 – Mobility – need to add bike language similar to p 252	Places Descriptions	Letter
P 251 - Larimer Street and 16th Street Mall are not neighborhoods. CPV-Auraria is mixed use like core of Downtown, not residential, and should be classified as Regional.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Future Places Map:Some U-MS-2 districts are mis-characterized as Community Centers or Local Corridors.-Along West 38th Avenue between Federal Boulevard and Alcott Street, areas zoned U-MS-2 are mapped as Community Center (3-5 stories) or Local Corridor (3 stories). This is another location where the commercial uses are at nodes rather than being continuous along a corridor. These designations on the Map and in accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment beyond current zoning regulations, significantly altering the character of those areas of our neighborhood which are particularly sensitive to change because of the adjoining Potter Highlands Landmark District. Heights are currently limited to two stories. Our request is to change the Map from Community Center and Local Corridor to Local Center to better align with the Highland Neighborhood. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Low: “Attached” Worry that residents will get stuck on duplex (and rally against triplex, row homes, which typically provide higher levels of affordability)	Places Descriptions	Letter
More generally, we are concerned that many of the goals and recommendations are broad in nature, and therefore will be hard to measure, or may even generate conflicting guidance. While we understand the desire to move away from defining only “areas of change” and “areas of stability,” abandoning this construct creates a lot of uncertainty about what is being proposed and where. What kind of change is anticipated for each neighborhood or place-type? Which recommendations are priorities in which areas?	Places Descriptions	Letter
Rezoning allowed under the plan lacks definition. Wholesale opportunity for up zoning will create a hodgepodge environment and not a “sense of place.” Zoning sets rules for what is allowed on the property including permitted uses plus the height and form of buildings. Rezoning change the zoning (or zone district) for a property. Maintaining the existing neighborhood context must be considered a high priority. Wholesale opportunity for upzoning is not a means to achieve a better built environment.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Applying residential “low density” guidance to proposed rezonings. Larger single parcels and small lot assemblages qualify for rezoning under this Denverright draft. Previously this was specifically not allowed. Scattered larger structures and density within an area would largely be perceived as “out of place” and therefore inappropriate. The single-family zone district should be allowed to remain a vital and viable housing form in Denver as it has been since the founding of the city.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Rezoning allowed under the plan lacks definition. Zoning sets rules for what is allowed on the property including permitted uses plus the height and form of buildings. Rezoning change the zoning (or zone district) for a property. The UPCC Board wishes to go on record to strongly require that any rezoning requests be thoroughly vetted by city staff and design review for appropriateness. Maintaining the existing neighborhood context must be considered a high priority. Wholesale opportunity for upzoning is not a means to achieve a better built environment.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Applying residential “low density” guidance to proposed rezonings . Larger single parcels and small lot assemblages qualify for rezoning under this Denverright draft. Previously this was specifically not allowed. The UPCC Board is concerned that scattered larger structures and density within an area would largely be perceived as “out of place” and therefore inappropriate. The single-family zone district should be allowed to remain a vital and viable housing form in Denver as it has been since the founding of the city.	Places Descriptions	Letter
We agree with the focus on three recommendations of complete neighborhoods: Land use, Mobility and Quality of Life Infrastructure. These themes also emerged in our community engagement activities and throughout our master planning process.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Foster Graham Milstein & Calisher, LLP (“FGMC”) represents a few property owners in the North Cherry Creek Neighborhood. Accordingly, FGMC has reviewed the updated Blueprint Denver regarding any proposed changes to land use in the North Cherry Creek Neighborhood. The particular area relevant to this letter is real property located north of 3rd avenue, south of 4th avenue, east of Milwaukee street and west of St. Paul street (the “Area”). Blueprint Denver has identified the Area as a Low-Medium Residential Area and a Future General Urban Neighborhood Context. Blueprint Denver defines Low-Medium Residential Areas as “[p]redominantly low-scale multi-unit residential mixed with one- and two-unit residential uses. Some higher-intensity residential uses may be mixed throughout.”Our clients generally support the identification that the Area should remain predominately low-scale multi-unit residential. However, our clients are concerned about the second sentence which states, “[s]ome higher-intensity residential uses may be mixed throughout.” Therefore, this letter is FGMC’s formal request, on behalf of our clients who own property in the Area, that the Area be identified in Blueprint Denver as not	Places Descriptions	Letter
At a glance imagery shows buildings with 18 floors. This doesnt seem to correlate to anything in that section regarding building heights. The tallest in that section is in the High Residential area (up to 20 stories), but the majority of the section verbiage indicates up to 12 stories.	Places Descriptions	Letter
Could be a better way to indicate on the image what type of building might be being shown by the height? Maybe color code the buildings to the various descriptive contexts/areas...?	Places Descriptions	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
This mostly occurs within the General Urban/Urban Center Contexts, for an example General Urban Local Centers could allow up to 8 stories, but mostly 3 to 5. A range of 5 stories is much to large for this context. Similar with General Urban Local Corridors, or Urban Center Community Center (range of 5 to 12)	Places Descriptions	Letter
Our specific comments below comport with the desires expressed to us by WWPNA residents. In particular, we have addressed ,three overarching issues: (1) the Blueprint plan's failure to provide for a designation exclusively for single-family homes;	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>(a) Chapter 6.3 - Urban Context.</p> <p>(l) As we have previously communicated, we are very concerned that there is no designation in the Plan for single-unit home zoning only. Residents within the WWPNA boundaries whose properties are zoned SU in the existing Blueprint Denver plan and the 2010 Denver Zoning Code worked hard to achieve this zoning that matches existing land use patterns. In fact, since the 1970's when new residents moved to WWP and painstakingly restored single family homes here, we've continually fought for this zoning. This is a quality of life issue for the many families who reside here. As you may know, the schools within WWPNA boundaries are full, with waiting lists of children from our neighborhood who walk and bike to them. Overwhelmingly again this year, WWP residents told us they want their properties to continue to be designated as SU only. Thus, we ask that there be created a "Low-SF"/"Low-SU" residential designation that would exclude new two-unit or ADU development, and that this designation be applied to the area within WWP and the Speer part of our neighborhood presently identified in Blueprint Denver as single-unit use.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>(2) We believe the text under "Uses" on Page 213 is ambiguous. That language states that applicant-driven requests proposing rezonings of individual sites or small lot assemblages would generally only be appropriate if there is an "established pattern in the surrounding blocks of two-unit or multi-unit uses." As indicated above, through significant efforts of WWPNA, its residents and CPD, our existing housing stock was inventoried and it was determined that WWP and a great deal of Speer have a predominantly single family home land use pattern. However, given the apparent push for density residents see throughout the City and this Plan, WWPNA residents need assurances that the City would not now construe our existing mix of housing styles or the land-use pattern within WWPNA boundaries to support more two-unit homes or ADUs - exactly the result our residents and members have asked us to avoid! We understand that residents could attempt to fight such rezonings by locating support in various plan documents and by petitioning their neighbors, attending hearings, etc. However, this pits residents against investors and developers. Also, continually having to fight in this manner is time-consuming for RNOs, residents and applicants, and creates significant and undesirable uncertainty for everyone. Residents should be able to have confidence they can rely on the existing zoning without having to constantly look over their shoulders. To avoid this, we ask that the second sentence of the "Uses" text on Page 213 be revised to clarify that an "established pattern" means that 80% of the surrounding properties comprise two-unit or multi-unit uses.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>(3) The general statement in the Land Use and Built Form text that "limited mixed-use" can occur along residential arterial and collector streets is objectionable, as there are a number of such arterials and collectors bordering and running through our neighborhood. For example, this general statement suggests that mixed-use along Logan Street (a residential arterial) as it traverses WWPNA would be appropriate. Should this occur, it would significantly alter the character of our neighborhood's interior and we object to it.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>Suburban zoning definitely needs regulatory help to improve pedestrian street front. Cook Park could greatly benefit from better requirements along our main streets. Specifically our only "local center" at Florida and Holly could be enhanced by more pedestrian-oriented (less auto-oriented strip mall) development. Also along "community corridors" like Evans and Colorado.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>a. Comment on Growth Map – Page 17</p> <p>i. The Growth Map disregards the current and continued potential for higher density TOD along the West Line Corridor. Consistent with station area plans, this corridor should be designated High and Medium-High residential.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Maps are a tool, frequently used by the public and neighborhood groups to determine what is possible in a given area, and even more frequently to argue against zoning changes. If these maps do not reflect the City's intention to add density in these areas, future rezonings will be extremely difficult. Additionally, the Plan broadly touches upon ways to implement missing middle and affordable housing. However, without better reflecting this goal in the Places Map and mapping low-medium housing along corridors, this goal will be underutilized or worse, overlooked. With regards to places designated for high growth such as regional centers, community centers, corridors and high and medium-high intensity residential areas, there should be clarification on allowable heights. In the descriptions of high growth type places, many heights are designated as fairly low-scale, 5-8 story buildings. On page 16 of the Plan, it states "Although the descriptions include height guidance they are general ranges and appropriate maximum building heights can vary." However, within each context chapter this language is not repeated. We would strongly recommend the City consider clarifying appropriate heights in each context and place. For example, we suggest language such as "5-20 story buildings will be accommodated" instead of relying on ranges that can be misinterpreted later. Vague language can create significant confusion for neighbors, property owners and the City.</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>1. Pg. 16 - "...neighborhood context should be consistent across an area and should generally not vary at the parcel level." We agree, as we have been told before by CPD that the City is not a proponent of 'spot zoning' one parcel to be a different zone district than the other surrounding parcels on the block, i.e. rezoning request at 3562 Ivy St: 2018I-00050 □</p>	Places Descriptions	Letter
<p>It seems like this plan is opening the door for upzonings to be easier, especially since we no longer have areas of stability. I like all of the recommendations about updating the zoning code to help with neighborhood character, but what happens with rezonings in the meantime? Also, the current Blueprint Denver has good language about how redevelopment in areas of stability should respect the character of the existing neighborhood. Can we add something similar to this Blueprint about lower growth/low residential areas</p>	Places Descriptions	Office Hours
<p>(street) access to community centers can be impactful to residential areas. Example: access to Lowry Town Center on 6th leads to people cutting through the neighborhood</p>	Places Descriptions	Office Hours
<p>More specifics related the Campus Districts as they have been a large part of development in Denver in the last 25 years and will continue to the impact many aspects of the city.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>District names are confusing. Come up with more distinct names, even if the names are longer.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>What do you like about Chapter 6? It helped in understanding how the city distinguishes the current use of various neighborhoods, and how they plan to evolve.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>What do you like about Chapter 6? I like the individual neighborhood context definitions. Overall, this plan (not just this chapter) is well done.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>The elements of a complete neighborhood as outlined in Blueprint and stated in the implementation section are the right areas to focus on to make sure the city develops appropriately.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>This is very specific, but I think that emphasizing community gardens/ community organization could be an important feature of improving neighborhoods.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>I would include language that encourages the development of more local centers/corridors to ensure that all Denver residents, especially in Urban Edge, Urban, and General Urban neighborhoods, are within a 1/4 mile walk of shopping opportunities. Large residential only areas, no matter how good the sidewalks and street design, are not walkable if there is nothing in walking distance. There should be stronger language supporting duplexes in Low Residential Areas, especially those which have historically allowed them. For example, Alamo Placita and Washington Park West have many duplexes, but building new ones are forbidden under current zoning. I would categorize all transit investment corridors as at least Low-Medium residential. Examples include Lincoln and University Boulevard.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>What do you like about Chapter 6? discussions and splits on the types of housing splits of low, medium, high.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>It sounds like areas which have been single-home areas for decades will now be allowed to become duplexes. What has happened in Cherry Creek has destroyed the community and neighborhood feel with the continued destruction of single family homes to duplexes. Same was happening around Highlands and Sloans Lake and it was stopped (YEAH)! Now it seems like all of Park Hill could be rezoned to allow a second dwelling or duplex.</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>neighborhood context categories are confusing. Urban, General Urban and Urban Center all sound the same</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>Photos in Urban, General Urban and Urban Center look like the same types of areas. Still confused on the differences between these districts</p>	Places Descriptions	On-line Survey
<p>in the description of residential low, add that small-scale neighborhood serving uses should be allowed where already existing (in addition to what is there now about on arterials, collectors and certain intersections). We also need to make it clear that it isn't just mixed use allowed interspersed in these areas, but also smaller-scale multi-unit/higher intensity residential (think S. Holly case)</p>	Places Descriptions	Planning Board
<p>Neighborhood contexts -- several call for "little reliance on cars." Does this mean a reduction of reliance on SOVs? Or on cars most generally? Please clarify.</p>	Places Descriptions	Task Force
<p>Terminology of differences between corridors and places is confusing. Would a table work better?</p>	Places Descriptions	Task Force
<p>Make sure we are coordinated with DHA plan for redeveloping their Sunnyside property</p>	Places Mapping	City Council

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Bellview Station - Change context Urban Center	Places Mapping	City Council
Concerned with 10th Ave and W line is not popping on the Growth Areas Map. E-TU in gulch area?	Places Mapping	City Council
W. Alameda and Federal should be included on growth areas map. Please confirm	Places Mapping	City Council
Confirm community corridor boundaries on Morrison Rd. aligns with area of influence in Westwood Neighborhood Plan	Places Mapping	City Council
<p>Thanks for getting back to us. My husband Tamir and I own a three-unit rental property at 4525 E. 16th Ave (16th and Clermont St.) and we're interested in adding another three units onto the property. We live a couple blocks away, at 1569 Eudora, and manage the rental property ourselves. Tamir and our architect met recently with Edson Ibanez about our pre-application request and Edson recommended that we contact you to provide input on the Blueprint draft and the East Area Plan. My understanding is that our rezoning request will be extremely difficult due to the way the neighborhood is currently characterized and that the maps being used in the East Area Plan do not accurately reflect the number of multi-family residences that currently exist in our area of the neighborhood. According to the maps, our part of South Park Hill near Colfax, is single-family, however, there are actually many multi-family residences between Colfax and 16th Ave, Colfax and Batavia, Colfax and 14th/13th Ave. Our own home is across the street from a recently remodeled historic 12-unit apartment complex and 2 duplexes. We enjoy living in our 1914 bungalow on a vibrant and diverse block with many people, and our wish is to provide three more housing units at 4525 E. 16th for the missing middle area of the rental market.</p> <p>We understand that this may be a particularly busy time of year for the City Planners, but we were hoping to speak with you about updating the map for our East Area to reflect the many historic multi-family residences that exist. If it would be helpful, I would be happy to lead a quick neighborhood walk highlighting some of these multi-family residences, or I could provide a list of addresses and photographs. We know you and your colleagues are hard at work on Blueprint Denver and all the growth happening, and we appreciate your time. ☺</p>	Places Mapping	Email
<p>Please accept my wholehearted endorsement of the Community Corridor designation, and a request to maintain it within the adoption of the Blueprint Denver Update, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Monaco Parkway is an arterial street and will be designated as Enhanced Transit Corridor. 2. Commercial property surrounds this property on three sides, as described above. 3. Denver's significant growth needs land with distinctly linear orientations along its major arterials to accommodate a balance of either high density housing or dining/ shopping uses. 4. The past 15 years has shown that the 2002 Blueprint plan is in dire need of updating. 5. Any development on the site will have immediate access to employment, dining, and shopping, and will be entirely consistent with the anticipated 	Places Mapping	Email
Request to keep BP mapping as-is in the draft (local center) for 111 S. Madison (corner of Bayaud and Madison) rather than change to community center	Places Mapping	Email
Mapping of CPV-Auraria -- should this be downtown core? Doesn't have the same attributes as Golden Triangle and Arapahoe Square. For example, unlimited height. Or, do we need to change the description of res high downtown?	Places Mapping	Internal
Parks/open space mapping: keep regional parks as a place type under the district context (and show on places map in dark green as a future place on the legend). Add smaller public parks under "other" to the legend (so clear it is not a place -- just like water bodies), medium green so they are not as dark as the regional parks. Add all private/other open spaces under "other" to the legend and map in lightest green. On the places map on p. 127 and the places maps in each context, add a note that describes what the two categories of open space -- small public parks and private open space -- mean. For small public parks, they are not really a place -- they are part of place, but still important to show separately on the map	Places Mapping	Internal
Places map: make the order of intensity from high to low colors consistent between corridors/centers and res areas (right now res areas start with highest place but centers/corridors start with lowest)	Places Mapping	Internal
Change mapping south of Lakewood Gulch to match West Colfax Urban Neighborhood Station mapping	Places Mapping	Internal
Fix mask on mapping of Glendale that is affecting Places map color appearance	Places Mapping	Internal
Review value manufacturing and heavy manufacturing areas to see if there is additional areas that need discussion for including innovation/flex transition.	Places Mapping	Internal

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>The property owners of the four corners of this intersection are concerned that the current zoning/plan guidance (which is generally 3 stories, with the NW corner at 5 stories) isn't enough to enable new developed that is mixed-use and supportive of the town center vision. The CC Area Plan calls for 3 stories for most of the corner, with 5 stories on the same parcel at the NW corner that is already zoned C-MX-5. In draft Blueprint places map, we show the corner as a local center. This makes sense given the plan and current zoning, but since there may be some community appetite for taller heights if it supports a better town center, community center could be a possibility. It is currently an area of change in Blueprint.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>For these reasons ISELO specifically requests that the Blueprint draft Places Map be revised to designate 2535 E. 40th Ave. as Innovation / Flex. Neighboring properties to the north and west have this Innovation / Flex designation. Innovation Flex better accommodates residential and vibrant mixed use Districts. (see letter for further details as needed).</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>I am the owner of 1680 N. Sheridan Blvd., at the corner of W. 17th Ave. and Sheridan Blvd. In thinking about the future of our growing city, the West Colfax neighborhood and our property in particular I have reviewed the draft of Blueprint Denver.</p> <p>I embrace Blueprint as it applies to the 1600 block of Sheridan. I am supportive of the General Urban classification. In particular, I am pleased with and very supportive of this block being designated as a Community Corridor Area on the Blueprint Places Map as we believe this designation has the potential to contribute to and shape the future sustainability vitality and livability of the neighborhood as Denver inevitably grows. This designation is also consistent with, supports and reinforces the West Colfax Plan which was adopted with much community input.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Rocky Mountain Communities is the owner of the 122 dwelling unit 5-acre Townview Affordable Housing community located at W. 17th Avenue and Grove / Hooker Streets in the West Colfax Neighborhood. Townview was built in the early 1960's and is approaching the end of its useful life. RMC desires to redevelop Townview to provide more affordable units for families, as well as needed social services. With affordable housing redevelopment in mind, in 2018 we successfully rezoned the easternmost portion of Townview to C-MX-5. The majority of the Townview property remains zoned R-2 from Chapter 59 – very low density. The remaining R-2 portion of Townview has not had adopted Plan support to inform a rezoning that would allow sufficient density to implement RMC's affordable housing and social services goals. We are underway working cooperatively with RNOs, neighbors, CPD and Council District 3 to prepare a Mini Plan that we hope will identify support for increased density at Townview, to include Plan support for buildings up to 5 stories in height on the full city block bounded by W. 16th Ave., Grove St., Hooker St. and W 17th Ave. In addition to the ongoing Mini Plan, we have had significant public outreach and community engagement on this, with no identified opposition. We have reviewed the Blueprint Denver Draft and are also aware of Denver's focus on addressing affordable housing needs. The redevelopment of Townview presents an excellent opportunity for Denver to add significant new and modern affordable housing units without exasperating displacement and gentrification. As such, we are requesting that Denver recognize the unique opportunity Townview brings to use best practices to bring more affordable units to an area of Denver most in need of providing increased affordable, attainable and mixed income housing.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Letter above continued: To do so will require visionary City policies and Plans that can provide support for land use decisions and development that don't exist for Townview today. With these community needs and goals in mind we are requesting that the draft Blueprint update be amended prior to presentation to and adoption by Denver City Council as follows: The current Blueprint draft Future Places Map designates the Townview property as Low – Medium. This site is easily capable of providing more affordable units, open space and community services in a neighborhood that has already densified. We therefore request that the Future Places Map be revised to designate Townview as High-Medium. This designation will be consistent with and supportive of the goals of the Townview Mini Plan and makes sense given the surrounding context given the Broncos plans, surrounding zoning immediately south of the Townview site and that 17th Ave is a Residential Collector and that Federal is a Mixed-Use Arterial. Multi-modal transit options are also proximate to Townview, which is close to downtown, Denver's largest employment Center. Townview is in a General Urban classification. The General Urban description of High-Medium on page 228 of the Blueprint draft exactly meets the Land Use/ Built Form, Mobility and Quality of Life aspirations of Townview, which are not achievable under the Low-Medium designation. Thank you for CPD's thoughtful consideration of this request. I and the Townview Mini Plan Team are available at your convenience should you have questions or require additional information. Also, Theresa Lucero and Scott Robinson in CPD, along with Adriana Lara in the Council District 3 Office have significant institutional history with Townview's entitlement efforts and history and could be helpful in vetting this request.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>With respect to the Places map generally and the Urban Center Places map specifically, the designated places do not reflect recently enacted rezoning and do not fit with infrastructure plans adopted by the City in this area. Focusing more specifically on our property, the map and designation of the area containing the majority of our property is Urban Center (Community) and Residential (High-Medium) for major portions of our property. These Blueprint designations call for building heights typically no more than 8 stories. Although we are aware that Blueprint does not change our zoning, the Station Area Plan and our recent rezoning of this portion of our property was almost entirely for 12 stories. We do not think it prudent to have City-adopted plans that do not conform at least with the height recommendations in previous plans because the new Blueprint would be a plan that the City would have to consider if we ever needed even a slight modification of the zoning on our site. Finally, it is not exactly clear where the Residential (High-Medium) and Residential (High) are differentiated on our site. This only adds to the concern over the 8-story maximum on the map because most of those portions of our property are zoned for 12 stories.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
West Colfax- W. 17th/ 16th/ Hooker/Grove should be a High- Medium residential mixed use	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- On 10th Ave. should be High- Medium residential with Urban Context to extending to Federal Blvd.	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- On 9th Ave. should be Low-Medium residential with Urban or Urban Edge	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- From the alley on Knox east towards Federal Blvd. and down to 6th Ave. should be Low-Medium residential with Urban or Urban Edge	Places Mapping	Letter
Barnum- From the alley on Knox east towards Federal Blvd. down to 1st Ave. should be Low-Medium with Urban Edge context	Places Mapping	Letter
Westwood- entire neighborhood should be Urban Edge context	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- From 6th and Knox on both sides down to 7th should be a Local Corridor Pg. 190	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- 10th /Knox/Julian/King should be a Local Corridor pg 190	Places Mapping	Letter
Villa Park- From 6th Ave. and Perry to mid-block on each side should be a Local Corridor	Places Mapping	Letter
Barnum- Make Sheridan Community Corridor from 6th Ave. to Alameda	Places Mapping	Letter
Change much of the General Urban and Urban Center context mapped to Urban (see marked map)	Places Mapping	Letter
Change area north of Stadium to Urban (from Urban Center) Local Center (from Community Center) (see marked map)	Places Mapping	Letter
Community Center at northeast area, change to Urban if no porosity requirement and limit northwest block of center to 5 stories (see marked map)	Places Mapping	Letter
Change along Federal to Local Corridor and Community Center (See marked maps)	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>(2) Broadway depicted as a community corridor is accurate as is the small portion indicated along Speer Blvd. at Logan. The "High" residential color designation of the area along Downing and north of Bayaud is also accurate; however, the "medium-high" (density/height) residential color depicted for the blocks west of Corona and north of Alameda would alter the existing character of single-unit form dwellings and the two-three story multi-unit buildings. Instead, this area should be depicted by the "Low" residential color (see Page 134) that is not offered as an option in General Urban. Currently there are only three high-rises along 1st A venue between Broadway and Downing. The two- and three-story late-20th Century apartments that sprinkle some blocks and predominate on very few blocks in the northern portion of this area should not suggest or force a change in neighborhood character to match them or to allow medium to high density or height. Even the designation as "low-medium" (Page 134) would significantly alter the neighborhood character that would make this neighborhood unrecognizable in 20 years. We ask that a "Low" residential category be added to the General Urban Context and that the Speer areas identified in this paragraph be mapped as "Low" residential.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>(3) The local corridor designation for the area at S. Logan and E. Bayaud rather than a residential designation is also of concern. The newest buildings at this intersection are out-of-character with their surroundings, especially as it relates to setbacks. Our Association members have learned through years of experience that zoning changes that increase density or height are much more easily achieved than any down-zoning. We object to the City's effort to violate our neighborhood plan with this vision to bring significant density or height changes as well as use changes to the interior of the greater WWPNA neighborhood. The changes suggested for the Speer portion would denigrate the best aspects of this part of our community.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXTS MAP:The implications of each context were unclear until we reviewed the Future Places Map-Because the descriptions of each Future Place do not coordinate with current zoning descriptions in each context, we recommend changing all Blueprint contexts in the Highland Neighborhood to URBAN. This allows the Future Places to maintain current zoning development densities and heights in most areas of our neighborhood. Without this change, increases in height and density would overlay areas of the neighborhood that have already seen full redevelopment since the New Zoning Code was adopted in 2010. SEE HUNI FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD MAP. IT IS CRUCIAL THAT THIS CHANGE BE MADE, OR OUR COMMENTS ON THE FUTURE PLACES MAP THAT FOLLOW WILL NEED TO BE SIGNIFICANTLY MODIFIED.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>FUTURE PLACES MAP:This map mis-characterizes significant portions of the Highland Neighborhood-We request that this map be updated per our version of the map. We have superimposed existing zoning districts to help clarify where the currently proposed map does not correspond to currently allowed zoning, densities, height, and locations of Centers and Corridors. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP and specific descriptions of areas requiring modifications that follow:</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Future Places Map:Some Low Residential areas are noted as Local Corridors-Where Low Residential areas are shown as Local Corridors, the Map and accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment, destroying the character of those areas of our neighborhood. Our specific request is to change the map where U-TU-B districts along West 32nd Avenue and along Tejon Street are shown as Local Corridors to Low Residential Areas. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:Some C-MX-3, U-MS-3, U-MX-3, B-4, and G-MU-3 districts are mis-characterized as High-Medium Residential Areas-Where C-MX-3, U-MS-3, U-MX-3, B-4, and G-MU-3 districts are shown as High-Medium Residential Areas, the Map and accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment beyond current zoning regulations, destroying the character of those areas of our neighborhood. These 3-story districts should be shown as Low-Medium Residential Areas. Our specific requests include changing the map where C-MX-3 and U-MS-3 districts south of West 32nd Avenue and east of Zuni Street are shown as High-Medium Residential to Low-Medium Residential Areas, where U-MX-3, G-MU-3, and B-4 districts along West 32nd Avenue, West 33rd Avenue (East of Shoshone) and Pecos Street are shown as High-Medium Residential to Low-Medium Residential Areas, and where a G-MU-3 district at West Caithness Place and Fife Court is shown as High-Medium Residential to a Low-Medium Residential Area. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:Some U-MX-3 and G-MU-3 districts are mis-characterized as Community Corridors-Where U-MX-3 and G-MU-3 districts are shown as a Community Corridor, the Map and accompanying descriptions of land uses, density, and height would incentivize redevelopment beyond current zoning regulations, significantly altering the character of those areas of our neighborhood. These 3-story districts should be shown as Low-Medium Residential Areas. Our specific request it to change the map where U-MX-3 and G-MU-3 districts at West 32nd Avenue and Federal Boulevard are shown as a Community Corridor to Low-Medium Residential Areas. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:The U-MS-3 parcel at the NE corner of West 32nd Avenue and Zuni Street is mis-characterized as a Local Center.-The U-MS-3 parcel at the NE corner of West 32nd Avenue and Zuni Street is mis-characterized as a Local Center. This is a residential structure developed by a neighborhood organization. Our request is to change the mapping from Local Center to Low-Medium Residential Area. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:The B-4 parcel at the NE corner of Speer and Federal is mis-characterized as a Community Corridor.-The B-4 parcel at the NE corner of Speer Boulevard and Federal Boulevard is mis-characterized as a Community Corridor. Because commercial uses along both Boulevards in Highland tend to be nodal rather linear, we request that this parcel be changed from Community Corridor to Community Center. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:The C-MX-5 triangle bounded by West 29th Avenue, North Speer Boulevard, and Zuni Street does not fit within the descriptions allowed in a Community Corridor in the Urban Context.-The C-MX-5 triangle bounded by West 29th Avenue, North Speer Boulevard, and Zuni Street should allow 5-story redevelopment (currently allowed for this zoning). Local Corridor designation recommends development up to 3 stories. Community Corridor designation recommends development between 5 and 12 stories in the Urban Context. There is a missing option for areas where 3 to 5 stories is appropriate. Our request is to develop middle option for Corridors where 3-5 stories are recommended. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:Some U-MX-3 and U-MS-2 areas are mis-characterized as Local Corridors, Community Corridors, and Low Residential Areas.-U-MX-3 and U-MS-2 districts along Tejon Street, Osage Street, Pecos Street, and West 38th Avenue are mapped primarily as Local and Community Corridors (5-8 stories). For accuracy, we believe that several changes are needed to more accurately represent the type of development that should occur along these streets: Along Tejon, areas that are primarily residential should be mapped as Low-Medium Residential Areas, and areas that are mixed-use or commercial should be mapped as Local Centers. Along West 38th Avenue, the areas mapped as Community Corridors should be changed to Local Corridors to align with heights that are allowed by current zoning. The same changes should be made to mixed-use and commercial areas along Osage and Pecos Streets. Where U-MX-3 zoned areas have residential structures, the Future Places Map should be changed to show Low-Medium Residential Areas. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:The C-MX-5 district on the north side of the intersection of West 32nd Avenue and Tejon Street is characterized as a combination of Local Corridor and Medium-High Residential while being primarily Medium-High Residential.-The C-MX-5 district on the north side of the intersection of West 32nd Avenue and Tejon Street is characterized as a combination of Local Corridor and Medium-High Residential while being primarily Medium-High Residential. We request that the entire C-MX-5 zone district at this location be shown as a Medium-High Residential Area to conform to actual and proposed development. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>To return the subject of housing - as indicated earlier, the allowance to developers to scrap single family homes and build small multifamily units on a single lot, is significantly threatening the viability of our longstanding West Colfax community. Putting unaffordable pricing aside, we simply cannot envision how we can encourage families to remain in our community when suitable housing for their family size is disappearing from our area at a rapid pace, and the new small units only encourage a more transient population. For the sake of our community's continuance, stability and ability to thrive, we ask as a priority for the close examination of the prospect of expanding within our neighborhood the current zoning area for singular family housing only.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
1. The Growth Map page 31 shows community center and corridor within the Eruv boundary. A local corridor designation is requested from Stuart St. to Zenobia St. It is requested that Sheridan between 17th Ave and Dry Gulch not be designated as a community center or corridor - except adjacent to West Colfax (14th Ave to 16th Ave). It is also requested that Saint Anthony redevelopment not be designated as a community center but remain a primarily residential area where not adjacent to the corridor.	Places Mapping	Letter
4. On Page 125 Centers are described as places to ‘engage in social activities and entertainment, such as shopping, dining and cultural events.’ It describes larger centers as ‘attracting people from a wide geographic area.’ Residential areas are described as containing ‘embedded uses needed for a complete neighborhood including schools, recreation and nodes of commercial/retail uses.’ The same page also shows that Urban Zoning context supports residential areas that are low, low-medium or high-medium in density. The Urban context correctly describes the neighborhood - including the Saint Anthony redevelopment. And, except for lots fronting Colfax, the neighborhood is nearly entirely residential (even where C Zoning was used for flexibility). We recommend that the neighborhood be Urban context and remain residential with the exception of lots fronting West Colfax.	Places Mapping	Letter
6. On Page 149 Neighborhood Context map we’re requesting that the area within the Eruv boundary be designated as Urban context with the following exceptions: C contexts at Saint Anthony redevelopment east of Stuart. G Context south of 12th Ave and between Zenobia St and Sheridan Blvd south of 16th Avenue only.	Places Mapping	Letter
Corridor Designation - On the Places Map we’re requesting that the Corridor designation be limited to zone lots fronting Colfax Avenue – as is the case along East Colfax Ave. Some rezoning has occurred to allow apartment buildings on lots near, but not fronting, West Colfax. However, apartment buildings constitute Low-Medium Residential – and do not indicate an extension of the corridor. We’re requesting that the Corridor designation be removed from Sheridan Blvd except at the NE corner of Sheridan and Colfax. A ‘draw’ along Sheridan is not supported by the steep grades, current traffic congestion and difficulty accessing properties from Sheridan. A Sheridan corridor in this area would bring traffic into the low-density neighborhood and disrupt traffic-flow from the neighborhood to its retail center on the NW corner of 17th and Sheridan. Lastly, Corridor designations within the Eruv boundary should be Local Corridors so as not to open the insular community to regional uses and entertainment. Limited Community Corridor designation at Saint Anthony redevelopment and at the NE corner of Colfax and Sheridan would be acceptable.	Places Mapping	Letter
The Community Center designation of the Saint Anthony redevelopment should be changed to areas of Low-Medium and High-Medium Residential (where currently zoned MX-8 or higher). Saint Anthony redevelopment is planned to be a primarily residential development of mostly low-medium density. Limited retail in residential buildings and the remodel of the very compact 5-Story Raleigh office building are not indications of a Community Center. If kept, the Community Center designation should not continue west of Stuart St. The local schools easily fit the residential area description on page 124. This property was rezoned for the ease of the remodel - not to extend the growth area.	Places Mapping	Letter
A significant portion of the area within the West Side Jewish Community’s Eruv – from 17th Ave to the Dry Gulch and from Perry St to Sheridan Blvd – is shown on the Places map as low-medium and high-medium residential. With the exception of Saint Anthony redevelopment (east of Stuart Street), and a pocket of General Urban near the Sheridan light-rail Station, the current Zoning Context is Urban with the majority zoned U-SU and portions zoned U-RH-2.5 and U-RH-3A. The row house district was intended by Denver to provide units similar-in-character to existing single-family homes that are no taller than 2.5 stories in height, are street-facing, are set back from the street and have rear yards – just different in that they would be attached to each other. Developers were able to subvert the Zoning Code and double the unit density from what was intended. We’re requesting that the Urban context be maintained and that U context zones be shown as low-medium residential on the Places Map - similar to the neighborhoods to the north.	Places Mapping	Letter
Also, CPD needs to better explain its maps. There are many errors. Specifically, they call out the Park Hill Golf Course as mixed-use development. The citizens of Denver have a 99-year conservation easement on the PHGC that should not just be torn up for development without a true transparent public discussion. This needs to be corrected. We request that the City staff explain better their maps as shown in Denveright.	Places Mapping	Letter
PLACES MAP: For some reason, the area owned by Colorado Golf – the wetlands behind Westerly Creek Dam and the Common Grounds Golf Course -- is depicted in yellow and carries the designation Residential Areas – Low. Although privately owned, LUN formally requested that it so be given a OS-C designation when the new Code was being developed, and it will need to remain open space because it is in the floodplain. We understand it is not designated parkland, but the private Denver Country Club is depicted as light green and we think it more appropriate than a residential designation.	Places Mapping	Letter
1. Low density, residential neighborhood south of Colfax: The highlighted area south of Colfax is currently zoned SU. The existing residents of this neighborhood appreciate the existing, low density, single unit zoning, and do not wish to see it changed. The land use maps in the draft plans do not differentiate this area from the surrounding streets that were up-zoned as part of the 2010 zoning changes. Residents feel that these maps encourage further multi-unit development and depletion of the already limited stock of single family homes in the area.	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>2. Low density, residential neighborhood between 16th and 17th along Sheridan: This highlighted block along Sheridan is currently zoned for single unit homes, and is specified as a 'Community Corridor' with 'General Urban' context. The property owners of the adjacent blocks object to this classification, and believe it is ignoring important aspects of neighborhood context and street topology. They would like to see the maps changed to reflect the current zoning which keeps density closer to Colfax, while respecting the existing low density residential neighborhood at 17th. a. The 2006 West Colfax plan grouped these properties into the "Pig and Whistle" district and noted 'proximity to high density residential', and 'deeper than normal' zone lots as justification for MS-2 rezoning. These particular properties have shallower zone lots and are only proximate to single family, single story homes. b. The 2010 legislative rezoning left these properties zoned for single unit residential. c. While these properties do border a designated community corridor (CO-95/Sheridan), they cannot directly access it, nor would CDOT allow additional access to be added, and the burden of density would unfairly fall to the adjacent low-density neighborhood streets. d. The stretch of Sheridan between 17th and Annie Place undergoes a ~25ft rise in elevation. The "Main Street" vision of the West Colfax Plan could not be realized here because of the topology. The base plane would be > 12 ft above ground level at 17th, and 12 ft below at Annie Pl.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Mar Lee- W. Florida from Sheridan to Federal Blvd. should be a Pedestrian Enhanced Area (day care, multiple apartments, Walgreens and 7-Eleven, bike lane, a lot of pedestrian crossing at Federal and W. Florida) Pg. 154</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>On the map "Vulnerability to Displacement" (Page 108), it seems ironic that the northeast portion of the Speer area is depicted as leaning toward "least vulnerable" to displacement when the remaining, scattered SU homes still in use are at the greatest risk for demolition given the proposed Plan's vision for potential rezonings beyond the current G-MU-5+ zoning to a "Medium-High (8 stories) setting in this General Urban zone. Where there are structures other than a single-family form, the predominant height is 3 stories or lower. The greater portion of the Speer area is depicted as leaning toward the "most vulnerable". Other maps in the Plan suggest greater density for this area than is either currently allowed or in existence, which seems destined to create vulnerability toward displacement in the Speer area. In summary, the existing depictions on this map's spectrum for the Speer area seem at best incorrect, creating tremendous unpredictability for residents as to how the community will look in 20 years when what is desired is preserving the existing character.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Blueprint Denver should expand the Community Corridor designation of Santa Fe farther south than 3rd Ave and include Kalamath as well (see maps, Blueprint Denver pp. 31, 126). This designation could extend to Alameda, though the eventual grade separation of the rail crossing at Santa Fe/Kalamath (Phase 4 of the Valley Highway Plan) will redefine much of the area south of Ellsworth. The street type should be Commercial Arterial where it is now marked Industrial Arterial (see map p. 139). The existing situation is not "characterized by manufacturing", and the trend is for more retail and commercial development.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Growth Strategy (Page 38) To fulfill the vision of many of us subscribed to, we believe that more of the area should be designated as regional centers to help achieve the full potential of the airport investment. To be consistent with the prior plan and vision, more land on the Pena Boulevard Corridor and north of 56th Avenue should be designated as Regional Centers similar to the vision expressed by the regional center designation at Stapleton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change designation of key interchanges including 48th and Pena, 56th and Pena, 56th and Tower, 64th and Tower to Regional Center • Change designation of land along Pena Boulevard particularly to the south to Regional Center to capitalize on the transit station in Gateway Park. • Increase the regional center shown at Pena Next 	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Places (Page 126) The areas along Pena Boulevard between 56th and the Aurora boundary should be designated as regional centers rather than community centers recognizing the goals of the original Gateway plan and invest in economic development for the region. It would also be more consistent with some of the PUD's in the area The intersection of 64th Avenue and Tower will increase in prominence as the Gateway to the Gaylord Hotel. This area should also be designated a regional center..</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Much like the areas reflected in Stapleton, the land on both sides of Pena Boulevard should be reflected as Urban Centers recognizing their importance for economic development.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Urban Center Places (Page 236) The areas referenced earlier as regional centers should also be considered for urban center places. The Pena corridor as well as land around the transit stations should be included in the analysis.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Districts (Page 265) The open space area north of 56th and west of Pena should be reflected on the map as an important regional amenity.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Future Places Map:Some Low Residential areas are noted as Low-Medium and High-Medium Residential Areas-Where Low Residential areas are shown as Low-Medium and Medium-High Residential Areas, the Map and accompanying descriptions of density and height would incentivize redevelopment, destroying the character of those areas of our neighborhood. Specific requests include changing the map where U-TU-B and U-TU-B2 districts along Federal Boulevard (in the Potter Highlands Landmark District) are shown as Low-Medium to Low Residential Areas, changing ALL U-RH-2.5 districts from High-Medium and Low-Medium to Low Residential Areas, and changing other U-TU-B, U-TU-B2 and U-RH-2.5 districts along West 32nd Avenue and in Northeast Highland from High-Medium to Low Residential Areas. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Future Places Map:Some I-MX-3 and I-A areas are mis-characterized as Low-Medium and High-Medium Residential Areas.-Along West 38th Avenue, east of Kalamath, the I-MX-3 and I-A areas are mis-characterized as Low-Medium and High-Medium Residential Areas. We request that these areas be changed to Local Corridor for consistency with the rest of the 38th Avenue corridor east of Tejon. SEE HUNI FUTURE PLACES MAP.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Make Lipan a local corridor (see comment above about support small business on Lipan).</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>3. "Urban Edge" Neighborhood along the Gulch: Residents of this neighborhood expressed concern that the traditionally residential neighborhood is taking on attributes of an urban neighborhood without the infrastructure to handle the increase in density. This is reducing quality of life for existing residents. Additionally, they believe the plans fall short on being economically equitable by allowing and encouraging excessive demolition.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>change park hill golf course from residential place to new "open space" designation and be considered a district 126-27. Ensure this is changed throughout plan.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>C.H.U.N. believes that the current zoning for properties between East 13th Avenue and East 17th Avenue allows considerably more density than is currently built and that any upzoning in that area would disrupt the scale of the area and incentivize demolition of many fine older buildings.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Support for the current mapping of Suburban community coordior at S. Monaco and E. Kentucky Ave</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Support for mapping of Low-Medium at the 3400 Block of Albion St.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Highland Ventures Holdings LLC owns 1090 King St., in Villa Park. This property is within¼ mile walk of the Knox Court station on RTD's W Line and, like much of this portion of the neighborhood there is a TOD opportunity here, taking advantage of proximity to rail. The adopted West Colfax Plan recognizes this. With this in mind and in thinking about the future of our growing city, north Villa Park and our property in particular we have reviewed the draft of Blueprint Denver. Highland Ventures Holdings LLC embraces Blueprint as it applies to the 1000 block of King St. and the surrounding neighborhood. We are supportive of the Urban Edge classification. In particular, we are pleased with and very supportive of this block being designated as a Low - Medium Residential Area on the Blueprint Places Map as we believe this designation has the potential to contribute to and shape the future vitality and livability of the neighborhood. Be assured that you have our support for Low-Medium Residential on the Blueprint places Map. We specifically request that you keep this Future Places designation as Blueprint works its way through the City Council adoption process.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>RE: Blueprfnt Denver Places and Context Designation for 1601 Lowell Boulevard In Sloan's Lake Lowell17 LLC, owner d Sloan's Lake Medlcal c.enmr and the undertyng land at 1601 Lowell Boulevard, along with Its partner Zoc:alo Community Development, submit this letter to request that the land at 1601 Lowell {mnpnsIng the blod(bmwaen 16th and 17th Avenues and Newton Street and Lowell Boulevard) be altegorized In Blueprint Denver, under "Places•, as "High Resldentlar• rather than the e>elstIng designation of "Community c:entllr",</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Park Hill Presbyterian Church embraces Blueprint Denver as it applies to the 3400 block of Albion. We support the Urban Edge classification. In particular, we are pleased with and very supportive of this block being designated as a Low-Medium Residential Area on the Blueprint Places Map as we believe ths designation has th.e potential to contribute to and shape the future vitality and livability of the neighborhood. Be assured that you have our support for Low-Medium Residential on the Blueprint places Map. We specifically request that you keep this designation as Blueprint Denver works its way through the City Council adoption process.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>RE: .92 Acres at 901 and 947 S. Monaco Street Parkway, Future Places Map Designation Ms. Kimble Crangle, Mr. Joel Noble, and Other Members of the Blueprint Denver Task Force: I have held the above referenced .92-Acre property for about seven years. On several occasions I have sought to improve it through development planning and/or rezoning. Despite being located along a major arterial (Monaco), being situated across from significant commercial development on three sides, next to multifamily condominiums on the fourth (alley) side, and being zoned R-2A under the old code, I learned that the 2002 Blueprint Denver Plan designated the property as residential and an area of stability. The property currently consists of three, rental single-family homes on the south half and a community building on the north half, with a two-story bank abutting to the south end, condos across an alley to the west, commercial retail and office to the north and east, and a signalized intersection directly northeast.</p> <p>You can imagine my great relief in learning that under the proposed 2018 Blueprint Denver Update, my property has been designated as “Suburban” in the future context map and as “Community Corridor” on the Future places map. Please accept my wholehearted endorsement of the Community Corridor designation, and a request to maintain it within the adoption of the Blueprint Denver Update,</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>We are committed to the character and flavor of the neighborhood we treasure and call home. While we obviously have seen changes in the neighborhood over the last 50 years and understand that growth and development are bound to occur (and can be a positive if done right), we have always treasured the fact that the essential character of the neighborhood has remained the same. As East Colfax has evolved into a wonderfully vibrant district, it was accomplished without substantially changing the buildings that line the street. It still feels like "our" neighborhood which has evolved positively. It does not feel like our neighborhood has been erased and changed. We believe that the historical nature of our neighborhood must be preserved and we therefore register our objection to BluePrintDenver consideration of increasing the zoning in our neighborhood from a low-medium residential area to a high-medium residential area. We believe that adopting a code allowing mid-scale multi-unit buildings up to eight stories in height would be a terrible mistake. We live near East High School. Perhaps the most defining feature of this neighborhood is the sweeping views toward (and from) the East High campus. The iconic tower of the 100 year old building and open air surrounding campus literally stand as the identifying feature and beacon of the neighborhood. Already, some of that has been lost with the construction of the recreation center on Colfax and Josephine. Losing the view of East from that intersection may seem like a small thing, but we view it as a substantial change for the worse. There was great value of driving eastbound on Colfax and to see the EHS Tower come into view as you approached Josephine. The same occurred when you used to drive northbound on Josephine to Colfax. The view of the tower from that intersection was fundamental to the experience of this neighborhood and losing it was a big loss for all of us. To go even further and allow growth additional through the construction of eight story buildings between Colfax and 17th Avenue on Detroit and Fillmore is a step too far that would ruin the character of our neighborhood. Already, permitting five story buildings seems to us to be too much, but to allow eight story buildings seems, by far, to be excessive, unnecessary and destructive to our community. In addition to preserving the feel, character and views within the neighborhood, there is one fact that should immediately stop any consideration of this excessive growth in this area: parking and traffic. Parking and morning traffic are already terrible problems on Detroit and Fillmore between Colfax and 17th Avenue. It is congested on a normal day and on those days when there are events in City Park (like Sunday night Jazz or Races or Walks), parking is impossible. And this serious problem already exists with a series of one and two story buildings on these blocks. Increasing the number of residences in this quadrant by 30-70% is a terrible idea and is certain to make the parking problem intolerable. We urge you to preserve the historical nature, feel and quality of our neighborhood. While development can be good in the right circumstances, it can be ruinous in the wrong circumstances. These are the wrong circumstances for the kind of growth contemplated.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
75 letters (approx.) I am an owner at The Pinnacle. I am very concerned that the current draft of the Blueprint Denver East Central plan adds to the half-block across Fillmore (between 16th and 17th Avenues) which is designated as an area of change color-coding which signifies a potential height limit of 8 stories. As an adjacent property owner, I object to any change to the density, height, or use characterization in the East Central plan and the Blueprint Denver plan which would encourage construction of a building higher than the currently allowed 5 stories on the block bordered by 16th Avenue, 17th Avenue, Fillmore, and Detroit. Set back from East High, a new 5 story structure will constitute a substantial change. Already we have parking problems and traffic congestion from East High, the park, and existing density. City Park South is an island with hard edges and no place for traffic or parking to disperse. Further, blocking views of property owners who bought with the existing zoning in place is unjust and unfair. I ask that you oppose this revision to the height limit in this draft of the Blueprint Denver. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	Places Mapping	Letter
The area around Regis University appears to be classified as Community Center & Corridors and Certain districts. We are committed to working with the City to support the development of new jobs and affordable living for families and individuals. We hope that the development of mixed-use and affordable housing will be incentivized in this area. Likewise, we would like to have authentic, community-driven retail become incentivized and integrated with a pedestrian mixed-use environment along the Regis University North Federal Boulevard corridor.	Places Mapping	Letter
We also support the noted vision for more density along Colfax Avenue and near the light rail. We would like to engage in further conversation about Sheridan Boulevard, as the neighborhood is mixed in opinion regarding desired density along that arterial.	Places Mapping	letter
West Colfax - Lowell Blvd./Newton/ 16th/ 17th agree it should be a Community Center	Places Mapping	Letter
Barnum- OS-1 should continue to connect Barnum Park from Grove to Federal Blvd. 6th Ave. down to 3rd. OS-1 should also be applied to Julian east to Barnum Park.	Places Mapping	Letter
Westwood- Morrison Road Influence Area should match what is recommended in the Westwood Neighborhood Plan. 1-2 unit with emphasis on 2-unit density as transition adjacent to Morrison Road Influence Area, except in the portions that shaded darker allowing for 3 units.	Places Mapping	Letter
Westwood- Westwood Park to be OS-1 should extend from the park to Kentucky. It should also extend from Kentucky/ Wolff to Wolff and Ada Place	Places Mapping	Letter
p. 30 and elsewhere – CPV-Auraria classification and other Downtown neighborhoods	Places Mapping	Letter
Jefferson Park is indicated to have more growth than the Downtown Area Plan Amendment, and the eventual Stadium District Master Plan? This should not be the case.	Places Mapping	Letter
Would like CPV to more closely match Downtown Area plan (porosity, higher buildings pushed to north/south)	Places Mapping	Letter
7. Chapter 5 - Future Places Map. WWPNA generally supports the mapping for WWP and our Speer neighborhood as set forth in the Future Places map in the August 6 Plan, with the exception of the area at S. Logan and Bayaud (discussed below). Based on input from WWPNA residents, WWPNA requests that within the "low" residential designation, a SU only designation be inserted and that this designation be used for the area of WWP from Lincoln through Downing, and from Alameda through 1-25, as well as for the portion of our Speer area that is presently zoned SU.	Places Mapping	Letter
(b)Chapter 6.4 - General Urban Context. (1)The Speer area in our neighborhood experienced a significant degradation of its historic character after the City's rezoning effort in the 1950s. What replaced stately single-family homes are incompatible two- and three-story, multi-unit apartment buildings (informally known as California Walkups). We are concerned that the treatment of the General Urban Context in our Speer area would further erode what remains of the original homes 120 years after construction. In particular, the narrative of "Land Use and Built Form" in Chapter 6.4 conveys the opposite of the existing character of the Speer portion of our neighborhood. Much of the Speer area is predominantly single-unit form, including along Lincoln Street, with some mixed use and multi-unit. We encourage the concept of being sensitive to the existing neighborhood character but are concerned that the General Urban map as proposed would significantly alter the existing character, especially along the western boundary. More than 72 blocks in the Speer portion are currently zoned U-SU or U-TU. Along Sherman, Grant, and Logan Streets most of the two-unit dwellings retain their single-unit form, which we believe is a significant feature of the existing character of the Speer part of our neighborhood.	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Cook Park is keenly interested in the CDOT-Holly development as it introduces a new "center" into our neighborhood. We are wary of the amount of people and automobiles it will introduce and feel analysis of this is extremely important. With thoughtful design, this could be a mixed-use enhancement to our neighborhood.	Places Mapping	Letter
Cook Park is eager for redevelopment to occur at the abandoned Sears property SE corner of Monaco and Evans and appreciate that it is noted as a development opportunity on the map.	Places Mapping	Letter
Park Hill Golf Course zoning designation is incorrect. The Park Hill Golf Course is zoned OS-B and there is a Conservation Easement on the property, purchased by the Webb Administration on behalf of the citizens of Denver, which is to ensure it remains Open Space. Your maps and related documents show this property as Residential, Urban Edge. Should the proposed Denveright Blueprint document be approved, you will have effectively rezoned the Park Hill Golf Course. This is unacceptable to our community.	Places Mapping	Letter
GROWTH AREAS MAP:The various shades of blue are very difficult to discern.-The shades of blue are very difficult to differentiate, and colors on the map do not precisely match the colors on the key. We request that the colors be adjusted for improved clarity. SEE FOLLOWING ITEMS FOR SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS.	Places Mapping	Letter
Growth Areas Map:Significant areas of future growth are shown in areas that have already been redeveloped since the new zoning code was adopted in 2010.-Significant areas of future growth are shown in areas that have already been redeveloped since the new zoning code was adopted in 2010. Our request is to change the map to show High and Medium-High Intensity Residential areas ONLY where opportunities still exist in the Highland Neighborhood. We see this as only possible in C-MX-5 Districts where redevelopment has not been completed in recent years. SEE HUNI GROWTH AREAS MAP.	Places Mapping	Letter
Growth Area Map:Public Parks are shown as "Certain Districts" and "High and Medium-High Residential" areas.-Public Parks are shown as if they can be redeveloped for residential and commercial uses on this map. We believe this map can only be representative of potential growth if it excludes parkland, and clearly identifies it as Open Space. Our request it to map Open Space to make this clear for Viking Park, Hirshorn Park, Highland Gateway Park, Community Plaza Park, St. Patrick's Neighborhood Park, Franco Park, and City of Cuernavaca Park. This should be changed city-wide. SEE HUNI GROWTH AREAS MAP.	Places Mapping	Letter
The following specific changes are requested to both the Places and Context maps:	Places Mapping	Letter
The Little Saigon area is still stabilizing and getting its feet, this area should be highlighted for potential but the current category is too much and could create instability, don't you realize this.	Places Mapping	Letter
34)The Knox transit station doesn't have local commercial, but could in the near vicinity. If we don't try to allow it, there will be only residential.	Places Mapping	Letter
35)Keep the commercial areas on 10th Avenue and at 1st and Knox. We need more neighborhood service commercial. (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED 3X)	Places Mapping	Letter
36)We need more local centers and less community centers. Our streets aren't going to get wider and they are already unsafe for pedestrians. This is also a comment for mobility because we can't have only big corridors and expect pedestrian safety and mobility to improve.	Places Mapping	Letter
37)MORRISON RD – make this street a 'local corridor' to support smaller scale, especially Perry to Alameda (THIS COMMENT SUBMITTED MANY TIMES) a)Add a center to Morrison Rd, a destination b)Include areas for district innovation and flexibility c)Consider greenway infrastructure such as the 'via Verde'	Places Mapping	Letter
Our proposal is to create a new color designation under the Districts concept for properties that are dynamic in nature with significant changes expected over the next 20 years, but which are yet to be determined. An example of this type of property in the City is the Loretto Heights campus. While that property is currently a school, it is expected to be redeveloped into a variety of non-school uses. Similarly, PHGC is currently a public golf course, but will likely be redeveloped into one or more different uses over the next 20 years, and in both cases the nature of that redevelopment remains undecided. We like the idea of creating another category of "green" for things that are not parks, but are also not built upon. This new category of green could designated as "Mixed Use/Open Space Campus". By either tying the property to Low Residential or Regional Park, any future redevelopment will lack plan guidance. Thus by labeling it "Mixed Use / Open Space Campus" it preserves the right to redevelop it in the future without creating any present controversy over what portion will be redeveloped and what portion will remain open space. For context, Clayton recently completed a Community Vision Plan with extensive community input. And, it will be followed with a Master Plan process, again with extensive community input. Our goal in any potential redevelopment is for the property to be sensitive to the existing neighborhood character, provide additional affordable and market rate housing in the area, while also offering residents a mix of uses, with street activation and connectivity, and appealing new open spaces accessible to all. And, we would be supportive of tying a community vision process to this new District designation.	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>. We also encourage staff and consultants to look at a number of sites throughout the city that represent different contexts and place types and overlay each of the maps on those sites and identify conflicts or mistakes.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>There are a number of Draft sections and maps that focus on Downtown – including mobility, urban form, development strategy and nomenclature. Again because of the complexity and specificity of the Draft, some of these recommendations and observations can easily be viewed too literally and taken out of context. In several cases, the recommendations and mapping in the Draft are not reflective of some of the recent and ongoing small area plans relevant to Downtown (e.g., 2007 Downtown Area Plan, Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan, Golden Triangle Plan, CPV-Auraria Plan, and the ongoing Denver Moves: Downtown Plan). One notable example of this is the naming and classification of several of the Downtown districts, which in several cases do not match the names and contexts ascribed to them in the small area plans (e.g., CPV-Auraria should have a Regional Center classification, and CPV-Auraria, Golden Triangle, Arapahoe Square, Commercial Core and Lower Downtown are not called out or are called by different names). Additionally, because of Downtown’s complexity and ongoing evolution, contexts can change rapidly and may vary from block to block. We would like to see language and mapping that acknowledge the dynamic nature of Downtown and better reflect the numerous recent and ongoing small-area plans mentioned above.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>PLACE DESIGNATION: For efficacy and dynamism, Morrison Road should be defined by an overlay designating two separate subareas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Perry Street to Alameda Avenue- Subarea 1- place designation should be a Local Corridor to maximize the unique opportunities created by historic buildings, a dense urban fabric and neighborhood scaled commerce. The parcels on the Northwest portion of Morrison Road are smaller, ideal for lower-scale buildings with active frontages and reduced, flexible parking requirements. Attention in this subarea is given to incentivize small, local business and adaptive reuse. In subarea 1 a "Community Center" should exist at the intersection of W. Virginia, Newton St. and Morrison Road as it is the epicenter for many existing plans and efforts that have originated or been embraced by the 2016 Westwood Neighborhood Plan, including the Via Verde, the Morrison Road Streetscape Plan, the Westwood Food co-op and the Westwood Creative District. • From Perry Street to Mississippi Road/Sheridan Boulevard- Subarea 2- place designation should remain a Community Corridor to coincide with larger scale development and allow for mixed uses. Attention in this subarea is given to development incentives in exchange for community benefits. Additional attention should be allotted to transitional zoning between single family zoning and high density mixed use. 	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT MAP: mapping of area between Quebec & Fairmount and Lowry Blvd. to Bayaud is much closer to Urban Edge than Urban. Had Lowry been brought into the New Code in 2010, the context would definitely have been Urban Edge, and nothing has changed to date. Current zoning of entire area is R-2A with waivers and housing ranges from townhomes with 50 foot setbacks lining Lowry Blvd. to individual houses with alleys. It includes Village Homes I, Village Homes II, and Park Square. The Lowry Community was not given the opportunity to participate in a legislative rezoning process to bring Lowry from the old Zoning Code into the New Denver Zoning Code in 2010. The neighbors who live within this area defined first need zoning under the New Code that reflects the existing environment before being rezoned through classification as Community Center and Corridor on this map. Leaving all of Lowry as Urban Edge for now seems a reasonable compromise. Keep in mind large chunks of Lowry NE and NW of the corner of Alameda/Quebec are currently R-1, and much of the rest of the area is R-2-A with waivers. c. The Blueprint proposed map itself is confusing. At the top left it says: “Neighborhood contexts demonstrate the differences in built environment between Denver’s neighborhoods.” Yet the legend calls these “Future Neighborhood Contexts.” Accordingly, it is difficult to tell what Blueprint wants to accomplish in this map. The classifications on the Future Neighborhood Context Map should be made consistent with the Growth map and Future Places Map; neither map includes the Park Square/Village I & II area as Community Centers and Corridors.</p>	Places Mapping	Letter
<p>Neighbors expressed a number of concerns related to land use. The draft neighborhood context and place type maps encourage continued high-density development and potential rezoning in areas that are currently low density, residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>1) Neighbors are concerned about;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the poor building quality and incongruous nature of the multi-unit slot homes / row homes replacing single family homes throughout the neighborhood. New development does not respect neighborhood character. b. how newer construction is incompatible with larger families, and how the 2.5 - 3 story, row-home form is incompatible with many seniors due to excessive stairs. c. excessive demolition of single family housing stock is not leading to economically equitable development. d. variety of housing stock and thus supports regulations which allow for ADU’s. 	Places Mapping	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
2) The SLCG neighborhood has a historically significant, and large population of Orthodox Jewish families. Members of this community expressed deep concern over how ongoing and planned development threatens to displace their community. a. This community has roots in this neighborhood dating back to the 1870s. b. The neighborhood is home to several orthodox Jewish schools and learning centers. c. Observant members of the community must live within walking distance of their Synagogue / Shul. An official boundary called an "eruv" is defined roughly from Sheridan to Perry between 17th and the gulch. d. Members of this community have larger families that create specific housing needs not met by high density vertical development. e. The available stock of single-family homes is extremely precious to this community, but they must compete with developers who can profit more by scraping and building multi-unit structures with smaller, less family friendly options. f. This is a long standing, and stable community, with many families having lived here for generations. They feel city plans are ignoring and displacing existing residents by gearing new development towards a younger, more transient population.	Places Mapping	Letter
The West Line Corridor needs to be included in the Growth Strategy and be considered for all the incentives and regulatory benefits of other regional, transit friendly corridors.	Places Mapping	Letter
b. On the Places Map, 10th Avenue through Sun Valley should have a Local Corridor designation based on the Sun Valley Ecodistrict Master Plan and the Decatur Federal Station Area Plan. For future planning and investments, the local corridor designation should extend west along 10th avenue to Sheridan Blvd.	Places Mapping	Letter
The Northeast Park Hill Golf Course at 40th and Colorado should be designated as a Regional or Community Center, to align the projected land use with future redevelopment plans and prioritize the adoption of a small area plan to guide the future development of that site.	Places Mapping	Letter
Mapping of Lower Highlands -- not sure whether it is a center/corridor or residential medium in urban center context (as mapped now). Part of the issue may be how we label residential category in urban center context -- not clear this is really mixed use. Could also be issue of building heights going to 8 stories max for some places they are considering, when the area is more 5 stories	Places Mapping	Letter
Major concern with the mapping of Sheridan between 16th and 17th. The community corridor place, combined with general urban context, extends too far north. It should end at 16th. North of 16th does not make sense in terms of (1) abutting low-intensity residential (2) allows for too much height (3) allows too wide a range of uses (4) traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhood, especially since the properties on this stretch of Sheridan do not have access to Sheridan and CDOT will never give it to them. Reduce the intensity of context and place	Places Mapping	Office Hours
Change mapping to High-Medium for 17th & Grove/Hooker. See letter that was provided (mini planning process is happening to confirm support for this)	Places Mapping	Office Hours
For the area mapped for more intensity south of colfax and north of the gulch, along the light rail ilne, it seems wrong to call for higher intensity development since there are so many small affordable homes in this area and it is vulnerable to displacement.	Places Mapping	Office Hours
Heavy manufacturing just south of Ruby Hill Park -- in between Jewell and Evans -- is this supposed to be heavy? Right now some I-MX zoning. Ruby Hill would like uses friendly to the park on the southern edge of the park so a more mixed use character seems to make sense. Ideally community corridor should be continuous along Evans and not get interrupted with industrial	Places Mapping	Office Hours
The neighborhood context from Ellsworth to Lowry Blvd, Quebec to the west should be Urban Edge., not urban.	Places Mapping	Office Hours
I think the Urban Edge Places Map could be adjusted. Denver should encourage high density in under served regions such as Vill Park.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I would curtail the increase in density in the West Colfax neighborhood.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Surrounding each transit line, especially at stations, is typically a vision for higher-intensity development... Which is appropriate! However, for some reason the northeast corner of Villa Park, which is within close walking distance to two light rail stations, remain stuck in a "Low" designation (despite having higher intensity visions directly east and west of the 4 blocks in question). The entire section from Federal to Knox between 10th and 12th should be at least Low-Medium, if not High-Medium. Without doing so, Denver is condemning that portion of the neighborhood to stagnation despite having so much potential by being close to multiple transit nodes. A low designation is appropriate for the rest of the neighborhood given the dated Villa Park Neighborhood Plan (1991), but the more recent West Colfax Plan (2006) clearly states that this northern section of the neighborhood is primed for "the greatest opportunity for redevelopment" in the plan. The rest of the Maple Grove Station area's "Future Places" is appropriately designated as such, but not those four blocks. Leaving those blocks (Federal to Knox, between 10th and 12th) designated "Low" only furthers the statement made in the plan that "Development in the vicinity of Maple Grove Station does not capitalize on the proximity to downtown, regional access and availability of rapid transit." That would be a shame and I encourage planners to reconsider that 4-block designation before these plans are made final.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>(1) On the “Districts” explanatory pages (pages 132-133) and on any other pages where the “Regional Park” icon might appear in the document (such as page 263): the color code for a “Regional Park” should be changed to the shade of green (dark green?) used to identify “Regional Park” land on the revised “Places” map.</p> <p>(2) On the “Districts” explanatory pages (pages 132-133): a new “Districts” category needs to be added to provide a “short, high-level summary” regarding the new “District” explained in (1) above with a title of something such as “Significant Privately-Owned and Public Open Space.”</p> <p>(3) On the “Districts at a glance” pages (pages 262-263): a new icon needs to be added for the new “District” explained in (1) above with a title of something such as “Significant Privately-Owned and Public Open Space.”</p> <p>(4) On the “Districts” map (pages 264-265): (a) the color code on the legend for “Regional Park” land should be changed to the shade of green (dark green?) used for identifying “Regional Park” land on the revised “Places” map, (b) a new legend and color code need to be added for the new “District” explained in (1) above with a title of something such as “Significant Privately-Owned and Public Open Space,” and (c) the land included in new “District” explained in (1) above with a title of something such as “Significant Privately-Owned and Public Open Space” must be identified on the map with the new color code.</p> <p>(5) A new detailed explanation needs to be added to Section 6.7 regarding the new “District” explained in (1) above with a title of something such as “Significant Privately-Owned and Public Open Space.”</p> <p>(6) On the “Neighborhood Contexts” chart (pages 146-147): the “Quality of Life” definition for “Districts” should be changed to read as follows: “A range of parks and quasi-public and private outdoor spaces with flexible open space and hardscaped plazas. Varies greatly by place and use.”</p> <p>(7) On the “Neighborhood Contexts” map (pages 148-149): the “Urban Edge” color code for the Park Hill Golf Course land should be deleted and changed to the “District” color code.</p> <p>(8) On the “Urban Edge Places” map (pages 190-191): (a) the yellow color code for the Park Hill Golf Course land should be deleted and changed to the “District” color code and (b) other changes need to be made to assure that all “District” property is correctly identified with the “District” color code.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I am VERY concerned about the explosion of growth in my north Sloan's neighborhood that stretches from Sheridan to Irving. The erection of so many high rises is inexplicable, giving the crowding, limited parking, and the large number of children that will now have to navigate through increasingly busy streets. I drive down 17th Avenue every morning around 6:30 a.m. Even then, the congestion is unacceptable. What is even more disturbing is that the very visible increased number of parked cars along the side streets make driving DANGEROUS. Since cars are parked almost to the corners, the visibility is impaired. These are accidents waiting to happen. The new maps show our neighborhood is targeted for more high density development. I understand that you are now contemplating rezoning the properties along Sheridan between 16th and 17th,. I think it would be a terrible mistake to have that area be rezoned into high density apartments. The intersection of Sheridan and 17th is already noted for frequent accidents. I implore you to reconsider that decision. Our once quiet, inviting neighborhood now looks like a crowded block in New York City.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>The Weat Side Jewish Community resides between Sheridan and Federal 17th Ave Till 13 the Ave.</p> <p>We have two large High Schools that have invested greatly in their properties and house the education of our teenagers. Most families have numerous children and need single family homes. We need to preserve our community. It has been in existence for 25 years. Please do not put density in our area. Don't refine for Multi housing. Thank you.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>In the Plan, there is excellent discussion about promoting equal access, ensuring housing diversity, and driving growth around transit centers. Relative to the many ightrail stations in the city, residents of immediately surrounding area can only realize the benefits of these policy goals if the permitted land uses in the areas adjacent to the stations facilitate these objectives. Appropriate adjacent land use recommendations next to transit stations promote a more equitable distribution of diverse housing and employment options.</p> <p>In Villa Park, like many other historically underserved areas of the city, residents are dependent on transit and walking and should have access to diverse and higher intensity infill development near transit to help support equity and access to economic opportunity. Accordingly, in order to maximize the value of taxpayer dollars invested in this valuable transit infrastructure, and encourage better access and connection to and between all parts of the city, Denver should encourage medium-high intensity growth near every single one of the city's transit stations.</p> <p>Pursuing medium-high intensity growth, particularly near the Perrry and Knox stations, will increase ridership, thereby decreasing personal car use on an individual basis, which reduces traffic congestion and avoidable pollution. By allowing increased residential densities near stations, in creased ridership will also bolster the economics of the lightrail and either generate and/or free up budget dollars for other public needs.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Villa Park has historically been under-served with less access to community resources, little to no diversity of housing and no localized community center etc....</p> <p>If it is the vision of Blueprint Denver to improve Villa Park's housing diversity, create equitable access, diverse resources, and make it connected and safe wouldn't that warrant new higher intensity growth near our transit stops at Perry and Knox St. stations? To, in your own words, 'focus growth near mixed-use centers and transit corridor. And, 'focus on strategic infill locations linked with strong transportation options? Villa Park has historically been under-served. With little housing diversity, few community centers and less access/connection to the City. RTD's FasTracks system has touched our community with two lightrail stations (Perry and Knox stations). But those stations can only provide opportunity if the adjacent land-uses support them. We need MEDIUM-HIGH INTENSITY growth near these stations. Instead of the existing Two-unit zoning next to a lightrail station, Blueprint Denver shall encourage MEDIUM-HIGH INTENSITY growth near the Perry and Knox lightrail stations. Villa Park needs (re: p. 28) 'focused...strategic infill locations linked with strong transportation options. Housing needs... that meet a wide range of options... that will improve public health.' The Perry and Knox lightrail stations are Villa Park's opportunity for diverse and higher intensity growth that will give our community a center, make it more pedestrian friendly, encourage access and connection to the rest of the City. The adjacent land-uses shall support increased ridership!</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Reflect the goals in the growth map as it pertains to West Colfax. Unfortunately for the long-established Jewish community here, the sale of land of St Anthony Hospital and Beth Israel was taken advantage of by Denver and developers to create a high density urban area in what was previously a quiet neighborhood on the edge of the city. The growth plan assumes that the St Anthony opportunity necessitates that the surrounding mostly single-family, 1-2 Story neighborhood also change into a community hub - or be immediately adjacent to one that continues to slowly expand along Colfax Ave, Sheridan and the light-rail corridor. With density increasing on all sides, the small neighborhood and its integral institutions will slowly be displaced. The new multi-family housing being constructed will not be an option for large families currently accommodated in single-family & duplex housing.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Do not reZone Our area from Sloan's Lake Till 13th Ave for multi family buildings. We cannot be displaced. We have invested in schools and synagogues. The boys High School Yeshiva Toras Chaim just built a Milti million dollar dormitory. On the corner of Zenobia and 14th they are planning to build a 3 million dollar Synagogue and youth center. WE NEED SINGLE FAMILY homes. Please do not choose this area for Density. I was born here. My Father was on the Mesical staff at Saint Anthony. We have history here. Please look elsewhere for the growth Denver is seeking. It's already way too much over here. Thank you for listening.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Please don't throw us out of our homes.....</p> <p>I am very opposed to this area being identified as an area of huge growth, multi-unit structures, and a community corridor. Adding more density anywhere within this area, on top of all the recent density already added threatens the security and continuity of the existing local corridor and urban single-family and multi-family low-to-medium density neighborhood.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Once again, the maps and color-coded keys for the maps are difficult to interpret. I am concerned that just west and north of 7th & Emerson, the map seems to designate increased density, which--depending on location, placement, etc.--could adversely impact the largely single-family nature of the blocks from 6th to 8th Avenues in that area (7th Avenue Historic District). The city should preserve existing densities under Blueprint Denver. I am concerned that the overriding goal of the new Denveright plan is to increase density everywhere, to the detriment of successful, long-established low-density and single-family neighborhoods.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I like that the city is working in a plan in where they want to focus the upcoming growth -But to push a large majority of growth to a small neighborhood like West Colfax/ Sloan's lake - will change the whole community. This area has been a quiet family oriented neighborhood for over 100 years and however much I like what is being planned for the city as a whole- there are some specific needs for my Jewish religious community that won't fit in this plan. Family are usually larger- and with the smaller units being built it's taking away housing for the community, and raise the large houses to an unaffordable prices. We can't just move anywhere- as a tight knit community based around walking distance to the synagogue (no driving on Saturday)- we are very limited in the housing market. In addition with the proposed plan to add more micro units and multi family units, these are usually for younger, smaller families who are in it for the short term location- and not about building the community for the long hall</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I believe the Growth Strategy Map could be altered!! I'm not sure if what is outlined sill help with new development. Map doesn't have the 2 RTD W-line transit stops in my VILLA PARK neighborhood making transit development difficult. With the light rail station I and traffic density getting out of hand Denver needs to have more HIGH DENSITY especially around transit stations. Villa Park's needs a center where more pedestrians without cars can be at ease and be connected to the rest of the city.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Some of the maps are inaccurate based on today's existing zoning</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I like the idea of keeping infill in context to height and situation on lots to maintain the integrity and appearance of a street block.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
I believe that the mapping of the city does not allow fully for the recommendation in the land Use and Built Form: Housing section that speaks to incentivizing the development of affordable housing and mixed income housing near transit and/or amenities. There appears to be very limited areas where density is allowed, and even further limited areas where high-rise buildings are allowed. This needs to change in order to insure affordable housing in the City.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Changing the current density of the area by simply changing the height restrictions form 5 stories to 8 or what ever is not a solution. Public transportation is a big issue as currently there are far too many cars for the parking that is available. The zoo and the golf course are on a collusion pattern as neither one has sufficient parking for normal days let alone special event days. Adding to that you have events at City Park that virtually block other from using the area and restrict homeowners. When views from existing properties are blocked by building of higher structures the value of the original property goes down. Increasing the density in an area by increasing the height of buildings is not an answer.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Growth is focused on specific areas that can best accommodate it and that will not be negatively impacted by rapid and significant change.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
It feels like this applies to all areas, which is not possible. You would distroy homes, neighborhoods, communities, etc. if all concepts were expected to exist in a given area. Some neighbors can't realistically allow cooridors or centers or districts within them given the nature of the existing homes....on the outskirts on business lanes yes.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
the ideas of creating local areas for shopping, recreation, work and community engagement with transit, biking, walking connections.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I would increase the density of housing allowed in all Denver neighborhoods that have or could have the infrastructure to support such a change. I would especially increase the density height and flexibility of use of all residential neighborhoods in several miles of the urban core. Simply because there are single family zoned areas near the city center does not mean that makes any sense for the city. Our resident need more housing in general, and this makes sense especially closer to major amenity and employment centers.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
looks just like old blueprint...where are the new corridors and centers?	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>(1) The Park Hill Golf Course land is improperly designatied as a "low-mediium residential area." This land is zoned OS-B (Open Space-Recreation). This land is also protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement purchased by the city in 1977 from the Clayton Trust for \$2 million. Clayton holds title to the land "as agent fo the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public." Additionally, this designation conflicts with important provisions of the draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the draft Game Plan for a Healthy City regarding Denver's critical need to protect and expand open spaces and parks.</p> <p>(2) The light green color coding currently makes no sense for many reasons (e.g., the coding for the Denver Country Club land). There needs to be a new legend for the light green color and it should be used for all significant privately-owned and public open space such as the Park Hill Golf Course land, the Denver Country Club land, the Cherry Creek Country Club land, the Pinehurst Country Club land, the Bear Creek Golf Club land and significant city-owned park and open space land that is not identified by DPR as a "Regional Park."</p> <p>(3) The City Park Golf Course land is not designated by DPR as a "Regional Park." It should be identified using the light green color.</p> <p>(4) Generally, more careful attention needs to be given to using the green [both the legend identified dark green and the currently non-legend identified light green] colors to make sure that the lands are consistently and fully identified.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
To the extent the Plan envisions increasing the permitted height of building in the area of Fillmore Street in proximity to City Park and the Pinnacle, I believe the Plan is ill-advised.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
as an adjacent property owner, I object to any change, height, density or use characterization in the east central plan and the blueprint denver plan which would encourage construction of a building higher than the currently allowed 5 stories on the block bordered by 16th AV, 17TH AVE, FILLMORE, and DETROIT. Set back from East High, 5 Stories IS the change; already we have parking problems from East High, the park, and existing density; City Park South is an island with hard edges and no place for traffic and parking to disperse and blocking views of property owners who bought who purchased with the existing zoning in place is unjust.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PHGC land is improperly identified variously as a "low-medium residential area" and as "Urban Edge." 2. PHGC is now zoned OS-B (Open Space Recreation) and 3. Denver taxpayers paid \$2,000,000 in 1997 for an Open Space Conservation Easement in perpetuity 	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
What do you like about Chapter 6? recognizing that some areas can or already do serve as community centers and deserve investment and connectivity, especially those well connected to transit.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I like the mention of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) being thoughtfully integrated into the Urban Edge Residential areas.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I like the idea of density in given areas such as downtown and transit areas.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
it preserves the existing single family homes	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Neighborhoods do not need additional traffic and large (8 story) buildings. This causes lots of congestion, which does not promote the beauty and tranquility of our lovely existing neighborhoods. This does not promote goodwill and respect for current residents.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
What is the rationale for so many areas to be considered as low residential for the future of the city when they are so close to urban centers, good transit?	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The Blueprint document is not integrated with the Parks and Recreation Game Plan, thus there is no Open Space Context to reflect current or future needs, facilitating the ability to identify, track and acquire open space to support the needs of Denver residents.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
See my prior statement concerning the OS-B zoning for the Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) area as to its perpetual use as open space-recreational.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
1. PHGC land is improperly identified variously as a "low-medium residential area" and as "Urban Edge." 2. PHGC is now zoned OS-B (Open Space Recreation) and 3. Denver taxpayers paid \$2,000,000 in 1997 for an Open Space Conservation Easement until 2099	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
As a neighbor at the Pinnacle I don't like the idea of changing the height zoning, only been in place since 2010, as we are in a tightly restricted area with 17th to the north, Colorado Blvd. to the East, Colfax to the south, and York to the West. Street parking is already a inadequate with no possibility of opening up more. Also, owners here at the Pinnacle with the zoning at 5 stories in place for our neighborhood and our views would be ruined.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
East Central Denver no more than 5 stories high. 8 or higher is out of the question	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The idea of keeping single family home neighborhoods zoned or characterized at low density or suburban just because they have been that way and a vocal minority of current resident want to keep it that way.		
The whole city needs to grow, please allow it to do so in a sustainable way and do not bow to the special interests of older, wealthier homeowners who wish to preserve their urban neighborhood as a rural suburban island to the detriment of the rest of the city.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I also have a number of specific issues with the map classifications for my direct neighborhood.</p> <p>In general, I would like it to be more specific about how it will promote some of the goals in the plan, and to alleviate anxiety for those living in an area designated by this plan for transformative change. For example. this talks about potentially adjusting the zoning code to help maintain neighborhood context better, but does not mandate that.</p> <p>So, in other words, I think the current zoning code, readily allows developers to violate many of the concepts in this plan, and it is sounding like the zoning code would not be updated until after this plan is adopted. However, once this plan is adopted, it can already serve as rationale for rezoning. So, I think this plan should guarantee that the zoning code updates, and a reform of the rezoning process are adopted at the same time as this plan.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
My Sloan's Lake neighborhood is FAR too crowded and now unsightly looking with high rise after high rise. I leave for work every morning around 6:30 a.m. and 17th Ave. between Sheridan and Irving is already unacceptably congested. I don't know what you were all thinking when you approved those high rises. It is a traffic hazard and a challenge for children especially. The street parking is also now ALREADY a challenge and a danger. Because of the high density people regularly park almost to the very corner of each street, impeding visibility, and it is an accident waiting to happen. I live on the North Side of Sloan's lake. The new maps show our neighborhood is targeted for more high density development. I understand you are currently considering rezoning into high density apartments the properties along Sheridan between 16th and 17th. That will only exacerbate the problem for both parking and traffic. There are already frequent accidents at the intersection of 17th and Sheridan!	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
There is way too much density on the west side of the Colfax corridor. While we would love to have more residents, having seen the incredible increases in traffic congestion and all of the problems that come with increasing density without having realistic ways to support that density is quite short-sighted. ("Fantasy support" such as expecting everyone to use mass transit is not reasonable!)	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I would change the plan to strictly enforce the 5 story limit and require adequate off street parking for any new building. Thank you. Cia Wenzel.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Any change to height, density or use description in the East Central plan and the Blueprint Denver plan which would encourage buildings higher than 5 stories on the block bordered by 16th Avenue, 17th Avenue, Fillmore and Detroit. 5 stories should be absolute maximum!	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
As an owner of a residence in the South City Park neighborhood for many years, I strongly object to any change to the density, height or use characterization in the East Central plan and the Blueprint Denver plan which would encourage construction of a building taller than the current 5 stories allowed on the block bordered by 16th Ave, 17th Ave, Fillmore and Detroit. We already serious parking problems from East High, City Park and existing density, and no place for traffic or parking to disperse. Little consideration has been given to over crowding, noise pollution, parking problems, vehicle and pedestrian traffic, and other issues creating serious safety issues, particularly for elders and children that live in the neighborhood!!	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>As a property owner I have personally observed the existing parking problems that come with the density in City Park neighborhood. It's a bottleneck from the park, East High school and all the people packed into a very small footprint. There is no place for people to go since City Park south is an island with hard edges. Increasing traffic would be unjust. Plus, the 5 story limit needs to remain with the existing zoning in place. Blocking views of property owners with anything higher is unjust. People bought specifically because of the view, and to take that away will have a negative effect for the property owners and the quality of life for the whole neighborhood.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>This is my second survey to amend my first survey. I live at 1650 fillmore st. The block across the street is proposed for 8 stories. My first reply supported 5 stories, but the more I think about congestion we already have, I would like the original 3 stories to be reinstated.</p> <p>Please let me know if there will be any public hearings on this issue.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I live in the area near Denver East High School and the intersections of 17th, 16th, and Colfax with Detroit and Fillmore. I strongly object to any consideration to significantly increase to the density of the area via granting zoning request changes to the existing 5 story building height. North/South traffic in this concentrated area is hindered by long street light signals on 17th and Colfax. Increasing the density in this area without altering the signal lights at these intersections would make things intolerable. Changing the signal lights on 17th and Colfax intersections would only worsen the already stressed traffic on both these main east/west arteries. In addition, adding density in this area would increase the pressure on street parking and traffic dangers from cars entering/leaving private parking facilities. Today, in order to leave these facilities, it is necessary to nudge into traffic lanes just to determine whether there is on-coming traffic. Increasing the amount of north/south traffic on these already busy roads (Fillmore in particular) would only increase the likelihood of traffic accidents. In addition to adding to the congestion in the area for residence, adding significant density would also impact students at Denver East. The morning sun on both the school building (which has solar panels) and the playing field directly north of the gymnasium would be blocked by building that would exceed the current 5 story zoning. Early period physical education classes would look sunlight on this playing field.</p> <p>Therefore, any changes to the existing 5 story zoning in this area would worsen traffic congestion, threaten safety, reduce the quality of life to existing residence, and adversely affect the safety and quality of education offered students on Denver East.</p> <p>Lastly many individuals in this area purchased property based upon the view offered by the existing zoning regulations. Any changes to zoning that would reduce the property value of these owners is unjust. Citizens should be confident in making significant financial investing based upon the rules and regulations the City established. The financial wishes of developers should not override those of existing residence.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I live in the City Park South neighborhood. Specifically near 17th and Fillmore. This area is designated as an "area of change". Current zoning for much of the area between East High and Fillmore is for 5 stories. This is already a change.</p> <p>Allowing for higher construction is contrary to the interest of persons who bought or continued living in the area with the expectation of 5 stories max.</p> <p>Parking is already a serious issue in this neighborhood.</p> <p>I oppose any change in zoning to allow higher than 5 stories</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>We write as five decade residents of the Congress Park/East High neighborhood. We met here, raised our families here, sent all of our children (and now grandchildren) through East High School and now we have retired here. We've been here and we're staying here. We are committed to the character and flavor of the neighborhood we treasure and call home. While we obviously have seen changes in the neighborhood over the last 50 years and understand that growth and development are bound to occur (and can be a positive if done right), we have always treasured the fact that the essential character of the neighborhood has remained the same. As East Colfax has evolved into a wonderfully vibrant district, it was accomplished without substantially changing the buildings that line the street. It still feels like "our" neighborhood which has evolved positively. It does not feel like our neighborhood has been erased and changed. We believe that the historical nature of our neighborhood must be preserved and we therefore register our objection to BluePrintDenver consideration of increasing the zoning in our neighborhood from a low-medium residential area to a high-medium residential area. We believe that adopting a code allowing mid-scale multi-unit buildings up to eight stories in height would be a terrible mistake. We live near East High School. Perhaps the most defining feature of this neighborhood is the sweeping views toward (and from) the East High campus. The iconic tower of the 100 year old building and open air surrounding campus literally stand as the identifying feature and beacon of the neighborhood. Already, some of that has been lost with the construction of the recreation center on Colfax and Josephine. Losing the view of East from that intersection may seem like a small thing, but we view it as a substantial change for the worse. There was great value of driving eastbound on Colfax and to see the EHS Tower come into view as you approached Josephine. The same occurred when you used to drive northbound on Josephine to Colfax. The view of the tower from that intersection was fundamental to the experience of this neighborhood and losing it was a big loss for all of us. To go even further and allow growth additional through the construction of eight story buildings between Colfax and 17th Avenue on Detroit and Fillmore is a step too far that would ruin the character of our neighborhood. Already, permitting five story buildings seems to us to be too much, but to allow eight story buildings seems, by far, to be excessive, unnecessary and destructive to our community. In addition to preserving the feel, character and views within the neighborhood, there is one fact that should immediately stop any consideration of this excessive growth in this area: parking and traffic. Parking and morning traffic are already terrible problems on Detroit and Fillmore between Colfax and 17th Avenue. It is congested on a normal day and on those days when there are events in City Park (like Sunday night Jazz or Races or Walks), parking is impossible. And this serious problem already exists with a series of one and two story buildings on these blocks. Increasing the number of residences in this quadrant by 30-70% is a terrible idea and is certain to make the parking problem intolerable. We urge you to preserve the historical nature, feel and quality of our neighborhood. While development can be good in the right circumstances, it can be ruinous in the wrong circumstances. This is the wrong circumstances for the kind of growth contemplated.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Zoning height at Fillmore and 17th, southwest corner should remain at the current 5-story level. Taller construction on that site would greatly devalue adjacent properties unnecessarily.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Please keep the maximum height of buildings in the City Park to 5 stories or less</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Do not build the building 8 stores high , please only build the building 5 stores. Will block my city view and reduce the value of my condo. I just purchased my condo less than a year ago.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Limit the height restriction to 5 stories on the half-block bordered by 16th/17th Aves and Fillmore and the alley. We are already challenged w parking and traffic congestion due to the S. City Park area being an "island" and the advent of new apartment construction.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I'm particularly concerned about zoning in the City Park South neighborhood. Currently the neighborhood is filled with beautiful, historic Denver Square homes and is zoned for a maximum of 5 stories. While we have already lost a number of these homes, the neighborhood seems to have stabilized and so far has retained its special character. The Blueprint Denver plan, however, would raise zoning in this neighborhood to 8 stories. Not only would this provide a greater incentive to bulldoze these historic homes, but it would also block sunlight on the south side of City Park. City Park should not be trying to replicate New York's Central Park.</p> <p>We already have the Manhattanization of Cherry Creek, in which a nice walking district has turned into a series of cold, windy canyons. We don't need that same feeling in City Park South. In addition, as a parent of a child who is likely to go to East High, I am concerned about parking that is already too crowded in that neighborhood. Having much increased density right next to the school is likely to result in more pedestrian-vehicle accidents.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Please don't make our currently desirable neighborhood unbearable with more than the 5 stories in the planned building across the street from The Pinnacle at City Park South. We like it here, and certainly don't want MORE traffic, parking problems, and people than 5 stories across the street will already affect. The 8 stories in your plan will further ruin the neighborhood, change the feel that we like now, and be unfair to those of us who've been here for 10 years.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
When you combine the growth map, future places map, street maps, and neighborhood context maps for West Colfax, it is clear this area is being targeted for some future, transformative change. This is not necessarily bad, but more needs to be done to protect the character of the existing neighborhood for its existing, long standing residents. Our neighborhood is being targeted for alot of new developement, and alot of the developement is unwelcome by adjacent neighbors.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
From Stuart St. Till Zenobia St. From 17th Ave Till the Gully's is Denver's oldest Jewish Community. I was born here and my Father was a prominent Physician at St. Anthony Hospital. Our Jewish families need one family homes. We have two high schools in this community. Yeshiva Toras Chaim and Beth Jacob Girls High School. The boys school just built a multi million dollar dormitory. PLEASE do not choose our area as one of displacement and multi building dwellings. We cannot exist if this happens. You f Jewish families cannot live in apartments. We need to be able to grow our community. Please do not further zone these blocks for multi family dwellings. Thank you!!!	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
In the Plan, there is excellent discussion about promoting equal access, ensuring housing diversity, and driving growth around transit centers. Relative to the many ightrail stations in the city, residents of immediately surrounding area can only realize the benefits of these policy goals if the permitted land uses in the areas adjacent to the stations facilitate these objectives. Appropriate adjacent land use recommendations next to transit stations promote a more equitable distribution of diverse housing and employment options. In Villa Park, like many other historically underserved areas of the city, residents are dependent on transit and walking and should have access to diverse and higher intensity infill development near transit to help support equity and access to economic opportunity. Accordingly, in order to maximize the value of taxpayer dollars invested in this valuable transit infrastructure, and encourage better access and connection to and between all parts of the city, Denver should encourage medium-high intensity growth near every single one of the city's transit stations. Pursuing medium-high intensity growth, particularly near the Perrry and Knox stations, will increase ridership, thereby decreasing personal car use on an individual basis, which reduces traffic congestion and avoidable pollution. By allowing increased residential densities near stations, in creased ridership will also bolster the economics of the lightrail and either generate and/or free up budget dollars for other public needs.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Please reach out to the 120-year-old Orthodox Jewish community on W Colfax. This community built this part of the city (literally) and should not feel threatened by rapid change and inconsiderate development.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I live in a quiet single family neighborhood. The density being proposed is not appropriate for this setting.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The use of zoning and land use regulations to encourage higher-density, mixed-use development in transit-rich areas (Villa Park Perry and Knox lightrail stations). Incentivize or require the most efficient development of land, especially in areas with high transit connectivity. (Villa Park has high transit connectivity at the Perry and Knox lightrail stations and should require efficient development not medium-low intensity).	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The idea that density should be targeted in specific areas of the city that have infrastructure that can handle this type of density is smart. My concern is that the areas where the city is allowing for density seems extremely limited. I believe the City needs to go back to the mapping exercise and find more areas of town that can be considered for density, especially high-rise residential buildings that will allow for affordable and mixed rate housing.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I am generally satisfied with the material in Chapter 3. However, I believe that at a minimum we should have medium-high intensity development near ALL transit stations, including Perry station. This is consistent with the recommendations in Chapter 3 and is a good urban design principle but is not executed in the Growth Strategy Map. There should not be low-medium intensity residential development near any lightrail station including the Perry and Knox lightrail stations.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I am so opposed to the improper identification of the future land use of the Park Hill Golf Course as low- medium residential/"Urban Edge" instead of as OS - B (Open Space - Recreation) that I cannot "like" anything in chapter 5's section on neighborhoods because it appears that anything that might be "likable" is merely a smokescreen to obscure the City's intent to take away the open space of the PHGC. This intent to remove & replace open space/recreational use is especially shocking and objectionable given the protection of the 1997 perpetual open space conservation easement purchased from the Clayton Trust by the City of Denver in 1997.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Park Hill Golf Course is NOT Urban Edge. It's protected Open Space (OS-B)	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The PHGC land is improperly identified as a low-medium residential area and as Urban Edge. In 1997 a conservation easement was purchased for \$2 million which was too protect this land as open space .	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>I would change the Places Map. Villa Park has historically been under-served. With little housing diversity, few community centers and less access/connection to the City. RTD's FasTracks system has touched our community with two lightrail stations (Perry and Knox stations). But those stations can only provide opportunity if the adjacent land-uses support them. Denver shall encourage MEDIUM-HIGH INTENSITY growth at ALL transit stations. Instead of the existing Two-unit zoning next to the Perry and Knox lightrail station, Blueprint Denver shall encourage MEDIUM-HIGH INTENSITY growth. I would change the Neighborhood Contexts Map. The dividing line between Urban and Urban edge between Villa Park and West Colfax neighborhoods do not seem to take into account the radial land-use considerations that encourage transit oriented development. For example, why is higher intensity development encouraged on the West Colfax side of the Perry lightrail station but not on the Villa park side of the station? There should be another category that encouraged medium-high intensity development near ALL lightrail stations.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Statement Regarding the Treatment of the Park Hill Golf Course Land in the Draft Blueprint Denver Document The draft Blueprint Denver document improperly identifies the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course land variously as a "low-medium residential area" and "Urban Edge" land. The "Places" map on pages 126-127 improperly identifies the land as a "low-medium residential area." The "Neighborhood Contexts" map on pages 148-149 and the "Urban Edge" map on pages 190-191 improperly identify the land as "Urban Edge." The definition "low-medium residential area" obviously is a residential land use characterization and the definition "Urban Edge" is a mixed residential and commercial land use characterization. This treatment of the Park Hill Golf Course land is improper for several reasons including the following: The Park Hill Golf Course Land Is Protected by a Perpetual Open Space Conservation Easement The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust ("Clayton") in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is "to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space...." Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the Park Hill Golf Course land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton's earlier decision to terminate it--Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the Park Hill Golf Course land "as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public...." The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at Reception No. 2000175267. Currently Operated as a Golf Course, the Park Hill Golf Course Land Is Zoned OS-B (Open Space-Recreation) The Park Hill Golf Course land is zoned OS-B (Open Space-Recreation). The land is currently leased to a private golf course operator that recently exercised its option to renew its lease for five years through December 31, 2023. The operator has an option to renew its lease for an additional five years through December 31, 2028. The Draft Blueprint Denver Classifications for the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conflict with the Draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the Draft Game Plan for a Healthy City and Denver's Critical Need to Protect and Expand Open Space and Parks Characterization of the Park Hill Golf Course land variously as a "low-medium residential area" and "Urban Edge" land diametrically conflicts with the draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the draft Game Plan for a Healthy City which thoroughly and powerfully document Denver's critical need to protect and expand open space and parks: • As Mayor Hancock stated on October 3, 2017, "(i)n a city nearing 700,000 people it's never been more important to protect, preserve and grow our parks and recreational opportunities." • "Rapid climate change...is an increasing problem for our city.... Without significant action, our city could experience infrastructure damage, drought and constrained water supply, reduced tree canopy,</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Not to make West colfax into a community corridor- but keep it a local one</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Portions of W Colfax are part of a heavily-invested, long-established mixed-class community of broad ages and stages. Homes are mostly low-density single or duplex. They're owned, well-cared for and often passed from generation to generation. Previous change and added changing to increase the density in parts of this neighborhood appear to threaten this thriving community and must be more carefully considered on a block by block basis.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I would really increase density even more in the Lower Highland neighborhood. LOHI is effectively now in the Downtown footprint and increasing density has made it one the most energized and satisfying neighborhoods. The High-Medium density designation seems to be the correct choice.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>We are very unhappy that our neighborhood has been separated out from the rest of the city for very "high density" housing. In addition, there is insufficient parking for the number of units that exist even now. Builders are not providing adequate parking spaces for the number of tenants they have. Biking has become extremely dangerous because of the number of cars parked on the street, one cannot see oncoming cross traffic, but also due to the additional traffic on those streets.. There is inadequate space for dedicated bus lanes on West Colfax. Streets are very narrow, and with cars parked on either side, there is not sufficient space for two cars moving in opposite directions, to pass. Because of lack of parking space, residents have found their driveways blocked by someone parking in that space.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Restore the OS - B open space/recreation designation immediately; then return to the public with an expanded comment period for the rest of Chapter 5.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Increase density along current and future transit corridors.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
My previous comments were submitted & then my survey was abruptly ended at the point of comment on pages 126-127 when I was dragging the icon to the Park Hill Golf Course and before I had commented. I am outraged that the Open Space Conservation Easement purchased in 1997 from the Clayton Trust has been completely ignored & anything else in Chapter 5 is just a smokescreen obscuring the proposed replacement of the PHGC land. The PHGC land needs the proper designation of OS - B. Then the rest of the neighborhoods section (s) should be resubmitted to the public for an extended comment period.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I'm disappointed that southwest Denver remains a somewhat ignored part of the city. I would have liked my neighborhood to be classified as urban edge. Unfortunately it remains suburban, low density, and car dependent.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
I am concerned that some of the areas in the General Urban context are not mapped correctly - there seems to be limited area that allows for heights above 12 stories with much of the context mapped as local or community center or low-medium to high-medium residential. These designations limit the ability to build higher buildings that will allow for more density and help make residential housing more affordable.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
The Park Hill Golf Course is marked as low-medium residential. Incorrect!!! Protected Open Space (OS-B) Don't put housing (and I know we need affordable housing) on this protected open space land.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
Pages 222-224 defines the area of the SLOANS project (17th to Colfax, Perry to Stuart) as General Urban Place, and then defines it as Place=Center, Community. This definition defines height as 5-8. One block here is currently zoned for 12 and thus seems it should be revised to be not Place=Center, Community but rather Residential=High for this block. It also took 4 reads to make heads or tails of how all the different categories are supposed to nest together. Seems as if the focus was on making the document visually appealing with all the imagery rather than making it user friendly and something that can be read and quickly understood by anyone who hasn't been deeply involved in its writing.	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>The draft Blueprint Denver document improperly identifies the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course land variously as a “low-medium residential area” and “Urban Edge” land. The “Places” map on pages 126-127 improperly identifies the land as a “low-medium residential area.” The “Neighborhood Contexts” map on pages 148-149 and the “Urban Edge” map on pages 190-191 improperly identify the land as “Urban Edge.” The definition “low- medium residential area” obviously is a residential land use characterization and the definition “Urban Edge” is a mixed residential and commercial land use characterization.</p> <p>This treatment of the Park Hill Golf Course land is improper for several reasons including the following: The Park Hill Golf Course Land Is Protected by a Perpetual Open Space Conservation Easement The Park Hill Golf Course land is protected by the perpetual open space conservation easement that the city purchased on November 4, 1997 from the George W. Clayton Trust (“Clayton”) in exchange for \$2 million. The stated purpose of the open space conservation easement is “to vest a real property interest in (the city) that provides for the conservation of the Golf Course Land as open space....” Therefore, Clayton in perpetuity relinquished its right to develop the Park Hill Golf Course land in exchange for this \$2 million payment. The open space conservation easement was recorded at Reception No. 9700159758. Although the open space conservation easement was subsequently released in accordance with the agency agreement entered into between the city and Clayton on October 13, 2000, the agency agreement provides that--upon its termination either on October 13, 2099 or upon Clayton’s earlier decision to terminate it—Clayton is obligated to re-grant the open space conservation easement to the city. Under the terms of the agency agreement, Clayton holds title to the Park Hill Golf Course land “as agent of the City, to hold for the benefit of the citizens of the City and the general public....” The agency agreement was recorded on December 1, 2000 at reception No. 2000175267. Currently Operated as a Golf Course, the Park Hill Golf Course Land Is Zoned OS-B (Open Space-Recreation) The Park Hill Golf Course land is zoned OS-B (Open Space-Recreation). The land is currently leased to a private golf course operator that recently exercised its option to renew its lease for five years through December 31, 2023. The operator has an option to renew its lease for an additional five years through December 31, 2028. The Draft Blueprint Denver Classifications for the Park Hill Golf Course Land Conflict with the Draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the Draft Game Plan for a Healthy City and Denver’s Critical Need to Protect and Expand Open Space and Parks Characterization of the Park Hill Golf Course land variously as a “low-medium residential area” and “Urban Edge” land diametrically conflicts with the draft Comprehensive Plan 2040 and the draft Game Plan for a Healthy City which thoroughly and powerfully document Denver’s critical need to protect and expand open space and parks: • As Mayor Hancock stated on October 3, 2017, “(i)n a city nearing 700,000 people it’s never been more important to protect, preserve and grow our parks and recreational opportunities.” • “Rapid climate change...is an increasing problem for our city.... Without significant action, our city could experience infrastructure damage, drought and constrained water supply, reduced tree canopy, large power outages during hot summer months, lower air quality and higher rates of asthma, and loss of water quality and aquatic life.” (Comprehensive Plan, 51) • The environment is changing. “Environmental issues of climate change in Denver are complex and multifaceted, from too much heat to too little water in some areas, and too much water in others. Today, the Denver region is experiencing an increase in temperatures, more storms with flooding, and longer periods of drought. Future summers are predicted to be hotter, with an average high of 96 degrees—more like summers in far south Texas today.” (Game Plan, page 26)</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Please consider my remarks about Park Hill Golf Course.</p> <p>I gather there's some consideration of busses on Montview Boulevard through Park Hill. With so many pedestrians, schools, churches, bicycles, that would be a huge mistake.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>As an adjacent property owner, I object to any change to the density, height, or use characterization in the East Central plan and the Blueprint Denver plan which would encourage construction of a building higher than the currently allowed 5 stories on the block bordered by 16th Avenue, 17th Avenue, Fillmore, and Detroit." Set back from East High, 5 stories IS the change; already we have parking problems from East High, the park, and existing density; City Park South is an island with hard edges and no place for traffic or parking to disperse, & blocking views of property owners who bought with the existing zoning in place is unjust. x 65</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I would recommend considering, allowing and encouraging greater density and height of development, especially housing and neighborhood amenities, local employment throughout Denver's neighborhoods, but especially all those closer to downtown, those already or easily served by transit.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>looks like the same blueprint from 20 years ago...growth mainly along corridors? what about new nodes?</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>More emphasis on growth around transit stations is a must. I see many transit stations noted surrounded by the "all other areas of the city designation." We really need to be focusing jobs and housing along our existing transit infrastructure.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>This document talks a lot about how this plan was developed with input from the community. However, I have been to all 3 RNOs in my neighborhood, and not one of them has been involved in any of the task force groups. Our neighborhood is currently being by a large amount of properties being scraped and replaced with high density units. When I talk to neighbors, they do not like this, and feel it is being thrust upon the neighborhood. When you couple that with the fact that the neighborhood, through our RNOs, have not had much input into this draft, it seems like this plan does not really take into account the feelings of our neighborhood. Blueprint Denver used to have more specific language in it about guidelines for development adjacent to areas of stability. I liked how it recommended specifically, that development adjacent to these areas should respect the "privacy, light, air, etc...." of adjacent properties. I see that is missing from this plan. At the Denveright community meeting, the planners talked about how "Transitions" were important, and I think this plan needs to have some more specific mandates that prevent insensitive transitions from occurring. The St. Anthony's / EFG development was very contentious for our neighborhood, and most are still bitter that such a large / out of context building was allowed next to the lake, in contradiction to what the neighborhood plan had recommended (keeping density and height closer to Colfax). Now there is an attempt to put an even taller building at 17th and Newton, which is also facing wide spread opposition from the neighborhood. There are also plans to try and rezone along N. Sheridan and put 5+ story buildings next to the single story homes along Zenobia between 16th and 17th, that is facing unanimous neighborhood opposition. This neighborhood has already been burdened by the high number of dense apartments being built along Colfax, and I think it makes sense to build them there, but what does not make sense is to start creeping that development into the low intensity residential neighborhood near the lake.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>As an adjacent property owner, I object to any change to the density, height, or use characterization in the East Central plan and the Blueprint Denver plan which would encourage construction of a building higher than the currently allowed 5 stories on the block bordered by 16th Avenue, 17th Avenue, Fillmore, and Detroit."</p> <p>Set back from East High, 5 stories IS the change; already we have parking problems from East High, the park, and existing density; City Park South is an island with hard edges and no place for traffic or parking to disperse, & blocking views of property owners who bought with the existing zoning in place is unjust.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PHGC land is improperly identified variously as a "low-medium residential area" and as "Urban Edge." 2. PHGC is now zoned OS-B (Open Space Recreation) and 3. Denver taxpayers paid \$2,000,000 in 1997 for an Open Space Conservation Easement until 2099 	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>I believe increased development should be allowed and encouraged in all neighborhoods near the urban center, not just small areas.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Some higher density residential areas and local corridors near some transit stations needed.</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>Amplify density in places like Bear Valley</p>	Places Mapping	On-line Survey
<p>The Manufacturing Districts Map on pages 270-271 is conspicuously missing the great potential that DEN has for developing industrial uses in the collateral lands of the airport, not only in the proximity to Pena Boulevard, but also in the lands north, east and west of the runways. This is an important aspect particularly since BNSF Brush Subdivision line is only 5 miles to the west of these collateral lands.</p>	Places Mapping	Planning Board
<p>9. Sections 05 and 06 carry the lessons learned from the previous plan and successfully ties with the zoning code. The Places Map in pages 126-127 is an excellent tool, but as mentioned in comment 3, above, the map is more descriptive than aspirational. Neighborhoods like Globeville, Virginia Village and Platt Park, for instance may have greater intensities in an aspirational map.</p>	Places Mapping	Planning Board

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Likewise, the Neighborhood Contexts Map on pages 147-148 shows some neighborhoods as urban edge context, which have all the characteristics of urban context, including lot size, building forms and density, except for walkways in most cases. These neighborhoods, which at some point were at the fringe of urban development, including Villa Park, parts of Park Hill and East Colfax, are now very much urban context neighborhoods. This comment also applies to the Urban Edge Map on pages 191-191.	Places Mapping	Planning Board
6 Growth Strategy Map (page 30) is an improvement from the previous plan. However, it leaves some areas of growth with ambiguous designations. For instance, the map shows areas around transit stations (West and Southeast lines) and certain arterial corridors (Colorado, Quebec and Sheridan) with their current characteristics and not necessarily with their potential to consolidate as community centers.	Places Mapping	Planning Board
mapping of S. Holly site doesn't seem right. Doesn't capture all of the commercial	Places Mapping	Planning Board
Blueprint Denver should set the stage for what makes a complete neighborhood and part of that should include house types and affordability	Places Mapping	Task Force
What about when growth doesn't actually occur where it's mapped?	Places Mapping	Task Force
Maps are relying too much on old guidance and old development patterns in places where there isn't a small area plan yet.	Places Mapping	Task Force
More opportunity within Places Map for visualization of mixture of housing types. Does the density or transit come first?	Places Mapping	Task Force
Add a strategy about public restrooms/daily needs to policy 10 for QOL. something like "Promote equitable access to daily needs, including public restrooms and shelter"	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	City Council
Acknowledge in implementation that focus is on healthy food that is accessible and attainable. Mobile produce markets are key in implementation. Accessible and culturally appropriate support.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Equity training
#2 Q of L Some neighborhoods cannot afford to mitigate tree displacement. Who decides which hoods need trees over additional housing units? Who makes the decision on tradeoffs? when conflict occurs in policy guidance, prioritize the biggest need. Where is burden being placed? what are we requiring and what is incentivized?	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Equity training
QL #2 Strategy d - add incentive after require see game plan page 146. Maybe reference Game Plan goal of 20% tree canopy	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Equity training
Affordable food options close by would make it easier to make healthy choices	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Focus Group
Incentivizing employers to take a proactive approach to health would go a long way in creating a healthy city	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Focus Group
More housing options for the homeless would free up parks for others to use	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Focus Group
QOLI Infrastructure intro, p.88: Shouldn't quality of life infrastructure include water? Streams, river, floodplains, etc.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
QOLI Infrastructure intro, p.88: What does it mean to include and recognize?	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
QOLI Policy 3 Background: replace urban water system with our urban waterways	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
P 90 Green infrastructure call out: Nitpicky, I know...but we only have 1 river (not rivers).	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
QOLI Policy 3 strategy E: increased urbanization and channelization	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
Pg.92 Impervious Surfaces call out suggested edit for first paragraph: As Denver continues to develop, impervious surfaces- which are hard surfaces such as roads, rooftops, and parking lots that repel water- continue to cover more and of the city's land area. This creates challenges to managing both the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. Additionally, impervious surfaces lead to urban heat islands which results in hotter temperatures in city neighborhoods. Impervious surfaces can also have negative effects on design quality, since paved surfaces are less inviting and attractive than areas with plants and trees. Currently, about 45% of the city's land area is covered by impervious surfaces. This percentage is projected to significantly increase in future years based on current development and redevelopment patterns.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
Page 40: Feels like overall water is missing in quality of life infrastructure throughout document. This should include enhancing between/to waterways as well as making space for water in design of our centers, corridors, etc.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Suggested edit to Water&Climate/QOLI on page 40: Increasing and promoting a network of parks and open spaces reduces greenhouse gases and cools our city. Smaller scale green infrastructure-including trees, green roofs, rain gardens, and bioswales-filters stormwater and promotes.....(rest of existing sentence).	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
P 90 Green infrastructure call out: Suggested edit/kind of confusing as is - Green infrastructure commonly refers to a method to treat stormwater runoff that protects, restores and mimics the hydrologic cycle. Green infrastructure comes in a variety of scales and uses vegetation, soils, roots, and other natural processes to slow and filter stormwater runoff. On a large-scale, green infrastructure refers to a network of parks, open spaces, drainageways and floodplains that help mitigate the impacts caused by impervious (hard) surfaces. On a smaller-scale, green infrastructure refers to structural, engineered practices, such as stormwater planters and green alleys, designed to mimic these larger systems.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
change requested related to wording in QOLI Policy 3 Strategy A to deleting “strategic stormwater plan” and changing to “multi-disciplinary water plan”.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
Remove "Infrastructure" from Quality-of-Life topic so that it includes softer things like social services and education	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Internal
Require all private development along designated Parkways to conform to landscape standards for vegetation, including street trees - especially the tree canopy - and vegetative ground	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
When discussing quality of life infrastructure include civic and institutional buildings (schools, sacred spaces, libraries, rec centers) which serve as focal points, landmarks, or organizing features for neighborhoods (pg. 88).	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
P90 - 01A and B– do we really want all developers to provide park space? Especially since Denver voters just passed a major tax increase to fund new parks? Also, consider tying to incentives such as density bonuses or relaxing build-to requirements.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
P 90 -02B – add incentives to plant trees.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
P94 -07 – add complete network by looking at opportunities to convert street to greenways for ecosystem and trail connecting.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Quality of Life p. 90 (24) #1 prioritize parks in areas with lower resident to park ratio 25) #2 identify or implement a fund for low-income homeowners, b/c critical repairs do not always include the budget for many trees 26) #5 why not recommendations for removing or consolidating curbcuts? 27) Why not give allowances (incentives) for owners to get benefits for removing curbcuts (residential or commercial)	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
For the plan’s recommendation for “Quality of life Infrastructure” it states Develop tools to improve access to healthy foods to support community health outcomes but does not mention literacy around why to eat healthy and programs/classes that educate the community on healthy eating options (page 49).	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The plans should explicitly incorporate principles of environmental protection and sustainability.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Require landscaping for all parking lots - including surface lots existing prior to Denveright. Use state-of-the -art water conserving landscaping, with trees to reduce heat island effects	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Restore and extend the tree canopy in all historic districts, as well as in all older and newer neighborhoods	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Regarding the reconstruction of Parkways that are part of the City's designated parkway system - do not allow the compromised or damaged condition today define that they have been lost. Rather commit to full rehabilitation according to historic plans	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Commit to expand Denver's parks commensurate with population growth. (Denver's standing with its once legacy park system has fallen in rankings among cities.) Parks and open space should also be expanded in close proximity to areas that are densifying	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The plans should stress the importance of tree planting and maintenance to the health and beauty of all neighborhoods; existing and new parking lots should be planted with trees.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The plans should stress the importance of tree planting and maintenance to the health and beauty of all neighborhoods; existing and new parking lots should be planted with trees.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The plans should commit to preserve, maintain, and expand Denver’s parks commensurate with population growth, particularly in areas that are densifying. Such expansion should be distributed equitably around the city.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Proposals involving the sale of any park properties, including but not limited to nationally and locally designated historic park sites, as well as mountain park sites, shall require a vote of the people with a mandatory 60 percent approval requirement	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The Quality of Life Infrastructure recommendations include protecting Denver's tree canopy. Regis University is an accredited arboretum, so we fully support this goal.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	letter
The plan supports access to healthy foods. We have worked for four years on a project called Cultivate Health that included a goal to improve access to healthy foods. The City's Food Policy network has made good strides in providing a complete food environment. However, there likely will need to be incentives or financial support to bring grocery stores to neighborhoods such as ours.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	letter
Landscaping standards promoting water-wise would be a good enhancement	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
Denver has great parks but some seem under-designed or under-utilized. We support maximizing existing parks as well as providing new parks in areas without equal access to parks.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
We agree our trees are very valuable and too many are lost to development, consider ways to preserve.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
We support promotion of environmentally-friendly development strategies including increasing impervious surfaces, water-wise landscaping. Consider regulations and also connect public and private developers to resources that can guide this.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
The Cherry Creek Trail and the Highline Canal are valuable resources to Cook Park. We support enhancing trails as it relates to plants, maintenance, safety, etc. and think this item could use some further specifics. Trail-oriented development is noted but not clear in intent.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
On page 90 we are in agreement that protecting our tree canopy is very important.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
15. Pg. 90 -93 - More 'Pocket Parks', require stormwater reduced run-off quantity and increased run-off quality. Green Zoning and Building Codes. Parks as a living machine that provide stormwater control; clean the air, open space, mature trees and opportunities for recreation and relaxation. Incorporate pocket parks within transit corridors to make for a healthier commute ☐	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
16. Pg. 94 and 95 – Example – turn Hale Parkway into a greenbelt – no longer for automobiles, but for pedestrians and cyclists and for stormwater quantity and quality control. Look for similar opportunities throughout the City. ☐	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Letter
A plan was laid out but some notable deficiencies are that it says nothing about an objective of having x amount of park space per capita, yet serious growth is expected to continue. It also does not say what is being done to increase public transportation or that it is a clear objective. Walking and biking in a four season climate doesn't solve it for all but a small percentage.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
There is mention of promoting water-wise irrigation and landscaping, but some context would be helpful to explain why: ie. statistics on summer water use and how much of that is from outdoor landscaping. For example, "70% of water use in summer months is from outdoor landscaping. By encouraging low water use plants in new development we can save water and reduce risk of drought." Also in addition to encouraging/incentivizing low water use landscaping, will you incentivize sod removal?	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
You are encouraging people to build on their green space on their lots. Adding more density. I thought the whole point of this DenverRight was to adopt more green space, for example people voted for the green roofs cause we want more green space. You need to stop punishing the neighborhoods my adding more congestions. You need to stop approving all these 3 floor apartments and build more hi-rises in the proper neighborhoods that can handle the high occuppency.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
page 90: 02: protecting the tree canopy is very important. More trees in denver the better from my perspective.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
page 90 05: agree with. Comcast should not be able to install these cell phone towers in our right aways and treat the beautiful tree lined streets and dumping grounds for infrastructure.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
Also, the quality of life infrastructure is particularly weak. You really should consider flipping this chapter, and your thinking, and building the city from quality of life outward. These are really the things that should inform "built-form" which is a biproduct of society.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
In the aspect of community centers and parks , the only thing I would add is a focus on providing substantial improvements and/or new construction incorporating pools for the neighborhoods to use year round. Swimming capabilities are so important and there is a significant struggle finding clean and operable public pool spaces in some of the neighborhoods. This was obviously incorporated into the plans of neighborhoods like Stapleton but neighborhoods for instance in Northwest Denver are really struggling to find pools and many of the Denver residents end up joining private swim clubs outside of Denver to get access. This would be huge for the city and paving the way for accessibility to swim lessons for families all over Denver.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
I would like it to go further by representing the great importance of public spaces in making any city supply highly memorable experiences for visitors and residents alike. Interactive spaces even of a very small size for art, or performance, or food carts, and many more notions, are so important.	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	On-line Survey
Need more language about increase of civic locations within neighborhoods as we increase in population	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Task Force
Language about parkway system should be open ended because it is an evolving system	Quality-of-Life Infrastructure	Task Force
I would like to add that the trend is also for more residential development. For example, there are currently ten residential units under construction at 542 N Kalamath, and there are others. I live on Kalamath between 4th and 5th, as do other residents, so I am aware of this trend and I think the City should encourage it	Street Types	Email
The Golden Triangle Urban Design Committee unanimously recommended that the Blueprint Denver Plan be updated to change 12th ave. from Speer Blvd to Lincoln St and Cherokee St. from Colfax to Speer Blvd from a Collector Street to Local streets. Both streets are parallel to another collector street one block away (12th is paralleled by 11th, and Cherokee by Bannock). These streets both end at Speer Boulevard and do not serve as connecting streets to the west. Both Bannock and 11th do connect to bridges across Cherry Creek to the west and are therefore better Collector Streets. See map excerpt.	Street Types	Email
Residential Arterial and Collector speed is greater than Mixed Use and main Street Arterial? Should be less.	Street Types	Internal
QC the entire street type map	Street Types	Internal
p.200 "and/or stormwater planters"	Street Types	Internal
Once we have finished renderings with green infrastructure for street types, maybe we can work on language a bit.	Street Types	Internal
add to street type variables descriptions - allocation of space, street width, mixing of modes pg 144-145	Street Types	Letter
North Federal Boulevard is considered part of the City parkway and boulevard system. The safe streets section should include preservation of these design elements that contribute to safety as well as visual appeal. We would like to see funds allocated for parkway improvements on North Federal Boulevard from I-70 north to the City/County border.	Street Types	letter
On page 143 and 213 there needs to be specific design recommendations for residential arterials that ensure the safety of the residents and their children living along those streets. Can you add more design requirements that would help improve the safety of the pedestrian?	Street Types	Letter
Green Valley Ranch Boulevard is a four-lane arterial from Tower Road to Chambers and should be reflected as a commercial arterial.	Street Types	Letter
56th Avenue is planned to be expanded to a six-lane arterial and should be reflected on the map.	Street Types	Letter
64th Avenue should be shown as an important arterial.	Street Types	Letter
Airport Road which runs parallel to Pena Boulevard should be shown as a commercial collector from the Aurora boundary to Green Valley Ranch Blvd./48th Ave.	Street Types	Letter
Bolling Lane should be shown as a residential collector.	Street Types	Letter
Telluride St./Salida running from 56th Avenue to the Aurora boundary should be shown as a commercial collector recognizing this important connection to the 40th Avenue transit station.	Street Types	Letter
Street Types: Residential Arterial Speed (page 145).On the scale of acceptable speeds by street typology shown on page 145, "residential arterial" streets are planned to allow the higher end of acceptable speeds. Streets that are primarily residential should not have high-speed traffic whether they are arterials or collectors. It makes no sense to say that people should be traveling at slower speeds on Downtown streets than on streets where people live and raise their families. The tendency to allow residential arterial streets to have high speeds has driven many families to move toward living in suburban communities where there is little connectivity but they believe their children will be safe on streets with slower traffic. This model leads to greater congestion and contributes to the loss of families from center city neighborhoods. Primarily residential arterial streets should have no greater speed than Downtown arterials if we are to expect families to feel safe raising their children on these streets which is essential for the future health of our city.	Street Types	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Chapter 5 - Street Types Maps. The side note on the Street Types Map at Page 138 indicates that the street type for one particular corridor is not always the same for the entire length of the street, because the land use character may change through the corridor. We concur, and this is the case as it relates to E. Louisiana Avenue where the maps reflect a jog between E. Mississippi and E. Louisiana. Louisiana Avenue from S. Emerson Street to S. University Blvd. comprises exclusively single-family homes, with the exception of South High School and Washington Park. Appropriate designation of this segment of E. Louisiana is important to us. The Louisiana-Pearl Station Area plan and Greenprint Denver both designate E. Louisiana Avenue for primary use by pedestrians and bicycles. E. Louisiana Avenue borders the south end of Washington Park and is a major access route to the Park used extensively by residents in the Washington Park area, Platt Park, and Cory-Merrill neighborhoods. Additionally, this segment of Louisiana Avenue serves as the footpath for students to walk to South High from their homes and/or the light rail station. Access from alleys to Louisiana Avenue also is important to residents (many park automobiles in garages here) and to service providers (e.g., trash, compost and recycling pickup). This is possible with pedestrian, bicycle and existing bus traffic but would be impeded by bus rapid transit or more frequent bus service along this street. Please change the references for the segments of E. Louisiana Avenue east of S. Emerson Street on the maps contained on Pages 162 and 166 from "multi-modal" to "pedestrian" and "bicycles".</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: West 32nd Avenue has four different street types between Highland Park and Zuni Street. -West 32nd Avenue has four different street type designations from Highland Park to Highland Gateway Park. We believe that a single street type would bring consistency to the public realm throughout our neighborhood. Given the numerous residences, multi-family residential buildings, and mixed use buildings (ground floor commercial, upper floors residential), we believe the Residential Collector designation would be the most appropriate, as it maintains tree lawns at residential uses. We request that a single designation of Residential Collector be shown on the map for the entire length of West 32nd Avenue in Highland. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: Zuni Street and West 29th Avenue have multiple street types shown and in some areas the map doesn't recognize the primarily residential uses in existence. -Zuni Street and West 29th Avenue have multiple street types shown and in some areas the map doesn't recognize the primarily residential uses in existence. We agree that both streets function as Arterials, due to the amount of through-traffic from other neighborhood funneling through Highland connecting the Downtown and I-25. However, we believe the Residential Arterial designation fits better with the primarily residential nature of these streets. We request that the Residential Arterial designation be shown on the map for the entire length of these streets in Highland. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: Tejon Street is shown as a Mixed-Use Street Type; it is a primarily Residential street north of 32nd Avenue. -Tejon Street is a primarily residential street north of West 32nd Avenue, so we believe that the designation should be changed to Residential Collector. This will preserve the ROW streetscape of tree lawns at residential properties. We request that the Residential Collector designation be shown on the map between 32nd Avenue and 38th Avenue. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: Umatilla Street is shown as a Mixed-Use Arterial between 29th Avenue and 31st Avenue; it is a narrow residential street and does not serve as a Collector, not to mention an Arterial. -Umatilla Street is a narrow local street serving primarily residential uses. It is neither a Collector nor an Arterial street. We request that the map be changed from Mixed-use Arterial to Local Street. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: 16th Street between Central and Boulder Streets is not shown with any designation beyond local street. It clearly acts as a Mixed-Use Collector, continuing from the south end of Tejon Street and connecting to Central Street, another Mixed-Use Collector. We request that the map be changed from Local to Mixed-Use Collector. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types Map: The trio of Pecos, Osage, and Navajo Streets, which work together at a local level while connecting through traffic between 38th Avenue and 20th Street, are shown incorrectly. Pecos serves as a Residential Collector. Osage is narrower, and serves as a local street north of 33rd Avenue. Navajo also serves as a Residential Collector. We request that the map be changed to show Pecos and Navajo as Residential Collectors and to show Osage as a local street north of 33rd Avenue. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>STREET TYPES: Morrison Road can be most efficiently utilized when defined by the Denver Street Typology as a Main Street Collector. A Main Street Collector best represents the desire of the community and businesses to have a pedestrian first street, deterring high vehicle traffic and closing curb cuts where possible. By this classification, the desired achievements of street activation, improved safety, and showcased culture can be obtained.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street Types - Thank you for including Street Types in Blueprint Denver! This is long awaited and much needed policy.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Page 142 and 143 – Street Types. The Local and Residential Street illustrations show streets that are much wider than existing or desired streets of these types. Please consider showing much narrower streets for these typologies.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>The recommendations support streetscaping and placemaking along city streets. We want to work closely with the City when we begin construction on our master plan goals with a footprint along Federal Boulevard.</p>	Street Types	letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
We strongly support the three top-level community themes of equity, urban design and water and climate. These themes are consistent with the values we have established as a neighborhood. In a recent survey we completed, these three themes were highly voiced by neighbors.	Street Types	letter
In the Streets Types map, the designation of all of Fox Street north of 38th Avenue as Main Street Collector seems to contradict the adopted zoning for much of the land along that street. The Mixed-Use Collector designation better fits the existing and proposed future zoning for most of that street. Mixed-Use Collector is a better functional equivalent for such an important road and the need for the transit options to fully leverage the significant public investment in the 41 st and Fox RTD station.	Street Types	Letter
Additionally, transit connectivity to the east of 1-25 over 44th Avenue as a Residential Collector does not fit the plan guidance for the large portion of that area that is designated as Urban Center (Community) along a commuter rail transit corridor. That land use designation is not achievable without fuller implementation of transportation options, which, again, are better served by the Mixed-Use Collector designation.	Street Types	Letter
Pg 138 - Is the plan flexible between collector and arterial streets in the downtown street type? As shown most streets are designated as arterial. Using this methodology, there may be streets that are more appropriate for collectors, but this is likely to be an outcome of the Denver Moves Downtown process.	Street Types	Letter
Monaco feels like a busier street than Holly and seems that it would be designated differently.	Street Types	Letter
STREET TYPES MAP:Street Types—There are too many street types shown in Highland.-In general, this map shows a wide variety of street types that don't capture a consistent approach to the public realm. It also assigns incorrect designations to several streets. Our goal is to create a consistent public realm that aligns with the predominant characteristics that make Highland a desirable place to live and visit. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP and specific descriptions of street types requiring modifications that follow:	Street Types	Letter
Street Types Map:Street Types do not include Parkways. Two of Highland's boundaries are Parkways.-Federal Boulevard and Speer Boulevard are the west and south boundaries of the Highland Neighborhood. They are shown on the map as Commercial Arterial, Residential Arterial, and Mixed-Use Arterial, depending on location. Since each street type has different Public Realm designs, we believe that a consistent approach is needed for both designated Parkways, and that the Parkway designation deserves its own category to align with City requirements. Our request is to change this map to add a Parkway street type along with appropriate design criteria. SEE HUNI STREET TYPES MAP.	Street Types	Letter
5. On Page 139 we're requesting that W 14th Ave maintain its status and not be designated as a collector street. This is of vital importance for the safety of our children. The corridor use has always been focused along Colfax so the local residential neighborhood is less impacted by activity along Colfax.	Street Types	Letter
31)Eipan Street Type: Make a collector no arterial; walkers and bikers need access to the Platte River and Alameda.	Street Types	Letter
Chapter 5: On page 134 and 139 we would like a mention of converting 1 ways back to 2 ways. Congress Park gets the brunt of a lot of the "residential arterials" running through the neighborhood and it is especially out of context when surrounded by single family homes. 8th, 6th, 14th, and 13th are designed to move cars fast to the detriment of the neighborhood and the safety of its residents. These streets will continue to create safety issues for our residents if not addressed soon.	Street Types	Letter
Pedestrian safety and walkability is critically important to Congress Park. Given the unbalanced amount of arterial streets dividing our neighborhood there needs to be priority given to design treatments on residential arterials.	Street Types	Letter
STREET TYPES MAP: We request that planners revisit the designation of Lowry Blvd. as Mixed Use Arterial. Alameda is a large thoroughfare from Aurora into Denver and carries far more cars/hour than Lowry Blvd. It does not abruptly end at Monaco as Lowry Blvd. will do when work is complete. East of Quebec St., the speed limit on Alameda is 40 mph, and west of Quebec it is 35 mph. Despite its role in is labelled Residential Arterial. Lowry Blvd, however, narrows at Quebec when it goes through Boulevard One, and includes residential in many segments, including the townhomes in Boulevard One west of Quebec, the Park Place/Village I & II areas mentioned above just east of Quebec, as well as the Colorado Trust homes, the Renaissance, and Legends east of Yosemite. Speed limit is 35 mph but slows to 15 mph at three traffic circles.	Street Types	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>3. Inconsistency in street character and designation.</p> <p>A. An identity problem: When overlaying all the maps that affect East Evans Avenue in University Park, there are significant conflicts of use and type which I believe will result in more and possibly fatal injuries. East Evans Avenue is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -zoned E and U, defined as a high degree of walkability, bikeability and good access to transit or a bit less. (Neighborhood Context Map, page 147) -an Arterial Residential Street. Speeds can be in the middle between low and high, no speed numbers quantified on graph. (Graph, Page 144. "Lower speeds are appropriate in certain neighborhood contexts and on collector streets, especially in highvolume pedestrian areas.") -quickly changing modes. It is a Main Street Arterial from Downing to High Street, then a Residential Arterial Street from High Street to Colorado Blvd then becomes a Mixed Use Arterial right at Colorado Blvd. (Street Types, pg. 139) -Pedestrian Enhanced near the parks and S. Saint Paul Street but not UP Elementary. (Pedestrian Enhanced Map, Pg. 155) -designated a high injury/accident street. <p>When thinking about the flow of traffic and a driver's mental planning, it is important to clearly indicate the change of context in a residential street by design, speed limits, strong controls on speed limits and "feel" of entering a low speed, residential area. Otherwise, the street type designations become confusing and dangerous to residents, pedestrians and cyclists. I am extremely concerned about this falling through the cracks in implementation.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>B. East Iliff Avenue is a Residential Collector except where East Iliff Ave intersects with Colorado Blvd and becomes a Commercial Collector. East Iliff Ave is also a planned bicycle route. Again, a consistent streetscape with respect to sidewalks, safe crossing, planned bicycle route, vegetation and active speed control need to indicate the change in designation a residential street.</p>	Street Types	Letter
<p>Street type for Sheridan north of Colfax does not make sense. It keeps switching between residential and mixed use arterial but it isn't clear why it is mixed use vs residential in different areas. For example, it switches to residential along the park, but the park has no residential uses, and if you look west to Edgewater there are a ton of commercial uses in this stretch so mixed use arterial seems to make more sense</p>	Street Types	Office Hours
<p>Extra detail for what a "residential arterial" means and what the design should be with Vision Zero in mind- the sliders seem off for a residential street</p>	Street Types	Office Hours
<p>(Arterial) designation for Lowry Blvd. is incorrect. Collector designation may be more appropriate. As compared to Central Park Blvd and Alameda.</p>	Street Types	Office Hours
<p>Too many Arterial streets cutting through the Park Hill neighborhood.</p>	Street Types	Office Hours
<p>- Add more language on residential arterials. (i.e josphine, 8th, 6th, etc) These east west connectors are single family residential streets and have continued to be ignored and push more and more cars onto throughout the years. It is very unsafe and needs to be examined. If a residential arterials is low density (single family) it should have even greater design requirments. Cars and speeds limits should be examined (no more than 25 mph) and there needs greater pedestrian treatment.</p>	Street Types	On-line Survey
<p>page 216: residential street types. can you add more design requirements to residential urban streets that carry a lot of cars in order to improve the safety of the pedestrian.</p>	Street Types	On-line Survey
<p>Page 143: only residential shown. what is the design difference between residential arterials and residential collectors. Residential arterials need a lot of design treatment and should not be 1 way streets. no residential street should be a 1 way. All residential arterials should have painted crosswalks and bump outs every few blocks.</p>	Street Types	On-line Survey
<p>Page 134: low residential areas should not have arterials running through them. Remove all 1 way streets in low residential areas</p>	Street Types	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
While I like the concept of complete neighborhoods, everyone can't always find work next to where they live, nor can everyone afford housing next to where they work. If I were to take transit to work currently, it would take me 1.5 hours, as opposed to 0.5 hours by car. I like the actual photographs the document shows for examples of neighborhood serving retail / main street character. However, new development along main street areas (like Tennyson) no longer looks like this. The 1-2 story shop fronts are being replaced by behemoth apartment buildings with no street level activation and neighborhood serving retail. What character that neighborhood has is a result of the older buildings, not the new construction which is slowly replacing it. The issue seems to be that zoning codes like "Main Street" still allow entirely residential based structures to be built, because their street level transparency requirements can be served by parking garages and rental offices. So, when rezoning is just removing single family homes and replacing with giant apartments, it does not make a more complete neighborhood. I am confused why the "street type" of Sheridan Blvd. is oscillating from residential arterial to mixed use arterial, and the oscillations do not correspond to the current land use. For example, between 16th and 17th, it is a residential neighborhood, but this says it is "mixed use". Then at 17th, Sheridan is adjacent to a large shopping center (target/king soopers/etc..) but it is classified as "residential here". Then, up near 38th and 44th, where there is a bunch of retail along the road, it goes back to "residential"	Street Types	On-line Survey
Page 75: I like that there needs to be a focus on pedestrian (wider sidewalks, easier to walk, strong street level active use standards, etc)	Street Types	On-line Survey
To be a walkable and livable "world class city" Denver needs to substantially reduce vehicle speeds on central urban and residential streets. I would scrap this plan to give speed reduction the central place it deserves rather than going so far out of the way to avoid it as the plan does now.	Street Types	On-line Survey
more specific implementation on pedestrian safety, funds for vision zero projects, etc.	Street Types	On-line Survey
Add friction to those residential streets, make the lanes more narrow, convert all 1 ways back to 2 ways.	Street Types	On-line Survey
Page 142: only residential shown. What is the design difference between arterial and collector streets?		
If single family residential street and arterials it needs a lot of special attention. There are a lot of conflicts and there needs to be better design requirements to slow traffic down and save lives.	Street Types	On-line Survey
low residential areas should not have arterials running through them. Remove all 1 way streets in low residential areas	Street Types	On-line Survey
I would be interested to see the City consider occasionally converting lower-usage roads into bicycle and pedestrian only passages. Additionally, I would like to see as part of the pedestrian safety section construction requirements that builders create protected walkways rather than close sidewalks.	Street Types	On-line Survey
You need to development minimum standards for what these streets are. Your public works standards need to be completely replaced by the urban design standards.	Street Types	On-line Survey
Slower automobile speeds. Make more streets bike priority and a more seamless system.		
I'd like to see some innovative bike infrastructure that would help put Denver on the for front of a bike able city	Street Types	On-line Survey
I would scrap this framework and start over completely with a plan to substantially reduce vehicle speeds on the majority of Denver streets to create walkable, livable spaces. You can build protected bike lanes but if cars and trucks are going 30+ mph it's never going to be a walkable livable street or even a street that attracts bicyclists of all ages and abilities. Denver seems to be very studiously ignoring the elephant in the room - cars and trucks are moving at deadly speeds.	Street Types	On-line Survey
The Federal corridor, one of the most dangerous streets in the city of Denver was not included in the sidewalk improvement plans. Just a few weeks ago a pedestrian was struck and killed in the intersection at 52nd and Federal. This area should be highlighted in bright red to show the desperate need for improvements.	Street Types	On-line Survey
8th and 6th should be converted to collector streets. Not residential arterials. these are dangerous. Look at how many residential arterials are running through congress park. this is a huge problem.	Street Types	On-line Survey
only residential shown. what is the design difference between residential arterials and residential collectors. Residential arterials need a lot of design treatment and should not be 1 way streets. no residential street should be a 1 way. All residential arterials should have painted crosswalks and bump outs every few blocks.	Street Types	On-line Survey
We need implementation. - you need to define "low density residential arterial" vs "high density residential arterial" . There is a huge difference of 3-10 stories of apartments surrounding a busy street vs all single family homes. Low density residential arterial should have special design requirements and I believe there are only a few in the city.	Street Types	On-line Survey
page 216: residential street types. can you add more design requirements to residential urban streets that carry a lot of cars in order to improve the safety of the pedestrian.	Street Types	On-line Survey
Page 139: 8th and 6th should be converted to collector streets. Not residential arterials. these are dangerous. Look at how many residential arterials are running through congress park. this is a huge problem.	Street Types	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Unclear why Cherokee and 12th are collectors -- both today and aspirationally this doesn't make sense (Bannock and 11th already serve the role of collector)	Street Types	On-line Survey
I am also a firm supporter of design quality and design review but would add that it should be universal. Cities like Seattle and Portland have versions of this that have inarguably led to better architecture.	Urban Design and Preservation	Email
LUBF:DQ Landscaping Problem ID: Replace plants and trees with vegetation	Urban Design and Preservation	Internal
LUBF:DQ Policy 6 background: air AND WATER quality	Urban Design and Preservation	Internal
LUBF:DQ Policy 6, For new infill development require trees, with adequate space to grow, to be planted on-site.	Urban Design and Preservation	Internal
LUBF:DQ Policy 3: Please add landscape codes to E.	Urban Design and Preservation	Internal
LUBF:DQ Policy 6 Strategy D: Green walls, green roofs?	Urban Design and Preservation	Internal
Commit to preserve historically significant structures and sites on campuses that are to be redeveloped. Also, commit to set aside significant green spaces and public places on redevelopment campus sites. This includes preservation of historic cemeteries, Native American burial sites, and other burial sites in the City	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Commit to design review for all civic facilities in each neighborhood, center, district, and corridor in the City	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Recognize historic commercial, mixed-use and multi-family buildings as models for desired design outcomes (pg. 74).	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Focus on being more intentional in transition areas between low-density to medium-density, from medium density to higher density - based on best design practices	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Current zoning does not really allow/force porosity. Jefferson Park would be ok with some increased building heights, but would like some porosity (view corridors, etc). Would recommend bringing back FAR or some similar tools to allow for this.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
(o) Recommendation - Design Quality -Mixed Use and Main Street Areas. Transitions between mixed-use and main street uses abutting low-density neighborhoods are imperative to the quality of residential life in Denver. We believe the Problem Identification statement is generally good, but we ask that you also add main street zoning to this Recommendation. Main street zoning allows many of the same uses and has many characteristics of mixed-use zoning, and thus transitions where main street areas abut low-density residential areas are equally as important as they are for mixed-use zones. Also, please add language clarifying that "abutting" is not limited to a property immediately next door to a mixed-use or main street zone but that it also could be across the alley or across the street and be "abutting" the mixed-use or main street zone.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Restore set-backs requirements between the sidewalk and where buildings and structures may be constructed. Such set-backs have been part of Denver's history for development and are an important characteristic that distinctively defines Denver's neighborhoods and districts	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Commit to urban design review for all street and thoroughfare projects in each neighborhood, center, district, and corridor throughout the City	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Commit to design review for all new construction in each neighborhood, center, district, and corridor throughout the City	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Some newer buildings in our neighborhoods lack high-quality design and C.H.U.N. requests that tools, such as design review for all new buildings, be included in Blueprint Denver and Comprehensive Plan 2040 to ensure high-quality design in all areas of Denver.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Page 68 – Recommendation 1 (Design Review). Design review creates a significant administrative burden on the development process (for both the city and the developers). The benefit of the design review on the public satisfaction with the quality of development is minimal. That is because it is extremely difficult to reach a consensus on what “ quality design” is (design preferences are very subjective) and to formulate objective criteria that can be evaluated as a part of permitting process. Please consider eliminating Design Review recommendation.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Include more reference and acknowledgement of existing landmarks and landmark districts, and add a recommendation that reinforces/sustains these protected assets.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>Preservation of existing structures in the neighborhood.</p> <p>The UPCC Board would like to see initiatives to incentivize the preservation of structures that contribute to the established character of an area, even if they are not designated as landmarks or historic districts. Such incentives might include ADUs (see above). We would also like to see the City adopt a "deconstruction ordinance" like Portland's that de-incentivizes the razing of existing structures by requiring the re-use of materials on replacement construction.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Design Review - Residential. Many of Denver's residential neighborhoods are composed of older homes, typically one to two stories in height with sloping roofs. Where appropriate, residential infill will be more context sensitive and will better engage the public realm. The UPCC Board is in favor of design review with objective factors outlined in order to meet the stated goals.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Density impacts from rezonings and ADUs proposed by Denveright should be minimized in SU (single unit) zone districts compared to existing TU (two unit) and higher density residential districts. Identifying infill opportunities in TU districts should occur before significantly increasing density in SU areas. We would support an opt-in/opt-out choice for neighborhoods or block areas for selected aspects of rezonings and ADUs. For example, no second floor ADUs in the rear of a property for the same privacy and solar access reasons as the proposed long house rezoning in UPCC, except when the property is adjacent to a higher density zoning (such as on the commercial edges of UPCC near Colorado and University.)</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Although we understand the desire for landscaping requirements, we have concerns that they will add unnecessary costs to developments. In our market, any actions that could potentially decrease housing affordability need to be very carefully considered before their implementation.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	letter
<p>Further, we are very concerned by the lack of good urban design being expressed in new developments. Specifically, most of new developments poorly integrate regarding scale with the existing single-family context. As a neighborhood, we require technical assistance from experts to effectively advocate for good urban design in new developments. We ask that the City invest resources to assist neighborhoods with this effort in advance of zoning code updates. Page 71 of the draft points out an important problem with the current zoning code – that it fails to adapt to neighborhood context. We are glad that the plan acknowledges this, but if this is to be addressed through changes to the zoning code, as it suggests, then there should be a concrete timeline for updating the code prior to adoption of this plan. Otherwise, adoption of this plan may encourage more rezoning overall, and would likely exacerbate the problems described.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	letter
<p>Design Recommendations: NDC members are committed to providing high-quality housing and amenities to the communities we serve. However, we know from experience that certain design elements can greatly increase the cost of our work. In the high cost environment we live in, this can negatively impact the already small margins non-profits operate on by virtue of the fact that we provide below market rate housing assets. We appreciate the statement on page 69 about avoiding costly design features, but we recommend that the City include language in any CPD document that allows waivers for certain design features if the creation of those features jeopardizes the sustainability of a community-serving project.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>2) We support the plan's recommendations to support quality design in neighborhoods, particularly as infill and redevelopment occur within existing, established neighborhoods like ours. However, we are concerned that the tools used to ensure design quality may increase costs to homeowners seeking to modify or expand their homes and create barriers which would disproportionately impact middle- and lower-income homeowners seeking to improve their homes.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>P 75 – 04A – I object to the idea that residential uses should be prohibited on the ground floor level. Go to all great cities - New York, London, Paris - they all have substantial residential along street frontages. This document is discouraging ground level residential programming in the urban core. As retail becomes more challenged (due to the large size of spaces, increasing rents, internet impact, etc) and our urban density doesn't keep up with other major cities, it will be increasing challenging to fill ground floors with retail. We should focus on providing more front doors, active uses, transparency at the ground floor.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Could a context be created that would encourage/force porosity? See marked up maps for areas we would like to encourage this. If a context cannot be created that would force the desired porosity, we feel we would need to reduce the potential heights allowed (see marked up map for reference).</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>(n) Recommendations -Design Quality; Residential Areas, Recommendation No. 2. We agree with the Problem Identification and desired outcomes in the "Residential" narratives (Page 70). We particularly applaud Item D. and concur that revision should be made to the zoning code to address these issues.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>(p) Recommendation No. 3 -Design Quality - Mixed Use . Please add main-street buildings to this recommendation and revise the language of Item F. to make it a requirement that zoning tools be adopted to create appropriate transitions. It's not sufficient merely to say you'll evaluate the feasibility of and desirability of this -residents have been asking for this action for at least the last two decades!</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>(q) Recommendation No. 6- Landscaping. We concur with this recommendation</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Yes require transitions in mass and scale from higher density to residential areas	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Land Use and Built Form Design Quality Policy 02:Neighborhoods need up-to-date Neighborhood Plans to retain the unique character as infill development occurs.-We agree with the premise of this Policy: “Ensure residential neighborhoods retain their unique character as infill development occurs”. What is missing from this policy is the need for having up-to-date NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS in place. For neighborhoods like Highland with a 1986 Neighborhood Plan, new Neighborhood Plans are needed so that there is a basis for new overlays, design review, pattern books, and other tools.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
The West Denver Jewish Community has unique needs that make some of the recommendations and design requirements either inappropriate or insufficient. We’d like the Blueprint to capture these needs – possibly using a cultural district overlay on the growth map with tailored recommendations and design requirements within the area: 1. Community members do not drive or use transit on Saturday and a fully-walk able neighborhood is a priority. Pedestrian walks should be improved throughout the Eruv area and be able to accommodate wheelchairs and strollers. 2. Community-Member Families need to live within easy walking distance of the Jewish infrastructure (see above) so large families displaced from single-unit or duplex housing due to growth must be accommodated within the Eruv. Design overlay shall require that each single family home or duplex unit demolished for redevelopment is replaced with a dwelling-unit having the same number of bedrooms (up to 4 BR max) and located on the first or second residential story of the new building. 3. Vehicular transportation is a necessary, efficient means of transportation for large families needing to access Jewish services in other neighborhoods. The overlay should require new development to provide minimum on-site parking of 1 space per unit up to 400sf and an addition half-space per each additional 200 sf within a unit – or a similar requirement. 4. Because transit is less-useful to this community and availability of transit does not justify the displacement of the community, Development policy related to transit shall be limited to the Saint Anthony redevelopment (east of Stuart) and the West Colfax corridor.5. This is an insular community with children outdoors. Growth shall consider how growth areas are accessed and avoid development that will introduce traffic patterns that access the community center & corridor is through other parts of the neighborhood. Adding a district or district overlay for culturally significant neighborhoods - such as the West Side Jewish neighborhood bounded by the Eruv - may be a useful tool for implementing the above ideas.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Land Use and Built Form Design Quality p. 66 12) 2 Are these tools what is referred to in #1? If not, who does this or pays for these in working class neighborhoods? 13) 6 This seems like good ideas, but how and when would landscape requirements be applied?	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Blueprint places a new emphasis on "context" and this is promising. However, the achievement of this goal is also going to depend heavily on the success of design quality strategies and tools. We acknowledge that there is much discussion about design review tools. And we would like to thank Community Planning and Development for participating on our Design Review Symposium.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
Design Quality – We commend the City for utilizing the work and recommendations BRUN has completed in our zoning revisions and overlay efforts these last four years. We are particularly supportive of the following elements in this section, with additional notes:	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
01 – The equity and affordability of design tools has proven to be a stumbling block for BRUN Zoning as we are reliant upon donations and volunteers.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
02 – These Recommendations are consistent with many of the Overlay recommendations that BRUN has developed. We are, however, wary of “Pattern Books” that could prove to be an inhibition to innovation. Rather, we would advise incentives for a developer and architect to address design review with the neighborhood Zoning Committee prior to plan finalization.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
03 – We would encourage any Design Review Board to incorporate an RNO Design Review component to give the neighborhood a voice in the process.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
04 – It is important to require that commercial use be something other than services supporting the building as “truly active uses”.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
06 – We agree with the need for this Recommendation.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
References are missing as to how new development should be expected to be compatible with and fit into the existing context of the stable, mostly historic, built environment of West Highland. During the Blueprint Denver process, suggestions of design guidelines or design review were made. We ask that the City consider incorporating design guidelines or design review for new developments in established areas, like West Highland.	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
<p>There is a strong sense from the neighborhood that new development generally ignores the surrounding neighborhood context, and that the existing zoning code offers little protection for adjacent properties. Better tools are required to ensure new development respect existing neighborhood character, and new zoning tools must be put in place to enforce this. Therefore, strategies related to Design Quality in the Land Use and Build Form section, such as the following, are appreciated:</p> <p>[LD] 03.E. Revise the zoning code to provide standards for new mixed-use development that better responds to the surrounding context. Standards to examine for improvement include build-to ranges, transparency minimums, lot coverage, and entry features.</p> <p>[LD] 02.E. For all residential areas, study the feasibility of implementing design review for projects that meet a determined threshold.</p> <p>[LD] 02.F. Promote the use of pattern books to identify character defining features and/or desired design outcomes for an area. Pattern books can be developed during neighborhood planning and used to inform regulatory tools including, but not limited to, conservation overlays and design overlays.</p> <p>[LD] 03.B. In other centers and corridors citywide, especially those that anticipate significant growth, study and implement a design review process guided by design standards and guidelines. This could include administrative design review by city staff with the potential for projects of a certain threshold or type to be reviewed by a board.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Lastly, we would caution against language that lays the groundwork for citywide design review.</p> <p>While quality design is a key component of any great City, stringent design review is likely to decrease predictability and increase cost. This is particularly troublesome given our dire need to increase Denver's housing stock. We firmly believe in relying upon the market to dictate design.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Design 2: We wholeheartedly support these strategies and we are currently developing an overlay for Harkness Heights with its major goal of maintaining the character of the neighborhood. More resources should be made available by the City to assist communities in exploring, developing and implementing overlays specific to their needs. The assistance of our City Councilman has been essential and he has been an integral part of our process. Assistance from the City administration is needed in order to make these valuable tools more within the reach of more neighborhoods.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>12. Pg. 69 "Ensure neighborhoods have equal access to design quality tools." Neighborhoods cannot access:</p> <p>1. Design Review, 2. Historic Designation, 3. Conservation Overlay, 4. Design Overlay without approval by City Council and an extensive amount of volunteer time to pursue it. 5 Zoning Code Form Standards are the only tools readily accessible. In addition, it seems that neighborhoods cannot rely on the Zoning Code to protect their neighborhoods, as developers can apply for variances and rezonings. Design Tools 1-4 are the actual quality tools that will protect neighborhoods. □</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Pg. 71 "Ensure residential neighborhoods retain their unique character as infill development occurs." We need this now! Park Hill Commons from 28th to 29th on east side of Fairfax will look like Stapleton, not the business district of a 100+ year old neighborhood.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Capitol Hill United Neighborhoods (C.H.U.N.) is comprised of many neighborhoods which are historic and have fine architecture, scale and design and the organization wishes to protect and celebrate those qualities in the future. There is too little mention in the plans of historic districts, historic structures, and historic parkways.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Letter
<p>Transitions between centers/corridors and residential areas - strengthen language around an enhanced standard of design for the center/corridor that is more compatible with residential</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>Prioritize LUBF -Design Quality Policy 3F and council needs to fund additional resources to accomplish design review.</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>Concerned with the design quality of new residential apartments</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>supportive of ADU pattern books or if not part of pattern book design review for ADUs citywide</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>would like to see LUBF Design Review Policy 2 E actually be design review for single unit homes when they scrape the existing home</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>supportive of better design quality across the city, especially in high profile centers and corridors</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	Office Hours
<p>reference to embracing historic assets and cultural heritage incentives to reuse existing buildings and houses</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
<p>Importance of neighborhoods and historic character and buildings</p>	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey

Comment on Draft Plan	Theme	Source
Design review should be implemented on multi-unit projects due to the bulk of these projects. Design goals should be clearly outlined and the goal posts for development should be clearly communicated. Many of the current design issues can be solved by requiring articulation in the exteriors or simply limiting the heights. Design review should exist only as much as necessary to verify that a design meets those standards. If design reviews becomes subjective, it will become political and frustrating to property owners trying to improve their neighborhoods.	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
Better description of how the city would use Discover Denver findings	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
States that recommendations will be directed to certain audiences by color. If that's done, it is not obvious. Policy 03 refers to incentivizing preservation of historic character which is important; however the qualification tying it to transit rich areas & threatened with displacement is not appropriate. it's important throughout the city.	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
As a 39-year resident of Capitol Hill who has lived for more than three decades in two historic districts (Alamo Placita and 7th Avenue H.D.), I like the emphasis on contextual in-fill development, and recognizing and furthering the goals of the Landmark Ordinance.	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
Page 71: I like "ensure residential neighborhoods retain their unique character as infill development occurs". I think this is important to protect some of our best neighborhoods from being over developed but do understand the need for more density in the city	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
Further define or clarify the role and structure of the proposed use of a Design Review process and how it cold be effectively implemented.	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
. I also like the emphasis on urban design. The proliferation of banal, look-alike, chap architectural boxes of apartments and condos in Capitol Hill has a deadening effect on the senses when contrasted with the area's rich and varied 100-plus year architectural heritage.	Urban Design and Preservation	On-line Survey
More language needed to speak to existing historic fabric, adaptive reuse, etc. Also add cultural	Urban Design and Preservation	Task Force
Design Quality tools- how are they specifcly implemented, need to keep equity in mind across the city	Urban Design and Preservation	Task Force