

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Amy Smith** <amycorinnesmith333@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Jul 9, 2016 at 3:27 PM

Subject: Opposition to I25 / Orchard Development

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Heather -

I am sending this email to you to express my significant concern regarding the proposed mixed use development at I25 and Orchard, and my strong recommendation that **this proposal not be approved.**

I am a somewhat newer resident to Greenwood Village, having moved here with my daughter in October 2014. We moved here from San Francisco for a variety of reasons, including the strong sense of community, fabulous public school system, open space, parks and family feel. We left San Francisco because I didn't want to raise my daughter in an area with high rise buildings, traffic, pollution (air and noise) and crowded schools. I have lived all over the world in big cities...I have yet to find a place like GV in terms of its charm, family atmosphere, parks, open space, quiet serenity and beauty.

I am extremely concerned that this new development will negatively impact Greenwood Village, potentially destroying all of the reasons for why we moved here. Here are a few of my specific concerns:

(1) High rise residential structure. It appears as if there will be ~1,200 residential units. Assuming there are 2 people per unit, that is more than 2,000 new residents into GV which will cause a list of issues, some of which I address below. Last I checked, our population via census was around 14,500 people. This is a SIGNIFICANT increase (over 10%). In addition to the headcount issues, a high rise residential tower would completely block certain views of our beautiful mountains, blue skies and trees;

(2) Air & noise pollution. Along with the proposed residential and commercial projects comes pollution: a significant amount of air pollution not only from the construction, but also as a result of the substantial increase in vehicular traffic. And, do not forget noise pollution, which would be substantial as well - construction and traffic noise. GV is a VILLAGE - we don't want issues associated with big cities (trust me); and

(3) Infrastructure / schools. Assuming a 10+% increase in population, as well as the increased number of commercial businesses, is GV prepared to deal with this with our existing infrastructure? Specifically, police, fire and schools? With respect to the schools, they are already overcrowded. Elementary children are learning in mobile trailers already (really? in one of the highest ranked public school systems in the state???) THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED FIRST BEFORE INCREASING OUR STUDENT POPULATION EVEN MORE.

I understand the allure of GV and why people want to live here. However, this allure will be tarnished substantially if this new development is approved. So much so, I would actually consider moving out of GV. I have many neighbors who feel the same way.

I have worked in finance for 20+ years, so I understand this project would provide a tax revenue windfall for GV / Englewood - I hope this isn't the main reason this project is being considered.

And, please remember GV has tried this before...it's called the Landmark. And from what I understand, it was far from a success with residential vacancies and lower than anticipated foot and car traffic for the businesses. Also, we have a lot of residential inventory either coming online or existing (Bellevue / Quebec residential building; empty homes for sale in GV).

Please forward this to any other elected officials as well and make this part of any public record of public commentary.

**DO NOT APPROVE THE PLAN FOR THE I25 / ORCHARD DEVELOPMENT. ALSO
DO NOT ALLOW OFFICIALS TO CHANGE OUR ALREADY-ADOPTED
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THIS DEVELOPMENT.**

Regards,
Amy Corinne Smith
Huntington Acres Resident (Orchard / Dayton)

[Amy Corinne Smith](#)
[\(415\) 310-5847](#)
amycorinnesmith333@gmail.com

From: **Becky Brown** <cobecky@msn.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 6, 2016 at 11:35 AM
Subject: Orchard/I-25 Development
To: "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>,
"glantz@greenwoodvillage.com" <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>

Hello Mr. Moran and Mr Lantz,

I am a concerned resident of Greenwood Village and writing to you both about the proposed development at I-25 and Orchard. I am VERY opposed to this development. We have lived in the same home in Greenwood Village for 26 years now and have loved the small town feel of our city. With all the other development along Belleview and I-25 where traffic is gridlock at all times of the day, adding another huge development only a mile or so away would continue to erode the type of community we have here in Greenwood Village. My biggest concerns are traffic, multi family units being built, and tall office buildings. We don't need this in Greenwood Village! Please oppose this proposal on behalf of your constituents. There are many long time residents of GV that have been living here for a reason. Don't turn our community into the likes of a California suburb!

Thank you,
Becky Brown
Sundance Hills

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Debbie Unkeless** <unkd5@hotmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Subject: Orchard Station Project

To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, "jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com" <jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com>, "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, "glantz@greenwoodvillage.com" <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, "rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com" <rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com>

Cc: "bbradyesq@comcast.net" <bbradyesq@comcast.net>, Leon Greos <greos@me.com>, "Cc: 'Renee Colby'" <rhcolby@msn.com>, Kim Danos <kim.danos@gmail.com>, Michael Bash <ara-bash@comcast.net>, Tom Swanson <tgs swanson@aol.com>, Gene Eby <eugeneebey@centura.org>, Charles Hazlehurst <drch2@me.com>, Libby Barnacle <beezneezbowz@hotmail.com>, Ron Abreu <AbreuR31@comcast.net>, Barbara Finke <barbara.finke@gmail.com>, Stanley and Suzi <kersteinss@gmail.com>, "Charles (new) Lawson" <teshnaha@gmail.com>, Ed Schenkein <eschenkein@starkcpas.com>, Debbie Swanson <debswanson26@gmail.com>, baus12 terry <baus12.terry@comcast.net>, Peter Burg <pburg@burgsimpson.com>

July 12, 2016

Greenwood Village City Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
City of Greenwood Village

Council and Commission Members:

We have resided in Greenwood Village since 1987. Our property address is 9381 East Lake Avenue, in the Huntington Acres subdivision.

We have reviewed the proposed Orchard Station project at the intersection of Orchard Road and I-25 and have the following concerns:

TRAFFIC FLOW:

Presently, the traffic on Orchard Road is becoming more and more congested. It is becoming more difficult to enter and exit our neighborhood particularly at morning and afternoon rush hour. There is an excellent prospect this project would compound the problem, not only in our immediate area but throughout Greenwood Village.

OVERALL CONCEPT:

The proposal calls for approximately 1200 residences with office and retail space. It is my understanding the proposed high rise towers exceed Greenwood Village permissible height limits. Obviously, the regulations were closely considered when promulgated. At a minimum, these standards should be abided by to avoid obstructed views etc. The high density housing would be at variance with the "village" concept which Greenwood Village residents so dearly cherish. If this project is approved, what would differentiate Greenwood Village from downtown Denver or any other major city core? Providing governmental services to the new residents should be closely analyzed using a cost benefit analysis. If it is determined this project will incrementally increase government expenditures and have a negative impact on future budgets, serious consideration should be given stopping the project in its inception. In addition, the city planners and council need to assess what impact the increased student population will have on the Cherry Creek school district. i.e. does Greenwood Village Elementary, West Middle School and Cherry Creek High School have the space and resources to serve the students?

In closing, Greenwood Village has done an excellent job of creating a village ambiance, with careful planning, in the midst of enveloping urban sprawl. It is our hope that Greenwood Village does not lose sight of this ideal when considering the Orchard Station Project.

Very truly yours,

Bradley and Debbie Unkeless

Heather Vidlock
Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village
6060 South Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

My name is Charles Whitehead. I am a resident of Sundance Hills. I am writing this letter to you as the Community Development Director and ask that it be provided to the Planning & Zoning Commissioners for their study and consideration prior to the P&Z meeting at which the P&Z Commission will consider the adoption of language for the comprehensive plan for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan. It is my understanding that the language is currently being refined by the City Staff and that it may be further revised after the City Council study session on July 11, 2016.

I understand that, in anticipation of the filing of a master development plan from Alberta Development, the City is considering adopting language for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan that significantly differs from the current comprehensive plan and will lay the groundwork for the high density urban TOD development that Alberta has studied with the City.

As stated in the Greenwood Village Goals section of the current comprehensive plan, the goals for development include “protect the peripheral areas of the Village from incompatible land develop and traffic patterns...mitigate the negative effects of traffic on neighborhoods, while promoting easy access to and from the Village’s commercial areas.... The Future Land Use Goals section call out for views of the mountains to be protected and mandates that developers evaluate the visual impact of their projects on existing and proposed developments. To that end, since before Greenwood Village was incorporated or the DTC was developed, the DTC area has been a suburban area that is primarily residential and also includes businesses located in low to medium height buildings. To protect the view corridors and maintain the feel of a suburban community, the City has historically limited the heights of buildings by following the radial height plan.

Although the proposed language for the subarea has not been finalized, I strongly urge that the following concerns be addressed in the plan.

Traffic. Traffic is already a problem for residents. New development should not cause additional traffic unless the impact is fully mitigated. The impact of traffic coming into and going out of the Orchard Station Subarea at all hours of business days, nights and weekends should be addressed. Any development should consider traffic patterns north of the development (to Belleview) as well as south of the development (to Orchard). The well-being and lifestyle of residents impacted by the traffic should be considered. To do this, the impact of traffic moving east as far as University as well as west as far as Havana should be considered.

Multi-Family Units. The City has historically had a strong preference for owner-occupied residences. That preference should continue and the construction of rental residences should be strongly discouraged.

Suburban v. Urban. Greenwood Village is suburban, not urban. Residents, who live here, have chosen the suburban lifestyle. Similarly, business that locate here, have made the conscious decision to conduct business in a suburban setting. Located within the Orchard Station Subarea is a light rail stop. Therefore, the subarea is a TOD. However, just because it is a TOD, it is not automatically urban. To the contrary, redevelopment of the subarea should protect the suburban nature of Greenwood Village.

Density. Density of buildings and developments should be consistent with the density of buildings and developments located within business parks that are currently located in Greenwood Village.

Building Height. New buildings should not be taller than the existing buildings. The Landmark is an example of buildings that are too tall. Buildings adjacent to I-25 should be compatible with the rest of Greenwood Village and the Tech Center and should be no taller than 10-12 stories.

View Corridors. View corridors for residences and businesses on the east side of I-25 should be protected. In accordance with the comprehensive plan, view corridor studies should include existing residences, mountain views from neighborhoods should be protected and building height should be limited so that new buildings are not visible from neighborhoods east of I-25 where neighbors cannot currently see buildings. Similarly, the comprehensive plan should discourage new buildings that will effectively create a concrete corridor along I-25 between Arapahoe Road and Bellevue (the south-north boundaries of Greenwood Village along I-25).

Parking and Access to Parking. The comprehensive plan for the subarea should call for adequate parking for both residents and visitors. Residents of Greenwood Village should continue to have no cost access to parking for light rail and parks and recreation facilities. As a Village, we want to encourage residents to use alternative transportation (specifically including the R line to A line connection) when traveling to and from DIA.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope that the City continues to maintain the concerns and lifestyle of residents as a priority that developers are required to acquiesce to as opposed to the residents being forced to change their quality of life to accommodate the desires of for profit developers.

On Jul 10, 2016, at 3:31 PM, DAVID J GIEM <dgiem1@msn.com> wrote:

Dear Sirs:

In regards to the proposed Orchard I-25 Development. **NO Don't Do It To US**

1) This project appears more to advance the objective of the developers **than** wellbeing & lifestyle of the citizens of Greenwood Village. I use Orchard, Quebec and Bellevue daily and encounter their I-25 access traffic. This development can easily double or triple the now backed-up morning & evening traffic congestion. What will it cost Greenwood Village in time & money to alleviate these problems as well as the necessary fire and police protection expansion?

2) Greenwood Village is a community of families & homes. Apartments/rentals is not consistent with our Greenwood Village life style. Homes and families generate tranquility, stability, safety and is an admired community. Does Greenwood Village really want to change this concept?

3) The current utilization of the area, which is mostly office and business activities, which produces a stable and organized daily environment and a quiet after work hour environment. It is a desired and respected location for companies to have offices. Don't destroy Greenwood Village's business area's reputation of quality and stability.

4) **No please**, not another Park Meadows Mall. I just dread going near that place. It is magnet of confusion, congestion, lights, noise and more and more people. Just leave Greenwood Village alone, let us be a village of homes, families with a respected & responsible office/business environment.

We moved here from Aurora Co. in 1980. It was like leaving the political city and moving in to a democratic village. We love it here and never want to leave. I have attended city council meetings, been active on Centennial Airport noise issues and always impressed by Greenwood's actions.

I know Greenwood Village will make the right decision on the Orchard I-25 Development.

Thank You: David Giem
5549 S. Hanover Way Greenwood Village
(303) 771-2332

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **DAVID K MARTIN** <martin_realestate@msn.com>

Date: Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 1:49 PM

Subject: Orchard Station Development

To: Ron Rakowsky <RRakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com>, Dave Bullock <DBullock@greenwoodvillage.com>, Leslie Schluter <LSchluter@greenwoodvillage.com>, Darryl Jones <DJones@greenwoodvillage.com>, Steve Moran <SMoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, George Lantz <GLantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, TJ Gordon <TGordon@greenwoodvillage.com>, Tom Bishop <TBishop@greenwoodvillage.com>, Freda Miklin <FMiklin@greenwoodvillage.com>

Mayor & Council:

I am sorry I will not be able to be in attendance this evening at the Council Meeting to voice my comments in person, as I had previous commitments. Please accept my comments below. Also, I ask to please keep me informed as to the process of how this Orchard Station Development project continues. In advance, thank you.

I am writing as a resident of Greenwood Village of over 21 years, and my comments are intended to be constructive for our community relative to the proposed development at the NWC of I-25 and Orchard Road.

This development seems to have taken a very rapid path to get to the Council for action to approve or consider further the Orchard Station Development ("OSD"). I am hopeful the Council and Development staff will move back a step or two to consider the impact of this development on the surrounding neighborhoods. My concerns are in the following areas:

1. Respect and consideration should be given to the view plane, or perhaps lack of view plane, for areas to the east of the OSD, that will be affected by the height of the proposed project. With building heights that provide for three 22 story towers and one 25 story tower, there will be an impact on view planes for many of the neighborhoods east of the OSD. The Rocky Mountains are a visual part of this community, and I hope the Council will not allow any further developments to rob many others in the community of the great pleasure such vistas provide to all residents.

2. In addition to "view plane" consideration, it appears that OSD would become the highest density area in Greenwood Village, which would then create an urban-like atmosphere, which to date, has not been the hallmark of Greenwood Village as a community. This community up to now has enjoyed a lower density life-style. I would ask that staff and Council consider reducing the density of the project to be more in tune with what has been created to date with great success, both from a commercial perspective and a personal residential perspective. I recognize there are many changes that occur over time, and that we all make concessions to "change", but to make a concession to create an urban environment when many residents moved to

Greenwood Village (me among them) for the low-density, neighborly, and quality lifestyle we enjoy, seems to be concession that is not warranted nor sought after for this community.

3. Reduce density: while in general I agree with the principal concepts that the OSD is espousing, I also think that the density could be reduced and kept more in line with previously established development guidelines by reducing the mid-rise components of the projects to the heights more typical of this community. That is, reduce the 22 and 25 story buildings to a more typical 12 to maximum 16 story (including rooftop mechanical) facilities that have been developed, and are currently being developed in Greenwood Village at this time.

4. Traffic impacts need to be studied for all areas around the OSD and how it will affect traffic into and out of the areas and neighborhoods, as there does not appear to have been any effort made to accommodate the level of increased traffic the project will create. As we see at this time, even the work on the Arapahoe Road interchange is making an effort to alleviate the level of congestion that has come with the rapidly growing metro area. However, there appears to be no major efforts made at OSD to accommodate the traffic to be generated by this development. I submit, that although it may be minor, perhaps reducing the scale and density of OSD, will help mitigate the traffic creation that will surely be part of this development.

Conclusion: I am not suggesting the OSD project be defeated, but rather that it be brought into line with the community and the life-style that is part of this community, and has been for many years.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of our community and the guidance by the Mayor and Council and by all our City staff. Greenwood Village is truly an excellent place to live and we all want to continue to provide that excellence for the future residents. Thank you for your consideration.

David Martin

David K. Martin

Office: [303-850-0505](tel:303-850-0505)

Cell: [303-898-2662](tel:303-898-2662)

Martin_RealEstate@msn.com

9306 E. Berry Ave, Suite 100

Greenwood Village, CO 80111

David B. Seserman
5823 S. Hanover Way
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111

July 9, 2016

Heather Vidlock
Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village
6060 South Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

My name is David Seserman. I am a resident of Sundance Hills (District 3). The current boundaries of Greenwood Village have been home to me since 1972. I am also a business owner in Greenwood Village (my office address is 6455 S. Yosemite Street). I am writing this letter to you as the Community Development Director and ask that it be provided to the Planning & Zoning Commissioners for their study and consideration prior to the P&Z meeting at which the P&Z Commission will consider the adoption of language for the comprehensive plan for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan. It is my understanding that the language is currently being refined by the City Staff and that it may be further revised prior to and after the City Council study session on July 18, 2016.

I understand that, in anticipation of the filing of a master development plan from Alberta Development, the City is considering adopting language for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan that significantly differs from the current comprehensive plan and will lay the groundwork for the high density urban TOD development that Alberta has studied with the City.

As stated in the Greenwood Village Goals section of the current comprehensive plan, the goals for development include “protect the peripheral areas of the Village from incompatible land develop and traffic patterns...mitigate the negative effects of traffic on neighborhoods, while promoting easy access to and from the Village’s commercial areas.... The Future Land Use Goals section call out for views of the mountains to be protected and mandates that developers evaluate the visual impact of their projects on existing and proposed developments. To that end, since before Greenwood Village was incorporated or the DTC was developed, the DTC area has been a suburban area that is primarily residential and also includes businesses located in low to medium height buildings. To protect the view corridors and maintain the feel of a suburban community, the City has historically limited the heights of buildings by following the radial height plan.

Although the proposed language for the subarea has not been finalized, I strongly urge that the following concerns be addressed in the plan.

Suburban v. Urban. Greenwood Village is suburban, not urban. Residents, who live here, have chosen the suburban lifestyle. Similarly, business that locate here, have made the conscious decision to conduct business in a suburban setting. Located within the Orchard Station Subarea is a light rail stop. Therefore, the subarea is a TOD. However, just because it is a TOD, it is not automatically urban. To the contrary, redevelopment of the subarea should protect the suburban nature of Greenwood Village.

Density. Density of buildings and developments should be consistent with the density of buildings and developments located within business parks that are currently located in Greenwood Village.

Multi-Family Units. The City has historically had a strong preference for owner-occupied residences. That preference should continue and the construction of rental residences should be strongly discouraged.

Building Height. New buildings should not be taller than the existing buildings. The Landmark is an example of buildings that are too tall. Buildings adjacent to I-25 should be compatible with the rest of Greenwood Village and the Tech Center and should be no taller than 10-12 stories.

View Corridors. View corridors for residences and businesses on the east side of I-25 should be protected. In accordance with the comprehensive plan, view corridor studies should include existing residences, mountain views from neighborhoods should be protected and building height should be limited so that new buildings are not visible from neighborhoods east of I-25 where neighbors cannot currently see buildings. Similarly, the comprehensive plan should discourage new buildings that will effectively create a concrete corridor along I-25 between Arapahoe Road and Bellevue (the south-north boundaries of Greenwood Village along I-25). View corridors should also be protected for businesses. By way of example, when the CoBank building and parking garage were constructed, the majority of the view of the mountains I had from my office was blocked. Simply stated, a view corridor analysis needs to include view considerations from different locations and angles taking into account the effect geometry has on narrow view corridors.

Traffic. Traffic is already a problem and growing source of frustration for residents. New development should not cause additional traffic unless the impact is fully mitigated. The impact of traffic coming into and going out of the Orchard Station Subarea at all hours of business days, nights and weekends should be addressed. Any development should consider traffic patterns north of the development (to Bellevue) as well as south of the development (to Orchard). The well-being and lifestyle of residents throughout Greenwood Village impacted by the traffic should be considered. To do this, the impact of traffic moving east as far as University as well as west as far as Havana should be considered.

Parking and Access to Parking. The comprehensive plan for the subarea should call for adequate parking for both residents and visitors. Residents of Greenwood Village should

continue to have no cost access to parking for light rail and parks and recreation facilities. As a Village, we want to encourage residents to use alternative transportation (specifically including the R line to A line connection) when traveling to and from DIA.

Building Signage and Lighting. To maintain a suburban feel, the comprehensive plan should strongly discourage (if not prohibit) exterior signs on the top of office buildings. To the extent such signs are permitted, they should be limited to a height, width and signage area that is minimally necessary for visibility. Signs at the top of buildings should not be visible to existing residences. Consistent with past practices, exterior office building signs that are visible from residences should be turned off no later than 10 p.m. Similarly, if newly constructed buildings are visible from residences (including residences such as The Landmark), interior lights should be muted so that they are not visible to residences after closing or 10 p.m. This is similar to the lighting restrictions in effect for Kuni Lexus.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope that the City continues to maintain the concerns and lifestyle of residents as a priority that developers are required to acquiesce to as opposed to the residents being forced to change their quality of life to accommodate the desires of for profit developers.

Sincerely,



David B. Seserman

c: Joy McGee, Planning Manager
City Council Member Lantz
City Council Member Moran

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **DC Dworatzek** <dworatz@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 6:59 PM

Subject: Re: Orchard/I-25 Proposed Development

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Dear Ms Vidlock:

I have recently learned disturbing details about a development proposed by Alberta Development at I-25 and Orchard Road which would include multiple high rise structures of 20 stories or more and would result in approximately 1,200 rental units, over 1.2 million square feet of office space, and about 300,000 square feet of retail space, as well as restaurants, a hotel, a grocery store and an athletic club. This proposal would seriously adversely impact the quality of life in Greenwood Village and flies in the face of the city's Comprehensive Plan which you were elected to create and implement. Many of my concerns are eloquently and persuasively detailed in a memorandum prepared by Randy Davis, a Greenwood Village resident; you can access his data and analysis at GVDevelopmentWire.com.

Please DO NOT approve the plan as proposed at the June 29 Open House, or any modification that would

- result in high rise structures that would obstruct the view of the mountains or cast shadows on the highway;
- further disrupt the already challenging traffic flow on Orchard Road and the southern portions of I-25; and
- stress the infrastructures of the light rail, our schools, and our predominantly owner-occupied neighborhoods.

While I am not averse to managed growth, I am committed to maintaining the exceptional quality of life that brought my family and my neighbors to Greenwood Village in the first place. The Alberta Development proposal might provide some tax advantages, but those positive aspects are completely overshadowed by the potential negative impact. Leave the tall buildings and the multi-family rental housing downtown and preserve for your electorate the unobstructed views and the intimate feel of our community that we cherish.

Sincerely,

DC Dworatzek

36 year homeowner in the
Orchard Gate subdivision

Re: Development Proposal I-25 & Orchard Road

A development proposed by Alberta Development at I-25 and Orchard Road which would include multiple high rise structures of 20 stories or more and would result in approximately 1,200 rental units, over 1.2 million square feet of office space, and about 300,000 square feet of retail space, as well as restaurants, a hotel, a grocery store and an athletic club. This proposal would seriously adversely impact the quality of life in Greenwood Village and flies in the face of the city's Comprehensive Plan.

The Alberta Development proposal might provide some tax advantages, but those positive aspects are completely overshadowed by the potential negative impact.

Has the city completed any of the impact studies required for rezoning related to traffic, views, schools, utilities and city services?

DC Dworatzek, a 36 year homeowner in the
Orchard Gate subdivision
5991 South Emporia Circle
dworatz@gmail.com

July 15, 2016

Heather Vidlock
Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

Re. ID16-206 Consideration of Comp Plan Amendment for Orchard Station and Case No. 16-12-ZC Orchard Station Sub Area Rezoning

As a Greenwood Village resident, I strongly urge the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) to vote “no” on both the “Consideration of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Orchard Station (ID16-206)” and the “Orchard Station Sub Area Rezoning.” There are several reasons:

- 1) As of this writing, the public does not have a copy of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Orchard Station, nor does the Planning and Zoning Committee, so it cannot be properly vetted in time for the public hearing scheduled for July 19th. The previous versions I have seen, however, are grossly out of character for Greenwood Village. No one I have spoken with wants a massive urban center erupting in the middle of their nice family-oriented suburban neighborhood. The proposed increase in density, building height and population is unfathomable and out of character.
- 2) Greenwood Village planners and officials can’t simply add an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. One part affects another. For example, if the proposed amendment/zoning change increases density for Orchard Station, that means, according to the existing Comprehensive Plan, “higher density residential development may be considered in the Village Center Planning Sub-Area.” (page 159 of Comprehensive Plan).
- 3) Traffic is already an “F” in many areas of Greenwood Village and is expected to get worse regardless of mitigation efforts. Given the current situation, I believe it is inappropriate for Greenwood Village, at this time, to initiate a rezoning to “Town Center” that will encourage greater traffic density/more cars. The Village must first get a handle on the traffic congestion that already affects existing residents, particularly given the expansive development currently underway.

A traffic mitigation study needs to be completed for the entire area before any decisions are made AND it should focus on residents’ ability to get around their neighborhoods, around town, to/from work as well as from to/from I-25. The company that Greenwood Village uses for the study should not be the same firm used by the developers to avoid any conflict of interest.

Greenwood Village is a family-oriented suburb – a “Village.” No one I know moved here to live in a City of high rises and multi-family rental apartments. Just because we have a train station in town doesn’t mean we have to jump from a kiss and ride stop to high-density transit-oriented development.

According to the most recent Greenwood Village Comprehensive Plan, approved in the fall of 2015, the number one overall goal is to “preserve and enhance the Greenwood Village quality of life.” The issues outlined above do not meet this criteria.

Please include this letter in the public record for P&Z and City Council.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Donna and Jim Johnston
5776 South Fulton Way
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

To: Councilwoman Leslie Schluter, Councilman Darryl Jones and Mayor Ron Rakowsky,

Our city is called Greenwood Village and that says it all. The name is based on a vision of low density, open spaces, parks, trails and a strong sense of community. The city's master plans have occasionally been updated, but only with the original vision in mind. To that end, we are not Greenwood City or Greenwood Metropolis. Generations of citizens, city councils, city employees and business people have worked together to foster development, but stay as close as possible to the original vision for our city. That is why Alberta Development Partners' proposal for the redevelopment of the Orchard Station area is so inappropriate and unreasonable. If one was challenged to develop a plan that is the anthesis of the concept that is Greenwood Village, this would be it.

The points below reflect my thoughts and concerns.

DENSITY

The Orchard Station property is not in an urban or downtown area. It is in a suburban office park with an open space requirement for each structure. By definition and the city's master plan, three point three million square feet of development on twenty four acres is not a desirable or acceptable density. The height of several of the proposed buildings is also out of sync with existing buildings and city development plans. This hyper density is magnified by the fact that seven of the twenty four acres are earmarked for a park which leaves only seventeen acres to support the construction of the proposed structures. It would be preferable to not cluster the open space requirement into a park, but rather have each building surrounded by its own required percentage of open space. Additionally, zoning of this magnitude will serve as a precedent for future development and redevelopment. The development of the Arapahoe Station area comes immediately to mind. None of this supports or complements the founding visions and quality of life that are Greenwood Village.

TRAFFIC

When considering traffic impact, this location could be considered an "at risk" area. Traffic converges into this area from Belleview, Quebec, Orchard, Arapahoe Road and Yosemite Streets and both the Belleview and Orchard I-25 interchanges. A development the scale of Alberta Development Partners' proposal will only add to the congestion, accident rate and pollution of the area and impact both residents and business people alike. Traffic studies predict a substantial increase in traffic density. Plans for a grocery store, forty restaurants, a huge park, retail businesses and town center activities and programming will only compound the problem by adding more in and out traffic and extended heavy traffic hours. These can be expected to occur seven days a week for approximately twelve to thirteen hours a day. Obviously, this type of usage is much less desirable than office buildings which generate traffic for more limited hours and usually only five days a week. Options for expanding the ability of intersections and streets to carry and handle increased traffic and density are extremely limited. Also, there does not appear to be a recent comprehensive traffic study which allows for current and potential future development and includes all streets and highway interchanges in Greenwood Village and surrounding communities that feed into this area.

RETAIL

Greenwood Village is fortunate to have several successful retail centers which are located in areas more appropriate for retail businesses, restaurants and so forth. These locations are able to handle heavy in and out traffic that may last twelve to thirteen hours a day or more. The

Alberta Development Partners' plan for forty restaurants in addition to retail outlets only compounds the concerns over traffic intrusion into the community exacerbated by more traffic on the roads, morning to night business hours, seven day a week operations, an increased incidence of crime and the introduction of loiterers into the area. Producing very little upside for village residents.

RESIDENTIAL

City plans have always indicated a preference for owner occupied housing. The Alberta Development Partners' plan has none and proposes approximately twelve hundred rental units equalling about one million seven hundred thousand square feet of space. When one factors in hallways, elevator space, lobby space, HVAC and electrical areas, and things like exercise and meeting rooms, these units will not be the stated fourteen hundred square feet. The numbers just don't work. Renters and property owners often have different interests and priorities which can affect city and school ballot issues, improvement measures and the sense of community. Rental units can also overcrowd neighborhood schools whose capacities were based on single family homes. Families searching for quality schools will be drawn to these apartments; sometimes having more than one family in a unit. With the passage of the Construction Defect Action Reform Act in 2001, the construction of owner occupied housing has slowed, but not stopped. As the years have passed, there have been court rulings, communities that passed their own construction defect measures and actions by developers that have clarified and helped the situation. Courts seem to be leaning towards arbitration. Developers have found ways to handle this problem. Some add an additional amount to the purchase price of a property to allow for problems, some write into the purchase contract that problems will be subject to arbitration and others have added a clause to the purchase contract that if there are problems the purchaser can sell the property back to the builder. One only needs to drive through downtown Denver, Lowry, River North, Cherry Creek, Stapleton and many other neighborhoods in the Metro area to see owner occupied properties being built and sold. In many areas there is beginning to be a surplus of rental units. According to many real estate experts, what is really needed and in high demand is owner occupied housing. Owner occupied housing provides stability to a community and a valuable asset to the purchaser. People who live in Greenwood Village made a conscious and well thought out decision to do so. They choose not to live in more dense and urban areas like Cherry Creek, Downtown or River North. Villagers are dependent on Greenwood Village to protect their investment and quality of life.

Park / Town Center

In addition to wonderful parks, trails and open spaces, Greenwood Village offers a broad range of programs, classes and events for its citizens. Villagers can enjoy special events like Greenwood Village Days, the Fall Fest, the Holiday Candle Lighting Ceremony and the Greenwood Goose Chase. Additionally, there are a variety of athletic events, youth programs, concerts, adult and senior programming and opportunities to volunteer and interact with the city and its agencies. All of these are well used, well attended and much appreciated. Alberta Development Partners are known as retail developers and there is the rub. Their goals and objectives are the exact opposite of the city's founding vision and the desires of its residents. It is to Alberta's financial benefit to build a high density project and generate as much retail traffic as possible into the Orchard Station area. Things like the park, town center, festivals and other programming are nothing more than marketing tools contrived to attract people into their development and to derive revenue from them.

People who live or work in Greenwood Village are very fortunate and benefit from a vibrance and quality of life rarely found elsewhere. It is much appreciated and the reason most are here. It is common knowledge that developers frequently ask for more than they expect to receive. Alberta Development Partners' proposal is so outrageous and inappropriate that I don't know if an accord can be reached. The visions and goals of the participants are very disparate. It is the job of the city and its representatives to protect and support the vision and the reality that is Greenwood Village.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline W. Davis
6840 East Powers Avenue
Greenwood Village, Co 80111

From: **Jennifer** <jennyjohn@aol.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 3:36 PM
Subject: Orchard station project
To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

I am against this project. There is enough traffic as it is. I know what will happen....the developers will say...."Ok..,we will lower the number of stories". That is still not acceptable. We do not need the congestion. When is enough, enough.

Jennifer Galloway
23 beacon hill lane
Greenwood village

From: **Jennifer** <jennyjohn@aol.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 3:39 PM
Subject: Orchard station
To: smoran@greenwoodvillage.com

I am against this project. There is too much traffic as it is. We don't need it. All this development is destroying this area. I don't care if they lower the number of stories...which is what they will offer...it isn't needed. Please be smart and think of what is good for the people that live here.

Jennifer Galloway
23 beacon hill lane
Greenwood village

Jerry Presley
PO Box 3250, Greenwood Village, CO 80161
Phone: 303-808-5453 Email: Jerry@Presley.cc
Web Site: www.JerryPresley.com

Don Provost, Founding Principal
Alberta Development Partners, LLC
Sent via Email: dgp@albdev.com

July 2, 2016

Dear Don,

We met at the Alberta open house to discuss the proposal for the Orchard Station Planning area. You offered to send the TIF financing model to me and I appreciate the openness that you and your team exhibited, especially the time you personally spent with me.

If trees and houses were not an issue, I think I could hit a golf ball from my back yard to your front yard in two strokes. You may be able to return the same golf ball to my back yard in one stroke. We are almost neighbors and I hope you receive this letter with my intent of being upfront and neighborly, not hostile or disrespectful. I'm available for a beer after work on most days of the week.

I have three issues with the proposed development.

First, and most important to me, is using Tax Increment Financing, or TIF funding by establishing a Downtown Development Authority, or DDA. Previously, Alberta submitted a concept to the city dated 5-13-15 that would use Urban Renewal Authority, or URA funding that would require a finding of "blight" in this area. At the time I chuckled at the concept of "blight" in any area of our city. Regardless of URA or DDA authority, this is a philosophical issue and you correctly observed that you won't be able to change my mind on this. I believe that I won't be able to change your mind either.

My view is that government should not pick winners and losers, which it would be doing if it granted a DDA for your project but denied it to anyone else. Generally, I don't like any tax incentives because taxpayers should not subsidize business. Capital should come from investors and bankers not government. If the project would not have been built except for a government subsidy, then perhaps the project simply should not be built. I believe another project, perhaps smaller in scope, would come along that does not require taxpayer financing and the assertion that nothing will be built without TIF is a false premise. I think TIF funding is an example of corporate welfare.

TIF funding for this project in particular, as admitted in your proposal of 5-13-15, would be significant because the primary land use is a church, which is not taxed to the same degree as a commercial enterprise. That means that the "incremental" taxes favor the developer to the greater detriment of other taxing districts. Our fire department, library district, school district, county, and taxpayers in general, would be the losers.

Despite my aversion to TIF, I do not fault you or your company for seeking it since it's a very rational thing for your company to do. It is in Alberta's best self-interest.

An alternative to forming a DDA would be to form a Business Improvement District, or a BID. A BID would tax those entities directly benefiting from whatever services or infrastructure that may be needed and I think this would be the foundation of a far better public policy. The city has never approved a DDA but there are several cases where it has approved a BID.

Secondly, the density of development appears to be out of line with our community standards. The Greenwood Village standard is a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.2. My napkin math of the proposal shows a FAR of 3.3. The density, expressed as the FAR, impacts traffic and view corridors. I'm okay with a FAR of maybe 1.3 or even 1.4 for properties

directly adjacent to I-25, away from neighborhoods. I'm also okay with taller buildings as long as the FAR standard is met. That would mean that there may be taller buildings, but the view corridor between buildings would allow for a better view of the majestic Rocky Mountains. A FAR of anything above 1.4 in the I-25 corridor should be beyond the limit and denied.

Thirdly, I do not agree with adding any Multi Dwelling Unit (MDU) construction regardless of if it is owner occupied or renter occupied. The project is located in the Town Center zone district, which allows residential as a "special use" requiring a special use permit. Residential development is not a use by right. Therefore, if the city were to deny a special use application for residential development, it would not be taking away any land use rights. The owner of the property would still have the right to develop under the TC zone rules.

Greenwood Village is currently about 50% single-family homes to multi-family homes. Residents consume far more services than they generate in revenue and commercial businesses generate far more revenue than they consume in services. Residents are net-cash consumers and businesses are net-cash contributors. As a matter of public policy, this is exactly as it should be. Residents should never subsidize business. It should always be the other way around.

Every resident, whether a renter or owner, takes away from the pot and diminishes the available distribution (in the form of services) to other residents. From my perspective, every additional resident dilutes my share value because these additional shareholders are consuming services. That means that I get fewer services or pay higher taxes. Further, if MDU residential is allowed in any TC zone district, every square foot of residential is subtracted from potential commercial development. That goes against my best self-interest. I want to grow the tax base by favoring commercial development in the TC zone district. The current Comprehensive Plan includes a sentence that states that multi-unit residential development is discouraged and I want the city to keep that sentence in the comprehensive plan. That sentence was placed there for a reason.

Don, I am sending this letter to you directly but asking the city staff to include it, and any response you may have, in the official record of the open house meeting. I don't expect you or Alberta to agree with any of my views. If I were you, I wouldn't agree with me because my views are not in your best self-interest. Regardless, neither you nor I have a vote.

My intent is not to win a debate, but instead to frame the debate on the three critical issues that needs to be debated.

- 1) TIF Funding (This is a Council policy issue, not a P&Z issue)
- 2) Density
- 3) MDU Residential

The Planning and Zoning Commission and ultimately the City Council will rule on any application and I will not second-guess any decision they reach. I believe they will make the right decision whatever that is.

Success to me is a good and respectful debate on these three issues.

Your neighbor,



Jerry Presley

July 6,2016

I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to the proposed zoning change along the I-25 corridor from B-1 to Town Center.

Fifty years ago, my husband and I chose to build our home in the Village because of what we believed would become a frenetic way of life in Denver. Our move was to give us a slower and more relaxing pace of life. My late husband, Richard, established the covenants for Harbold Acres to keep this area as a rural, pleasant, relaxing place to live. Of course we knew there would be changes through the years. That would be inevitable. We believed that the governing departments would come together and maintain the original goals for the Village

Now it seems the development plan envisioned by change to Town Center zoning will nullify the appeal and desirable qualities of the Village. But change without acknowledgement of or regard for the major impact upon the residents is unfathomable. Population growth has already overwhelmed our schools, traffic already burdensome, money needed to support necessary services are just a few of the problems that will engulf the Village.

In my opinion, such change is proposed under the guise of progress and as a way to satisfy the insatiable demand for more money. I sincerely hope the present B-1 zoning is kept in place and stops the insane idea that growth is necessary and a good thing.

Yours truly,

Joyce L. Dworak
5618 S. Newport St.
Greenwood Village, CO

-----Original Message-----

From: kevin evans [mailto:ketalesofthewest@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 4, 2016 2:18 PM

To: lschluter@greenwoodvillage.com; djones@greenwoodvillage.com; dbullock@greenwoodvillage.com; fmiklin@greenwoodvillage.com; glantz@greenwoodvillage.com; smoran@greenwoodvillage.com; tbishop@greenwoodvillage.com; tgordon@greenwoodvillage.com

Subject: Orchard Station development proposal

July 4, 2016

Kevin and Linda Evans
5669 East Ida Circle
Greenwood Village CO 80111
27 year residents
[303-771-6290](tel:303-771-6290)
kevinevansdds@gmail.com

Dear Greenwood Village Council Members,

We have attended two of the public meetings outlining the Orchard Station development proposal, including the most recent on June 29.

We have serious concerns and questions. The impact on the residents appears severe. Specifically:

There was no completed traffic analysis. That seems to be an unconscionable omission. The existing traffic on Quebec between Belleview and Orchard at rush hour is already a crawl at best. Add a dusting of snow and it can take 45 minutes or more to drive between Belleview and Orchard. What about the secondary effect on Monaco and Holly? When asked about the inevitable traffic increase, the two representatives told us not to worry, that additional turn lanes were to be added to Orchard. That answer is unacceptable.

The two representatives we spoke with had no idea about the impact on existing schools and weren't even sure where their water was coming from. They thought perhaps Denver Water.

Presently, of the three freeway access points into Greenwood Village, Orchard is the least congested. This development promises to effect the egress and ingress backups on I-25 to equal those on Arapahoe. This development will have a negative impact well beyond Greenwood Village. Still, there is no completed traffic plan. Wow!

Were we expecting too much to assume that Alberta Development Partners would show the actual benefits to the existing residents of Greenwood Village and their quality of life? No, a new Whole Foods just doesn't sell the plan.

We recognize the inevitability of the development of this valuable parcel. We do however ask what happened to setbacks, height restrictions (multiple 20+ story buildings?), and development densities that defined what was once unique about Greenwood Village? The men and women that established these parameters are gone now, but the residents remain.

Our elected representatives must exercise great foresight. We encourage your thorough analysis with an ever watchful eye to the future of our city. For many years Greenwood Village has prided itself on "A High Quality Living Experience". Let's don't turn it into a LoDo@Greenwood.

Sincerely,
Kevin and Linda Evans

From: **Leon Greos** <greos@me.com>

Date: Fri, Jul 1, 2016 at 1:24 PM

Subject: Comments on Orchard Station proposal

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com, jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com

Cc: smoran@greenwoodvillage.com, glantz@greenwoodvillage.com, rakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com

Leon and Jean Greos
9351 E. Lake Avenue
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
June 30, 2016

Greenwood Village City Council
Planning and Zoning Commission

Dear Greenwood Village City Council:

We are longtime residents of our city and we are writing to express our concern about the proposed Orchard Station project at the intersection of Orchard Road and I-25. We did attend the informative session held on Wednesday evening June 29 at the Doubletree Inn. We have concern that the project as proposed will severely impact traffic and congestion at the intersection in the area, and adversely affect the quality of life that separates Greenwood Village from other communities along the Front Range. Our concerns are as follows:

- High-rise structures: The proposal offers many high-rise structures that exceed our current standards. If these were to be built, a planning and zoning waiver would need to be offered to allow that to happen. Our community does have reasons for limiting the height of structures in our city, and we can see no justification for waiving this current standard to meet the request of the developers.
- Parking: The proposal offers 1186 residences with many office buildings and shops. If each of these residences were to be occupied with two adult individuals, and each adult has a car of his/her own, we are adding almost 2400 automobiles to the area. Of course, Orchard Station sits on the Light Rail and individuals may use Light Rail on occasion, but in our society each adult is likely to own his or her own automobile. In addition, the wages and salaries of the businesses in the center are not likely not to be adequate to allow individuals who work in these businesses to live in the proposed expensive housing. Thus, individuals who work in the offices and stores in the center will likely drive in to work and need parking. Patrons who shop in the stores will need yet additional parking. We do not see that there is an adequate planning or space to accommodate all of this parking demand in the proposed development. We have witnessed recent development of high-density housing in DTC where Light Rail has not provided adequate relief of demand for parking.
- Traffic and congestion: Even when completed, the traffic flow in and out of the development such as the one proposed would significantly impact local traffic. We do see that there is a proposal to expand Orchard Road to four lanes in each direction, but the congestion around I 25 and Orchard road will be tremendous. Currently, traffic is impacted during early morning and late afternoon rush hours in these areas. Many cars coming off the highway are busy attempting to change lanes slowing down through traffic East or West bound on Orchard Road. The additional traffic from the proposed project would overwhelm congestion in this area.

- Traffic and congestion during construction: the proposal is a major development construction in the area. As noted above, there is already excessive traffic and I 25 in Orchard Road during rush hours. With construction ongoing, truck traffic, and necessary delays, and would be severely affected and affect local residences and businesses.

- Traffic flow along Orchard Road: We live in Huntington Acres and traffic during rush hour makes it difficult to enter or leave our neighborhood. The additional traffic flow along Orchard Road, westbound in the morning, and eastbound in the evening, would make it increasingly difficult to get out of our neighborhood and enter the flow of traffic. This may necessitate the addition of a traffic circle or streetlight at the entrance of our neighborhood, and perhaps other neighborhoods would request the same due to increase overall traffic in the area. These sorts of unintended consequences to neighborhoods in the area need to be considered as part of such a large proposal.

- Inner City Concept: the proposal appears to be a concept more appropriate for high density living such as one would find in an inner-city area. Noise and congestion, obstructed view lines, and high-density housing would add little to the quality of life that we enjoy in Greenwood Village. Residents of the city have always taken pride in this quality of life and we cannot justify sacrificing it for this development. A City Center has been proposed further south and is under development. Perhaps this inner-city concept could be transferred to that location rather than adding a second area of high density high-rise concrete, glass, and steel buildings in the heart of our community.

Although of the artist's renderings of this proposal are quite attractive and can be "seductive," the concept is ill-conceived for our city. Thus, we stand in opposition to the proposal as it currently stands. Significant improvements that would make this a more viable concept would include significant reduction in height of the many proposed buildings to our current height standards. Consideration for parking and traffic flow both during construction and upon completion would be paramount to community acceptance of the proposal. Energy considerations, sustainability, noise pollution from auto traffic, and effects on air quality must also be included in the discussion. We have always been advocates of parks and green space in our city and our many city residents have enjoyed living in our city for just these reasons. We see that the current proposal would add little but negatively impact the quality of life of the residents of Greenwood Village.

Sincerely,
Leon and Jean Greos

On Wed, Jul 6, 2016 at 8:07 AM, Lorraine Keeth <keeth2@msn.com> wrote:

We live in Sundance Hills in Greenwood Village and have lived here for more than 25 years. We are very concerned about the proposed re-development of the Orchard station.

We are NOT interested in increasing the population of GV and increasing traffic, retail space, parking issues and the hassle of 6 years of construction.

This proposal is BAD for Greenwood Village.

We are not able to attend the Planning and Zoning meeting on July 19, 2016 so would appreciate passing along our sentiments to the group.

Thank you,
Lorraine & Bob Keeth
9894 E. Ida Ave
Greenwood Village

July 8, 2016

Heather Vidlock

To: Greenwood Village Mayor City Council

Re: Orchard Station Development

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

I am writing with respect to the above referenced development. Thank you for the opportunity to communicate with you. I have lived in the Village since 1978 and worked here since 1985. I have totally enjoyed the lifestyle of the Village.

It is my understanding that the developer is requesting a change in the Master Development Plan as it relates to the Orchard Station Development area

The "purpose statement" to the 2012 amendment to the Greenwood Plaza Master Development Plan (GPMDP) or (MDP) states that "the purpose of the GDMDP is to maintain the development framework, standards and hierarchy of land uses established by the original plan." It further goes on to state that new development shall respect the development standards in the Municipal Code. Further, it states that views shall be preserved both within and without the District.

The amendment continues to allow for "LIMITED (my emphasis) dwelling units, including detached and attached single family dwelling units and multi family dwelling units."

The original plan for this area, that MUST be followed to maintain the intent of the lifestyle intended for the Village, provides for the number of residential units on each parcel of land (plan is attached). I do not see where in the MDP the proposed 1,186 residential units can be placed in the Orchard station subarea. The City must adhere to the MDP. Not only will the MDP be violated but it is not even a close call.

The MDP allows for 6,195,851 square feet in the Greenwood Plaza area. This square footage is allocated to various parcels. Much of this square footage is allocated South of Orchard or West of the proposed development. The Plan states that density CANNOT be transferred between parcels. I asked the Greenwood Village staff how much of the allocated square footage for the planned development is still available. The City Clerk advised me that this has NOT been calculated. How can the proposed development be approved without this information? How can this project go forward without knowing this information? The Square Footage allowed per parcel CANNOT be violated.

In approving both the rezoning and the change to the MDP the Village must follow both 16-2-30 and 16-2-40 of the Greenwood Village Municipal Code.

Both Planning and Zoning, and Council must carefully consider paragraph d of both sections of 16-2-30 and 16-2-40.

For example, in 16-2-30 Planning and Zoning and Council must consider whether the proposed MDP:

- (1) is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan
- (2) is compatible with surrounding land uses
- (3) Adequately mitigates any adverse impacts it causes, including without limitation adverse impacts on traffic, view corridors, noise, property values and the provision of public services.

With respect to subparagraph (3) I have requested copies of studies performed by the Village and have not received anything. Have studies been conducted? How can it be determined that the MDP mitigates these issues without proper studies?

Regarding traffic, which is already a nightmare on Orchard, Quebec and Bellevue, how can traffic not be negatively impacted by adding 3.3 million square feet, including 300,000 of retail. People will not be taking light rail to get to Whole Foods. Cars not only will exit onto Orchard, but also onto Quebec to travel North to Bellevue. The intersection of Bellevue and Quebec cannot handle any more traffic (and the development on Bellevue West of Quebec is not yet completed).

Regarding views, some of the buildings will be over twenty stories. People choose their residences and offices in Colorado because of the views of the mountains. These views in many cases will be compromised due to the proposed development.

Regarding noise, an individual who works for Alberta told me that the developers desire that the proposed park bring people from all over the metropolitan area to visit the park. Bringing all these people to the development is likely to create noise to the surrounding area as well as more crime and safety concerns – not to mention traffic.

Does the proposed development plan adequately mitigate the issues referenced in d (3)? If it does not, the Village is bound to reject the Plan.

Obviously, this development will create a huge burden on City Services, such as police protection, etc.

My neighbors and I are extremely concerned that the proposed development will violate, in a material respect, the master development plan and tremendously affect our quality of life which is why we live here. The proposed development does not belong in our Village.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very Truly Yours,

Louis J. Davis

Louis J. Davis
Attorney

July 14, 2016

Heather Vidlock

To: Greenwood Village Mayor City Council

Re: Orchard Station Development

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

I have read with interest part of the cover letter from Carolynne C. White regarding the submission of the development plan for Orchard Station.

On page two of Ms. White's letter in the first full paragraph of her letter Ms. White states "However, the ultimate density and mix of use will depend largely on the results of a traffic study that currently underway. Alberta is committed that it will not construct more density than the traffic study will support."

Therefore, Alberta, the Village and the residents have no idea what will be proposed. Could it be 3.3 million? Could it be 1,000,000? Nobody will know until the traffic study is done.

Why is the development being pushed through when this CRITICAL piece of information is not yet available?

How can the Village make a determination on such a LACK of information?

Once the study is done does Alberta come back to the Village for another round of approvals? Alberta seemingly makes the decision on the density, not the Village, based on Ms. White's letter.

Is the Village not obtaining its own traffic study? Is the Village relying solely on the developers study?

The review process should NOT be commenced until the Village and its constituents know what the density is.

Let us at least stop the process until the traffic study has been completed and The Village obtains its own traffic study.

16.2.30 and 16.2.40 of the Village Code requires the Village to determine the adverse impact on things like traffic and other matters and how these adverse affects will be dealt with. How can this be done without the studies?

The only reason this is being pushed through is probably because the Developer has deadlines on its real estate purchase contracts. That is not the Village's problem.

On another note, the last survey Greenwood Village did was in 2014. A copy of this is attached. By far the biggest concern of the residents (YOUR CONSTITUENTS) was traffic congestion at around twenty-one percent. Reduce traffic is the third at seven percent. Second, is limit new development/maintain low density. More and better restaurants and shops checks in at TWO PERCENT.

Since 2014 traffic has worsened significantly. Maybe a new survey of the populace should be conducted before this development is voted on.

Let's not rush through something that will negatively impact all of us in a significant way for many years.

Very Truly Yours,

Louis J. Davis
(303) 378-8353

**TABLE 12 WHAT ISSUES RESIDENTS WOULD LIKE ADDRESSED IN GREENWOOD VILLAGE
BY COUNCIL DISTRICT (UNAIDED) - 2014**

<u>Issue Would Like Addressed*</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Council District</u>			
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
<i>Traffic control/management</i>	21%	24%	20%	18%	20%
<i>Limit new development/maintain low density</i>	7%	5%	8%	8%	6%
<i>Reduce traffic</i>	7%	5%	7%	7%	10%
<i>Improve/increase police protection</i>	6%	8%	6%	6%	6%
<i>Eliminate coyotes</i>	6%	7%	2%	8%	8%
<i>Street maintenance</i>	5%	5%	7%	2%	5%
<i>Improve trash/recycling services</i>	4%	4%	5%	6%	4%
<i>Noise (other than airport)</i>	4%	3%	8%	4%	4%
<i>More/improved parks & open space</i>	4%	2%	8%	5%	4%
<i>Improvements to medians/landscaping</i>	4%	6%	4%	1%	3%
<i>Code enforcement – building/zoning/covenants</i>	4%	2%	2%	3%	9%
<i>Reduce speeding</i>	3%	5%	0%	3%	5%
<i>Domestic animal control</i>	3%	3%	5%	3%	2%
<i>Sidewalks/pedestrian/bicycle access</i>	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%
<i>New/improved recreation facilities/recreation center</i>	2%	3%	0%	3%	4%
<i>Street lights</i>	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%
<i>More/better restaurants/shops</i>	2%	0%	4%	4%	1%
<i>Reduce noise at Centennial Airport</i>	2%	1%	1%	1%	5%
<i>Lower taxes</i>	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%
<i>Ease codes and processes for permits</i>	2%	2%	0%	4%	0%
<i>Improve communications from City</i>	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%
<i>Other</i>	22%	25%	27%	20%	18%
Base (Respondents Who Answered)	(450)	(132)	(104)	(107)	(104)

* Reflects multiple responses.
Source: The Howell Research Group

LYNN N. MEYER

**10487 East Ida Avenue
Greenwood Village, CO 80111-3746**

**(303) 796-7954
LNMeyerEsq@comcast.net**

July 7, 2016

Mayor, Greenwood Village
Greenwood Village Council Members

Re: Orchard/I-25 Proposed Development

Dear Elected Representatives:

I have recently learned disturbing details about a development proposed by Alberta Development at I-25 and Orchard Road which would include multiple high rise structures of 20 stories or more and would result in approximately 1,200 rental units, over 1.2 million square feet of office space, and about 300,000 square feet of retail space, as well as restaurants, a hotel, a grocery store and an athletic club. This proposal would seriously adversely impact the quality of life in Greenwood Village and flies in the face of the city's Comprehensive Plan which you were elected to create and implement. Many of my concerns are eloquently and persuasively detailed in a memorandum prepared by Randy Davis, a Greenwood Village resident; you can access his data and analysis at GVDevelopmentWire.com.

Please DO NOT approve the plan as proposed at the June 29 Open House, or any modification that would

- result in high rise structures that would obstruct the view of the mountains or cast shadows on the highway;
- further disrupt the already challenging traffic flow on Orchard Road and the southern portions of I-25; or
- stress the infrastructures of the light rail, our schools, and our predominantly owner-occupied neighborhoods.

While I am not averse to managed growth, I am committed to maintaining the exceptional quality of life that brought my family and my neighbors to Greenwood Village in the first place. The Alberta Development proposal might provide some tax advantages, but those positive aspects are completely overshadowed by the potential negative impact. Leave the tall buildings and the multi-family rental housing downtown and preserve for your electorate the unobstructed views and the intimate feel of our community that we cherish.

Respectfully requested,
Lynn N. Meyer
33 year homeowner in the
Sundance Hills subdivision

On Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 10:21 AM, Margo Cooper <margocooper6@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Heather,

I'm a resident of Greenwood Village and recently became aware of the proposed development at Orchard & 25. What is the best way to act in order to express my strong opposition for this proposed development? We plan to attend the July 19th Planning & Zoning event.

Thanks,

Margo Wilcox
9590 E Orchard Dr
Greenwood Village

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Melissa Scully** <mmcguinn@hotmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2016 at 2:23 PM

Subject: Letter regarding Alberta Development

To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, "glantz@greenwoodvillage.com" <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, libby <beezneezbowz@hotmail.com>

To whom it may concern,

I am deeply concerned about the potential redevelopment of the area just NW of I-25 and Orchard. We moved to Greenwood Village 5 years ago, specifically to live in the Cherry Creek School District, and even more specifically to live within the Belleview Elementary boundaries. In the last several years, we have seen huge population growth and overcrowding at Belleview. Last year, 5 classrooms were moved to outdoor mobile units, in order to accommodate our record number of students. Belleview is completely full and has no room for additional growth. Other schools in the immediate area, such as Greenwood, Cottonwood Creek and High Plains are also extremely full, with no room for additional growth. Families have chosen to live in this area specifically to attend their neighborhood schools. If this new development goes through as planned, it will almost certainly require rezoning of local elementary schools, which would be devastating to kids and families in the area. The Cherry Creek School District can confirm that we are completely landlocked on the west side of the district, with no opportunity to add another elementary school. The addition of more than 1100 units of housing will completely overwhelm our schools and require either enormous class sizes or rezoning, of which neither option is acceptable to current residents.

In some ways, your duty as a planning and zoning commission should be similar to a physician's, "first, do no harm." This proposal, as it currently stands, is extremely harmful to our existing communities. It has the potential to irreparably damage our schools and create upheaval in our close knit neighborhoods and communities.

Although the impact on our schools is my number one concern, I am also hugely dismayed about the additional impacts such a large development would have on all Greenwood Village residents quality of life. We should expect to see worsening traffic, in an area that already struggles with a proliferation of traffic. I am also opposed to the idea of numerous high rise buildings being added to our city. Greenwood Village has always been an oasis in the heart of the DTC, future development should be beneficial to the current residents of Greenwood Village, and this proposal brings more problems than benefits.

Thank you for your time and service.

Best Regards,
Melissa Scully
6048 S Clinton Ct,
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
[303-316-3938](tel:303-316-3938)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Peter Burg** <pburg@burgsimpson.com>

Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2016 at 8:56 AM

Subject: Re: Orchard Station Project

To: George Lantz <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, Debbie Unkeless <unkd5@hotmail.com>

Cc: slburg@aol.com, Tom Swanson <tgs swanson@aol.com>, Gene Eby <eugeneebby@centura.org>, Ron Abreu <AbreuR31@comcast.net>, Michael Bash <ara-bash@comcast.net>, baus12 terry <baus12.terry@comcast.net>, "bbradyesq@comcast.net" <bbradyesq@comcast.net>, Barbara Finke <barbara.finke@gmail.com>, Debbie Swanson <debswanson26@gmail.com>, Stanley and Suzi <kersteinss@gmail.com>, Kim Danos <kim.danos@gmail.com>, "Charles (new) Lawson" <teshnaha@gmail.com>, "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, "jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com" <jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com>, "rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com" <rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com>, "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, Libby Barnacle <beezneezbowz@hotmail.com>, Charles Hazlehurst <drch2@me.com>, Leon Greos <greos@me.com>, "Cc: 'Renee Colby'" <rhcolby@msn.com>, Ed Schenkein <eschenkein@starkcpas.com>

I would just like to echo the sentiments expressed by Brad and Debbie Unkeless. I had been planning to put together a similar transmittal, but travel and work demands created time constraints. However, I will avail myself of this string to express my full support regarding the concerns that have been voiced by the Unkeless' and others. Put simply, we must be careful and conscientious about not destroying what has made Greenwood Village a special and desirable place to live. We've all seen too many communities in recent years where poorly planned development, sprawl, and high density demands have substantially diminished the quality of life for residents. Thank you all for your consideration! Best, Peter.

Peter Burg, Esq.

pburg@burgsimpson.com

BURGSIMPSON

BURG | SIMPSON | ELDREDGE | HERSH | JARDINE PC

ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS AT LAW

Good Lawyers. Changing Lives.

40 Inverness Drive East

Englewood, CO 80112

www.burgsimpson.com

Telephone: [\(303\)792-5595](tel:(303)792-5595)

Facsimile: [\(303\)708-0527](tel:(303)708-0527)

From: Peter Jacobson <jacobson_p2@yahoo.com>
Date: July 8, 2016 at 11:52:16 AM MDT
To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>
Subject: Orchard Station Development
Reply-To: Peter Jacobson <jacobson_p2@yahoo.com>

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

I am a resident of Greenwood Village, and would like to express my concern about the potential development proposed by Alberta Development for the Orchard Station Subarea.

In short, Greenwood Village is a wonderful place to live, and I would not like to see that disrupted by a large scale development that would almost certainly have an impact on traffic, schools and site-lines. While I understand that there is a goal of mitigating any impact on traffic and schools, these goals may not be met, and there is certainly risk that they won't. Traffic could get even worse than it already has in the past few years and classroom sizes could increase past their already large sizes. In addition, one of the things I cherish most about where I live, namely the beautiful view I get when driving West on Orchard Road from my home in the Sundance Hills community, will certainly be impeded.

Living in Greenwood Village is already wonderful, and I don't need the city to provide any additional services. I even see some services that are excessive and which could be cut if necessary. I see limited benefit to the additional revenue, and certainly any benefit that is outweighed by extra cost, both monetary and to the quality of life.

Please do not risk transforming our wonderful city for the sake of this large new development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Peter Jacobson

July 7, 2016

Heather Vidlock
Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village
6060 South Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

I am writing this letter because I am a resident of Sundance Hills, grew up in Greenwood Village and I have serious concerns regarding the creation of the proposed Orchard Station sub-area, the rezoning of existing B-1 zone properties into Town Center zoning and the anticipated application by Alberta Development to build a 3.2 million square foot mixed-use development on 24-acres within the Orchard Station sub-area.

Pursuant to the Municipal Code "Sec. 16-2-30 – Rezoning", the following must be considered:

In reviewing the proposed rezoning, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council shall consider whether the rezoning:

- 1. Is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan;*
- 2. Is compatible with surrounding land uses; and*
- 3. Adequately mitigates any adverse impacts it causes, including without limitation adverse impacts on traffic, view corridors, noise, property values and the provision of public services.*

The development is expected to be 3.2 million square feet, **which is twice the size of Park Meadows Mall**. This will clearly have an impact on "traffic, view corridors, noise, property values and the provision of public services".

My wife and I travel on a daily basis along Orchard Road, Greenwood Plaza Blvd., Quebec Street and Bellevue Ave. and encounter significant traffic issues during the morning and evening rush hours. Traffic becomes gridlocked to the point where it is dangerous to cross intersections and turn on to the major streets. The current roads do not support the existing development and we cannot begin to imagine the traffic impact of the Alberta Development proposal on the Greenwood Plaza area.

The initial traffic study discussed at the April 19, 2016 Study Session **only** proposes a traffic increase of **30% – 45%** on Orchard Road, which already becomes gridlocked at I-25 and Greenwood Plaza Blvd. Even the 30% - 45% projected increase is significant given the current traffic issues; however, it appears to dramatically understate the traffic increase and negative impact of an almost **seven-fold increase in square footage** in the development area (1.7 million sqft (apartments) + 1.2 million sqft (office) + 0.3 million sqft (retail) x 4 (per Chris Fasching, traffic engineer with Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, retail brings in four-times the traffic of office space) equals 4.1 million office equivalent sqft. 4.1 million office equivalent sqft / 600,000 existing sqft = 6.8x increase in square footage).

The traffic study not only fails to mitigate the proposed traffic increase, but it is also **not comprehensive**, because it only contemplates improvements within a **½ mile radius** surrounding Orchard and I-25, which doesn't even reach to Bellevue and Quebec.

We live in the Greenwood Village because we have chosen to raise our family in the suburbs. We chose the incredible village atmosphere where I grew-up, because of the comfortable quality of life, high quality schools and exceptional city services.

The Cherry Creek schools that our children will attend were not physically built to support the density of housing that is proposed. The schools will likely be subject to intense overcrowding and potential teacher shortages given greater than anticipated enrollments. There are arguments that the apartments will not attract residents with school-aged children, but that has not been the case with other apartment complexes in the surrounding area; which specifically have attracted residents who desire to send their children to the great Cherry Creek Schools.

The original Greenwood Plaza master development plan and the existing Comprehensive Plan strictly limit the maximum density and building heights. The original MDP called for a maximum of approximately 22,000 sqft/acre (6.2 million square feet / 283 acres), where a significant amount of the square footage would reside south of Orchard. Alberta is proposing 133,000 sqft/acre (3.2 million square feet / 24 acres), this is a 6-fold increase in density. The original MDP limited multi-family to 10 dwelling units per acre and Alberta is proposing 50 units per acre (1,200 rental units / 24 acres). Alberta is also proposing several high-rise buildings that will come close to or exceed 20-stories. These buildings will impede or block the mountain views from east of I-25.

Additionally, the city has always maintained a strong preference for owner-occupied housing and what Alberta is proposing includes 1,200 rental apartments. This would dramatically increase by 20% both the number of households and number of residents in Greenwood Village and would likely create competing interests and priorities between homeowners and renters.

I am very worried that the Alberta Development proposal will have a permanent negative impact on the City of Greenwood Village. I also fear that the City of Greenwood Village, through its rezoning application and desire to change the language of the Comprehensive Plan, is trying to pave a path for Alberta or other developers without providing the necessary studies and adequate mitigation of any and all adverse impacts.

My family and I truly love Greenwood Village, but living in the suburbs, we never expected to see this type of density even proposed; especially since the Comprehensive Plan, master development plans and current zoning do not allow it. Please protect the city that we love by maintaining the standards and character of the Village that has been in place for the nearly 40-years, since I moved here as a child.

Very truly yours,

Randy Davis

Appendix:

Here are a few pictures from this week at 5:30 p.m. at Belleview and Quebec. There is clearly no additional room for more traffic and traffic will only worsen upon the completion of the high-rise office building at Belleview and Quebec and the unfinished apartments on the north side of Belleview and west of Quebec.



From: RENEE BRILLIANT <reneebril@msn.com>

Date: July 7, 2016 at 3:07:37 PM MDT

To: Lynn Meyer <lnmeyerEsq@comcast.net>

Cc: <rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com>, <fmiklin@greenwoodvillage.com>, <dbullock@greenwoodvillage.com>, <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, <lschluter@greenwoodvillage.com>, <djones@greenwoodvillage.com>, <tgordon@greenwoodvillage.com>, <tbishop@greenwoodvillage.com>

Subject: Re: Proposed Orchard/I-25 Development

To my Greenwood Village elected officers,

I fully agree with the eloquent letter Lynne Meyer has written below. Perhaps not so eloquently I would like to say this development is disastrous in size and the created traffic would be horrific!

Please reconsider this massive proposal.

Thank you,

Renee Brilliant
5792 S Hanover Way
Greenwood Village

Sent from Renee Brilliant

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Shelley Krovitz** <shelley@skrovitz.com>

Date: Thu, Jun 30, 2016 at 6:08 PM

Subject: FW: Orchard Station MDP Neighborhood Input Meeting

To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, "glantz@greenwoodvillage.com" <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>

To all,

Your email was forwarded by the Canon Villas HOA manager to residents like us. The size and impact of the Orchard Station project boggles the mind. Trying to access I25 at most times during week days at Orchard Rd, Belleview, or Arapahoe Road is currently an exercise in blood pressure control and long delays. Taking surface streets to avoid the highway traffic and to find another way through Greenwood Village is already difficult and time consuming. Add another few thousand cars most hours of most days and you have a dysfunctional community that has lost its considerable charm.

Regards,

Robert and Shelley Krovitz

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sherry Courtney** <sherrycourtney@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jul 8, 2016 at 3:13 PM

Subject: Alberta Development Concern

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Heather Vidlock
Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village
6060 South Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

My name is Sherry Whitehead. I am a resident of Sundance Hills. I am writing this letter to you as the Community Development Director and ask that it be provided to the Planning & Zoning Commissioners for their study and consideration prior to the P&Z meeting at which the P&Z Commission will consider the adoption of language for the comprehensive plan for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan. It is my understanding that the language is currently being refined by the City Staff and that it may be further revised after the City Council study session on July 11, 2016.

I understand that, in anticipation of the filing of a master development plan from Alberta Development, the City is considering adopting language for the Orchard Station Subarea Plan that significantly differs from the current comprehensive plan and will lay the groundwork for the high density urban TOD development that Alberta has studied with the City.

As stated in the Greenwood Village Goals section of the current comprehensive plan, the goals for development include "protect the peripheral areas of the Village from incompatible land develop and traffic patterns...mitigate the negative effects of traffic on neighborhoods, while promoting easy access to and from the Village's commercial areas.... The Future Land Use Goals section call out for views of the mountains to be protected and mandates that developers evaluate the visual impact of their projects on existing and proposed developments. To that end, since before Greenwood Village was incorporated or the DTC was developed, the DTC area has been a suburban area that is primarily residential and also includes businesses located in low to medium height buildings. To protect the view corridors and maintain the feel of a suburban community, the City has historically limited the heights of buildings by following the radial height plan.

Although the proposed language for the subarea has not been finalized, I strongly urge that the following concerns be addressed in the plan.

Suburban v. Urban. Greenwood Village is suburban, not urban. Residents, who live here, have chosen the suburban lifestyle. Similarly, business that locate here, have made the conscious decision to conduct business in a suburban setting. Located within the Orchard Station Subarea is a light rail stop. Therefore, the subarea is a TOD. However, just because it is a TOD, it is not automatically urban. To the contrary, redevelopment of the subarea should protect the suburban nature of Greenwood Village.

Density. Density of buildings and developments should be consistent with the density of buildings and developments located within business parks that are currently located in Greenwood Village.

Multi-Family Units. The City has historically had a strong preference for owner-occupied residences. That preference should continue and the construction of rental residences should be strongly discouraged.

Building Height. New buildings should not be taller than the existing buildings. The Landmark is an example of buildings that are too tall. Buildings adjacent to I-25 should be compatible with the rest of Greenwood Village and the Tech Center and should be no taller than 10-12 stories.

View Corridors. View corridors for residences and businesses on the east side of I-25 should be protected. In accordance with the comprehensive plan, view corridor studies should include existing residences, mountain views from neighborhoods should be protected and building height should be limited so that new buildings are not visible from neighborhoods east of I-25 where neighbors cannot currently see buildings. Similarly, the comprehensive plan should discourage new buildings that will effectively create a concrete corridor along I-25 between Arapahoe Road and Belleview (the south-north boundaries of Greenwood Village along I-25).

Traffic. Traffic is already a problem for residents. New development should not cause additional traffic unless the impact is fully mitigated. The impact of traffic coming into and going out of the Orchard Station Subarea at all hours of business days, nights and weekends should be addressed. Any development should consider traffic patterns north of the development (to Belleview) as well as south of the development (to Orchard). The well-being and lifestyle of residents impacted by the traffic should be considered. To do this, the impact of traffic moving east as far as University as well as west as far as Havana should be considered.

Parking and Access to Parking. The comprehensive plan for the subarea should call for adequate parking for both residents and visitors. Residents of Greenwood Village should continue to have no cost access to parking for light rail and parks and recreation facilities. As a Village, we want to encourage residents to use alternative transportation (specifically including the R line to A line connection) when traveling to and from DIA.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope that the City continues to maintain the concerns and lifestyle of residents as a priority that developers are required to acquiesce to as opposed to the residents being forced to change their quality of life to accommodate the desires of for profit developers.

Thank you,
Sherry Whitehead

From: Stacie Sarsfield <staciesarsfield@comcast.net>

Date: July 7, 2016 at 3:44:46 PM MDT

To: smoran@greenwoodvillage.com, hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com, glantz@greenwoodvillage.com

Subject: Proposed Development at Orchard and I-25

July 7, 2016

Greenwood Village Council Members

Re: Orchard/I-25 Proposed Development

Dear Elected Representatives:

I have recently learned details about a development proposed by Alberta Development at I-25 and Orchard Road which would include multiple high rise structures of 20 stories or more and would result in approximately 1,200 rental units, over 1.2 million square feet of office space, and about 300,000 square feet of retail space, as well as restaurants, a hotel, a grocery store and an athletic club. This proposal would seriously adversely impact the quality of life in Greenwood Village and flies in the face of the city's Comprehensive Plan. Many of my concerns are eloquently and persuasively detailed in a memorandum prepared by Randy Davis, a Greenwood Village resident; you can access his data and analysis at GVDevelopmentWire.com.

Please DO NOT approve the plan as proposed at the June 29 Open House, or any modification that would

- result in high rise structures that would obstruct the view of the mountains or cast shadows on the highway;
- further disrupt the already challenging traffic flow on Orchard Road and the southern portions of I-25; or
- stress the infrastructures of the light rail, our schools, and our predominantly owner-occupied neighborhoods.

While I am not averse to managed growth, I am committed to maintaining the exceptional quality of life that brought my family and my neighbors to Greenwood Village in the first place. The Alberta Development proposal might provide some tax advantages, but those positive aspects are completely overshadowed by the potential negative impact. Leave the tall buildings and the multi-family rental housing downtown and preserve for your electorate the unobstructed views and the intimate feel of our community that we cherish.

Respectfully requested,

Stacie Sarsfield

5832 S. Geneva St.
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
July 7, 2016

Heather Vidlock, Community Development Director
City of Greenwood Village
6060 South Quebec Street
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Re: Orchard Station Subarea Plan and Rezoning

Dear Ms. Vidlock:

We are residents of Sundance Hills, where we have lived for over 20 years. We are writing this letter to you both for your consideration, and for you to provide to the Planning & Zoning Commission members for their review in connection with the upcoming meeting at which the P&Z Commission will consider the proposed Orchard Station Subarea Plan and rezoning for that proposed subarea. We understand both those items are on the P&Z Commission agenda for July 19, 2016.

We understand that the City is considering adopting an Orchard Station Subarea Plan as a significant departure from the current comprehensive plan, in anticipation of further development plans to be filed by Alberta Development. We are quite concerned with the massive scale of the development that Alberta proposes for Orchard Station, especially the height of several buildings just west of Interstate 25, the extent to which these tall buildings will interfere with mountain views from I-25 and Greenwood Village areas to the east, and the impacts of additional traffic to and from the hundreds of residential units and large commercial spaces proposed. If the City adopts any new plan for the area surrounding Orchard Station, its plan should provide for minimizing and mitigating these impacts in ways consistent with the current comprehensive plan.

The current comprehensive plan already provides for ða Village Center that will serve as a community focal point and provide a source of community pride for Village residents.ö However, this Village Center is planned, and has been developing for several years, at Arapahoe Stationö not at Orchard Station. The development of a second Village Center or Town Center, with more dense commercial use and new, massive high-density multi-family residential use, is contrary to the City's sound, long-standing plan.

One of the City's foremost ðFuture Land Use Goalsö in the current comprehensive plan is to ðStrive to protect the views of the mountains.ö Specifically with regard to the I-25 Corridor Planning Area, one of the Land Use Goals/ Objectives in the current comprehensive plan (p. 139) is to ðPlan redevelopment to preserve scenic views and vistas.ö However, the proposed Subarea Plan for this part of the Corridor Planning Area ignores this objective. The same objectives should be included in any Subarea Plan recommended to City Council, in order to preserve what is left of the vital mountain views for Village residents located east of I-25.

Buildings adjacent to I-25 should be compatible with the rest of Greenwood Village and the Tech Center, and should generally be no taller than 10-12 stories. The City's plan should also consider the impacts of additional ice creating road hazards on I-25 and other traffic corridors when shaded from the sun by adjacent tall buildings. Consistent with the comprehensive plan, any subarea plan should require view corridor studies that take existing residential neighborhoods into consideration. Mountain views

from neighborhoods and roadways should be protected and building height should be limited so that new buildings do not block mountain views from neighborhoods east of I-25. Similarly, the subarea plan should ensure that new buildings that will not effectively form a wall or turret along I-25 between Arapahoe Road and Bellevue.

Traffic is another crucial consideration that needs to be addressed in any new subarea plan. The Southeast Corridor light rail lines are an amenity that gives some people an alternative to driving for some of their trips. However, the City cannot wishfully assume that most Orchard Station residents, employees and customers will forego the use of their cars. In adopting any new plan, the City needs to require realistic traffic studies that will quantify the worst-case traffic impacts of proposed developments, rather than hope for the best case. One of the Transportation Goals/ Objectives for the Corridor Planning Area in the comprehensive plan is to "Minimize traffic congestion on the periphery of the planning area." Traffic congestion is already a reality almost every day on several nearby streets including Orchard, Quebec, Yosemite and Bellevue. Developments now underway in the Village Center (Arapahoe Station) area will significantly increase traffic on several of these streets. To protect quality of life for Greenwood Village residents and businesses, the City needs to assure that new, dense developments will not exacerbate these problems.

Similarly, any subarea plan for Orchard Station should require realistic and adequate parking so that Village residents can access light rail, commercial areas and recreational spaces without significant cost or inconvenience.

Greenwood Village has always had strong policies encouraging owner-occupied housing and disfavoring multi-family rental housing. While the City may want to experiment with allowing some housing variety adjacent to a light-rail station, any allowance for multi-family housing at this time should be very limited, rather than throwing the doors wide open to such a radical change to the City's longstanding character and policies.

To summarize, the City should not rush to adopt the currently proposed subarea plan or rezoning, and should not accommodate the enormous scale of development that Alberta proposes. Rather, the City should carefully consider the needs and quality of life of current residents, and should ensure that the values reflected in the comprehensive plan will remain protected in any new subarea plan or rezoning.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Respectfully,

Stephen and Cheryl Leonhardt

-----Original Message-----

From: Sue Baker [mailto:Sue-Baker@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2016 5:34 PM

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com; fmiklin@greenwoodvillage.com; dbullock@greenwoodvillage.com

Subject: Proposed Development at Orchard and I-25

July 10, 2016

Greenwood Village Council Members

Dear Elected Representatives:

I have serious concerns about the development proposed by Alberta Development at I-25 and Orchard Road which would redevelop 600,000 sqft of existing office space and empty land into 3,200,00 sqft of mixed-used space. The current traffic at both Belleview and Orchard and I-25 is already challenging and seems to get worse every day. I am also concerned about high rise structures going up which will obstruct the view of the mountains. I also feel that this development will change the dynamics of Greenwood Village from an intimate feel to a very commercial feel.

Please vote against this proposal on July 19,2016.

Thank you.

Sue Baker

From: **Susan Williams** <susanwilliams11@msn.com>
Date: Tue, Jun 28, 2016 at 12:59 PM
Subject: Feedback regarding I-25 and Orchard Redevelopment
To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>,
"smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>,
"glantz@greenwoodvillage.com" <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>

Heather Vidlock, Director of Community Development

George Lantz, Greenwood Village District 3 Representative

Steve Moran, Greenwood Village District 3 Representative

Dear Sirs and Madame,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Orchard Station development along I-25. Our family has resided in the Sundance Hills neighborhood for 18 years. What attracted us to Greenwood Village was the open space, unique character and laid back lifestyle.

I have been concerned about the traffic in the area for some time and I think this development would make it worse. I recently made an agonizing job change partly due to the difficulty I had with the traffic in Greenwood Village. My three mile commute from Dayton and Orchard to Holly and Orchard was often gridlocked due to multitudinous construction projects and high traffic volume at random times during the day. The Orchard and Quebec intersection is particularly onerous. Add this to the already overburdened I-25 and Orchard intersection and my eight minute commute often turned into forty minutes. Looking ahead to the increased construction at I-25 and Orchard and the closure of Arapahoe, I chose to explore other options and now work in Englewood instead of Greenwood Village... and it's quicker to get to work!

Our family relishes the serenity and ease of living here. Some of the treasures of Greenwood Village are the open spaces and semi-rural feel of the community. The Highline Canal, parks, trail and wildlife are some of the truly remarkable features of our city. I don't see how high rises and high density development fit synergistically in the picture. I feel like this development threatens the relaxed and harmonious feel of our community, especially our natural surroundings. We fear that the high density development plan now advocated by the city leadership may adversely impact our community's delicate environmental balance as well. Ultimately, we choose to live in Greenwood Village instead of Lodo, Lone Tree or Highlands Ranch for a reason. This revised development seems too geared to transform Greenwood Village into a similar overdeveloped locality.

I agree that our community needs to control and capitalize on opportunities for growth and development (would love to see a Pizzeria Locale here by the way). I see this latest

plan, however, as a betrayal of our trust in our leadership, especially given the plan that we viewed in the spring did not feel as high density. I feel like we've been given the "bait and switch" treatment by the city planners and it doesn't set well at all!

Thank you for soliciting our feedback and hope it will result in a scaled back approach to this plan.

Sincerely,

Susan R. Williams

Susanwilliams11@msn.com

From: Vincent Donahue <vpdonahue@aol.com>

Date: July 13, 2016 at 12:20:00 PM MDT

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Cc: jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com, dbullock@greenwoodvillage.com, fmilkin@greenwoodvillage.com, rrakowski@greenwoodvillage.com

Subject: ORCHARD STREET STATION PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Dear Heather,

I am writing to you to express my very strong objection to the proposed roughly 3.3 million square foot residential and commercial development plan being proposed by Alberta Development Partners.

I spent my entire career at one of the nation's largest residential and commercial development firms "Arvida Corporation" that was based in South Florida for over sixty years.

Arvida master planned and developed some of Florida's largest residential and commercial communities in Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, Jacksonville, Longboat Key outside of Sarasota, Florida.

Arvida was the largest master plan developer in Boca Raton, Florida and was deeply involved in all of the master plan developments at Walt Disney in Orlando, Florida.

I am intimately familiar with large-scale master developments and their overall impacts on community and regional infrastructure find that the Orchard Street Station would place such overwhelming pressure on our existing and in many areas inadequate infrastructure in Greenwood Village, that it would result in a major diminution and degradation of the quality of life within our great community.

It is complete folly to assume that the existence of the Light Rail transportation system would mitigate any significant impact on traffic, pollution, noise and overall congestion within the surrounding areas of the proposed development. No amount of road widening will be sufficiently adequate to shoulder the incremental burden of this overly aggressive development proposal given it's location at the northwest corner of Orchard and I-25. An intersection that is already greatly overburdened with traffic. The entire Greenwood Village community will be negatively impacted by this development as a result of spillover effects, which in my judgement, will far outweigh the economic benefits of the development to Greenwood Village.

Unless the Mayor and City Council stops this development plan or any other alternate plan that would be even a small fraction of what is being requested for by Alberta Development Partners, then the quality of life in Greenwood Village as we have known it to be over the past twenty years will basically cease to exist.

Greenwood Village is at it's maximum level of congestion today. It is up to the City Council to ensure that we do not fall into the abyss of even more congestion by allowing this project or, for that matter, any other project that even approaches a fraction of the size and scope of Orchard Street Station. Additional large-scale real estate

development within our community does not constitute progress. Economic benefit does not trump the preservation of quality of life. The density of future development within Greenwood Village must and should be drastically reduced in order to ensure the beauty, the vibrancy and the enjoyment that all our citizens are so fortunate to have. It could be argued that some of this has already slipped away.

Greenwood Village is a very special community. Please do not ruin it by allowing such massive and quite frankly irresponsible development.

Sincerely,

Vincent P. Donahue, Jr.

Vince Donahue
5870 South Clayton Court
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80121

Office [720-493-8540](tel:720-493-8540)
Mobile [303-908-8644](tel:303-908-8644)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <bbradyesq@comcast.net>

Date: Wed, Jul 6, 2016 at 6:37 PM

Subject: Orchard Station

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com, jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com, smoran@greenwoodvillage.com, glantz@greenwoodvillage.com, rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com

Greenwood Village City Council
Planning and Zoning Commission
City of Greenwood Village

Council and Commission Members:

My wife, Helen, and I have had the good fortune to celebrate almost 30 years as residents of Greenwood Village, residing in the Huntington Acres (HA) subdivision at 9644 East Lake Circle. Our home backs onto South Dayton where, courtesy of the City many years ago, an attractive brick sound abatement wall sits on our backyard property line. Initially, we also had most traffic views blocked by a stand of eleven tall pine trees.

These amenities have provided sight barriers and privacy, and at one time muffled some of the local traffic sounds. Over the years with increased traffic on South Dayton, the noise, automobile exhaust and the seemingly constant traffic view has become terribly intrusive.

Moreover, as I teach early evening classes at DU Law School and in DU's Graduate Environmental Policy and Management Program, I've found exiting during the 5 o'clock rush hour onto Orchard from South Boston Street has become even worse than exiting East Lake Avenue onto South Dayton. These two exits are our neighborhood's only means of egress from our subdivision to these two collector/arterial streets. At times I have waited as long as 5 minutes for a kind motorist to provide a break in traffic before exiting the subdivision onto Orchard. Many of my HA neighbors have had similar experiences.

We have also had increased air traffic from Centennial airport, with more disruptive sound and air pollution added to the traffic woes. While these adverse impacts are understandable in a growing community, much of the sound, traffic noise, and air and light pollution at night comes from commuters who do not live in Greenwood Village. We often have commuter traffic rerouting through our HA streets to avoid the congestion on South Dayton and Orchard, oftentimes at unsafe speeds with children and elderly adult pedestrians present.

With growth comes commercial development. My wife and I didn't object to the addition of the Westin Hotel project on I-25 at Caley because it appeared logical that this vacant land location should be commercially developed over time. This use I believed would largely divert most of the hotel traffic away from our subdivision and keep it within the adjacent I-25 corridor. However, with the increased commuter congestion we are now experiencing, I am fearful of this development exacerbating the backed-up traffic congestion especially at the Orchard and South Yosemite/DTC Boulevard intersection.

Also problematic is getting onto I-25 during rush hour. IGoing to DU at 5 o'clock, it now takes almost 20 minutes to get from my HA subdivision through the Great West Building traffic, blocked by unceasing right turns onto Orchard, then onto the I-25 on-ramp and traffic light control, before getting onto I-25 northbound. I have found it a little faster to take DTC Boulevard to the I-225 ramp north of the underpass for access to I-25.

Permit me to provide a brief synopsis of my professional experience. I have spent the most significant portion of my almost 40 year legal career representing dozens of Colorado municipalities in countless

lawsuits, including civil rights claims under 42 USC 1983, unconstitutional takings and inverse condemnation, as well as litigating environmental, insurance, product liability and serious injury tort and wrongful death cases on behalf of multi-national corporations, domestic businesses and individuals, both in the US and in Europe.

As a former Assistant Littleton City Attorney advising our City Council, Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment for many years as Littleton grew in the late 70's and 80's, I experienced there that much of the congestion and pollution now occurring in HA is not an unfamiliar scenario within a successful, suburban expansion corridor. Creative measures to equally expand Littleton infrastructure had to be found when Highlands Ranch (although mostly not within the City of Littleton boundaries) and E470 were built, and when the railroad tracks were depressed through town and under Main Street. Frequently urbanization doesn't respect municipal boundaries, and inter-governmental cooperation on unintended cross-border impacts occurred.

Unfortunately, the prospect for added, uncontrollable traffic congestion on Orchard, with its attendant delays, noise, air pollution and stress will be further compounded by the proposed Orchard Station project. In my experience in Littleton over more than 30 years, first as an Assistant City Attorney and then Special Trial Counsel, it is an entirely unsatisfactory response to assert that the proposed 26 acre project will only impact the west side of I-25. The east side of I-25 at the sited locations are already massively overburdened with traffic congestion, and our quality of life has slowly, inexorably deteriorated. With reasonable certainty, permitting several new 20 story high rise structures with 1,200 proposed residents, offices, shops and consumer traffic will inundate already intolerable traffic log-jamming, and compound our City's environmental problems and accelerate our quality of life deterioration.

From my practice I am familiar with most of the constitutional and other legal and factual arguments advanced by business and property owners to justify developing private property rights. I am also very sympathetic to allowing the "highest and best use" so long as it does not jeopardize countervailing neighboring property rights interests. Properly balancing those interests requires a comprehensive assessment of all stakeholder values and adverse consequences to adjacent property and surrounding neighborhoods. Continued overburdening of the Greenwood Village infrastructure will create creeping urban sprawl, and decimate land values.

Given the immense design of the proposed plan, I am also reasonably confident that the Orchard Station developers expect you to scale back this untenable proposal. One caveat: Please do not be lulled into thinking that *minor adjustments* will satisfy their needs, or our requirements. At a minimum, this project needs to be redrawn and potentially replatted to less than half of its proposed density before serious consideration for approval can commence. Discussion can then turn to additional concurrent proposals for infrastructure improvements, including traffic system flow and traffic reduction, parking, techniques for diminishing and/or eliminating pollution, and citizen proposals for alleviating the adverse impact on the character of the City of Greenwood Village.

As a longtime resident of Greenwood Village, I do not wish to reside in a replicated Crystal City or Arlington, Virginia, or perish the thought, Houston, Texas. If you permit the Orchard Station development as proposed, we will be well on that highway.

I have also read the email letter of June 30th written to you by Leon and Jean Greos, and would join in their analysis and concerns.

Thank you each for considering my input,

William J. Brady

9644 East lake Circle

Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111-5211

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Charles Lawson** <teshnaha@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2016 at 10:20 AM

Subject: Re: Orchard Station Project

To: Peter Burg <pburg@burgsimpson.com>

Cc: George Lantz <glantz@greenwoodvillage.com>, Debbie Unkeless <unkd5@hotmail.com>, slburg@aol.com, Tom Swanson <tqswanson@aol.com>, Gene Eby <eugeneebby@centura.org>, Ron Abreu <AbreuR31@comcast.net>, Michael Bash <ara-bash@comcast.net>, baus12 terry <baus12.terry@comcast.net>, "bbradyesq@comcast.net" <bbradyesq@comcast.net>, Barbara Finke <barbara.finke@gmail.com>, Debbie Swanson <debswanson26@gmail.com>, Stanley and Suzi <kersteinss@gmail.com>, Kim Danos <kim.danos@gmail.com>, "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>, "jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com" <jmcgee@greenwoodvillage.com>, "rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com" <rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com>, "smoran@greenwoodvillage.com" <smoran@greenwoodvillage.com>, Libby Barnacle <beezneezbowz@hotmail.com>, Charles Hazlehurst <drch2@me.com>, Leon Greos <greos@me.com>, "Cc: 'Renee Colby'" <rholby@msn.com>, Ed Schenkein <eschenkein@starkcpas.com>

George,

I am very sympathetic to every letter our neighbors have submitted regarding the expansion of the Orchard Station project. I would hope that traffic on Orchard Road would remain a primary concern, and I really hope that it would not lead to another \$66 million intersection improvement for Orchard Road at I-25, like we are watching take place at Arapahoe.

At the minimum, I would expect to see that a traffic light installed at Orchard and Boston be a requirement for this project, whatever the final size and shape that it takes.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Chris Graber <graberc@gmail.com>
Date: July 7, 2016 at 7:46:10 PM MDT
To: "hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com" <hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com>
Subject: Development

I like what I see regarding the development of i25 and orchard. I live at s Havana and caley

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Marcy Balogh** <marcybalogh@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Jul 6, 2016 at 1:23 PM

Subject: Comment from GV resident related to Orchard Station Project

To: hvidlock@greenwoodvillage.com

Cc: smoran@greenwoodvillage.com, glantz@greenwoodvillage.com

I have been learning more about the Orchard Station Project and want to add my voice to the conversation.

I enthusiastically support this project - it has the potential to bring energy and opportunity (within walking distance) to our community. Given my confidence that the project will be developed with the quality and thoughtfulness that we have come to expect here in Greenwood Village, I support this proposal.

Thank you,

Marcy Balogh

19 Beacon Hill Lane

[303.694.2468](tel:303.694.2468)

I attended both the Study Session and the Open House yesterday. As part of the ownership group of 6900/6950/7000 E. Belleview – our comments:

We support this project

We are supportive of both for rent and for sale residential product. I believe the Village should get good legal advice on its stance on for-rent housing. On the east coast, cities have been sued for discriminatory housing practices by out-lawing rental housing.

Increased traffic is a fact of life and is one of the negative side effects of the popularity of Denver and the Village. People will desire to have everything closer to them (retail, offices, housing) so they can minimize travel times. Orchard Station accomplishes this.

Regards,

Nate Schnabel
NAS Properties
6900 E Belleview Avenue, Suite 200
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

On Jul 9, 2016, at 3:38 PM, Yanni Stavropoulos <yanni1226@yahoo.com> wrote:

Just wanted to drop a line to express my appreciation for a well presented open house on the development of the Orchard Station project.

It would be quite a boon to the area. Especially since the Italian Village debacle has left the area quite stagnant the past 7 years.

As a resident of Greenwood Village, I applaud your effort to try to bring quality development to the area.

Thanks,

Yanni Stavropoulos