

Attachment 19: October - November 2021 Have Your Say Public Comments. A public comment forum was hosted on the City's Have Your Say website between October 28, 2021 and November 28, 2021. Notice of the public comment forum was sent to The Streets at SouthGlenn email list and through the City's social media channels. City staff responded to and acknowledged receipt of the public comments, however the standard responses are not included in this attachment. Staff responses that answer a question or provide additional information are included and are shaded gray.

First Name	Last Name	Posted	Text
Madison	Rhea	Oct 28 2021 11:50 AM	<p>I'm a property owner in the condos adjacent to Southglenn, and I'm excited to see some redevelopment happening! The current vacant areas of the shopping center detract from the appeal of this beautiful space, and it's great that change is coming soon.</p> <p>I would love to see some mixed-use structures come out of this redevelopment process rather than residential only - will the new residential units include shops/dining on the bottom level, similar to Portola?</p> <p>Adding residential units to help support existing retail stores is great, and it's understandable that adding retail-only is not feasible in the current market. But, diversifying the shopping and dining by including handful of mixed-use units with retail on the bottom level might strengthen the long term appeal of the area and provide more variety for consumers and residents in the nearby.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>
Jenna	Campbell	Oct 29 2021 10:48 AM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Hi Madison, thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. The overall intent of the Master Development Plan (MDP) is to create and maintain mixed use development at The Streets at SouthGlenn. If the MDP is approved, the developer would have the option to build standalone residential units or mixed use residential in the redevelopment areas.</p>
Rachael	Toth	Oct 28 2021 01:19 PM	<p>I love the plans suggested for Southglenn! Here are my thoughts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can affordable housing be sure to be built at Southglenn as they make more apartment buildings? I would love more diversity in the Southglenn area. 2. Instead of fast food places opened, could there be space for local food trucks to operate?
Jenna	Campbell	Oct 29 2021 02:48 PM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Hi Rachael, thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. The City does not currently have a requirement for affordable housing and it is not part of the approval criteria for the Master Development Plan amendment. Your comments will be shared with the Owner-Developers, Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council.</p>
Melissa	Lotz	Oct 28 2021 07:25 PM	<p>Will this increase in apartments provide any opportunities for affordable house/ rent stabilized?</p>
Jenna	Campbell	Oct 29 2021 02:50 PM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Hi Melissa, thank you for your comments. The City does not currently have a requirement for affordable housing and it is not part of the approval criteria for the Master Development Plan amendment. Your comments will be shared with the Owner-Developers, Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council.</p>
Jane	Mataich	Oct 30 2021 07:51 AM	<p>The SouthGlenn development will NOT include affordable housing. The developers and city have no plan or intention to include affordable (or even reasonably priced) housing. A one bedroom apartment at the Portola costs from \$1800 - \$2400 per month. Developers have said the new apartments WILL COST MORE than the Portola. People working in the shops and restaurants, along with most of us living nearby, will not be able to afford these apartments.</p>

Henry B	Lacey	Oct 29 2021 11:55 AM	<p>Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to again comment on the planning for the Southglenn development.</p> <p>I urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to consider these priorities as it decides this matter:</p> <p>1. Affordable housing in Centennial is a necessity.</p> <p>The average home price in Centennial, according to Realtor.com, was \$540,000 in September 2021. Young families, single people, and individuals starting their careers cannot afford home prices that high. The average price in nearby Littleton is not much different at \$503,000. Therefore Centennial leaders cannot expect to reap economic benefit from people choosing to live nearby driving into west Centennial, including the Streets of Southglenn development, to make purchases.</p> <p>One very practical way to increase the number of affordable homes in Centennial, especially in west Centennial, is to authorize the developer at Streets of Southglenn to include more units in the residential component of the redevelopment plan and, importantly, to mandate that a reasonable proportion of them - say, one-fourth or one-third - be affordably priced (\$250,000 or so).</p> <p>The developer should be permitted to increase the number of multi-family housing units on-site to facilitate this expansion of affordable housing choices and increase the number of regular visitors to retail, entertainment, and other facilities at the redeveloped Streets of Southglenn property. Arbitrary building height limits that are too low, and therefore unnecessarily and unwisely impede this expansion, should be changed for the redevelopment project and instead be set at a level practical for the objective of increased residential occupancy and significant additional affordable housing options for the community.</p>
Henry B	Lacey	Oct 29 2021 11:55 AM	<p>2. Assure community benefits in the redevelopment.</p> <p>Streets of Southglenn is an important community destination in west Centennial. There is a significant need both for more open space and parks and for other recreational and cultural facilities in this part of the city of Centennial. The redevelopment proposal offers the city a valuable opportunity to advance the effort to meet those needs.</p> <p>The city's leaders can and should require that the developer set aside a reasonable amount of acreage at Streets of Southglenn for undeveloped open space in which visitors to the development can recreate. The availability of that space will attract more visitors to the development, which will in turn lead to more spending there and more tax revenue to the city. In addition, a reasonable open space requirement (one-third of the property would be appropriate) offers an indispensable opportunity to provide for community gathering events, much-needed tree cover, and encouragement of physical activity, which is important to advancing public health in our community.</p> <p>The existing Arapahoe Libraries facility at Streets of Southglenn is far too small for the area it serves. The city has a great opportunity here to facilitate a much-needed expansion of this vital public resource. City leaders should require the developer to set aside enough acreage in the development to allow construction of a library similar to the Koelbel Library located near Holly at Orchard and to help with the financing of that facility.</p> <p>3. Improve alternative forms of transportation in Centennial and the south metropolitan area.</p> <p>The Streets of Southglenn redevelopment project also provides an opportunity to improve infrastructure for alternative transportation options, including electric passenger cars and passenger trucks, electric bikes, bicycles, and scooters. The city can and should mandate that the redevelopment plan include ample charging facilities for electric vehicles, bike paths and secure bike racks, community bicycle borrowing options, and scooter corridors.</p>

Henry B	Lacey	Oct 29 2021 11:57 AM	<p>4. Encourage local business occupancy.</p> <p>One of the most pressing problems at Streets of Southglenn and in west Centennial generally is the abundance of vacant retail space. This crisis is the result of two causes: first, a shift in the national economy away from "big box" and other retail stores to online purchasing by consumers and, second, excessively high retail space rents charged by landlords who are encouraged to engage in that practice by a federal tax code that effectively subsidizes empty retail space.</p> <p>The city can help to address this problem by requiring that the developer set aside a significant portion of the retail space at the redeveloped Streets of Southglenn for locally owned and operated businesses rather than national or international chains and provide opportunities for those local businesses to benefit from appropriate programs aimed at lowering their costs of operation.</p> <p>The city should assure that any redevelopment plan completely excludes new "big box" stores from the Streets of Southglenn development. That model of retailing is obsolete and, in any case, inevitably leads to an exodus of money needed to circulate in the local economy to investors who, overwhelmingly, are not located in Colorado, let alone the Centennial and Arapahoe County area.</p> <p>Importantly, the redevelopment plan should be made to include a guarantee of diverse businesses at the Streets of Southglenn property. The project cannot succeed and will only become a blight, as the other strip mall centers along University Boulevard between Arapahoe Road and County Line Road basically are, unless adequate restaurant, night club/tavern/sports bar/brewpub, theater, and other entertainment spaces are included.</p>
Henry B	Lacey	Oct 29 2021 11:57 AM	<p>5. Assure environmental values are protected.</p> <p>Many people, it is safe to assume, value the trails, parks, wildlife, and trees in the Centennial area, especially in the neighborhoods around the Streets of Southglenn property. The redevelopment proposal offers an opportunity to enhance these assets of the community while advancing the important objective of water conservation.</p> <p>The city's leaders should require the developer to assure a connection to the South Suburban Parks and Recreation District urban trail system from the property, provide ample native coniferous and deciduous trees and other plants needed to give urban wildlife habitat, and provide for interesting and beautiful landscaping, and minimize water-intensive landscaping practices.</p> <p>The Streets of Southglenn redevelopment proposal offers a rare opportunity to establish a large xeriscaped public space. That opportunity should not be missed, especially as water availability is generally on the decline on the Front Range and the price of obtaining water rights for the city and transporting water to the city is unlikely to decline in the future and will very likely continue to rise.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
Kevin	Daly	Oct 29 2021 01:43 PM	<p>I am excited to see this moving forward. I attended previous public meetings and was dismayed when I heard speakers refer to residents as "Those People. We moved here from the Knolls neighborhood and I can assure everyone that demographics at the Portola Apts is very similar to my old neighborhood. As resident of the Portola Apts I look forward to new neighbors. The latest plan looks fantastic especially the additional green space.</p>
Anne	Borg	Oct 29 2021 01:52 PM	<p>Thank you, once again, for giving people a forum to express their thoughts on the redevelopment of the Sears (and eventual Macy's) Southglenn properties. As a homeowner for 25+ years in the neighborhood immediately west of Southglenn, I believe any structure higher than 80 feet on the property will cause Southglenn to become more "urban" than "suburban". Also, any more residences than doubling the current zoning (300+ now, up to 700 or so if passed) will detract from the suburban feel of the neighborhood. Please keep the new structures under 80 feet in height, and limit the total residences to 725.</p>
Liz	Martin	Oct 29 2021 04:24 PM	<p>Please allow public comment on both days of the public hearings.</p>
Richard	Fromm	Oct 30 2021 09:51 PM	<p>I am concerned that this project will interfere with the operation of the RTD bus stop on Race street on the east side of Southglenn Shopping Center. It is a major bus stop and the number of passengers might substantially increase with the 1000+ new residential units. Will bus passengers be allowed to park in the shopping center garage or lots? I took the bus before I retired and recall that street parking was limited. Will the existing passenger shelter be removed or hopefully expanded to handle the likely increased number of bus passengers?</p>

Jenna	Campbell	Nov 02 2021 09:48 AM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Hi Richard, thank you for commenting on Have Your Say. There are no changes to the bus stops proposed with the MDP Amendment and RTD did not indicate that it doesn't have capacity to serve new residents at The Streets at SouthGlenn. RTD will be included as a referral agency and impacts to nearby bus stops and bus shelters will be evaluated with any future site development on the property.
Susan	Janssen	Oct 31 2021 11:30 AM	I am pleased with the effort of developers to listen to the District 1 community and to offer compromises within proposed plans. For example, the original requested increase of building height from 50 ft to 75 ft. The updated proposal includes reduced building height limit of 50 ft within a 55 ft setback. This is a good compromise to make a transition from the surrounding neighborhoods But - I wonder why the total number of units did not decrease as well. Smaller apartments or less retail space?
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 02 2021 09:52 AM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Hello Susan, thank you for commenting on Have Your Say. The MDP amendment requests that buildings be setback 35 feet from E. Easter Ave. and S. Race St. and that portions of buildings over 50 feet in height must be stepped back an additional 20 feet. In addition, a 75 foot setback is required along 15% of the building frontage along those streets.
Susan	Janssen	Nov 02 2021 10:15 AM	Hello Jenna, Yes, I understand the new setbacks in the proposal. My question is to understand why there was not an decrease in the number of units as well.
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 03 2021 03:22 PM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Your question about decreasing the unit total has been shared with the Owner-Developers who may address that during the public hearing.
Jill	Wilson	Nov 01 2021 04:03 PM	My concerns are, what will be the plans to retain current and bring new businesses. How will current businesses be impacted by construction and how will the parking be managed. Thank you,
Paula	Hillman	Nov 01 2021 06:06 PM	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Southglenn proposed changes. I appreciate that the city does not have requirements for affordable housing. Is the city required to approve the changes the developers are requesting? If the answer is no, why is it not possible for the City to negotiate with the developers for something that would benefit it's citizens? Not suggesting all the units be affordable, perhaps a small percentage.
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 02 2021 09:57 AM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Hello Paula, thank you for sharing your comments on Have Your Say. The MDP Amendment is reviewed against five (5) approval criteria, as required by the Master Development Agreement and noted in the staff report. The Planning and Zoning Commission will review the request against these criteria and provide a recommendation for approval or denial to the City Council. The City Council will also review the request against the criteria and makes the final decision to approve or deny.
K	B	Nov 01 2021 08:45 PM	As stated previously, I am very opposed to expanding the zoning to allow for 1100+ units. No one has realistically addressed the traffic impact throughout the neighborhood, as well as the impact on the major highway interchanges adjacent in the area 470 and 25). No real attention has been paid to the impact on major utilities in the area, as well as on our schools. The renderings, while aesthetically pleasing, so not align with that of the established neighborhood. The height is too tall, there isn't enough green space and the number of units is entirely too dense. This whole plan simply feels like a money grab by the city with no regard for the best interests of the tax payers/neighborhood residents. The affordable housing/subsidized housing issue is ridiculous - it's not our fault that the houses in our area have done very well in the current market. We made good investments and should not be punished for it. If I wanted to be in a dense area that offered affordable housing, I would have moved to Five Points. This statement isn't coming from a self-entitled trust fund baby either. I graduated from college at 22 years old in the early 2000s with \$30k in loans and made \$25k/year in my first full time position. I worked a second job to pay off my student loans in five years, just prior to starting grad school. I had to take loans to finish that degree and paid those off within three years as well. I saved as much as I could throughout that time and bought my house in Southglenn in 2015 for market rate, even paying well over the asking price. My point is that I was able to pay off debt and save to buy this house in my own. There was no affordable housing program for me. If I can do it on a small salary, these other young professionals and families can too. Sometimes you have to sacrifice to achieve your goals. Please reject the zoning request for this big of an increase and figure out a plan that will align with the look, feel and values of the neighborhood.

William	Paluch	Nov 02 2021 06:43 AM	Please prioritize: Affordable housing Improve transportation options - transit, bike, walking etc Green space and environmental values
Bob	Johansen	Nov 02 2021 08:17 AM	The zoning for the property was put in place prior to the owners purchasing it. Changing it now, against the will of the neighborhood, through "impartial" city council and unelected zoning bureaucrats living 15 miles east of Southglenn is not acceptable. Lawsuits against city councilmen personally and zoning personnel for damages to the neighborhood will also be pursued. Please remember Centennial is only 21 years old and the succession of the Southglenn neighborhood is always on the table. This whole multi-year debacle is proof Southglenn needs more local control than a town 20 miles long and 2 miles wide can provide. Represent your constituents that do not want to see the zoning changed and the character of the neighborhood altered. There is no reason to change the prior zoning nor does the neighborhood affected endorse this change.
K	B	Nov 02 2021 08:50 AM	Will the hundreds of comments that were submitted in the prior round be presented to the zoning committee and city council as well? I noticed that they have been removed from this page. There were valuable points made about the potential impact of this on the homeowners in the neighborhood in that round.
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 02 2021 10:08 AM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Hi K B, thank you for commenting on Have Your Say. The comments from Have Your Say in July and August 2021 are included as Attachment 15 to the staff report for the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing and will be included as an attachment to the City Council staff report. The comments are considered part of the public record for this project and are available on the project webpage here: https://www.centennialco.gov/Government/City-Projects-and-Initiatives/Streets-at-SouthGlenn .
Kathy	Davidson	Nov 02 2021 09:01 AM	I appreciate that the developers have scaled down their original plans for less apartments and decrease in the height of the buildings. I also am glad that there will be some green space that hopefully can be enjoyed by the neighborhood as well as the residents. I can not stress enough my feeling that we need housing that people that work here can afford. I think of health care workers, fire fighters, teachers and others that serve our community and yet cannot afford to live here. Centennial often talks about community but in order to fully have a community: one must be able to live in the area where they work.
Jane	Mataich	Nov 02 2021 12:33 PM	Traffic Impact Study question. Fig 3, Existing Traffic Volumes: Traffic counts were conducted in 2018 at three intersections along Easter (Vine, Gaylord and Mall Dwy). All other traffic counts were conducted in 2019 and 2020. The Sears store closed in 2018. Table 4, Sears Trip Generation: Shows PM In trips reduced by 131 (removing existing Sears store), resulting in 130 PM In trips. "Sears Site New External Trips" reflects the increase in traffic beyond the original Sears store. It appears "Sears Site New External Trips" were added to the Existing Traffic Volumes to arrive at Fig 10, 2022 Short Term Total Traffic. But since nearly all the traffic counts were taken in 2019 and 2020 (particularly the counts along University Blvd), when Sears was closed, seems like the reduction of existing Sears store does not apply. Since Sears was closed when most traffic counts were taken, wouldn't the PM In trips from Sears development area be 261 instead of 130? My concern is 2022 Short Term Total Traffic volume at intersection of Commons Ave and University. Without the reduction of Sears store trips, wouldn't these volumes be higher? Fig 10 show WBLT PM as 272. Without the reduction of Sears store trips, isn't WBLT PM over 300 (maybe about 330)? Would a double left-turn lane be required?
Jane	Mataich	Nov 02 2021 09:22 PM	Jenna, I'm looking for an answer to my question, not a thank you. Can you please pass this on to the traffic engineer and get a response? Thank you.
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 03 2021 03:25 PM	On behalf of Centennial Community Development: Your questions about the Traffic Impact Study have been shared with the Owner-Developer's Traffic Engineering Consultant who prepared the Study and may respond during the public hearing.

KEVIN	ESCHEN	Nov 02 2021 01:14 PM	Years ago the city asked the voters what they wanted for zoning rules. We voiced an opinion and the city created the zoning rules based off of the input. What has changed that allows developers to go way over these limits? The Commission needs to hold the developer accountable for the rules put into place. If you allow developers to go over then others will follow and pretty soon the city will be nothing but skyscrapers. The commission was put into place to make sure the rules are followed and I urge them to do what the citizens want and not what the developers want.
Rolf	Asphaug	Nov 02 2021 01:41 PM	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the final plan for the Streets at Southglenn redevelopment. I'm a resident in the nearby Cherry Knolls subdivision, and SaS is an easy walk from my house. I feel that the developers have done a good job of responding to previous concerns raised by the public, and I support their moving forward. My only concern is that there may be additional traffic from residents along Arapahoe Blvd., especially during rush hours, making it even harder for Cherry Knolls residents to enter and exit our subdivision at Elizabeth Street and Arapahoe Blvd. This would be a materially adverse impact on existing development, so I would ask that in connection with factor 5 to be considered in granting/denying approval,* serious consideration be given to installing a street light at the Elizabeth/Arapahoe intersection similar to what was recently done at the other major entrance/exit point for our subdivision, at Colorado and Easter. (*"The amendment is compatible with or will not materially and adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties, or measures will be taken to substantially buffer or otherwise substantially mitigate any incompatibility or adverse impacts.") Thank you for this opportunity, and best wishes to the developers and future residents of the new and improved Streets at Southglenn!
Rolf	Asphaug	Nov 02 2021 01:48 PM	I forgot to mention that the Elizabeth/Arapahoe intersection is also a major access point for Sandburg Elementary School as well as the soccer/baseball fields at Cherry Knolls Park. It is already a challenge to enter and exit at this intersection - especially making left (west) turns from Elizabeth onto Arapahoe. Again, thanks for your consideration.
Sara	Hamann	Nov 02 2021 02:16 PM	It appears the developers have not made any concessions to their last proposal. They still want to increase building height 50% from the original plan. In addition, they want to add an incremental 911 multiple dwelling units, which is a 426% increase from current levels (214 units) and a 260% increase from the original proposal (350). The plan does not support Centennial's 5 point criteria for approval. This will adversely affect the area. Based on the prior round of comments, 95+% of residents are not in favor the increased height of the buildings or the increased number of housing units. Please listen to Centennial residents and do not approve these variances. The developer agreed to the initial plans and should adhere to it. The traffic study is also very suspect. It is absurd to assume adding 1000+ vehicles to a 20 acre property will not adversely impact traffic. Please don't look at short term revenue/gain and lose sight of the long term vision for Centennial. These changes will have a very negative impact on the area.
Anne	Darnley	Nov 02 2021 04:13 PM	As a resident if Centennial, I understand the need to redevelop Southglenn. There remain, however several areas of concern: 1) even with the setback requirements density will be markedly increased. The developers' comment regarding existing building heights neglects to address future density 2) the addition of approximately 800+ units could increase the population by up to 3,200 increasing traffic flow substantially 3) it is unclear if parking requirements are adequate 4) is there a plan for improved signage? This is a very important project for Centennial and its future.
Julie	Dillon	Nov 02 2021 04:17 PM	221.4% INCREASE IS TOO MUCH I am all for new development and removing abandoned buildings however this proposal is CRAMMING TOO MANY PEOPLE IN A SMALL AREA. This proposal is giving me the impression the developers are not concerned about residents in the surrounding area. I am hoping the City of Centennial is concerned about preserving values of our community and standards set by previous administrations. POINT 1: Increase the allowed number of residential units from 350 units to a total of 1,125 units is 221.4% INCREASE AND WAY TOO HIGH. This increase is excessive and WILL DIMINISH my standard of living. This increase is not reasonable under any standard. Are the developers open to negotiating this number down to something that is reasonable? POINT 2: Modify the permitted height on the Sears parcel and the Macy's parcel from 50 ft. to 75 ft is a 50% INCREASE AND WAY TOO MUCH. The original permitted height was put in place for a good reason. I believe it DECREASES MY STANDARD OF LIVING. The standard set at 50 ft. preserves the integrity of the neighborhood and our community values. The surrounding homes (apartments and townhomes) are 2 stories so please keep the height at 50 ft. I live in the 2-story townhomes on Easter and University. POINT 3: Decrease the required amount of retail from 909,815 sq. ft. to 621,000 sq. ft. I am FOR THIS CHANGE OF 31.7% DECREASE. As I see demand for retail decreasing and IT'S WISE to move in this direction. However this 31.7% decrease does not accommodate the excessive increases above. Thank you!! :)

Tom	Cooper	Nov 02 2021 04:53 PM	<p>To all council members,</p> <p>These final plans ignore everything the people who live in the area have suggested / demanded.</p> <p>I am not surprised. I intend to see if people in the area would like to demand an investigation to see if graft was paid to any council member or government official.</p> <p>This gives the developer everything they wanted from the beginning. It will flood the area with traffic. I have heard this developer intends on doing the same thing all the way up the University Corridor to C-470.</p> <p>The increase in apartment units means they will be smaller, and less expensive, making for what will become lower income housing over time and depreciate the neighborhood.</p> <p>I believe you are being influenced by the Agenda 21 /30 plans and the Biden plan to destroy suburbs and private property rights. Also described in Klaus Schwabs The Great Reset. This is why the amendment for tax reduction for property owners was changed to exclude private homes and benefit just rental properties.</p> <p>Everyone who goes along with this plan is suspect as far as I am concerned. If you do not know about the communist plans being forced upon us right now in plain sight then you are ignorant and not competent to do your job.</p> <p>Centennial was supposed to retain its small town atmosphere and lower tax rates. Just like all government promises, it is taken over by power hungry / money hungry carpetbaggers and thieves.</p> <p>This plan must be soundly rejected, and the city needs to put real restrictions on number of units (350 at the most) and keep the height at 50 feet. This is disgusting. Any council member that approves of it is reprehensible.</p> <p>I hope I made myself clear!</p> <p>Tom Cooper</p>
Sharon	R	Nov 02 2021 04:58 PM	<p>It would seem that in spite of a majority of prior comments pertaining to the redevelopment proposal for Streets @ Southglenn voicing concern for increased building height from 50' to 75' for the Sears/Macy's sites as well as major concern for the massive increase in residential density, no accommodations of our concerns were factored in to the final redevelopment proposal.</p> <p>Therefore, I encourage Planning and Zoning to deny the height limitation increase and to also deny the residential unit increase from 350 to 1,125 units. Planning and zoning should not approve the requested amendments to the existing Master Development Plan and request the developers to modify their redevelopment plans to a proposal of less density and within the existing height limitations for the redevelopment sites.</p> <p>I believe the development, as proposed, violates No. 5 of the criteria to be considered.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jane	Mataich	Nov 02 2021 09:53 PM	<p>50 foot high, 4-story apartment buildings are fairly common. Thus, a 5-story apartment building requires about 62.5 feet. Adding 2.5 feet of leeway results in a 65 foot building. Would the developer consider a height limitation of 65 feet (instead of 75 feet) for their 5-story apartment buildings? I don't believe the developer is providing 1st floor retail. Why do they need 75 foot high buildings when 65 feet will work? What are they planning to build that requires 75 feet? Please ask the developer. And please don't say compatibility with the other tall buildings on the site. Consider compatibility with the adjacent 2-story condos and townhomes.</p>
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 03 2021 03:31 PM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Jane, thank you for your questions and comments. The Owner-Developers have not submitted a Site Plan for any future redevelopment on the property that would indicate the actual height of the building(s). Your questions have been shared with the Owner-Developers who may address them during the public hearings.</p>
Jane	Mataich	Nov 02 2021 09:56 PM	<p>What parking will be provided for the apartment buildings? Will they use the city's residential multi-family parking requirements?</p>

Jenna	Campbell	Nov 03 2021 03:35 PM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Jane, thank you for your questions. The parking requirements for The Streets at SouthGlenn are contained in the Master Development Plan on Sheet 2 (Development Standards and Standard Notes). Parking spaces are required at the following ratios:</p> <p>Retail: 4 spaces per 1000 square feet of Gross Floor Area (GFA) Residential: 1 space per bedroom Office: 3 spaces per 1000 GFA Sit Down Restaurant: 10 spaces per 1000 GFA All other uses: 2 spaces per 1000 GFA</p>
Jim	O'Donnell	Nov 03 2021 10:38 PM	<p>As a neighbor in the surrounding SouthGlenn neighborhood of the Streets at SouthGlenn, I want it noted that while I'm not opposed to a reasonable increase in dwelling units, I am strongly opposed to an increase in dwelling units at the expense of decreasing retail space and increasing building height limits. I am not opposed to the development of the property; in fact I'd prefer the property owner improve the areas they have outlined in their proposal but only under most of the existing specifications of the current zoning ordinance. I disagree that the minimum required leasable retail floor area should be reduced from 909,815 to 621,000. The current 909,815 is less than 29% of the total 3,142,762 square feet included in the master development plan Amendment 8 effectively changing the entire area originally zoned for retail to an urban residential area. The required leasable retail floor area should be held at 909,815 or increased to accommodate a reasonable percentage of retail space for the expanded areas included on the proposed development plan over what was included in the 2006 development plan. Retail square footage is a major source of the city's tax revenue which garnishes easily auditable point of sale tax revenue from a physical location within city boundaries. Without a city consumer use tax imposed in Centennial, I think retail square footage within the city is a critical tax revenue point which benefits all citizens of Centennial. I further oppose increasing the max 75 ft. building heights on the Sears and Macy's parcels that is being requested because this property is a retail zoned property, and an increase in building height seems from the conceptual images to only increase dwelling square footage, not retail square footage. Increasing building heights will also result in the Streets of SouthGlenn producing a more urban feel which will likely bleed into the surrounding neighborhood if nothing else in the form of a significant increase in traffic activity certainly beyond what I would expect from a lower maximum dwelling count if the city retains the current 50 ft. maximum building height of these areas. The owners' submitted development plan proposal currently requests an increase to a maximum of 1,125 dwellings which is calculated assuming the 75ft max building height zoning is approved. I would like to see that dwelling number that is being requested adjusted considerably downward by appropriately recalculating for the current maximum 50ft height and minimum 909,815+ square feet retail space requirements, but a recalculation would likely result in a number higher than the current zoning of 350 maximum dwellings for which I think there is room for a more moderate increase. If the current property owners do not think it is a profitable endeavor to operate the property under the current zoning parameters, they should investigate options including selling the property to someone who can effectively operate the retail property. Effectively changing the primary zoning purpose of Streets at SouthGlenn from a retail area to an urban residential area under this proposed plan is not in the best interest of the surrounding neighborhood nor to all the citizens of Centennial who also benefit from the sales tax revenue designed to be generated from this designated retail space.</p>
Uriel	Akiva	Nov 09 2021 10:46 AM	<p>And with that, Jim has pointed out that this amendment WILL VIOLATE THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN. In Article II it states that "residential use of the property is secondary to meeting the requirement of minimum retail." Its only page 8 so you don't have to read too far. If it violates the master development plan than it cannot pass.</p> <p>I did some quick research and the average apartment at on the site right now is 942 sq ft. If you say that the average apartment size won't change, and then build more apartments, then eventually you have more residential Sq Ft than retail. By the developers own numbers, they want to reduce the retail to 621,000 sq ft. If they increase the number of apartments to 1,125, at 942 sq ft per apartment on average, then you will have 1,059,750 sq feet of apartments. This will make residential use of the property, per se violating the master development plan.</p> <p>Great point Jim!</p>

Cathy	Meserole	Nov 08 2021 11:57 AM	<p>If we allow these developers to increase the number of apartments from 350 to 1,125, we will also be increasing our population in District 1, which will only compound the severe traffic congestion that already exists! Our suburban feel in this community will be completely lost, as we know it, today and this isn't fair especially to the Senior residents, who wish to remain in our homes such as myself. I also have no desire to move into any apartment, as I enjoy my privacy and quiet home. These apartments will also not be affordable for anybody of lower incomes and certainly not for most Seniors.</p> <p>We also don't need to increase the height of any building structure to over the 50 ft., which presently exists, as it will cast very large shadows, when we get snow and ice in the Winter months. We should never become like NY City with high rise skyscrapers! Our road crews don't have the man power or enough equipment to clear our busiest streets, right now as it is of the snow and ice. This will put more financial burden on individual property owners, who already are struggling to make ends meet for their families, because the city will keep raising our sales taxes, which is already too high! The rental for these apartments aren't going to be affordable.</p> <p>All these developers care about is padding their own pockets for huge profits for themselves and don't care about what the residents want! They proved that, when they did the traffic studies and schools weren't in session and when they didn't include the residents, who live near Arapahoe High School, So University and East Dry Creek. All of us over here also drive through and around South Glenn to go any place. May I remind these developers that the citizens, who live over here don't live in a different city in case you forgot!!</p> <p>The developers also have claimed that they can't get retailers into the South Glenn area. First of all, these developers are asking extremely too much money. The developers and the city keep telling us that the ways most people shop have changed. Although, many people perhaps are ordering online, there are still many of us, who enjoy shopping the old fashion way and still appreciate using other entertainment venues, which could be included in the mall to serve our citizens better, such as perhaps making the Sears building into a recreational bowling center, as The bowling center on County Line caters mostly to leagues :) Both the developers and the city really needs to also listen to the community's needs and ideas. Therefore, I also disagree with reducing our retail space!</p> <p>This issue should also be an exception to any planning and development policies that are in place by our city government. We the people, who live in District 1 should be allowed to also vote on this important matter, since this redevelopment will have a permanent effect in the future on how we live, work and play in The City of Centennial, which so far isn't making me as one individual impressed at all :(</p>
Maud	Naroll	Nov 08 2021 05:37 PM	<p>I live walking distance from SouthGlenn. I support adding more multi-family units, if there is truly sufficient parking, to add housing units to the area and vibrancy to SouthGlenn businesses. But I am dismayed that the city is granting amendments without requiring that the project include some housing affordable for the people who work in SouthGlenn businesses, or payments form the developers sufficient to fund building affordable housing elsewhere in the city.</p>
Jenna	Campbell	Nov 09 2021 10:18 AM	<p>On behalf of Centennial Community Development:</p> <p>Hi Maud, thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. The City does not currently have a requirement for affordable housing and it is not part of the approval criteria for the Master Development Plan amendment. Your comments will be shared with the Owner-Developers, Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council.</p>
Katie	Murphy	Nov 10 2021 07:46 AM	<p>City Council:</p> <p>Thank you for reading our comments; please take each one to heart.</p> <p>From residents' comments over these recent years, you clearly must know that the overwhelming majority of property owners in Centennial do not support the over-development and the resulting destruction of our neighborhoods in the Southglenn area. You also must realize that the developers' 'traffic study' was a sham, and that they should respect the zoning parameters set forth before their purchase of the respective lots.</p> <p>We are asking that you use your good conscience to do what is right in representing the concerns of those who voted you into office, and please (!) vote down this inevitable ruin of Southglenn and surrounding areas.</p> <p>This redevelopment proposal is nothing more than an opportunistic plan, and has nothing whatever to do with enhancing our suburban setting and lifestyle, property values, public safety, aesthetics, or quality of life. Your siding with the developers in overdeveloping our area will likely, as some have already stated, bring you grief and law suits. You have committed to serving your constituents- please don't sell your souls out for a few lousy dollars. We value our area as it stands- please don't destroy it by voting 'Yes.'</p> <p>Respectfully, KM</p>

Pam	Welker	Nov 10 2021 08:56 AM	The property is zoned for 50 fee and I hear the developers are still requesting 75 feet in height; they knew what they were buying. I have yet to hear an explanation of how the current infrastructure (roads, water, schools, city services, i.e., police/fire, grocery stores) can possibly accommodate the number of units being planned. Please listen to what the actual citizens who live in Centennial are telling you and don't add to the ruin of our way of life. I understand development, but the numbers presented don't make sense. Thank you for reading my comments and considering that I do not want the level of development being proposed.
Ryan	Thornton	Nov 12 2021 12:49 PM	Concerns with the setback from the sidestreet on the sears side proposed build. With additional height it would be good to have it set back more from the road than 25'. With 1200 or so apt. Proposal where will all the cars park what is the impact to university at rush hour at drycreek and Arapaho rd. What are the improvements to thoes intersections to handle the load.
Lisa	Vicek	Nov 12 2021 06:10 PM	I am requesting that our city leaders consider scaling back the Southglenn redevelopment heights and number of apartments. The traffic on University is already too aggressive and heavy. Having lived here since 1985, I would like to see Southglenn succeed but for my ability to still be able to park and use the library and shops. I use University and have seen the Highlands Ranch traffic backed up from Countyline to East Mineral Drive. The light coming south on University at Arapahoe is also very heavy. More traffic and not enough parking from the Southglenn location is going to be a bigger problem for current longtime residents. Please don't sell us out. I am already missing my old mall where I could shop indoors for most of my families clothing, household bedding, kitchen and gift needs. The Arapahoe High school traffic should also be figured in to peak transit times. I don't desire a defunct shopping area but the loss of Macy's and Sears makes the current mix of retail very ignorable as it is not a broad enough mix. Thank you.
Yvonne	Barton	Nov 19 2021 11:46 AM	I would like to see Streets of Southglenn remain a RETAIL and OPEN SPACE location. The proposed changes to increase the height of the buildings, increase the number of number of apartment units, decrease the SETBACK from the buildings to the sidewalk are all very disagreeable to me. These changes and traffic congestion and noise will totally change the feel of my neighborhood.
Dave	Dyer	Nov 19 2021 12:09 PM	This is a horrible idea, and rewards an already-failed plan with expansion to reinforce investor greed and will only serve to turn our community into a revenue generator for the ultra-wealthy. The only stores that can survive at Streets of Southglenn are big box systems who are capable of going toe-to-toe with the ironclad, biased, and greedy agreements put forth by this business owner. If we want to have true community, you would force these investors to prove that they can successfully support small businesses while also making a reasonable amount of profit. Until they can do that (versus making a ridiculous profit on the deaths of dozens of small businesses every year), this is a horrible idea and bad planning. I wish everyone involved would think about this from a community-first perspective, but it is clear to me that that hasn't happened to date, nor will it in the future.
Liz	Martin	Nov 21 2021 04:38 PM	PARKING CONCERNS I believe there will not be enough parking at the redevelopment. The residential parking requirements in the SouthGlenn MDP were created in 2006 and do not reflect current standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MDP requires 1 parking space per bedroom, while the city requires 1.5 spaces for a studio or one bedroom unit. • The MDP requires NO guest parking, while the city requires 1 guest space for every 4 residential units. With the high price of housing the demand for parking in residential areas has increased considerably. The city's residential parking requirements are very reasonable, and should be met by new developments. Using the MDP requirement, 100 one bedroom apartments would have 100 parking spaces, and no place for couples with a second car to park. Using the MDP requirement, where do guests park? If the new Southglenn apartments do not have adequate parking, residents will either park in the shopping center's open surface lots (in front of Whole Foods, for instance) or in surrounding neighborhoods. Shared parking may be possible, but this requires analysis and a parking plan. Given the LARGE INCREASE in the number of residential units (from 200 to 1125 units), the city should ask the developer to use City of Centennial parking standards, or demonstrate (with public review) that the development will provide sufficient parking. Council, PLEASE ask the developer to use City of Centennial parking standards. Or demonstrate with a parking study (and allow public review) that the development will provide sufficient parking.

Liz	Martin	Nov 21 2021 04:52 PM	<p>COMPATIBILITY</p> <p>One criteria is the development must be compatible with adjacent properties. There is NO WAY the proposed 75-foot urban style buildings will be compatible with the surrounding 2-story condos and townhomes. HUNDREDS of residents have commented that the proposed development is NOT compatible with adjacent properties. You can drive about 3 miles in any direction from Southglenn and NOT see a building taller than 50-feet.</p> <p>The criteria is compatibility with ADJACENT PROPERTIES surrounding Southglenn (NOT compatibility within the Southglenn site).</p> <p>Council, please vote to deny based on lack of compatibility.</p>
Tom	Cooper	Nov 22 2021 02:39 PM	<p>It has been clear that the surrounding neighborhoods are strongly opposed to the plans of the developer in terms of impact on traffic, number of apartments in a single-family home community, devaluation of the properties in surrounding neighborhoods, and the fact this is following the O'Brien & Agenda 21 / 30 plans for destruction of private property rights and the suburbs in general. The spate of recent comments in favor of this power grab by local politicians and money grab by an out of state developer who could care less about our diminished living standards are suspect as far as I am concerned. Like bots and trolls on the Internet, a false support is being ginned up for this project. I don't for a minute believe it.</p>
Glenda	Sadler	Nov 23 2021 07:49 AM	<p>Please include affordable apartments. If there is additional legal work to be done, have it done. Our public servants teachers, police, fire workers need to be able to live in Centennial.</p>
Bettygene	Sorte	Nov 23 2021 08:22 AM	<p>I did post comments the last time, but to be perfectly honest I don't feel it does any good to post what I think. The developers are going to go forward with their plan, the City Council will approve it as amended and life will go on. My question is still how does this plan benefit the residents/constituents living in the area around SSOSG. How is the possibility of increased traffic, parking issues, noise issues, etc benefit existing residents? My big fear is that it will probably make the problem of cars speeding down the street in front of my house at about 40 MPH in a 25 MPH zone and running the stop signs without hesitation because there is never any enforcement, worse due to increased population. Thank in for listening.</p>
Amy	Hughes	Nov 23 2021 08:39 AM	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinions. We have attended every public forum. We would prefer the proposed apartments be home owners vs renters. At the last public forum, the developers mentioned this was being explored. Owners have a vested interest in the community where they live/own. We would prefer the original building height proposed by the MDP which would also reduce the number of single family units. These standards were in place for a reason and should not be negotiable. We appreciate the increased set backs and graduated height of the proposed buildings. We agree the property needs to be developed.</p>
Rudy	Melena	Nov 23 2021 08:55 AM	<p>Littleton Public Schools are closing elementary schools and consolidating the students onto larger campuses. Additional students will overload the schools.</p>
Martin	Jones	Nov 23 2021 04:49 PM	<p>The City of Centennial has a unique opportunity to "do it right" when it comes to the future plans for the Streets of SouthGlenn. I am opposed to the idea of increasing the number of residential units from the original plan. Making it just another mega condo project would ruin the special "village character" of the Streets of SouthGlenn. Our city has a rare asset here that it should preserve and protect. I suggest that instead of adding a clutter of residential units, traffic, and noise planners should consider replacing the vacant retail space with parks and/or recreational facilities. There is precious little space left in our city that will make it and keep it a community of help make it and keep it a community of unique character that our citizens can be proud of.</p>
Debbie	Richards	Nov 27 2021 01:41 PM	<p>Streets of Southglenn was developed to be a mix use center. The developers had a choice to up the allowed units in the original master plan if needed for the future. I've seen the many changes with businesses in and around this area over the 34 years as a homeowner that have come and go. When inquiring why they are closing the main reason was the high leases. No one wants to see empty buildings and something needs to be done but adding the additional units, height and removing more retail will change the demographics and diversity of this area. If you look up the Portola it's obvious that there will be no reasonable housing with these new units. We are not a high end urban neighborhood. Colorado is growing and in need of more housing but why cram high dollar, high rises in that area to profit the owners. I do believe everyone agrees some housing would be fine but what the developers are asking for is too much and not practical at SOS. It's obvious they want to take advantage of the high demand with the market; otherwise they would consider something to bring our community more together like a youth sports center, senior center, etc. No matter what the traffic study shows, this will impact the flow of traffic around and through the residential areas. The increase of residents will overwhelm the already thriving businesses pushing the surrounding neighbors to shop elsewhere. Limited resident parking will impact our side streets. This area does not have enough accommodating transportation to cut down on traffic. We voted to become Centennial with elected council members to support the ones that live here, not developers that don't live in this area. Please listen to our voices with the concerns with this proposal. Now that it's in your hands for a vote, I ask to not approve this new development. Let's keep Southglenn suburban and the Streets of Southglenn the attraction for our community.</p>
Autumn	BLESH	Nov 27 2021 03:44 PM	<p>I dont want southglenn to become more residential. We need restrants, shops, etc..</p>

Renee	Schulte	Nov 27 2021 04:18 PM	Don't want in neighborhood that's it in a nut shell
Jeff	Kennedy	Nov 27 2021 05:10 PM	This plan is just too much for this area. Too many apartments, too much traffic, not enough parking. I encourage the city to vote against the plan as presented. Thanks.
Mary	Byrnes	Nov 27 2021 05:12 PM	Adding all these housing units is a terrible idea. The traffic will increase more than it already has, and our property values will decrease, especially in neighborhoods close to the Streets. Schools will be overcrowded as well. Please rethink this!
Megan	Kennedy	Nov 27 2021 05:15 PM	I understand some development needs to take place but please do it more thoughtfully. The parking plan simply does not provide enough spaces and there is too much potential for overflow in the surrounding neighborhoods and if there is no parking, retail stores which remain will suffer. The number of units they are requesting is triple what was originally agreed upon. This will have a negative impact for the entire area including parking, the aesthetics in the neighborhood and traffic in the area but especially on Arapahoe and University - both of which already see a lot of traffic and accidents. Again, please consider thoughtful redevelopment which will benefit the entire community and not just the developer.
Suzanne	Staiert	Nov 27 2021 06:15 PM	I have lived in Southglenn for twenty years. My children and I have enjoyed everything Southglenn shopping center has to offer from the indoor mall to the redevelopment. It is obvious from the past few years that the area needs to be redeveloped to remain active and vibrant. I think the current plan strikes a balance between the wants of the developer and the neighborhood. I welcome new housing options that will add diversity to the current neighborhood options. I have read comments from others about increased traffic in the neighborhood and I find this unpersuasive. No driver is going to go through an unknown neighborhood to access a shopping center on major cross streets. I wonder if the objectors have considered what may have happened to the property without the current development. There were talks of various big box stores that would have met the current zoning but detracted from the neighborhood. Instead the council worked with the developers and we got an entertainment hub that enhanced our property values. I urge the council to again work with the property owners and support the new plan.
Liesbeth	Osa	Nov 27 2021 08:43 PM	I am against this many new residents. Traffic already terrible and this will just add more congestion.
Ben	Easley	Nov 28 2021 09:21 AM	Long term resident. Not in favor of continuing to ad more housing complexes such as this. This is not a big city downtown area. Tall multi family housing should not continue to be approved.
Karen	Hannon	Nov 28 2021 11:45 AM	It almost seems pointless to comment since the comments made this summer didn't make any difference. Maybe it was because those comments went to the developers who have a vested interest in going ahead with their plans. This time the comments are going to the council members who are supposed to be representing the people who elected them. Reading through the comments that have already been made it seems like the vast majority are opposed to this project as it stands especially concerning the number of new residential units proposed and the increased amount of traffic resulting from that. If you are listening to your constituents you should reduce that number and come to a compromise that is more in line with the surrounding neighborhoods.
Samuel	Cremona	Nov 28 2021 11:53 AM	I do not see the need to change the zoning at Southglenn.Southglenn is surrounded by an established neighborhood. If the developers cannot make enough money with the current zoning then they should move on. How about a high end, quality development with beautiful landscaping.It does not take a planning group to know there will be a huge traffic increase. Where are the drawings for the current zoning? Keep the current zoning,present another plan.
Jocelyn	Mertens	Nov 28 2021 12:05 PM	Please preserve the residential quality and zoning of Southglenn area. The proposed density appears to be patently unfair to current residents, and forcing through the increase does not reflect the character of the neighborhood or the desires of constituents. Most of us understand the need for housing. Increasing height destroys the skyline. There are significant traffic concerns. You've already seen those numbers on many opinions. Spinning the impact on 1200 units won't sell common sense. I live across the street, and the pace of traffic at all times of year are frantic. Crossing University on foot, or with a stroller, or in a wheelchair can be harrowing. Driving requires full vigilance. We really want to preserve what quality is left. The hug impact of construction also has to be considered. We will be enduring years of construction traffic, noise, vibration, and dust from removal and builds. The individual, the neighborhood, and the community will all be affected so that a corporation can collect more rent. Please keep a lid on the project to the original proposal.

Jocelyn	Mertens	Nov 28 2021 12:07 PM	<p>Please preserve the residential quality and zoning of Southglenn area. The proposed density appears to be patently unfair to current residents, and forcing through the increase does not reflect the character of the neighborhood or the desires of constituents. Most of us understand the need for housing. Increasing height destroys the skyline. There are significant traffic concerns. You've already seen those numbers on many opinions. Spinning the impact on 1200 units won't sell common sense. I live across the street, and the pace of traffic at all times of year are frantic. Crossing University on foot, or with a stroller, or in a wheelchair can be harrowing. Driving requires full vigilance. We really want to preserve what quality is left.</p> <p>The huge impact of construction also has to be considered. We will be enduring years of construction traffic, noise, vibration, and dust from removal and builds. The individual, the neighborhood, and the community will all be affected so that a corporation can collect more rent. Please keep a lid on the project to the original proposal.</p>
Cynthia	Schallennmuller	Nov 28 2021 01:21 PM	keep it 3 stories. listen to residents. hire more police. limit residents. build a big park. frustrating as money speaks louder than any.
Virginia	Maguire	Nov 28 2021 03:23 PM	Our neighborhood can't support the number of apartments nor the insufficient available parking. Traffic is already difficult and by building apartments instead of homes, you'll only force more of us to sell due to an unlivable neighborhood.
Jim	Tyrowicz	Nov 28 2021 03:36 PM	<p>The thing that will affect me personally the most is the traffic associated with an additional 1,000 (or more) vehicles at the intersection of University and Arapahoe for the 800 new apartments. I'm sure there will be on average multiple vehicles per unit.</p> <p>The other problem I have with the project is the city losing the tax revenue from the loss of retail space. I heard the developers say that retail is dying, but just look at Cherry Hills Marketplace, just one mile south of the Southglenn. The plaza has 45 thriving businesses that are collecting taxes for Greenwood Village. The owners of Southglenn have decided on a business model that discourages businesses such as these. So the owners want to have a rental revenue stream, while cutting tax revenue for the city. I find this blatantly shameful as the original development was supposed to help the city as well as them. Please reject this redevelopment project.</p>
Patricia	Schaff	Nov 28 2021 04:19 PM	<p>I have lived in my home in the SouthGlenn Subdivision since 1986, and I am strongly opposed to the proposed redevelopment plan of Streets of SouthGlenn as submitted by the developers, to build 1125 multi-family dwellings at a height of five stories in such a small space. This is not in line with the surrounding area of mainly single family homes and properties that do not exceed two stories in height, and would lead to increased density, traffic and urbanization of this local suburban neighborhood. This will have a very negative impact of this area.</p> <p>The developers have made the point that the proposed change in height to 75 feet (or five stories) "will allow for the new buildings to be of similar size and scale" of other currently existing buildings at Streets of SouthGlen (including the Portola Apartments). This applies to the actual heights of these referred to five story buildings. However, Council should take into consideration that the ground zero level of the entire Sears parcel right up to the edge of Easter Avenue is considerably higher (approx 25 feet) than the rest of the complex north to Arapahoe Road. Please note the down sloping streets and entry ways from Easter Avenue through the Sears parcel and the steps leading down from the Sears building North doors to the level of the fountains below and to the level of the rest of the complex. Looking at the top of the new five story buildings on the Sears parcel in profile with the Portola and other already existing five story buildings, the Sears parcel buildings would appear to be approx 25 feet higher than anything else at the Streets of SouthGlenn. This property would stand out like a sore thumb compared to the residences on Easter Avenue.</p> <p>I agree that something positive needs to be done with the empty Sears building and surrounding parcel. At the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing on 11/10/2021, two of the commissioners stated that they would encourage a variety of properties at the Sears parcel site, namely ownership properties (such as townhomes and/or condominiums) with plenty of open green spaces. These types of properties would certainly be more in line with the houses and other two story townhomes and condos in the surrounding areas. I consider that these types of properties would be a good fit on the Sears parcel.</p> <p>City Council has stated that it will take community public comments into account when making its decision on the proposed redevelopment project. Council should represent and support its constituents. The majority of individual comments (approximately 95% of the total of all submitted comments) are adamantly opposed to this proposal. The people of SouthGlenn have spoken! Please listen to the local residents and do not approve these changes or the proposed redevelopment as submitted. Thank You.</p>

John	Gillen	Nov 28 2021 04:37 PM	<p>I am hoping the City Council denies the request for changing the current Height Limitations of the Streets of Southglenn Project and allowing a variance to build higher structures.</p> <p>The Developers knew the height limitations when they acquired the property and allowing them to go taller is showing preferential treatment towards them. It is not in the best interests of longtime residents.</p> <p>Please deny the variance to build higher than the present law allows.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my request.</p>
Kelsey	Haddock	Nov 28 2021 05:23 PM	<p>I am opposed to current proposed changes to the Streets of Southglenn MDP. The overall density increase does not adequately account for parking needs of the new buildings, nor the long term impact on traffic in an already congested area.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed changes will be significantly higher than current buildings in the area, and will detract from the overall neighborhood appeal.</p> <p>I am in support of some changes to the MDP, including a small adjustment to the building height requirements, as well as a smaller increase in the apartment numbers. I would love to see some more creative mixed use opportunities come on board, such as food halls and entertainment options beyond the movie theater (thinking of options like Main Event or Pindustry).</p>
Nicki	Mueller	Nov 28 2021 05:38 PM	<p>Would be so nice to build something other than residential units. Some new restaurants, or an indoor marketplace or something nice for the suburbs. We keep building new housing with nothing for these people to do! How about some good restaurants?</p>
Anne	Darnley	Nov 28 2021 05:54 PM	<p>I believe the request of the developer for a significant height increase is not in keeping with the current neighborhood in which most residential units are no more than three stories.</p> <p>As a current resident, I am concerned that the increase in vehicle traffic has not been adequately addressed namely 1) changes to turn lanes and 2) timing of traffic signals.</p> <p>Furthermore, Southglenn should be required to provide parking at the same level as Centennial requirements, including guest parking.</p>
Anne	Borg	Nov 28 2021 06:17 PM	<p>Although the City of Centennial Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and approved the proposed changes to the 8th Amendment to the Master Development Plan for the Streets of Southglenn on 10 November 2021, I believe the Commission's decision did not follow the criteria detailed on the Have Your Say Centennial! website. Specifically: 1 - The amendment will provide public benefits to the project and the City as a whole AND 2 - The amendment is compatible with or will not materially and adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties. For item 1, increasing the allowed number of residential units from 350 units to a total of 1,125 units will NOT provide public benefits to the project or the City as a whole. The city benefits from tax revenue from shopping and dining expenditures, not from rent being collected by the owners of the residential buildings. Leaving the the allowed number of residential units at the current amount of 350 will accomplish the goal of increased neighborhood housing, and force the developers to be creative and less dense as to how they build out the remaining 136 allowed residences. Meeting the current allowable number of residences will leave room for other tax revenue generating enterprises, as outlined in the current Master Development Plan. For item 2, the amendment is not compatible with existing development on adjacent properties, and it will materially and adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties. The current MDP states the maximum height of new buildings to be 50 feet (approximately 4 stories tall), which is acceptable. Increasing the maximum height of new buildings to be 75 feet (approximately 6 stories tall) will give the redeveloped area an "urban look and feel", which will adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties. This is a suburban area, with adjacent buildings and residences 2-3 stories tall (with the exception of the Portola, the parking garage and the office building). I ask the city council to consider these facts when reviewing the proposed amendment. Thank you.</p>

Christine	Leon	Nov 28 2021 07:23 PM	<p>As an immediate neighbor of the Streets of Southglenn, I am very concerned about what the timeline for construction will be and what mitigation will be done to contain dust and debris during that time. Will there be consistent work hours and how will any violations be addressed?</p> <p>I have little faith in the Management Company as there are many signs of neglect on the south side of "The Streets" and along Vine Street going into the mall. The plants, shrubs and trees have had no maintenance for at least 2 years (including watering), the outdoor lighting is either turned off or lights burned out creating a very unsafe egress and exit after dark and the trash is left in the planted areas and gutters are not maintained. There are also many places where the sidewalks have either heaved or been damaged by snow removal creating many unsafe places to walk.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the number of vacant business sites within "The Streets" and the why those store fronts are not being filled as well as concerns about the vacancy rate at The Portola. If these sites are currently not filled, why is this not a major concern for the City of Centennial? What efforts have been made to fill these spaces. How many of the offices above the shopping areas are currently occupied?</p> <p>It is very easy for those of you who live "nearby" to not be too concerned about this proposed development. But the many of us who border "The Streets" will be very negatively impacted for a long time by this proposal. I support the current businesses and walk through and shop the Streets on a regular basis, but I am very concerned about the short-sightedness of the proposed changes and the impact they will have on the quality of life of the neighborhoods in and around The Streets of Southglenn.</p>
Samuel	Cremona	Nov 28 2021 08:02 PM	<p>Follow Up Please do not compromise and allow any portion of these plans. I think it is presumptuous of the developers to want to completely change the character of a neighborhood. The citizens of Centennial who own homes and businesses pay a variety of taxes - willingly. As citizens we are not required to suddenly give up our sovereign rights and allow a small group of people disrupt an entire neighborhood and its surrounding neighborhoods. Please- no zoning change, no height change, no accepting half of a bad plan - and respect those who live near Southglenn.</p>
Cathy	Meserole	Nov 28 2021 08:35 PM	<p>The City of Centennial has failed to mention to the community how they plan to upgrade the flooding issue at our major intersections of So University and E Arapahoe Rd. It seems to me that this issue should have been addressed by Arapahoe County, when the areas around the original Southglenn Mall were initially part of unincorporated Arapahoe County. Our city now claims in the article that was published in The Centennial Citizen Newspaper that the developers would now be responsible for paying for these upgrades. At this point, I feel that our city government just wants to pass the buck onto the developer instead of stepping up and taking full responsibility for an issue that our city officials should have taken care before this property was even sold to these developers! Our residents deserve more transparent responses from our city officials than what we are receiving to this potential health issue; not to mention other issues that can and will cause other problems to our infrastructure!</p>

Sue	Carlton-Smith	Nov 28 2021 10:46 PM	<p>It is with deep regret that I/we continually need to express our concerns about the redevelopment of Southglenn and the quality of life for the residents in this area. We residents have expressed our opinions vehemently over two years ago before covid hit. We expressed our concerns about the density, traffic, parking, schools and the developer made concessions. We worked with the developer and felt there had been some progress made for a plan that would be agreeable to all parties involved. And the City staff was involved with the process and has been very aware of our concerns.</p> <p>Fastforward to today and the developer has submitted the original plan without taking any suggestions from the residents. They have ignored our concerns and suggestions. We live here and they live in Cherry Hills or out of state. We will be living with the density, traffic, parking issues, etc., after having expressed our concerns. The developers have ignored our comments and are proceeding with this plan because it's a big money maker for them. It's disheartening to repeatedly express our concerns to the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council and still feel our comments are falling on deaf ears. By approving this dense development in the middle of our suburban neighborhoods, you are changing our lives for the worse. We did not purchase our homes to live in a densely populated area, otherwise we'd be in Denver. We chose Centennial and particularly the Southglenn areas because it was family friendly with many services. The developer many have filled out the form, crossed all the t's, dotted all the i's, filled in all the boxes, met all of staff's requirements but we will be living with the lasting negative effects of this redevelopment. This is a quality-of-life issue and we vehemently opposed this redevelopment several years ago as well as today.</p> <p>I urge you to not approve this issue or postpone your decision. Even though there have been news releases about this redevelopment and opportunities for people to express their opinion, there are many new residents who have moved into the area unaware of the redevelopment and many still struggling to exist with life and covid variants. City Council and staff deal with these issues everyday while residents are juggling jobs, lack of jobs, kids, illnesses, financial issues while trying to stay abreast of all the local, county, state and local issues. Additionally, setting these types of decisions of this magnitude at this time of year is even more challenging for residents. Your decision will affect all of us personally, financially and our quality of life.</p> <p>Additionally, I tried to send my comments via southglenn@centennialco.gov earlier this evening and my email was rejected because "Your message couldn't be delivered because the recipient's email server (outside Office 365) suspected that your message was spam." Am sure there are other emails that have been rejected due to this technicality.</p> <p>Thanks! Sue Carlton-Smith Cherry Knolls resident</p>
Dee	Getchel	Nov 28 2021 10:56 PM	<p>I live on University Blvd. in a townhome and don't look forward to more traffic on Univ. due to the huge increase in apartments proposed to be built. This large increase was not in the original proposal when the Sears property was purchased, so why has it changed? I also feel that this project is being pushed through - with public comment and meetings scheduled in the height of summer when people are on vacation and now during the holiday season when people are preoccupied. Was this timing planned this way to avoid getting pushback from the residents impacted by this new proposal?</p>