

**Attachment 16: July - August 2021 Have Your Say Public Comments.** A public comment forum was hosted on the City's Have Your Say website between July 23, 2021 and August 13, 2021. Notice of the public comment forum was sent to The Streets at SouthGlenn email list and through the City's social media channels. Comments were generally regarding traffic impacts, proposed building height, housing affordability, loss of retail square footage, and dwelling unit density. City staff responded to and acknowledged receipt of all public comments, however the standard responses from staff are not included in this attachment. Staff responses that answer a question or provide additional information are included and are shaded gray.

FirstName	LastName	Posted	Text
Kris	Saline	Jul 23 2021 02:08 PM	is parking provided for the new proposed park ??
Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Jul 27 2021 11:21 AM	<p>Good morning, ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to Have Your Say. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>All new residential units are required to provide 1 space per bedroom, retail is required to provide 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area, office is required to provide 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area, sit down restaurants are required to provide 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area and all other uses are required to provide 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. This parking is distributed evenly throughout the entire development in the form of public and private parking garages, surface parking lots and internal on-street parking. Specifically, parking is provided for the park through adjacent on-street parking, a public parking garage and surface parking lots all located within walking distance.</p>
Nancy	Cronan	Jul 23 2021 03:34 PM	<p>1. The surrounding streets cannot be expanded to add additional lanes; what is the traffic mitigation strategy when adding a potential 3,000 trips in and out during rush hour times? The traffic at Arapahoe and University is already a nightmare and the increase in resident trips will add to the nightmare. Surrounding neighborhoods should not bear the brunt of cut-through traffic, something that happens today whenever the major North-South streets are excessively backed up.☐</p> <p>2. Given that new development does not pay its own way, are the owners of Streets of Southglenn being given tax breaks or other incentives, at the expense of the existing taxpaying citizens of Centennial, for this project?</p>
Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Jul 27 2021 04:23 PM	<p>Good afternoon Nancy,</p> <p>Thank you for your patience, please see the responses to your questions below:</p> <p>1. The surrounding streets cannot be expanded to add additional lanes; what is the traffic mitigation strategy when adding a potential 3,000 trips in and out during rush hour times?</p> <p>The 3000 trips and their potential impacts are taken into consideration in the level of service (LOS) analysis (a process that assigns traffic delays based on project traffic volumes) required for the TIS. The projected LOS is compared against the acceptable LOS with the end result of this analysis being to identify areas with potential needs for traffic mitigation. The TIS does recommend changes in signal timing operations to improve traffic flow and access modifications to address safety.</p> <p>1b. The traffic at Arapahoe and University is already a nightmare and the increase in resident trips will add to the nightmare. Surrounding neighborhoods should not bear the brunt of cut-through traffic, something that happens today whenever the major North-South streets are excessively backed up.</p> <p>The City's Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program (NTMP) is the best tool available to mitigate traffic impacts in neighborhoods, which is a program that implements traffic mitigation measures on streets that qualify for NTMP mitigation to address documented neighborhood traffic issues.</p> <p>2. Given that new development does not pay its own way, are the owners of Streets of Southglenn being given tax breaks or other incentives, at the expense of the existing taxpaying citizens of Centennial, for this project?</p> <p>The owners are not being given direct tax breaks or incentives. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) has been in place since the opening of the Streets at SouthGlenn in 2009. In this instance, TIF are the bonds issued to the SouthGlenn Metro District to pay for public improvements. Because the redevelopment of Streets at SouthGlenn resulted in higher property values and more people visiting the site, there was an increase in property and sales tax collected. These increases in property and sales taxes, called increment are used to repay the bonds.</p> <p>Specifically, 100 percent of the property tax increments (paid by the owner-developer), and 76 percent of the sales tax increment (paid for by the patrons at The Streets at SouthGlenn when they shop and dine) is pledged for repayment of the bonds until 2030. The remaining 24 percent of the incremental sales taxes collected goes to the City of Centennial. Only the incremental increase resulting from the redevelopment's success is used to repay the bonds. The base of taxes collected at the time of redevelopment still go to the City of Centennial and all other taxing authorities in the area as they would have if the redevelopment of Southglenn Mall did not occur. The property taxes paid by property owners in the adjacent neighborhoods do not go toward repayment of the bonds.</p>
Patrick	Santana	Aug 13 2021 09:31 AM	The traffic at Arapahoe and University is not a nightmare. And LOS has been discredited as a way to evaluate projects by California -- after studies showed that LOS just increases the pollution and number of car trips when used as a measure. Instead, VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) is the proper metric. Dense infill projects in mixed use areas REDUCE vehicle miles traveled, and thus have a better environmental signature. Centennial planners would be wise to ignore LOS, as it simply leads to more cars, wider roads, more pollution, increased planetary warming, more drought -- and an increasing cycle of forest fires which are already plaguing Colorado. ☐

Yvonne	Barton	Jul 24 2021 11:41 AM	As a Southglenn resident since 1969, I am opposed to the proposed concentration of residential units at Streets of Southglenn. I used to enjoy the shops that were in the original Southglenn. They are gone and this new proposal will further decrease the available shops, while increasing the number of residents and cars. This may bring more income for someone, but the cost to the neighborhood in visual esthetics (height of proposed buildings and their proximity to the street), noise and traffic will be detrimental to the existing community. I will have to do my shopping in Lone Tree, and the traffic will make driving to and from my home more troublesome.
Jody	Block	Aug 05 2021 08:09 PM	I would agree with Yvonne. I am opposed to the increase in residential apartments. I have lived in the area since 1995. Prior to moving to the area, I would drive from Denver to Southglenn Mall for most of my shopping. I still do much of my shopping here - Macy's, Chico's, Bath and Body Works, Sephora as well as many restaurants and would love more like what Southglenn Mall had for the convenience and less congestion of not having to go to the Park Meadows area. Southglenn area has the space for parking, too. In addition, I agree the aesthetics, look and feel, noise and traffic of adding more residences would be detrimental to the community. I don't want this area to become cramped and a concrete jungle like the old Villa Italia area in Lakewood, which has very little parking and tall residential buildings.
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 05:59 PM	Ms. Barton - <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I share your dismay about the reduction in retail store variety in our area, but this trend is, for better or worse, the inevitable result of the rise in online shopping. SouthGlenn is highly unlikely ever again to see significantly more retailers locate there and, with regard to traditional department stores, I would assess the odds as being practically zero. Therefore it's logical for the developer to desire to dedicate more space there to residential construction, since that will provide revenue to replace the lost commercial revenue.
Lisa	Stennes	Aug 12 2021 08:02 PM	In reply to Mr. Lacey's reply of "SouthGlenn is highly unlikely ever again to see significantly more retailers locate there and, with regard to traditional department stores, I would assess the odds as being practically zero." I would suggest that we have several very successful retailers/restaurants in SouthGlenn now - Snooze, Chick-Fil-A, Whole Foods, H&M, Sephora, Old Navy, Best Buy. I don't know if Macy's is planning to close or if they are being pushed out by the developer. I believe the Streets at SouthGlenn should be able to be profitable with additional retail and housing, but the housing should still be limited to 50', in the same style as the current development (not all glass and concrete), and something more like 500-600 units, not 1125. That would provide housing similar to the size of the Portola. However, rents at the Portola for a one bedroom (570-938 sq ft) are currently listed at \$1,874 to \$2324 per month. Not affordable to most of the nearby community.
Lucy	Evans	Aug 13 2021 04:38 PM	I absolutely agree and <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly oppose the new proposal for redevelopment that including adding 25 ft of height to the building(s) will further ruin the Mountain View's and community landscape we have worked to preserve for the residents and inclusivity of all. <input type="checkbox"/> Please also, keep the retail space as it was originally intended noting the community presence it combines with the surrounding residential spaces already in place but not occupied. <input type="checkbox"/> Finally, it was once a lovely thriving development until the prices became out of control and pushed a lot of good people out of homes and businesses - only to get the chance to redevelop for profit and not community sustainability. This is NOT what our community needs <input type="checkbox"/>
Rachael	Toth	Jul 27 2021 11:10 AM	For the proposed residential dwellings in South Glenn, I ask that they are affordable housing so that there can be more diversity in this amazing area.
Sonya	Pennock	Jul 28 2021 05:10 PM	Comments Regarding Amendment 8 to Streets of Southglenn Development Plan <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The League of Women Voters of Arapahoe and Douglas Counties (LWVADC) urges the Centennial Plan and Zoning Commission and City Council to require that the proposed redevelopment plan for the Sears and Macy's parcels in Streets of Southglenn be revised to either include low income and affordable housing units in the project or provide funding for alternative affordable housing efforts elsewhere in Centennial. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> High rental costs and the COVID pandemic's impact on the finances of many residents in Centennial have made the need for low income and affordable housing even more critical. Inclusion of such units in the development will enhance the public benefits of this project. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> LWVADC believes that housing is a basic human need and that addressing that need is a responsibility of all communities. This responsibility includes providing incentives for private developers to build an adequate supply of low income and affordable housing or provide funding for construction of such units elsewhere in the community. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Sonya Pennock, Homelessness Committee Chair <input type="checkbox"/> League of Women Voters of Arapahoe and Douglas Counties <input type="checkbox"/> 6751 S. Marion Cir. W. <input type="checkbox"/> Centennial, CO 80122 <input type="checkbox"/>
Susan	Janssen	Jul 30 2021 05:01 PM	I support a city requirement to include affordable housing in proposed large developments. Recent comments by the City Council about the future of housing in Centennial have recognized that home ownership is beyond many residents, including council members' children. Here is a chance to make a difference!
Timothy	Eff	Aug 12 2021 03:36 PM	I sure hope comments from groups and people that only work in the area carry less weight since they won't be nearly as affected by the increase in units as those that live here.

Susan	Janssen	Jul 30 2021 04:55 PM	I understand that the developers are asking for a 75' height. It is more appropriate to keep the 50' restriction in this part of "the burbs." Please do not grant the waiver.
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 06:01 PM	Ms. Janssen - <input type="checkbox"/> The office building southeast of SouthGlenn, located on the west side of University Boulevard, has a height greater than 75 feet. The 50-foot limit is not, and as far as I can see, was never intended to be a Centennial-wide height limit or even a limit applicable to all of the SouthGlenn area. It would seem unfair to deny the SouthGlenn developer a height variance that would result in apartments that are not as tall as the office building adjacent to the complex.
Debbie	Sundgren	Aug 12 2021 06:14 PM	Mr. Lacey is either confused or mistaken. The two office buildings to the south of the mall are 3 & 4 stories high. 75 ft is a 7-8 storey building (a storey is typically 10-12 ft high). I have lived directly across the street from the mall for 25 years and I assure you, there are no 7 or 8 storey structures in the area. The highest structure is the Portola at 5 storeys or 50 ft.
Patrick	Santana	Aug 13 2021 09:37 AM	There is a 60-65" structure in the mall at E Commons Ave already, so claims that there are "only 3 and 4 story buildings" in the area is wrong and false. Another 10' of height compared to this building is not a big deal, will not harm the area, and will mean dozens more available homes if permitted: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps/@39.5915497,-104.9628104,3a,60y,313.84h,96.26t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sokeqUYNJCb0wSN4Dh8AQg!2e0!7i16384!8i8192">https://www.google.com/maps/@39.5915497,-104.9628104,3a,60y,313.84h,96.26t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sokeqUYNJCb0wSN4Dh8AQg!2e0!7i16384!8i8192</a> <input type="checkbox"/> YES to 75' variance. <input type="checkbox"/>
Susan	Janssen	Aug 13 2021 09:50 AM	Yes, the Portola and office buildings in the center of SoS are higher than 50 ft. HOWEVER, the Master Development Plan allows 100 ft height in Lots 5 - 10. The approved MDP allows 50 ft height in Lots 1 - 4 and 11 - 14 restricts building height to 50 ft. This acts as a transition from 1 and 2 story single family residences and townhomes. The MDP also requires minimum retail space, minimum parking, etc. Please read the MDP and consider the impacts of the proposed changes to those of us who reside, raise families, shop and recreate in District 1. I have read the comments in support of the proposed changes. I see little merit in those arguments of "you can't stop progress." I heartily agree. BUT what does progress mean to me? It does not mean destroying the suburbs for developer profit. It means IMPROVING the quality of life by promoting smart growth.
Jim	Typrowicz	Jul 31 2021 10:16 AM	I would like to keep the height restriction to the current 50 feet maximum. I'd also like to see a bigger park along Easter, the one proposed looks way too small to offer a buffer to the existing townhomes and homes along Easter.
E	M	Aug 01 2021 01:36 PM	The developer purchased property zoned for a maximum building height of 50 feet. They knew the height was limited to 50 feet. If the developer wants to build apartments, fine. But keep the building height at 50 feet. <input type="checkbox"/> The site is not in Denver. It's not near I-25. It's not near a light-rail station. The site is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood. The site is surrounded by 2-story townhomes, single family homes, and a few 3-story buildings. Fifty feet allows a 4-story building. A 50 foot, 4-story building would be taller than nearly everything around SouthGlenn. Fifty feet is the appropriate height for a suburban neighborhood in Centennial. <input type="checkbox"/>
Jody	Block	Aug 05 2021 08:19 PM	I agree with E M. The developers knew the requirements when purchasing, which should include keeping the number of residences to 350, and not allowing the increase to over 1,125.
Bettygene	Sorte	Aug 01 2021 04:51 PM	I live across the street from The Streets of Southglenn. I moved there because I liked the mature neighborhood and the suburban neighborhood feel of the community. I did not move to Denver, which it seems to me the Administration at the City of Centennial is trying to turn SOSG into. At least that is what the artist's renderings makes it look like. With 1125 apartments, come more people, more traffic, more crowding in the one grocery store and drug store in the neighborhood. What are the elected officials doing that benefits their constituents? How does this benefit the existing residents?
Liz	Martin	Aug 02 2021 05:22 PM	How high is the Portola apartments? How high is the office building along E Commons Ave? I'm try to establish what 75 feet would like like.
Michael	Gradis	Aug 03 2021 03:38 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Liz. The Portola Apartment building is about 75 feet high, and the Office building is about 85 feet high.
Ashlee	Grysiewicz	Aug 02 2021 05:39 PM	I would like the building height max to stay 50 feet. These developer's plans do not benefit the surrounding neighborhoods. They will only add people and no new businesses. Basically, if the developers are given what they want we can kiss our suburban area goodbye as we know it. Tell them to come up with new plans or sell the property.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 02 2021 06:02 PM	Who owns Lot 3 (the existing office building) east of Sears? Is this parcel part of the SouthGlenn Master Plan? Are there any plans for this parcel? <input type="checkbox"/> What about Lot 13? Is it owned by Alberta or Northwood? What are plans for this parcel?

Michael	Gradis	Aug 03 2021 03:34 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Jane. The building to the east of the existing Sears building (7061 S. University Blvd.) is owned by Hallmark Real Estate Holdings. There are no known plans for this parcel. Lot 13 is owned by SouthGlenn Property Holdings, LLC. There are no changes proposed for this lot at this time.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 02 2021 06:09 PM	I do NOT support the increase in height to 75 feet. Please keep 50 foot maximum building height. 75 feet (5 or 6 story buildings) is NOT compatible with our suburban residential area.
Shelby	Leonard	Aug 02 2021 08:07 PM	I don't support this new Complex at all, its already an accident prone zone off of University and Easter. We have many empty store fronts in the Street of Southglenn, that been empty for awhile now. Many more after COVID that never reopen. I heard Barnes and Noble was going thinking about opening and they look at the mall feet traffic and change their mines. I think its important to look around at the revenue before you build a apartment complex. You don't want an apartment to sit empty.
Debbie	Sundgren	Aug 03 2021 10:11 AM	I'm a longtime resident and homeowner in Centennial (25+ years). I live directly across the street from the Southglenn mall. I am not in favor of the proposal to build 13 new drive through restaurants between Arapahoe and Dry Creek. I assure you, the streets and the neighborhood cannot accommodate the idea. The reason people live in this particular spot is for the quiet, friendly, safe atmosphere. Your proposal would utterly destroy it for those to whom it actually matters. The two restaurants in the area which already offer drive thru are a serious problem for local traffic at peak times. I fail to see how compounding the problem solves anything. I respectfully suggest you come up with something else.
Michael	Gradis	Aug 03 2021 03:28 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Debbie. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. I would like to clarify that this proposal relates to a request by the developer to make modifications to The Streets at SouthGlenn Master Development Plan to allow for additional residential dwelling units within The Streets at SouthGlenn and does not relate to drive thru restaurants. I believe you are referencing a change to the rules within the Centennial Land Development Code to other properties along S. University Blvd., which does not relate to this proposal. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project.
Brett	Barrett	Aug 03 2021 11:40 AM	I live on Arapahoe just west of the Streets of SouthGlenn. We already have parts of the day where pulling out of the driveway can take 5 or more minutes due to traffic. <input type="checkbox"/> This quiet suburb is on the fast track to being little Denver. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The developers understood what zoning the location had prior to buying. Now things haven't planned out as they wished. Aka they are not rolling in excess profits from the venture. <input type="checkbox"/> So now they want to change. Smart business move! However, they are trying to make this progress at the expense of everyone who came before them and all those who wish to come next. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Debbie	Sundgren	Aug 03 2021 04:16 PM	According to the information available online for the Portola, it is just over 60 feet high. So, Michael Gradis for Centennial Community Development is either misinformed or mistaken by 15 feet, which is roughly another 1.5 storeys.
Debbie	Sundgren	Aug 03 2021 04:50 PM	I do not support raising the height of the proposed development at Southglenn. 50 ft is high enough for the area. I do not support adding 1100+ more residential units, either. Aside from street congestion, the sewer and water systems could scarcely be adequate. Additionally, the proposal for parking previously detailed would be inadequate. One parking spot per bedroom is not enough by half. Usually both people sharing a bedroom each drive a car and need to park it somewhere. This is a poor proposal and unacceptable for our suburban neighborhood. If we wanted an urban lifestyle, we would live in the big city, not the suburbs.
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 06:12 PM	Ms. Sundgren - <input type="checkbox"/> Centennial and Littleton are rapidly becoming much more inner suburbs than outer suburbs as population growth on the Front Range continues. Moreover, the concept of an automobile-intensive suburb with low-intensity, dispersed, single-family homes is not a construction pattern or urban growth design that is compatible with assuring affordable housing, lowering fossil fuel use, and assuring an environmentally friendly cityscape. This area cannot be what it was 30 or 40 years ago. It is going to become more urbanized, whether those of us who live here like it or not, and that is inevitable given the continuing population growth and imperative to limit suburban sprawl and ongoing dependence solely on personal automobiles for transportation.
Janet	Match	Aug 03 2021 05:07 PM	Lets preserve our mountain views and maintain the character of our neighborhood by keeping the maximum building height at 50 feet. Please say NO to 75 feet.
Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 11:52 AM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Janet. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council.
Janet	Match	Aug 03 2021 05:08 PM	What is the approximate/potential price the apartments will rent for?

Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 11:51 AM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Janet. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Rental prices for any future residential dwelling units would be set by the private owner/developer.
Janet	Match	Aug 08 2021 02:49 PM	Is it like the apartments will rent for the market rate? Can you check with the owner/developer please?
Janet	Match	Aug 03 2021 05:12 PM	What is quasi-judicial and does it affect this project? Who can or can't residents talk to? Can we speak to prospective councilmen about SouthGlenn?
Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 02:34 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Janet. A quasi-judicial process is when a political body (in this case, the members of Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council) must act as a "judge" when deciding on whether or not consider the proposed changes to The Streets at SouthGlenn. As they are acting as "judges", they can only consider what is presented to them during the public hearings (which have not been scheduled yet) as part of the official record to make their decision. Comments received from the public during the review process will be presented as part of the official record. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council must remain unbiased throughout this process. As prospective Councilmembers are only prospective, this would not apply to them until sworn in. <input type="checkbox"/>
K	B	Aug 10 2021 04:30 PM	So, if the City Council has to be unbiased, who will represent the needs of the constituents of council members? Isn't that what we voted them in to do?
Kevin	Eschen	Aug 04 2021 09:53 AM	A few years ago the City of Centennial created a comprehensive plan for buildings/residence in the city. In it they stated all of the setbacks and height requirements and made changes on these due to citizen feedback. The plan was adopted and passed. The citizens spoke on what they wanted for the city. Why are we allowing this development to not follow the setbacks and height requirements? I could see it if it was a few feet but this is not even close. Please enforce the requirements that were adopted and send a clear message to the developers that the City will hold firmly to them.
Jocelyn	Mertens	Aug 04 2021 10:23 AM	I am in total agreement with Kevin.
Jody	Block	Aug 05 2021 08:27 PM	I agree with Kevin as well.
Carol	Mason	Aug 04 2021 10:24 AM	I wish our council members would live in our area for a few months and see if they think it's still a wonderful idea to add more apartments (people) to this area. I think they might have a little different view of the matter. What's the old saying "until you walk in my shoes——"!!!
Gregory	Gleason	Aug 04 2021 10:25 AM	Re-zoning for profit is wrong. Keep the existing limits.
Kathy	Otero	Aug 04 2021 10:27 AM	I oppose the developers request for a building height of 75'. It is more appropriate to keep the 50' restriction in this part of the suburbs. Please do not grant the waiver.
Beverly	Jacobsen	Aug 04 2021 10:29 AM	Most homeowners settled here because of Southglenn. Shopping, restaurants, available within walking distance for a lot of homeowners Now you want to take all of that away The developers need to go elsewhere. We like it the way it is and or was. Do any of the council members live here? I doubt it or they wouldn't be approving this proposed change.
Bettygene	Sorte	Aug 04 2021 10:30 AM	Please keep the height of the buildings to 50 feet instead of 75. I don't see the need for higher buildings with more apartments that will be empty. Thanks
Dee	Getchel	Aug 04 2021 10:36 AM	Please keep Southglenn a suburb - not a metropolis. Keep the original maximum height at 50' - the height that the developers agreed to when they purchased the lots. We want to keep our way of life - without so much added traffic on University. We want to keep our mountain views!
Jocelyn	Mertens	Aug 04 2021 10:36 AM	The character of this neighborhood is unique. The initial addition of 350 rentals was hard to get used to but amending to 1200+ Units is unacceptable. The citizens spoke. The traffic impact alone would be highly detrimental. I'm dubious as to how you think timing lights will address the density. It flies in the face of common sense in such a bean counting way. The traffic to the east on E Easter Ave will increase as people cut through neighborhoods. Denver has let these Moscow like rentals spring up everywhere. Keep the 50 foot limit to preserve the skyline. If you want more rentals in the city, please disperse the impact. We all know that the original negotiations were based on real estate 101: ask for as much as you can get. Please don't cave to overarching profit.
Cynthia	Kennedy-McLoughlin	Aug 04 2021 10:38 AM	As a resident of Centennial owning property across the street from The Streets of Southglenn, I do not support any of the proposals as written. I do not support a height increase to 75 feet, I do not support building more than quadruple the amount of existing rental properties and I do not support a reduction of retail space. <input type="checkbox"/> I suggest instead a number of compromises: Height increase capped at 60 feet instead of 75 Rental units expanded to 600 instead of 350 Designate the proposed reduction portion of retail space to become office space <input type="checkbox"/> Thanks for listening.

Christy	Parker	Aug 04 2021 11:00 AM	I am opposed to the development at 75' and the addition of so many more apartments because this property is in the middle of a neighborhood. Not near infrastructure that can handle that type of traffic or aesthetic. It will look desperately out of place. Please please keep adequate retail and restaurant access. Our families like to walk to dine and shop.
Carol	Bickers	Aug 04 2021 11:16 AM	Don't go over 50 feet. It makes no sense to cram more people into small spaces. And 2 parking places for all units.
Sue	Valentine	Aug 04 2021 11:23 AM	We have lived in Centennial since 2003 the amount of traffic on Dry Creek has made our back yard unusable for several hours a day if you want to have any conversation without yelling. The exhaust from vehicles floats into our home if we have our windows open at times. That is with current traffic patterns. I am opposed to more residential units for Streets of South Glenn. Dry Creek & Arapahoe cannot handle more traffic without compromising the homes that border the major streets in the surrounding area, without sound & pollution barriers. You will be impacting the quality of the city of Centennial & their residents.
Catherine	Wagner	Aug 04 2021 11:43 AM	Dear City of Centennial, <input type="checkbox"/> In regards to the SouthGlenn redevelopment project, please consider keeping the 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 feet). 50 foot height would help preserve mountain views, and maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood. And we need AFFORDABLE housing, not luxury expensive apartments. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for your consideration.
Lauren	DeBow	Aug 04 2021 11:52 AM	This is a horrendous idea. The developers are setting the area up for failure. Littleton public schools is closing the elementary school nearby. There aren't sufficient plans for parking, there isn't sufficient public transport, the increased traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods will make it less desirable with more noise and cars. The city already doesn't do anything to keep reasonable traffic speeds in the area and adding more traffic isn't going to help. Also, how much will be rental apartments vs units to purchase? This isn't going to be "affordable housing" until it gets rolled into section 8. Expand retail, make Southglenn a nice place to shop again, don't mess up this neighborhood anymore than has been allowed.
Shirley	Merryman	Aug 04 2021 11:53 AM	responding to increase of Southglenn apartments: Number of new units are way too many for this neighborhood. I live nearby and walk to Southglenn weekly and enjoy doing it. Increase of people and cars will overflow the available area. Please consider cutting the 1125 total units to 800 new total units. thanks for listening.
Paul	Arangua	Aug 04 2021 12:19 PM	hello I am definitely against this proposal. adding such a large amount of luxury apartments is going to significantly increase the traffic in the area. I am also concerned that it will make the SouthGlenn area much more difficult to navigate and reduce my property value overall. I am strongly against the building of these new luxury apartments in the southglenn area
Jack	Reiter	Aug 04 2021 12:35 PM	Bad idea, keep increasing the stress on all aspects of the current infrastructure and environment. Nobody has the moral compass to oppose the unbridled development in our community. Let's pave the highline canal trail.
John	Gillen	Aug 04 2021 12:36 PM	Dear Mayor and City Council Members of the City of Centennial, <input type="checkbox"/> I am writing to ask you to keep the building height at the current limit of 50 feet, per the City Code, pertaining to the proposed application request for a variance concerning the Streets of Southglenn redevelopment project. I feel it is important to keep the character of our area intact, and not allow taller buildings. The Developers bought this property knowing the current codes, and showing them any preferential treatment is not in the best interest of long time residents, like myself. <input type="checkbox"/> I request that you deny the Height Variance that has been submitted. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Sincerely, John P. Gillen
Jonna	Perlinger	Aug 04 2021 12:43 PM	As a resident and tax payer of this area, please do not add more crowding to an area that is not built for it. University cannot expand out. Traffic is already a disaster at the Arapahoe, Dry Creek, and County Line intersections.
Angie	Osili	Aug 04 2021 12:53 PM	This would increase traffic in an already dense area (particularly since it isn't near light rail). This is a suburban neighborhood whose school was just shut down due to lack of enrollment so adding this many rental units would significantly change the character of the neighborhood and add too many cars on smaller neighborhood streets with people trying to avoid University. You already have Littleton Village to the west with significant issues - this request is solely for developer profit with no strategic long term community view being considered.
Liz	Martin	Aug 04 2021 01:03 PM	There are errors in Tables 3 and 4 of the Traffic Impact Analysis. These errors make it too confusing and I will stop looking at the traffic analysis. When can you get a corrected version of the Traffic Impact Analysis? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> SouthGlenn is one of the largest developments in Centennial and the southwest suburbs. Aren't city engineers reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis? <input type="checkbox"/>

Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 11:34 AM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hello Liz. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Traffic Impact Analysis submitted is for first review, which means there will be additional reviews and ample opportunity to revise the study as needed. those will also be available for review. City Staff are currently reviewing the study.</p>
Liz	Martin	Aug 07 2021 04:16 PM	When will we have a corrected version of the Traffic Impact Analysis?
Jeri	Lawrence	Aug 04 2021 01:40 PM	<p>Limit building heights to original proposal. Compromise on number of units. 1100+ is too many. Hard to read "blueprints" but parking looks inadequate for the 1100+ units. I didn't see traffic impact info. Might have missed it, but a major concern. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Also, how is LPS impacted?</p>
Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 11:31 AM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hello Jeri. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the 1st submittal of the Traffic Impact Study prepared by the developer has been included as one of the documents that you can find at (<a href="https://www.centennialco.gov/Government/City-Projects-and-Initiatives/Streets-at-SouthGlenn">https://www.centennialco.gov/Government/City-Projects-and-Initiatives/Streets-at-SouthGlenn</a>) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As for Littleton Public Schools, they have been referred the application and will have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal.</p>
Elsa	Bradley	Aug 04 2021 01:41 PM	<p>Southglenn development should not extend above 50 feet in height. This is still a suburban neighborhood. Anything higher would add too much traffic and congestion. These will not be affordable housing which is what this area needs most. For once, think about quality of life, not satisfying the greed of developers who pay very little in taxes with all their loopholes</p>
Julie	Brewer	Aug 04 2021 02:23 PM	I don't agree on the 75. 50 foot is preferred To keep view of mountains
Denise	Brickley	Aug 04 2021 03:18 PM	<p>*Keep height at 50 - keeps within the integrity of community/neighborhood feel <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Provide for low income/affordable housing <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Consider the safety/traffic issues involved when adding extra residents with additional rental units - THIS location is a suburb not city, close to elementary school students walking to school and blocks away from high school students driving and walking to school; Traffic is bad enough now, the additional cars, usually 1-2 per household, will be significant <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Lower retail/restaurant rent to bring in revenue in other ways to make up for fewer apartment rentals. Will also help make Streets a walking destination spot again for neighboring community members <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Linda	Richards	Aug 04 2021 03:35 PM	They are wanting to add too many units to the site. This area can take that traffic and their solutions are not well planned. They also want to raise to 75 ft. That is too high for the area.
Anne	Borg	Aug 04 2021 03:37 PM	Hello - as a homeowner in Southglenn for 26 years, I prefer that the building height for new development at the Streets at Southglenn remain at its current cap of 50 feet. I am also in favor of a total of 750 - 900 residential units in the parcel, rather than the proposed 1,125 units.
Ryan	Thornton	Aug 04 2021 04:19 PM	I am against the number of units due to the high traffic issues we already have. The study executed does not fully reflect a non pandemic and non summer traffic reality. The setbacks are also a concern with such a tall building proposed. I count on our elected officials to weigh this opinion higher than the need for tax revenues. I plan to vote based on outcomes. Some new apartments would be ok but not the ultra high level requested.
Deborah	Miller	Aug 04 2021 04:24 PM	<p>The original planned 50 feet in height for the residential component is appropriate for the area. Increasing the height, thereby increasing the density, will overwhelm the existing neighborhoods nearby. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In regards to parking, agree with an earlier comment that one space per bedroom is not enough at this location. It might be enough near a light rail station but is certainly not enough for a development in the Southglenn area where the only mass transit option involves limited bus routes.</p>
Robert	Johanson	Aug 04 2021 04:38 PM	If you believe that adding 1000 more people in a small area will not increase traffic I have a bridge for sale. You guys will allow anything for more tax money. Please do not allow taller buildings.
Al	Sundgren	Aug 04 2021 05:44 PM	I am totally against density that high. Traffic will be crazy as well as parking. I doubt anyone we voted in to office in the city of centennial cares though since they don't live in this area. Revenue is the most important thing to them since it doesn't affect them directly. Sad situation that the people most directly affected have such little influence. The surrounding neighborhoods have turned out and protested at every turn to no avail. It proves that anything can be bought with enough money. Very disappointing and irritating.

Cynthia	Bibb	Aug 04 2021 05:52 PM	It is disturbing that this continues to be discussed. The voters have made their distaste for this project known, but our city officials are not listening. I have been involved since the beginning. I remember that meeting in the old Sears building. I asked one of the developers if they lived here, their answer was NO. So they just want the dollars they receive from the project, but don't have an investment of living here and dealing with the impact. This is a residential area. continue doing projects that don't have to be rezoned. Our former city officials were on the side of the homeowner, that's why it is zoned as it is. Is it the love of the tax money? It's a great question to ask our supposed city officials. I even had coffee with one of you before Covid to express our concern. But you are not representing those who live here and pay those taxes. Our houses are worth more and our taxes have increased as a result. Where is your integrity city officials?
Corynne	Friend	Aug 04 2021 05:58 PM	I am very concerned about the proposal to add an additional 1225 units to the Streets at Southglenn. Our roads in this area are already under capacity for the amount of traffic. What would the influx of that number of people do to our emergency services capacity, the water capacity and to our schools. The long term quality of life in Centennial is more important than short term padding of the budget. Our city services are already poor at best. Where is code enforcement, road repair, etc. This is a very bad idea.
Michele	Craig	Aug 04 2021 06:42 PM	<p>Hello. As others have noted, please do not allow a height increase from 50' for this development and with that more density. There is no good mass transit, leading to a great increase in vehicles both parking and driving in the area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Another concern I have with having this many units is the increased risk for cyclists and others who take Easter across University to get to the park and the Highline Canal trail. I use that crossing often with my dog and know it can be unsafe at times, even now. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Also, keeping the first floors as retail units can be a benefit both for SS residents and those in the surrounding neighborhoods, giving access to restaurants and shops without adding to traffic and pollution issues. Less retail space does not seem like a good idea, except that the developers will need to provide fewer parking spaces. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> And, lastly, are the developers taking steps to create a more green development? Is this just going to be cement and asphalt, with a token park or are they going to incorporate some of the innovations that will help this area from continuing to be a big heat sink? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for the opportunity to comment—it is appreciated.</p>
Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 11:15 AM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hello Michelle. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As for your question regarding cement and asphalt, any redevelopment of the Sears or Macy's site would result in reduced impervious surface as the current site is largely building footprint and parking lot. Any new buildings would be significantly more energy/resource efficient than the existing Sears and Macy's building, which were built in 1974 and 1981, respectively.</p>
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 06:09 PM	<p>This point by Ms. Craig is very important: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> "And, lastly, are the developers taking steps to create a more green development? Is this just going to be cement and asphalt, with a token park or are they going to incorporate some of the innovations that will help this area from continuing to be a big heat sink?" <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Average air temperatures on the Front Range are rising. As the metro area has grown, surface temperatures have also increased because there is so much more concrete and blacktop. This prevents nighttime cooling by as much as occurred before development. It's crucial that, whatever the redevelopment plan looks like, concrete and blacktop are minimized. Parking garages should be used instead of surface parking. Existing parking lots should be converted to areas landscaped with xeric plants, <u>native grasses, and abundant trees.</u></p>
Donald	Carroll	Aug 04 2021 06:52 PM	Please keep the 50ft height limit. The existing buildings are already the tallest around. 75ft is simply too high for this area. Please do not allow that variance
Sarah	Hoge	Aug 04 2021 07:33 PM	As homeowners since 2013, my spouse and I are opposed to the redevelopment plan. While there's a significant need for housing in the metro area, the infrastructure which exists in the Southglenn area was not intended to handle the proposed additional car and occupant traffic. Part of the appeal of this area of Centennial is access to local shops, restaurants, and parks - paired with a quieter suburban feel. Increasing the occupancy to the levels outlined in the proposal creates a more metropolitan feel, and further contests an already stressed infrastructure. There must be a middle ground which allows for redevelopment of the Southglenn area, without sacrificing our quality of life and that of our potential new neighbors.



K	W	Aug 04 2021 07:48 PM	<p>More traffic (which is already awful), more congestion, more accidents. Harder to get around. Probably more crime over time with higher density. More trash, more inconsiderate people. Gee, what's not to like? If you're trying drive long-time residents like myself away, this is a GREAT way to do it. At the least, limit the height of the development to 50 feet so we can preserve some semblance of openness and be able to get some sunlight to melt the snow &amp; ice in the winter. 75 feet will feel like a canyon. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I find it interesting another commenter referred to this area as "amazing". Packing Southglenn with hundreds of new residents and seriously more traffic volume and congestion will change that in short order. Again, if you're looking for a way to drive long-time residents out, this is a great way to do it.</p>
Dustin	Szenderski	Aug 04 2021 08:08 PM	<p>Please keep the maximum building height at 50 feet. This area is already very busy on the trails, school playgrounds and local roads. Any amount of apartments at this site will make this even busier. Minimizing the impact of multi story units in any way would be greatly appreciated. You'll still make enough money with a smaller number of units.</p>
Bonnie	Mattox	Aug 04 2021 08:10 PM	<p>Increasing the number of units by stacking units higher seems more like greed and will have a negative impact on traffic on University which is already so busy only a couple cars can cross on the light.</p>
Linda	Lemmer	Aug 04 2021 09:12 PM	<p>We are very concerned and upset about proposed changes. They would completely alter character of neighborhood and <input type="checkbox"/> create massive amounts of traffic. Consider people who have lived around there for decades</p>
Maureen	Lyles	Aug 04 2021 11:11 PM	<p>Do NOT build above 50'. If I had any say, it would be NOT to build Apts at all. Our peaceful neighborhood cannot handle a large increase of bodies or traffic.</p>
Christy	McConnell	Aug 05 2021 07:14 AM	<p>Because of the current nature of the suburban neighborhood, I absolutely do not support a height increase to 75 feet. It will be out of character and will negatively impact current residents. Further, a reduction in retail space negatively impacts all current and future residents. This should be a vibrant place where the community, new and existing, can gather and interact.</p>
Cathy	Eaton	Aug 05 2021 07:33 AM	<p>Sound Barriers on both side of Arapahoe road to reduce the traffic sounds.</p>
Rob	Elsner	Aug 05 2021 07:41 AM	<p>This is great! Please consider making them add some affordable (income based) units as well. No other restrictions, the additional building height should be allowed (up not out is a much better way to develop our land).</p>
Mike	Harrington	Aug 05 2021 07:47 AM	<p>Please keep the 50 ft max structure height and set back requirements. The existing tall buildings in Streets at Southglenn are already too tall compared to the surrounding neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I understand that Sears/Macys and other large retail spaces have fallen out of favor, but replacing with dense apartments is not good for our neighborhood. The streets cannot contain the added traffic or influx of a large increase in residents to the neighborhood. Please hold the maximum unit restrictions and encourage open spaces and retail, we bought in the surrounding neighborhood 13 years ago because of the promise of a revitalized Southglenn Mall area with retail/restaurants within walking distance.</p>
Beverly	Testa	Aug 05 2021 07:59 AM	<p>Our quaint community is not in need of additional "bee hive" housing apartments. Plea do not increase the height of buildings or the number of apartments at The Streets at Southglenn.</p>
Keri	Scott	Aug 05 2021 08:08 AM	<p>I am opposed to this redevelopment. It is not appropriate for this location and will strain the infrastructure, likely negatively impact property values and ultimately increase taxes to pay for improvements needed to support increased population. Quality of life will be diminished as a result of the number of people competing for space and services . There will simply be more people and the site line will begin to resemble a downtown area. What impact will this have on local schools? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The number of retail businesses will be reduced. Southglenn currently enjoys a balance of residential units and businesses. "Because the (fairly recent) redevelopment of Streets at Southglenn resulted in higher property values and more people visiting the site, there was an increase in property and sales tax collected." The proposal will DECREASE retail space, the likely reason for visiting the site and the purported source for repayment of bonds. The increased traffic has not been adequately explained. "The City's Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program (NTMP) is the best tool available to mitigate traffic impacts in neighborhoods, which is a program that implements traffic mitigation measures on streets that qualify for NTMP mitigation to address documented neighborhood traffic issues." And what might those mitigation measures include other than changing the timing on lights?<input type="checkbox"/></p>
Michael	Gradis	Aug 05 2021 09:50 AM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hello Keri. Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other mitigation techniques could involve additional signage, modified striping, and pavement modifications. those would be considered when an actual building development is proposed.</p>

Lauren	Doyle	Aug 05 2021 08:26 AM	I don't like to see vacant retail space at Southglenn, but I feel the increase to 1,125 residential spaces (up from 350) is way too much. I would like to see the heights stay at 50 feet, much more green space included in the plan, and fewer residential units added. This current plan looks like it will overcrowd the area, and make it difficult to host the events the residents enjoy (summer concert series, art fairs). The summer concert series was crowded this year and you want to add at least 1000 more people? That would be uncomfortable. Less people, more space - that is why we moved to the suburbs. We don't want it to feel like downtown.
Teresa	Isaak	Aug 05 2021 08:32 AM	1125 units up from 350 is an abomination!!! The impact on traffic in the area will be huge. If each unit has at least 1 vehicle, that is an increase in traffic of over a thousand vehicles that will impact the current residential area. This proposal by developers is a behemoth disaster. I hope more people will voice disapproval for the increase in units and the increase in height being requested by the developers. The city of Centennial cannot let this happen!
Renee	Schulte	Aug 05 2021 09:15 AM	Way to many apartments keep at least to 50 remember you are elected to <input type="checkbox"/> Do our bidding
Sandra	Sarniak	Aug 05 2021 09:28 AM	Please maintain the integrity of our Streets of Southglenn as a quaint shopping experience rather than another urban jungle. We do not want to be over run by high rise apartment buildings that bring hordes of people and traffic into an area that we have grown to cherish just the way it is. More retail for that area would be great..ir even a park to service the families in the area. What a concept!
Zach	McCall	Aug 05 2021 10:12 AM	I live directly across from the Streets of SouthGlenn and moved here approximately a year after SOSG was completed. At the time, I was slightly concerned about the impact it would have on the area, however, I've grown to really enjoy the outdoor retail shops and restaurants being within walking distance from my house. I feel over the years it's been a good fit/addition. I also enjoy that for the most part, it hasn't changed the things I love about the neighborhood and the community that surrounds it. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> With that said, the traffic is already a headache between University and Arapahoe and also 'already' impacts the surrounding neighborhoods. With the proposed increase of 1,125 residential units and an increase to 75ft on the building, I simply cannot see a positive outcome for existing residents. I strongly oppose the developers proposal and would like to better understand how our city officials expect these changes would positively impact the existing residents?
Matthew	Moran	Aug 05 2021 10:52 AM	As a resident of Cherry Knolls I do not support this proposal without massive modifications to area traffic management and affordable housing. Traffic at University and Arapahoe is already chaotic and crowded. The proposed number of new residences would likely make that issue significantly worse. What are the developers required to modify or provide to mitigate congestion? <input type="checkbox"/> Also why is there so little affordable housing required in this proposal? Do we need more unaffordable luxury housing? Can affordable housing be made a component of this?
Karen	Harris	Aug 05 2021 11:20 AM	Please say no to increase in apartment numbers and height restrictions. This area is becoming too congested as it is. More dwellings means more traffic congestion. Please keep Centennial, Littleton and GV liveable.
Susan	Janssen	Aug 05 2021 01:20 PM	I compared the Nov 2019 and July 2021 traffic studies and have a question about traffic volume in Table 5 on S Race St. The Nov 2019 study reported 37% to 65% changes in traffic volume. The July 2021 study reported 7% to 10% changes in traffic volume. What contributed to this significant REDUCTION in volume? Does this make sense when the other roadways show a modest INCREASE in volume? This discrepancy is important to understand because pedestrian safety along Race (and Easter) is at stake. There are no marked/signaled pedestrian crossways to access RTD or walkways into SoSG.
Susan	Janssen	Aug 10 2021 05:43 PM	I have not received a response to my input so am replying to bring this back to the "top" of the pile. Please ask the consultant for an explanation. Thank you.
Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 11 2021 01:02 PM	Good afternoon Susan, <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> My apologies, I added the response to your question to another comment that was asked above. Here is the response provided by our staff. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Q: What contributed to this significant REDUCTION in volume? Does this make sense when the other roadways show a modest INCREASE in volume? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A: While we would expect a lower number in the percent change based on the updated volumes, we wouldn't expect a change from 65% to 10% which points to a discrepancy in the 2019 or 2021 report. We will share this concern with FHU and ask them to look into this issue and resolve.
Patriciaxe XJEQ9	Wallace	Aug 05 2021 02:48 PM	\$1,100 apartments is entirely entirely too many. We need diversity not box after box after box and \$1,100 is too many
Sharon	van der Meer	Aug 05 2021 03:51 PM	Southglenn was meant to be retail. Retail brings in taxes to support the community. To build as many units that have been proposed will RUIN!! the community. University, Arapahoe, Broadway, Dry Creek, and University are maxed out with traffic. To go 1 mile it sometimes takes at least 20 minutes. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> LPS is already ruining the community by creating BIG elementary schools. If we want to be connected and have a safe community people need to feel like they belong not just be a number. Building these units will just create more chaos. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> In the event that this does pass I will rethink about whom to vote for in the upcoming election.

Lisa	H	Aug 05 2021 04:00 PM	I strongly support this proposal. The higher building and additional units will provide additional housing that our metro area desperately needs. If we do not allow higher buildings, we will just keep sprawling outward to meet our housing needs, which is bad for the environment and exacerbates travel issues. More housing in the immediate area will help support the retail businesses in Southglenn. The traffic study shows minimal impact to the surrounding residential areas. I urge the City Council to support this proposal!
David	Taryle	Aug 05 2021 06:18 PM	I am opposed to this project and think it primarily benefits the developers
Karen	Atencio	Aug 05 2021 06:37 PM	Horrible idea! Southglenn does not need that kind of density.
Sue	Gunn	Aug 05 2021 07:54 PM	This is a bad idea! The traffic is already bad on University between Dry Creek and Arapahoe. There is already increased traffic when Arapahoe high school is in session. People will be cutting through all the nearby neighborhoods to avoid the increase in traffic. People will also be avoiding the Southglenn mall due to increased traffic in/out. The King Soopers on Dry Creek/Univ will be more crowded.
Emery	Sidebotham	Aug 05 2021 07:56 PM	Easter Ave is truly a residential street with houses; it already has an increase in traffic with cars speeding (especially down the hill towards Clarkson). I've personally witnessed close calls with neighborhood pedestrians, children and pets. Adding 700 Units is going to dramatically increase traffic on back streets, notably Clarkson, Franklin and Easter Ave. I don't see any plans that include reasonable solutions to combat what an influx of traffic on these residential streets will cause. Cars already speed and traffic is already a concern on these residential streets. I don't support adding a large amount of units for this reason alone. This area was never developed to be an urban development with condo/multi unit housing. I understand the area needs redevelopment, but I have yet to see the city combat issues on these streets that we have now. Adding more units and more traffic is only going to compound an already frustrating situation. What plans are in place to ease traffic increase in neighborhoods? What protections are in place for houses on those streets? Homeowners purchased these houses without the increase in traffic and this is only going to devalue homes on these streets? What is the city planning on doing to ensure the safety of families with houses on these streets? An increase in traffic means the close calls will turn into tragedies. Again this is a small area. There is no way this space can handle such a large number of units. This new proposal is not far off from the last. When will there be a more logical and reasonable proposal for this community?
Kathleen	Gaskins	Aug 05 2021 08:31 PM	I am raising my opposition to the proposed concentration of residential units at Streets of Southglenn. I moved to the community two years ago because of the shops that were at Southglenn This will decrease the available shops, while increasing the number of residents and cars. This may bring more income for someone (the developer), but the cost to the neighborhood in visual esthetics (height of proposed buildings and their proximity to the street), noise and traffic will be detrimental to the existing community. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> How do the taxpayers benefit from this development? It seems retail sales taxes will be lost to other locations. If I don't shop at Southglenn, I go west, north, or south to shop, not further east to Centennial. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I understand that a traffic mitigation study was done two years ago, but I am already experiencing difficulty making a left turn onto Arapaho at several times of the day. The congestion will likely result in traffic spilling onto side streets. That is a safety issue.
Anne	Strand	Aug 05 2021 09:00 PM	I am opposed to the addition of so many apartments and the resulting cars and traffic congestion at Streets of Southglenn. I have enjoyed shopping and seeing movies and restaurant visits and walking the lovely streets and would hate to see that atmosphere lost. Also believe the increase in height max from 50 ft to 75 will change the suburban feel of Southglenn and block some Mountain View's
Ben	Easley	Aug 05 2021 10:40 PM	Long time resident for about 30 years. We are not in support of adding higher buildings, not in favor of adding all the extra people and cars in this area. A project like this is better suited for a location closer to Denver that is more big city not suburbs. Projects like these are driving natives out of the area.
E	Pulli	Aug 06 2021 08:15 AM	What is the plan to deal with increased traffic through the neighborhoods as a way to avoid traffic at Arapahoe and University? My children play around neighborhood thoroughfares as do many families' kids. Streets like E Easter Ave and Nobles are easy routes to avoid the main streets and do not need increased traffic from people who do not live in those neighborhoods.
Mimi	Diaz	Aug 06 2021 08:28 AM	Please keep the 50 ft height limit on the new buildings that will replace Sears. Less density and height will keep this area a suburban enclave rather than urban. We live here for that reason.

Trinda	Farber	Aug 06 2021 10:31 AM	<p>1. Please consider keeping to the original plan of 50 ft for building height versus 75 ft. 50 ft is consistent to the family oriented neighborhood witch has existed for more than 50 years in view of this site. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2. Please keep to the submitted limits for number of units of 350 versus 1125. Once again, the neighborhood can not support the additional traffic that an additional 775 apartments would bring to the area. Can an additional 25 ft in height support an additional 775 apartments? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3. Why decrease retail space? This means what retail space there will be will cater to these residents versus the neighborhood and other residents within the area. Gone will be those retail spots that we have come to enjoy comfortably and within our own community. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I am not in favor of the project as a whole but as originally planned I have come to accept the project and its impact to the community. But, exactly and in accordance with my fears, the developers want more than was requested, more in line with what they want at the expense of the local home owners. Centennial government is the only defense we have in maintaining our neighborhood and in keeping our pride high in living and supporting the City of Centennial.</p>
Cathy	Meserole	Aug 06 2021 10:40 AM	<p>The City of Centennial shouldn't allow the change, regarding the height from 50 to 75 foot in the height of any of the buildings in the Streets of Southglenn. 1) When there is ice and snow, the shadows that will be created by taller buildings will make the walkways and streets very dangerous. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) We don't need to add more traffic congestion to already busy intersections. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) These developers have been bad news from the very beginning, because all they care about is selling very expensive housing and making huge profits at the cost of our neighborhood loosing the pleasant suburban feel that established residents such as myself have enjoyed for many years. We don't need our area having the appearance of the Denver Tech Center! <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I attended that large meeting at Powell Middle School that evening and voiced my concerns. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The traffic studies weren't done accurately to start with and left many of the properties out, including my area near Arapahoe High School. We should've been included and we weren't included and that was just plain wrong to start with. We deserve just as much consideration near the Arapahoe High School area, as the traffic does come through our area from Southglenn area. We could also use more retail shops to shop at. I suggested this to our City Council members and they need to convey our thoughts to these investors more than they do. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Many of our concerns aren't being addressed because our City of Centennial has failed to represent all of us and their only concern is to make profit at our expense.</p>
Kathie	Weaver	Aug 06 2021 12:36 PM	<p>The proposed redevelopment plan for the Sears and Macy's parcels in Streets of Southglenn should be revised to either include low income and affordable housing units in the project or provide funding for alternative affordable housing efforts elsewhere in Centennial. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>High rental costs and the COVID pandemic's impact on the finances of many who live and work in Centennial have made the need for low income and affordable housing even more critical. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The inclusion of such units in the development will enhance the public benefit of this project by making it possible for low- and middle-income workers in Centennial to live in the community. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Access to safe housing is a basic human need and meeting that need is a responsibility of all communities. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Furthermore, I am not in favor of altering the Streets of Southglenn Master Plan regarding zoning. The residential development of 1000+ units is too dense for the site, and the building height limitations should not be changed. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Kathy	Jacob	Aug 06 2021 01:33 PM	<p>I am against building more apartments in Southglenn. We need to keep the area for retail. However, if that fails I am hopeful that the height will be maximum of 50' so the area maintains some mountain views and skyline.</p>
LORI	DERBY	Aug 06 2021 03:59 PM	<p>Increasing the height to 75 feet changes the character of our suburban neighborhood, not to mention the traffic. Arapahoe and University are already congested enough. Adding another 2,000 people to a suburban neighborhood is not sustainable for anything, let alone traffic. 75 foot (5 or 6 story) buildings are appropriate for DTC which, is near light rail, but they are, not at all, appropriate in the middle of a 2 to 3-story suburban neighborhood.</p>
Todd	Beagle	Aug 06 2021 04:11 PM	<p>A 75 foot structure in this area is absolutely absurd. 50 feet is perfectly reasonable, allows for better ambiance, and with retail below, guarantees a nice blend of urban living district, not a high rise apartment complex.</p>
Sharon	R	Aug 06 2021 06:47 PM	<p>Centennial Staff and City Council Members, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The proposed redevelopment plans and requested height and density modifications for the Sears and Macy's parcels at the Streets at Southglenn absolutely violates our expectations, as long term residents, that this suburban community remain just that - SUBURBAN. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This proposal is urban in nature and belongs in the City and County of Denver, NOT in the neighborhood of west Centennial. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I strongly encourage planning and zoning AND City Council members to reject any current or future proposal for increasing maximum height permitted from 50' to 75'. Additionally, nearly tripling the number of permitted units is excessive. Capping the total number of apartment/condominium units for the Streets at Southglenn to be no greater than 800 would help to preserve west Centennial as a suburban neighborhood.</p>

Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 09 2021 11:05 AM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hello Sharon, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. We appreciate that you took the time to offer alternatives like limiting the number of Units. By giving proposing a compromise and a starting number you offer the opportunity for further conversation. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project and will be reviewed by the Developer, City Staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Council. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 06:18 PM	<p>Good evening. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> At the risk of being overly blunt, it is very unlikely that Centennial can remain a suburban community, as that term has been understood for the past half-century or so, because rapid population growth on the Front Range and the imperative of avoiding sprawl of the metro area to minimize adverse environmental impacts and water infrastructure demands cannot be avoided. This part of the metro area will urbanize. It is unavoidable. The question is how best to manage it so that the community has ample quality-of-life resources like mass transit, parks, additional libraries and schools, and cultural and sports facilities. Ultimately, the developer has a fundamental right to use its property and it's hard to see how this proposal is in any way inconsistent with public safety or public health. Our desires for a continued suburban, low-density, single-family-house style of development are not realistic in the modern era.</p>
Jane	Mataich	Aug 12 2021 06:46 PM	<p>Henry B Lacey 7 minutes ago <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Good evening. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> At the risk of being overly blunt, it is very unlikely that Centennial can remain a suburban community, as that term has been understood for the past half-century or so, because rapid population growth on the Front Range and the imperative of avoiding sprawl of the metro area to minimize adverse environmental impacts and water infrastructure demands cannot be avoided. This part of the metro area will urbanize. It is unavoidable. The question is how best to manage it so that the community has ample quality-of-life resources like mass transit, parks, additional libraries and schools, and cultural and sports facilities. Ultimately, the developer has a fundamental right to use its property and it's hard to see how this proposal is in any way inconsistent with public safety or public health. Our desires for a continued suburban, low-density, single-family-house style of development are not realistic in the modern era. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Response to Mr Lacey - No one is asking that SouthGlenn construct single-family-houses. We are only asking to retain the existing 50 ft (building height) zoning for the property. A 50 ft height allows a 4-story building. Look around SouthGlenn and you will see a 4-story building will be taller than all the surrounding buildings. I can show you many recently constructed apartment complexes 50 ft or less. The new apartments near UC Health in Highlands Ranch are 3-story. The apartments at the old Marathon site near Broadway &amp; Dry Creek are 3 and 4-story. The new Parq Apartments near Iliff &amp; 225 are 3 and 4-story. I agree the developer has a right to building on their land. They can build a 50 ft high building, per the existing zoning. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I very much disagree with you. I am a resident living close to SouthGlenn and believe I will be adversely impacted by the current proposal. As many have said, this is NOT Denver, or DTC, or property near a light rail station. The proposal amounts to dropping high-density apartment complexes in the MIDDLE of a two-story suburban neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> May I ask who you represent and what is your job title? I doubt you are a resident. Thank you. <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Joe	Wiggins	Aug 06 2021 06:56 PM	<p>Thanks for taking comments. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>First of all I'm against any changes to Southglenn based on their proposal especially increasing the number of new apartments and the requested height of 75 feet. I'm also against any major expansion due to the increased traffic it will bring. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In the owner's proposal they have included a traffic impact analysis. How is the city of Centennial verifying the traffic study? Is the City performing it's own traffic analysis? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>As others have mentioned I believe the owners should abide by their original development agreement. I would venture that they knew at that time that there was a glut of retail space (but had investors) and therefore they should have had a different original development plan. Also they know, as we do, that any real estate development can be a risk. Since their investment is now not paying off the company should bear responsibility for that risk and should continue to work within their current footprint and original development plan. They should not (and the city should not) ask or force the neighborhood to accommodate their risky original plan with a new risky redevelopment plan. The neighborhood impact and our well being should not be dismissed nor traded because of a bad business plan. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>We do not have to help bail out this company (although I sympathize with the current tenants). There is nothing wrong with not having more housing, more people, more traffic, more stress, more noise and pollution, etc. Sometimes you have to say no. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Debbie	Richards	Aug 06 2021 07:03 PM	<p>I do not support this proposal with the amount of units and height increase they are asking for. This will make a huge impact in this area. Adding another estimated 2,000 people will increase traffic making more vehicles use the side streets through the residential areas especially at high traffic times. Increasing residents, reducing retail is not going to bring others from the outside to support and shop there. Some businesses around here could use the increase sales but many others will end up being overwhelmed trying to accommodate this many more people forcing us, the surrounding neighbors, to go elsewhere. Southglenn is an old established neighborhood with its own character and adding these luxury apartments just doesn't fit. Please take into consideration the neighboring residents with this proposal.</p>
Amy	Sherwood	Aug 06 2021 09:50 PM	<p>The City of Centennial should consider Climate Change Impacts on the state regarding air pollution control, excluding gas pipelines to housing planned in the South Glenn Development plan. The installation of EV charging needs to be incorporated throughout, like other states have already done in shopping areas. Finally, there should be affordable apartments for our lower income residents who contribute to the economy too.</p>
Barbara	Shangraw	Aug 07 2021 09:21 AM	<p>I believe the Streets of southglen proposal will create too much traffic and density</p>
Cynthia	Schallermuller	Aug 07 2021 11:51 AM	<p>In reference to the Southglenn development. The increase in people and traffic will add to the increase in crime in our area. Keep the numbers low in this development and make a small neighborhood feel. Consider the families directly next door. Keep Centennial rural. Will there be more police to help with increase of population? Don't add more residents. Keep it small.</p>
Liz	Martin	Aug 07 2021 04:19 PM	<p>What is the timeline for the project? Approximately when will it go to City Council to vote? When would the developer like to see the City Council Public Hearing?</p>
Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 09 2021 11:14 AM	<p>Good morning Liz, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>On the Streets of SouthGlenn page on the Centennial website, there is a timeline that covers the entire project. The timeline runs down the right side of the main page and details each step of the process. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><a href="https://www.centennialco.gov/Residents/Have-Your-Say-Centennial/SouthGlenn">https://www.centennialco.gov/Residents/Have-Your-Say-Centennial/SouthGlenn</a></p>
Carolyn	Corcoran	Aug 07 2021 04:43 PM	<p>Please do not build over 50ft. Everything about this project is a recipe for disaster. The water usage? The parking? The lifestyle? This is going to ruin Mountain Views and add drama for everyone who already lives in the area.</p>
Christine	Amini	Aug 07 2021 07:07 PM	<p>Traffic, traffic, traffic, overall congestion, and a radical departure from the existing character of the South University/Southglenn community. One has only to travel S. University Boulevard almost any time of day to see the increasing demands on this thoroughfare, especially between Orchard and Dry Creek Roads. The addition of 1125 rental units at both ends of Southglenn at a height of 75 feet would forever alter the character of this part of Centennial and fly in the face of the stated goal of "protection of neighborhoods." (See 2004 City of Centennial Comprehensive Plan). Downtown Denver this area is not and should not be railroaded into by reckless development. And why has the developer scaled back its original proposal for retail?</p>
Roger	Wohletz	Aug 07 2021 08:00 PM	<p>Please keep to the original plan of 350 apartments total with a 50' building height limit. With added traffic and congestion, the developer's changes would fundamentally alter the character of the neighborhoods surrounding the Streets of Southglenn. This is not a downtown area. A tall apartment building with over 1,000 units is completely out of place here.</p>
Clara	Cichosz	Aug 07 2021 09:25 PM	<p>I am opposed to these new apartments, the traffic, congestion and I always will be opposed. Affordable apartments are not possible in our current economic conditions. Don't insult us by telling us they are because my idea of cheap apartments is less than 1,000.00 per month, what's yours??</p>

Kimberly	Buono	Aug 08 2021 10:46 AM	Please keep height to 50ft or less to preserve current residents Mountain Views.
Steve	Bulota	Aug 08 2021 11:09 AM	Keep the 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 feet). This would reduce the number of apartments, cars and people. 50 foot height would help preserve mountain views, and maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood.
Donna	Chrislip	Aug 08 2021 12:47 PM	Please do not ruin the character of the SouthGlenn community by building structures that are 75 ft. in height. A structure that tall will block the view of mountains for many of us in the Knolls, not to mention the number of appartements rhat height will allow and the accompanying number of people and cars that will be swarming in our area where we have an elementary school and a high school nearby. No child's life is worth the added taxes this development is to bring in. I am against this project altogether, but if you are going to do it. please listen to your constituents and limit the height to 50 ft. At least that will reduce some of the conjection in our area.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 08 2021 02:39 PM	Traffic Study question - Along University Blvd, near SouthGlenn, the existing traffic counts show more vehicles travelling north (than south) in the morning. The 2022 short traffic shows the same thing. Most vehicles are probably driving to Denver or DTC in the morning. <input type="checkbox"/> Yet "the distribution used for this study favored SB traffic with 34 percent SB and 12 percent NB." Why would more vehicles travel south when existing and 2022 volumes indicate more vehicles travel north? Why the shift from north to south?
Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 10 2021 10:45 AM	Good morning Jane, <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for your questions and taking the time to participate in Have Your Say. Your questions are below with responses from our Community Department Staff. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Q: Why would more vehicles travel south when existing and 2022 volumes indicate more vehicles travel north? Why the shift from north to south? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A: The existing traffic counts reflect ALL of the traffic in the larger area which includes the existing S@S traffic and beyond. The distribution for the S@S (34% SB and 12% NB) reflects ONLY S@S traffic and does not include the larger area. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Q: The July 2021 study reported 7% to 10% changes in traffic volume. What contributed to this significant REDUCTION in volume? Does this make sense when the other roadways show a modest INCREASE in volume? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> A: While we would expect a lower number in the percent change based on the updated volumes, we wouldn't expect a change from 65% to 10% which points to a discrepancy in the 2019 or 2021 report. We will share this concern with FHU and ask them to look into this issue and resolve.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 10 2021 06:42 PM	Please ask the traffic consultant - how do they explain the majority of traffic going south instead of north (southbound traffic is almost triple northbound)? What's causing/attracting traffic to the south? Denver and DTC are to the north. I'm sure the consultant can explain. Please ask the consultant. Thank you.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 12 2021 10:38 AM	I do not feel like my question was answered.
Pete	Goss	Aug 09 2021 08:55 AM	The SouthGlenn redevelopment proposal states: <input type="checkbox"/> "Modify the permitted height on the Sears parcel and the Macy's parcel from 50 ft. to 75 ft." <input type="checkbox"/> I am against increasing the building height to 75 ft., as keeping the suburban character of my neighborhood is important to me and was a key factor in my property purchase decision. If I wanted to live around taller building, I move back to the city.
Carol	McCall	Aug 09 2021 01:44 PM	I have many problems with the proposal..Building height is way too tall. It doesn't fit with the other buildings at Southglenn. Too many apartments. Cars, traffic, and density=less quality of life for surrounding area. This is the suburbs, not downtown Denver. Please respect what we have here, and not what urban planners are trying to force onto us.
Louise	Crosby	Aug 09 2021 03:11 PM	I'm concerned about the reduction in retail space (negative impact on sales tax receipts) and increase in residential units (increased demand for city services)
Lisa	Stennes	Aug 09 2021 04:24 PM	I do not support the increase in building height to 75 feet. Please keep the 50 foot maximum height. 75 feet (5 or 6 stories) is not compatible with our suburban residential area. I also oppose the increase from 350 units to 1125 due to the congestion, parking issues, traffic, and noise they will cause. <input type="checkbox"/> I recently moved back to the metro area after being gone for 4 years for work. I specifically chose the Southglenn area for it's residential, suburban nature and access to the Streets of Southglenn shopping and restaurants. I understand the need for redevelopment but believe that the city of Centennial and the developers should honor the original plans (50' height and 350 units). Since there are already 221 units in the Portola, I would not be opposed to an increase above the 350 units but an increase of more than 3 fold over the initial plans in not acceptable.
Marmee	Hasemeyer	Aug 09 2021 06:07 PM	I, too, agree with the majority of local residents. The increase in building height to 75 feet is NOT what this community wants. This is not downtown Denver. Also, to increase the number of apartments by 3 fold is way out of line. The developer was given the green light for 350 units and the building height was not to exceed 50 feet. I ask that it is kept at that. Also, I truly want to see a deeper green belt area next to the street. This will help lessen the concrete jungle feel.

David	Anderson	Aug 09 2021 07:31 PM	I am a concerned citizen of Centennial regarding the recent submission of a proposal to expand multiple dwelling residences at the streets of Southglenn. The proposed buildout of residences by over 1,100 dwellings I believe will further congest an area that has brought charm and taste to our neighborhood. Development is fine when it is well planned and considers all aspects of the area being proposed, but in this case I believe further development with the addition of so many residences will only downgrade a wonderful area of shopping, living and recreating. Please don't over build and further impact an already traffic congested area!
Teresa	Parish	Aug 09 2021 09:57 PM	I seriously hope the board is listening. We who live here and deal with the rush hour traffic and the accidents, are not wanting this development to happen at all!! The developers have already called 1400 + a month for an apartment, affordable. It is not! To allow them to build more than 50' when we already have height restrictions is not right and I am opposed. We all are opposed. Please hear us!!! This is not a good thing for our community on many levels. Parking, traffic, non affordable housing, and tall buildings sticking up like a sore thumb. Please find another area for this proposal. Not here on University and Arapaho, we are against this whole heartedly! Seriously, is there anything good that can come from this, aside from lining some big businesses pockets?
Christy	Roese Ramp	Aug 10 2021 07:26 AM	Please keep the 50 foot maximum building height.
Donna	Jantz	Aug 10 2021 09:08 AM	This looks like a lovely development. But I am absolutely against anything higher than a 50 feet height. It needs to feet our community. High rises in the middle of our community will block the views of the mountains except for the few that would live in the high rises. We live in Colorado for a reason. It is not for the few in our community to see keep our MOUNTAIN VIEWS!
Nancy	Cronan	Aug 10 2021 10:30 AM	The developer purchased the property at the known allowable height of 50' and they should stay within that height for the Sears and Macy's redevelopment. Granting anything higher than that, and increasing the number of apartments, will drastically and detrimentally change the suburban feel of Streets of Southglenn and the affected surrounding neighborhoods. □ With all due respect, the responses regarding the increased traffic concerns are woefully inadequate for the potential of 2-3k more car trips per day if the max number of apartments is allowed. □ From an all-around perspective, this proposal is utterly deficient - the traffic plans are not robust enough and 'suggestions' of striping and signs is insulting when residents are already mired in daily traffic challenges. The requested height will overwhelm the existing area and frankly, the city should be looking to increase retail options vs adding more apartments. No one wants the Streets of Southglenn to turn into the eyesore that Zocalo created on Littleton Blvd (out of place and character for the neighborhood) or Littleton Village - too many problems and now not enough money to fix them.
Lori	Levigne	Aug 10 2021 10:44 AM	I also agree with EM. The developer purchased the property with the building restriction and agreed to it. An increase in that height changes the aesthetics of the neighborhood and is unacceptable. Making a change from 50 to 75 is significant and will have an adverse impact on this area in terms of aesthetics, congestion, traffic. I have just moved from Lone Tree where I lived for 7 years and it went through a dramatic transformation when Charles Schwaub moved to the area and light rail was extended. There is no need to congest this area. It is not positioned along I25 or light rail and is merely benefitting the developer and their profits, not the community.
Kate	Vaughn-Hervey	Aug 10 2021 10:55 AM	Please keep apartments at 50 feet we do not want to lose our mountain views
Kate	Vaughn-Hervey	Aug 10 2021 10:57 AM	We don't want apartments across from us
Abbe	Odenwalder	Aug 10 2021 11:36 AM	I am greatly concerned about the increase in traffic that would result with the addition of 1150 apartments and see no way that this would not increase drive times in the surrounding areas, which are already horrendous. I am also in agreement with most on this site that the 50' height should be retained. Additionally, I am wondering about the decrease in retail. If the number of residents increase, I would think retail would need to increase also. However on the other hand, judging by the number of businesses that have not been successful, I am not sure that retail is the key. To sum my comments up, I am not for this project as it doesn't appear to be well thought out in terms of infrastructure. What types of residents will be living here-families with children, seniors, singles? In each case, services need to be looked at also. How would this all be supported?
Ben	Rejai	Aug 10 2021 01:39 PM	I am concerned that a development this size would have a negative impact on the traffic and pollution in my neighborhood. Can you please reduce the height to 50 ft (4 stories) and cut down on the number of units? This will help preserve the suburban character of the area. Also, helping create new public or private employers in the Streets of SouthGlenn would create jobs for the residents that will not need to drive across town to work and generate more air pollution. Thank you.
Lori	Hanson	Aug 10 2021 02:59 PM	Please limit the height of any apartments in the Sounthglenn development to 50 feet.
Carol	Squires	Aug 10 2021 03:04 PM	Please leave the apartment numbers to 350, and the building height to 50.
Carole	Rollins	Aug 10 2021 03:07 PM	Please maintain the 50' height limits. This community certainly does not need high density apartments. We are a quiet residential area and would like to remain that way! We don't need the additional population, congestion or traffic. Perhaps this area would be better suited for some lovely patio homes.



Kathleen	Gaskins	Aug 10 2021 03:08 PM	<p>I would like to express my opposition to the proposed changes to Southglenn. My husband and I moved here two years ago and part of the reason we chose our location was the close proximity to Southglenn and the retail shopping and restaurants. I am concerned that the loss of retail space for additional apartment living will create more traffic than the community can handle and less income (from sales taxes). The loss of retail will result in me doing more of my shopping in the Littleton area. Other than Southglenn, I do most of my business to the North and West. I likely will not travel further west in Centennial to shop. I do not see any benefit to the current taxpayers of Centennial. The benefactors are the developers. ☐</p> <p>The concern of additional traffic spilling onto Arapahoe Road will make an already busy street unsafe for those making left hand turns, waiting for buses, or crossing the street. There are many times of the day when there is congestion in the area and adding additional vehicles into the mix will drive traffic onto side streets and back up during busier times of the day. ☐</p> <p>The development request of 75 feet creates an eyesore for the community and blocks views for the area and sunshine in the development. The proposed parking seems inadequate and may further infringe on the remaining retail businesses. ☐</p>
Lori	Melena	Aug 10 2021 03:08 PM	<p>I have been a resident of Centennial (near Southglenn) for 30 years. I am AGAINST increasing the number of apartments and I do not want the building to be higher than 50 feet!!!!</p>
Marilyn	Wert	Aug 10 2021 03:28 PM	<p>I believe that our streets are not made for so many apartments. I also believe if they build some they should only be 50 feet high. I have lived in the South Glenn Town Homes since 2000 and really enjoy the peace and quiet of this area. I know many others have lived a lot longer and it seems to me a builder should consider our objections. It would be sad to see all the traffic and ruin our area.</p>
Martha	Parsons	Aug 10 2021 03:29 PM	<p>"The City's Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program (NTMP) is the best tool available to mitigate traffic impacts in neighborhoods, which is a program that implements traffic mitigation measures on streets that qualify for NTMP mitigation to address documented neighborhood traffic issues". If this is a possibility, why has it not already been completed? Why are you waiting for this project to be completed when people who live here have told you it is an issue. You say this will fix it, but you won't do anything to fix the current issue, I have trouble believing you.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>The traffic study stated that currently Vine &amp; Arapahoe were an issue and they would fix it. Why the wait since it was building the Streets of Southglenn the cause? Why has this not already been fixed. Sorry, again, have trouble believing this will be fixed when current issues have not been fixed.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Have you seen Broadway in the last couple of years? I have a hard time making right turns from Panama to Broadway in traffic and forget about making left turns. Ever since Littleton Village. And they too said according to their traffic study it wasn't going to increase traffic. I know for a fact it is an issue. 3xs a week at 4 pm, I am making a right turn. These last couple of years have been horrible. Before these past couple year, never had an issue making right turns and making a left was possible. Yet, you want me to believe traffic will be good at Arapahoe &amp; University when I head out to work in the AM after they have built triple the number of apartments?☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>They knew the height restriction when they purchased the land. Why is this even a discussion? I live in this neighborhood because it has a homey feel. If I wanted to live in an area with that amount of dense apartments (see Peakview &amp; Havana, Lima &amp; Caley near Arapahoe Rd), I would be living over there. Have you talked with the Sherriff and ask him how crime has increased in that neighborhood since the new apartments have been built? I have spoken with several police officers in Greenwood Village and Arapahoe County. And it has. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Maybe, just maybe, retail might stay at the Streets of Southglenn longer if they didn't jack up the rent after 2 years. Maybe they might have a higher capacity at that mall. Why are restaurants choosing any other neighborhood except this one? \$\$\$\$ You let greed buy that land, you want greed to take away reasons why I live in this neighborhood. They choose to have higher rent than anywhere else, that is their issue. They agreed to the original business model.</p>
Martha	Parsons	Aug 10 2021 03:56 PM	<p>And, in case I hear retail and restaurants are dead. I need to say that is not the case. I am sure you have heard of Pindustry? Have you been there? They are packed. You can't get in. Have you been to Avanti or Edgewater market. Edgewater opened in 2019. Avanti opened in 2015. You can't find parking in Avanti it is so popular. Edgewater is packed on weekends. Again, this company has priced out restaurants and retail who would love to be there.</p>
Sue	Smith	Aug 10 2021 03:44 PM	<p>We attended all the development plan meetings and still feel the same as we did several years. The development has too many units/people for the area, the buildings are too tall and too dense, the parking is inadequate (sending folks into the nearby neighborhoods) and the area can not handle that many additional people/cars. University and Arapahoe Road are already maxed for traffic and adding that many more people/cars will create many more problems. And the last thing the neighboring residential areas need are the new residents cutting/racing through our residential area. And the reduction of retail will permanently change that area from a business/shopping area to a residential area. So many of us shoppers (and we do not all shop on line) will go elsewhere, such as Park Meadows reducing the sales tax base for Centennial. The residents are still not thrilled with these changes and am sure the City of Centennial budget will see a further reduction of sales tax from this area. We live here because it is suburban and these changes will be it more urban. Am still voting no and prefer a blending of the development into our area, not a huge urban development in the middle of our suburban area. This development affects our quality of life and not in a good way!</p>
Judie	Quill	Aug 10 2021 03:49 PM	<p>I have lived in Southglenn for 35+ years and was here when the original Southglenn redevelopment included condos for sale. The price per sq foot at that time was ridiculous and while many many people expressed interest, when the actual prices were revealed, well, now you know how Portola happened. These developers have a history of over-pricing and should we should be careful trusting their proposals. Perhaps lowering the rents for stores and restaurants might actually allow them to stay in business!! Its hard to get any kind of income from empty storefronts! As others have said, 50 ft height limits should remain. They do not have a history of making good decisions.</p>

Pam	Welker	Aug 10 2021 03:50 PM	<p>Good Afternoon - ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>I fully support and agree with the comments of several other authors on this site - specifically, the developer purchased property zoned for a maximum building height of 50 feet; they were well aware of this zoning restriction when they purchased the property. What would be the reasoning from the City of Centennial for a change to accommodate a massive apartment complex at this point in time. Just for once, please consider the current and certainly long-time residents of Centennial. I've lived here for 24 years (I moved after 7 years of massive growth in Highlands Ranch). I've been to meetings that have been held in the past, I've followed this topic - there is still no validity to the traffic studies that have done to date and given to citizens...c'mon man - do you really expect us to take those studies at face value and accurate. When will enough be enough, you have an opportunity for true planned growth, please respect the citizens of Centennial, you have heard their voices. Thank you for listening to mine.☐</p> <p>☐</p>
Anne	Borg	Aug 10 2021 03:54 PM	<p>Hello - I have additional thoughts on the proposed changes to the Master Development Plan for Streets at Southglenn: ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>1 - Increasing the number of apartments from 350 to 1125 is a bad idea. This is a sub-urban neighborhood, not an urban one, and low density housing is important here. I support an additional 500 units, no more.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>2 - Increasing the allowable building height from 50 to 75 feet is also a bad idea. I support keeping the current 50 foot maximum building height, to maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood, to reduce the number of apartments, cars and people and to preserve our mountain views.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Thank you for considering my thoughts.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Anne Borg ☐</p> <p>☐</p>
Deb	Nazzaro	Aug 10 2021 03:56 PM	<p>Regarding your UPDATED proposal:☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>Please maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood by:☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p><b>**Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood. Good people, those who love community and are committed to preserving it, move to this area not to have a replicate of downtown Denver. ☐</b></p> <p>☐</p> <p>The updated proposal is a VIOLATION OF TRUST with those who have spent the past several years working with the developers and the city of Centennial.☐</p> <p>☐</p>
Tom	Cooper	Aug 10 2021 04:13 PM	<p>Centennial City Council is obviously operating for the benefit of the developers and not the people who own homes and pay the taxes. This development is fulfillment of the UN plan Agenda 21 and 35. It is in cooperation with the Obama, and now Biden determination to destroy private property and targeting the suburbs. It is a stated policy of the Biden administration (A coup d'état as a result of a stolen election). They are working quickly to instill Communism, as they have been trying to do for over 100 years. Read Cloward-Piven writings on destroying the US and you will see everything being done today as a fulfillment of those plans. There are multiple places you can find boatloads of information announcing these plans and in my opinion this city council is either ignorant, or complicit. I for one call for a moratorium on the city council's ability to make any decisions until a full investigation of their actions has been completed. I call for a Citizen Jury.</p>
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 12 2021 06:24 PM	<p>How is allowing a private developer to build on their privately-owned property to make profit a form of "communism"?</p>
Tom	Cooper	Aug 10 2021 04:19 PM	<p>Centennial City Council is obviously operating for the benefit of the developers and not the people who own homes and pay the taxes. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>This development is fulfillment of the UN plan Agenda 21 and 35. You can find it on UN.Org.☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>It is in cooperation with the Obama, and now Biden determination to destroy private property and targeting the destruction of the suburbs. It is a stated policy of the Biden administration (A coup d'état as a result of a stolen election). ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>They are working quickly to instill Communism, as they have been trying to do for over 100 years. Read Cloward-Piven writings on destroying the US and you will see everything being done today as a fulfillment of those plans. (i.e Open Borders, Pandemics and Health Crisis, Dividing the People Against Each Other - Critical Race Theory, Vaccinated vs Unvaccinated, Destroy Economy - any checked your gas prices and grocery prices? Everything is about to crash - uncontrolled spending - they are zeroing in on \$8 Trillion since Biden was illegally installed. Etc...) Wake Up People. There are multiple places you can find boatloads of information announcing these plans and in my opinion this city council is either ignorant, or complicit. ☐</p> <p>☐</p> <p>I for one call for a moratorium on the city council's ability to make any decisions until a full investigation of their actions has been completed.☐</p>

Ricki	Feist	Aug 10 2021 04:23 PM	The height of the Streets of Southglenn buildings was supposed to be 50 feet. That is in keeping with the original plan. Now the developer wants to raise the height of the buildings to 75 feet, increase residential occupancy and reduce the retail footprint. The area is not in an office park. It backs up to residences with young children. The increased number of residences will result in more traffic through the Southglenn neighborhood, especially as a cut-through from Southglenn, down Easter and then to Franklin going to both Arapahoe Road and Dry Creek. I go on record as a strenuous objector to the increased height and number of residences. This doesn't bring additional revenue to the city as businesses do and it adds to traffic congestion and adverse impact on the nearby neighborhood. I worry about the kids walking and riding their bikes and speed of cut-through traffic. Please leave the height as is.
Allie	Molinda	Aug 10 2021 04:25 PM	When we allow overdevelopment we lose in so many ways, not only views of sky and sunset, but resource overconsumption, degradation of nature and excess waste. The earth is at a critical tipping point and we have to do absolutely everything we can to avoid pushing it over the edge.
Cathy	Lester	Aug 10 2021 04:29 PM	As a long term resident of Southglenn, I am very concerned about the proposed increase of building height and population. We are a suburban neighborhood! Please know that we strongly object to an increase of apartment density from 350 to 1125!!
Sukie	Schroeder	Aug 10 2021 04:33 PM	I am opposed to the zoning change to such a major increase in the number of units. We already have a traffic issue surrounding the entire Streets of Southglenn which isn't even at capacity now. <input type="checkbox"/> I understand that developers need to develop to get a return on their investment especially since demand in retail has waned. Good quality restaurants and a smaller density of residential should be sought.
John	Holley	Aug 10 2021 04:40 PM	Please keep the 50 foot height limit as it is, the developer bought knowing that was the limit. Preserve the character of the surrounding neighborhoods, preserve mountain views. It's a residential neighborhood, not DTC. Traffic is already bad in surrounding areas, don't increase it too horrible.
K	B	Aug 10 2021 04:53 PM	I am very concerned about the revised proposal for the Streets at Southglenn. 1100+ units is entirely too many and 50" is too tall. If there are just over 300 units there currently, can't they see how another 300 are received? I'm Lori of the apartments, it would be great to see an entertainment venue like Main Event or Pindustry, which could be a great asset to the complex and a fun gathering place for neighborhood residents. Or even something like Fieldhouse USA in one Sears or Macy's would be better than apartments and continue to drive business to the surrounding restaurants and shops. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> My biggest concern has to do with traffic. University and Arapahoe will be a mess, no matter how much addition striping and signals are installed. Even worse will be the cut through traffic in the neighborhood. Clarkson Street runs alongside my house. It is a race track nightly. Less than half of the cars stop at stop signs, including the ones around Clarkson Park, even after the traffic mitigation signs and concrete barriers were installed. Earlier this year, we had a car flip onto its hood a block north of Dry Creek while drag racing. This is a mere feet from a crowded park which hosts four soccer fields every spring and fall, not to mention various other kids practicing and playing on the path and playground. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> In addition, what 1100 units do to our schools? LPS says they have capacity based on an extrapolation of the number of school age kids in the Portola. But what if these apartments are inhabited by more kids than anticipated? How will this impact the quality of education? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Finally, I am still perplexed by the notion that the city council members have to remain unbiased on this issue. We voted for them to represent our best interests. How can they do that if they have to remain unbiased? We, as a neighborhood, have no voice outside of these comments, especially since they can't attend the community meetings. Theres no telling what info the council is actually receiving.
Deborah	Venrick	Aug 10 2021 04:54 PM	Having lived in the area for 30 years, I am strongly opposed to an increase in residential apartments as well as an increase in the height of the units. Please keep this area predominately individual homes rather than high density apartments.
Barbara	Grady	Aug 10 2021 05:15 PM	In regards to the Southglenn Development Plan: <input type="checkbox"/> Please don't let greed and need for tax money cloud your thoughts for this judgement. Consider it is your house a few blocks away from Southglenn. We are a nice suburban neighborhood and we want to stay that way. *Please consider asking to keep the 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 ft). The lower 50 foot building height will: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce the number of apartments, cars and people <input type="checkbox"/> Preserve our mountain views <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> The developers knowingly purchased property with a 50 foot height limit. SouthGlenn is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood (this is not Denver or DTC). A 50 foot building height is appropriate for a suburban neighborhood. Reduce unintentional crowding on our public school system. Traffic, dog poop that hasn't been picked up, dirt and trash on our trails and playgrounds. All we the public see everywhere we turn are developments going up without consideration to the effect of urban planning. Traffic congestion, basic human needs and family neighborhoods. I beg you not to pass this. <input type="checkbox"/>

Michael	Brooks	Aug 10 2021 05:15 PM	Absolutely not on height change. Also do not agree with more rentals. Southglenn was not designed for that much traffic. <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Brooks <input type="checkbox"/> 1101 E. Pinewood Ave
Renee	Schulte	Aug 10 2021 05:25 PM	Please remember the people who will make the final decision were voted in by us if unhappy with results make sure to vote next election. I believe we should go like <input type="checkbox"/> Lakeland and make an amendment to the charter that only 1percent of existing housing will be allowed permits to build per year If anyone has the knowledge how to draft this amendment will be glad to help getting signatures and settle this once and for all let's take these decisions out of our elected official hands who don't always vote what the communities desires
NANCY	MURRAY	Aug 10 2021 05:38 PM	Do not increase the height above 50 ft. I live 1 block away and that increase would not fit into a community layout. Where do those individuals park ?
Vicki	Tanin	Aug 10 2021 05:54 PM	I live between the Streets of Southglenn and Arapahoe High School in what is now a relatively quiet neighborhood of 2 story condos. I have many concerns including preserving the character of the the area and not increasing the already heavy traffic going north out of the area. Keeping the 50 foot current height limit seems like it would help address these concerns.
Mike	Smith	Aug 10 2021 05:57 PM	There is no benefit to residents from this developer's request on either number of DUs or adding 50% more built space above the 50 ft ht limit. Parking will already be a mess, and adding 350 x 1.5 (525) cars pef day to the immediate area is bad enough- expanding that to 1150 x 1.5 avg per DU (1675)- not even including guest parking! Eliminating a retail tax base to help deal with the obvious added costs, MORE traffic lights, etc... <input type="checkbox"/> Bad idea to entertain such a request. Don't do it. If Centennial leaders feel this us again thing, step down / leave your office. You clearly don't have the backs of the citizens.
Justine	Holck	Aug 10 2021 06:05 PM	I strongly oppose the overdevelopment within the Streets of Southglenn. This is a community, not an urban area and does not have true infastructure to accommodate 1125 high density dwellings. The developers should consider moving their investment to a location that would welcome their offering. Nothing about this plan is in the best interest of the established citizens here. At one time I was willing to compromise to make this work for everyone. I no longer feel the same and would prefer the builders move on, please.
Robert	Wolper	Aug 10 2021 06:24 PM	I urge you to not allow the developer to increase the height of the apartment buildings. To do so will adversely impact our community aesthetically and practically. We want to protect our property values.
Jacquelyn	Bell	Aug 10 2021 06:24 PM	Please keep the 50-foot maximum building height (instead of 75 ft). The lower 50-foot building height will: <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce the number of apartments, cars and people <input type="checkbox"/> Preserve our mountain views <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> The developers knowingly purchased the property with a 50-foot height limit. SouthGlenn is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood (this is not Denver or DTC). A 50-foot building height is appropriate for a suburban neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/> The surrounding roads can not be increased in width.
Cheryl	Cassaly	Aug 10 2021 06:39 PM	Hi. I am part if the Southglenn community. I wanted to formally request that all building heights in yhe proposed southglenn redevelopment be kept to 50 ft. The developers knew of the restriction when they purchased the property. This is a dense residential area and will negatively impact our community. Please honor the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood and hokd yhe developers to what they purchased.
Yvonne	Barton	Aug 10 2021 07:00 PM	The 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 ft) will: <input type="checkbox"/> •Maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> •Reduce the number of apartments, cars and people <input type="checkbox"/> •Preserve our mountain views <input type="checkbox"/> •Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> The developers knowingly purchased property with a 50 foot height limit. SouthGlenn is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood (this is not Denver or DTC). A 50 foot building height is appropriate for a suburban neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/>
rich	miles	Aug 10 2021 07:11 PM	I believe controlled growth is an important part of our future. The traffic on university is heavily dependent on the Highlands Ranch development. To a much lesser amount the people in and around Southglen. The vacant retail space all around this area is proof that retail space is not the answer. The developers have a very workable plan and it will enhance the demographics of our area.
Tiffany	Cothren	Aug 10 2021 07:24 PM	No resident surrounding Southglenn wants this development pushed up higher and bigger. What measures will be taken to make congestion better? This is not necessary and I personally will not shop there anymore cause it will be crowded and unpleasant.

Debbie	Sundgren	Aug 10 2021 07:41 PM	I have noticed that all the people living in the immediate vicinity of the mall are against the increase in height and number of apartment units, as it directly negatively affects their daily life. The people who have commented favorably live several miles away in single family homes. The owner/CEO of the mall lives in Greenwich CT. None of the other 16 owners live in CO, much less near Southglenn. They've made several billion dollars over the past 2-3 decades, so don't shed a tear for them not getting their way here. The developers have \$812 million in active projects, so they won't fold up over not getting the variances, either. Additionally, there are currently 477 vacant dwellings in the seven-square-mile 80122 zip code, so building 1100 more seems illogical at best. I hope the elected officials consider such things when making their decision. The information cited here is readily available for free online if one cares to dig just a little bit.
Cathrine	Floyd	Aug 10 2021 08:04 PM	My biggest concern is the height of the proposed buildings. 50 feet is already high enough for structures in the middle of residences and I don't think that looking like we added a mini-downtown is going to be good for the community. I would like to encourage that the request for an increase in height be denied. I think it will help keep the number of people and traffic at a more reasonable level.
Cathrine	Floyd	Aug 10 2021 08:14 PM	My biggest concern is that it feels like this is going to become a mini-city right in the middle of a residential area which will add to traffic and a pretty large scale change to population congestion. I definitely do not want the buildings to get any higher than 50 feet.
Rudy	Melena	Aug 10 2021 08:19 PM	My wife and I absolutely do NOT want this new development in our neighborhood! We have lived here 30 years and have enjoyed the quiet. When Arapahoe High School starts and ends each day, that activity causes the activity of 2000 cars. A new development would double the traffic congestion in the area. Littleton Public School is closing several schools as a result reduced student population. New students would wreck havoc on their plans for consolidation. It's ironic that the new teachers necessary for these addition students could not afford to live in these units. It's all a money making scheme for rich investors. You care nothing about community!
Pam	Wolper	Aug 10 2021 08:24 PM	I urge you not to allow as many units or above the 50' height limit to the streets of Southglenn. I feel it would hugely impact the suburban feeling of our neighborhood and detract from our property values. We do not want another cherry creek north! Parking is awful and the abutting neighborhoods hate it. More out of control development is not an asset to the community.
Liz	Keating	Aug 10 2021 08:59 PM	Please consider asking to keep the 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 ft). The lower 50 foot building height will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce the number of apartments, cars and people</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Preserve our mountain views</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> The developers knowingly purchased property with a 50 foot height limit. SouthGlenn is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood (this is not Denver or DTC). A 50 foot building height is appropriate for a suburban neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/>
Pamia	Guttenberg	Aug 10 2021 09:01 PM	The 50 foot height limit in current law needs to be respected, 75 feet is not okay. 1125 apartments is ridiculous and would not be in keeping with the neighborhood. Also should not be built right up on Easter, but closer to the existing Sears building.
Vincent	Mortenson	Aug 10 2021 09:05 PM	Lets just scrap the apartments and turn it into a big park. <input type="checkbox"/> The traffic in the area is a nightmare. No amount of adjustments to the timing of the lights will help that. The road has already been widened at the intersection other than the extension of the lanes on the east side of Arapahoe in front of the gas station. Which shouldn't the developers pay for instead of the city ? Trying to go East bound Arapahoe from Walgreens is a nightmare unless you make a u-turn at the mall. More traffic will only make that worse also. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> It seems way to ambitious for a neighbor hood. Just look at the mess around Cherry Creek mall where they have done the same thing. Its only a matter of time before a developer wants to start buying up property around there and redevelop those also. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Adding additional living space does make sense just no where near on this scale. If it needs an elevator its too big in my opinion.
CHAD	MARTINEZ	Aug 10 2021 10:31 PM	The Streets of Southglenn seem to be struggling to get the foot traffic needed to support the retail. Can't blame it all on COVID since many stores closed and remained empty prior to any shutdowns. I, for one, would like to see Streets of Southglenn succeed with many diverse and locally owned shops and restaurants. It is with that in mind that I believe more residential in the direct vicinity would support small and local shops that are housed at Streets of Southglenn. We also need more affordable housing options in the area and I would hope these residential spaces would help. I agree that keeping the height requirements that were previously accepted should kept in place since it appears that most of the comments that oppose this project are related to the height considerations.

Henry B	Lacey	Aug 10 2021 11:09 PM	<p>Any redevelopment of the SouthGlenn shopping district Master Development Plan should assure that five goals are met.</p> <p>First, it is vital that this area of the metro region have more affordable housing. Practically, that means homes under \$225,000-\$250,000. That, in turn, means smaller units that can profitably be sold at that price.</p> <p>Second, the mixed-use nature of the SouthGlenn Master Plan area should be retained and improved.</p> <p>Third, the region is in desperate need of additional park space and an expanded Arapahoe Libraries branch at Southglenn Mall.</p> <p>Fourth, any changes to the Master Plan must assure that increased residential development and occupancy at SouthGlenn is accompanied by sufficient mass transit resources, electric vehicle infrastructure, and bicycle accessibility and convenience so that neither local traffic nor our regional air pollution problem are worsened.</p> <p>Fifth, water availability for at least three or four decades must be absolutely certain.</p> <p>To achieve these goals, I would be supportive of the increase in maximum building height to 75 feet, but only if space is set aside and dedicated, at developer expense. It may be necessary to allow a higher building height in order to provide for the additional volume of construction needed in a dense residential development to permit a reasonable quantity of affordable homes to be available. The increased number of residents in the area will need additional public, recreational, and educational services. Requiring a set-aside and developer financial sponsorship of those neighborhood components at the SouthGlenn site is a reasonable ask considering the increased profits the developer will make from the redevelopment project.</p> <p>The number of apartments being increased from 350 to 1,125 absolutely must include at least one-fourth of the total being affordable units, sold at a maximum price of \$225,000-\$250,000, for this change to the Master Plan to serve the community. Too many single people, young people trying to get started in their professions and careers, and families lack housing options because housing is both scarce and far too expensive for the salaries and wages many people can expect to earn. Centennial will not do itself any favors by continuing to allow over-priced housing to predominate. Buyers will go elsewhere, then shop elsewhere and build businesses elsewhere, and that will cost the municipality tax revenues that could stay right here with a strong commitment to mixed-use, high-density housing that includes ample affordable options.</p>
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 10 2021 11:17 PM	<p>Retail sector is less important at the SouthGlenn site because of the general decline in demand by the retail sector. I think it's unlikely that will change, especially with respect to big box-sized or large retail spaces. However, the point about needing more library space and park space must be emphasized. The vast waste of land represented by the blacktopped parking lots surrounding the former Sears and Macy's retail stores could be repurposed to green space, with trees, hiking and biking trails, a community garden, playground facilities, and an athletic field or two.</p> <p>And surely some of the building footprint represented by those two now-empty retail spaces could accommodate a larger and more accessible library for the neighborhood. The existing Arapahoe County Libraries branch requires too much use of stairs and is too small for the population it serves, which means people in this area do not have convenient access to the education, multimedia, and information resources that they should have readily available. And it's important to discourage driving, not encourage it, so it's not an answer to say "go to the library at Holly and Orchard."</p> <p>Any change to the Master Plan should clearly provide for and protect access for both school buses and RTD buses on the SouthGlenn site itself. This is important to minimize the need to drive. The site must also be made ready for the inevitable growing use of electric cars. Ample secure bike storage should be required. The developer should build additional parking garages so that the vast amount of wasted land spent to provide for surface parking can be re-purposed to more useful goals.</p> <p>Water availability should be a high priority for the city's administrators and leaders to assure. Guaranteed safe drinking water supplies for at least 30-40 years should be the target.</p> <p>Finally, please push the developer to use low water-intensity landscaping and install an abundance of trees to provide shade and assure a pleasant experience for all at SouthGlenn. Average temperatures on the Front Range are rising and sufficient shade will be more and more important as time goes by, while water conservation is already becoming much more vital.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my comments and opinion.</p>

Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 11 2021 02:10 PM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Good afternoon Henry, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for taking the time to relay your perspective and to provide additional context when explaining the reasons detailed above. We appreciate that you took the time to expand on your comments and provide additional context to support your position. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this project.</p>
Jane	Rerecich	Aug 10 2021 11:16 PM	Developing Sears and Macy's areas make sense. 75 feet high and 1125 units does not, particularly the height. It's a classy shopping area, why make it look like the 1000s of cheap box units now lining Santa Fe.
Ronna	Landy	Aug 11 2021 07:07 AM	Please stick to the original plan for southglenn redevelopment- 50 ft high max building heights and less apartments- we who live closeby want less traffic, congestion and people-always enjoyed this quiet and not too crowded areas of shops and restaurants- please keep it that way!
Linda	Baker	Aug 11 2021 07:14 AM	I would not want the increase in density nor the increase in height.
David	Yarian	Aug 11 2021 07:30 AM	<p>While I am certainly in favor of a thoughtful new development in this space, I do not support the maximum height being raised to 75 ft. As many others have pointed out, a raised height is inconsistent with the area, is not beneficial to anyone but the developer, and goes against the previously agreed upon restrictions. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I am also strongly opposed to a 3X+ increase of the number of apartments in the redevelopment. Such a large number is obviously ridiculous given the original proposal. That said, I urge everyone to be wary of what could eventually become a "meet in the middle" final number of proposed apartments. i.e. For example, as laughable as 1,125 units sounds today, perhaps 750 units (or something similar) won't sound quite so bad in the future by comparison. The number of units should remain reasonable and in accordance with the character of the area and the original Master Development Plan.</p>
Sara	Hamann	Aug 13 2021 11:35 AM	David, I so agree with your "meet in the middle" statement. As will all business negotiations, you go with a high (unrealistic) number, knowing that your "real or wanted" number is much less. The "compromise" feels like a win-win, but in reality it is not for Centennial. My other concern is that this amendment sets the city up on a slippery slope. If approved, other developers will demand the same treatment/exemption, and there could be potential high rise apartments on other vacant parcels. This would be a disaster for the city. Thanks for your comments.
Bruce	Bowman	Aug 11 2021 07:35 AM	I believe the Height limit of 50 feet was approved when it was adopted and is still appropriate. The Southglenn Development should not be allowed to exceed the 50 foot height limit currently in place. Thanks
Melissa	Yongue	Aug 11 2021 09:36 AM	If the elected officials are interested in running a city like Denver, I invite them to move to Denver. Centennial was founded on the premise of being a small, suburban home for us. Fortunately, we have had great growth and development since it's birth. We are now close to capacity. The idea of inviting this type of traffic, noise, pollution, etc, is ridiculous. All you will do is drive out the long time home owners that have made this city what it is today. Our small neighborhood streets are already filling up with traffic trying to avoid the main roads. This proposed nightmare is a death sentence for the Centennial that we know and love. Please don't allow it to happen.
Karen	Maertins	Aug 11 2021 10:14 AM	<p>Please keep the height limit on this Southglenn development at 50 feet...this is OUR neighborhood, not the developer's, and we want this to continue to fit into the surrounding neighborhood not look like downtown or the business section of the Tech Center. They knew about this height limit when they purchased the property, hold them to it. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Additionally, 1125 units is absolutely way too many!!! The additional people, traffic, cars, and road congestion in this area will be intolerable!! This area is already overburdened and cannot handle much more traffic. Rather than attracting people to the area, this kind of density will repel people from moving here. I am not opposed to the continued development of this area but not at the expense of destroying our neighborhood. I suggest we find where the developers live &amp; build it in THEIR neighborhood.</p>
Amy	Cronan	Aug 11 2021 10:28 AM	Why would you want to add so many people and decrease the parking? This will over-crowd the whole area, traffic will be worse than downtown as well as parking into the neighborhoods. Who thought this was a valid idea? You're wrecking our city with these dwellings, when there are empty buildings in downtown Denver that you could use for your tenants.
Julia	Gumper	Aug 11 2021 10:59 AM	The redevelopment of Streets of Southglenn should not look like the middle of downtown Denver with 75 ft buildings instead of the the 50 ft. max. Please restrict the building height to maintain the flavor of the suburban neighborhood, constrain the number of cars, people, traffic, and maintain our mountain views and adhere to the original intent of the master plan.
Dale Ann	DiPane	Aug 11 2021 11:46 AM	Please keep the building height at 50'. I am not in favor of the redevelopment of Streets of Southglenn, as well as most residents in this area. Please respect the ambiance of the neighborhood feel by restricting the building height to maintain the essence of an established suburban neighborhood. Less cars, people, traffic and of course please maintain our mountain views.

Steve	Blaine	Aug 11 2021 12:15 PM	The proposal of 1125 total units is 911 more than the 214 at The Portola now. That's over 4 times as many units as there is now. I can only think that would have a negative impact on the quality of life on the surrounding neighborhood. I would like to see the project limited to 2 complexes, both no larger than The Portola. I also hope that the committee takes into account the hard work and input that was given this subject Pre-Covid. ( Also Pre Election).
Lisa	Stennes	Aug 11 2021 12:20 PM	I would support this option as a reasonable compromise. I would also like to add that the style of the apartments should remain consistent with the existing development, and not be built as modern steel and glass units as depicted in the proposal.
Kelly	Wall	Aug 11 2021 01:48 PM	50 foot height requirement needs to enforced.
Joan	Moore	Aug 11 2021 01:50 PM	Residents expressed concern over the number of units when the meetings were held...asking for 1125 units is way too many. Capping height at 50' will make it look more acceptable rather than a downtown Denver look. These units are profitable for the developers and City, but allow fewer and more green space and trees to help our environment. I'm concerned with the traffic from all the units, could be a nightmare.
Paul	Barrera	Aug 11 2021 02:00 PM	Councilmembers, <input type="checkbox"/> The City Council should not amend the original development agreement made at South Glenn Mall. This sets a bad precedent by rewarding the developers who have not delivered on their original commitments. <input type="checkbox"/> I want your commitment not to support the proposed amendment and vote NO to defeat the developer's plan of less retail and increasing height restrictions to create high rise/high occupancy rental housing. <input type="checkbox"/> I do not believe the council should consider any amendment to the original agreement until the developer has lived up to their commitments of bringing in restaurants, retail and shops. Instead of considering an amendment, we should enforce the current agreement. The City certainly should not reward the developer for reneging on their commitments. We have already made concession by allowing rentals apartments in lieu of owned units. Where is the retail the developers committed too? Why are they planning residential when they should be focused on the retail they promised? <input type="checkbox"/> I believe the developers long term plan/ploy was to bring in additional residential from the very beginning and I hope the Mayor and Council sticks to the original agreement that abides by the Cities own 5 criteria for issuing building permits. By changing zoning to allow buildings over 5 stories and to reduce the retail by even 10% more would: <input type="checkbox"/> •Fail to uphold the community character and will ruin it <input type="checkbox"/> •Fail in an opportunity to pursue recreational, civic, art and culture opportunities....what happens to District's 1 community meeting and hang out place? Who wants to visit a housing project? <input type="checkbox"/> •Fail to complement and enhance the vitality of the surrounding area. It will turn the planned gathering retail mall into a transient over crowded high rise housing project. <input type="checkbox"/> When we redevelop South Glen Mall, we did not commit to high rise dwellings, which could more than triple the occupancy, and few retail / shops and restaurants. I expect you to stand by the commitment the community expected and not fold to the pressure of an outside profit focused developer, who does not care about the long-term impact to District 1. <input type="checkbox"/>
Shauna	Keller	Aug 11 2021 02:13 PM	Times do change. When the original Southglenn Mall was built we thought it was silly because it was in the middle of no where. The restrictions have been modified as the area became developed with townhomes, apartment & condos. These same restrictions need to remain for any future development. Fifty feet is much higher than Glen Oakes or Cherry Knolls and should only apply to retail. Don't push your luck & please be a good neighbor. We know you'd make more money with high rises but this is not the place & you shouldn't expect unnecessary changes.
E	D	Aug 11 2021 02:15 PM	I strongly oppose the new development. This is way too many units. It is completely ridiculous and outrageous to go from 350 to over 1000 units. The developers also knew that 50ft was the max, so it should be kept at that height.
Valley Club Acres	HOA	Aug 11 2021 03:02 PM	Valley Club Acres HOA is opposed to the height increase. The City of Centennial should maintain the height for retail/commercial area buildings to 35' or less. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Catherine	Wren	Aug 11 2021 05:33 PM	The 4 fold increase of residential units at Southglen is ridiculous. I feel like the city of Centennial has sold us out! Neither Univesity nor Arapahoe can handle the current traffic flow so let's add to it why don't we. Yes I read the traffic analysis that says it's fine BUT I drive those roads so I know firsthand that it's not at all fine. But hey the city is developing a Master Plan for transportation-WHAT A JOKE
Janice	Barber	Aug 11 2021 05:41 PM	I am copying someone else wording exactly because this is how I feel. The comment you are hearing repeatedly is respect the neighborhood and stick yo your original plan. Take note! <input type="checkbox"/> I strongly oppose the new development. This is way too many units. It is completely ridiculous and outrageous to go from 350 to over 1000 units. The developers also knew that 50ft was the max, so it should be kept at that height. <input type="checkbox"/> Also I would love to keep the shops and stores open that are there.



Norma	Shettle	Aug 11 2021 05:59 PM	I am very concerned about the increased elevation from 50 to 75 feet and the dramatic increase in numbers of apartments from 350 to 1125. This dramatic change from the original plan seems like a "sneak attack" against the neighboring communities on the part of the developers, taking advantage of the pandemic situation whereby neighbors feel less confident to engage in public meetings. I live about a mile from SouthGlenn and rely on the Streets of SouthGlenn for much of my shopping. I avoid Park Meadows like the plague. The increased elevation of more structures will decrease the suburban character of the entire area, increase traffic, pollution and congestion and become a nightmare for me. I will add this to my avoidance list and proceed only to shop and dine at Orchard and South University. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Additionally, our librarians and teachers are aging out. We need affordable and low income housing within SouthGlenn, to enable new young professional who are teachers, nurses and librarians to reside in our community. They are crucial professionals who have chosen careers that benefit the community as a whole. They have student debt, and they are not highly paid. We need to enable these decent, crucial professionals to live near their place of work. They chose people over profit, which is a rare commodity these days.
Norma	Shettle	Aug 11 2021 06:01 PM	I am also alarmed that the proposed height of a new large swath of structures will block our mountain views.
Yvonne	Barton	Aug 11 2021 07:06 PM	the density of apartments (1100+) is not consistent with the feel of this community. The increase in traffic using University Blvd. will be a constant problem. The loss of stores will force many to shop in Lone Tree or neighboring communities. This is not something existing homeowners will look forward to.
Maggie & Clif	Schmidt	Aug 11 2021 07:17 PM	We are voting to reject developers' proposal to build 1125 apartments. This is an outrageous proposal from developers. 1125 apartments will only bring more traffic jams, more road rage, car accidents, air pollution, and the chaos to our neighborhoods. Please stop developer's greedy plan. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Limit the building height to 50 feet. <input type="checkbox"/> Limit the apartments to 350 <input type="checkbox"/> Increase the amount of retail space. Thank you. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Winston	Smith	Aug 11 2021 10:26 PM	I'm all for new development. But if that development impacts my enjoyment of my property, my property value, my safety, or my quality of life, then I and the rest of the neighborhood are due compensation for damages. This will come from the developers, the city, and the impartial city council when they are sued personally.
shirley	Munsey	Aug 11 2021 11:46 PM	As a resident of Centennial (Littleton) for 35 years, these investors are just out to make a ton of money, its ALL about making the almighty buck!!!!NO NO NO we don't want these apt buildings all around us. What about traffic the adjoining streets , i.e, University. You can't travel on this street as it is. TAKE YOUR PROJECTS ELSEWHERE. WE DON'T WANT YOU IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!!!!
Donna	M Monroe	Aug 12 2021 05:52 AM	Please remain with the original plan of only 50 ft high buildings and please keep the number of units low. This area is way too close to Arapahoe high traffic to get it too congested. Also it would be nice to keep quite a few businesses for the new units residents that are going in.
John	Caligaris	Aug 12 2021 07:55 AM	Please approve the project as submitted. The retail marketplace is changing rapidly, there is less of a need for the idea of the old style "shopping centers" and I believe the submittal may be a way of giving the neighborhood a positive space that helps our area thrive. I believe any height, density or traffic issues are moot.
jean	oatman	Aug 12 2021 08:02 AM	It is absurd to think that the infrastructure and the surrounding area and school district could even handle the approved number of apartments in this suburban area. We are not Denver nor DTC. We are a suburban neighborhood with an area that will not even be able to handle the extra traffic the already proposed and approved number of apartments. I am very disappointed that the City of centennial is not putting its residents first in this matter. You are putting our community and children in this area at risk with the already approved number of apartments. There has always been a height restriction at southland as well ad now you are letting a big greedy developer come in and ruin our neighborhood by now proposing changes??? scoff I say not no HELL no. The schools in the area are not even going to be able to handle the already approved proposal. I implore you city of Centennial to do what is right for the residents af this suburban area and stand by the already approved and restrictions made to the greedy developer on height and number of apartments. The changes they are requesting is absurd but not surprising. DO WHAT IS RIGHT city of Centennial and stand by your original decision. <input type="checkbox"/>
Anne	Darnley	Aug 12 2021 08:04 AM	As it relates to Southglenn, the developers of the property purchased the property with a 50 foot height restriction. I strongly believe this should be adhered to, as a variance up to 75 feet is material. In addition, a height variance changes the open nature of the property and potentially obstructs views. Furthermore, the addition of up to over 1,000 residential units is excessive given the already difficult traffic patterns on University and Arapahoe. <input type="checkbox"/> How do these variance requests relate to the proposed amendments to the LDC? Would the developers still require these variances if the amendments to the LDC are passed?
Austin	Alldredge	Aug 12 2021 08:29 AM	On the streets of southglen redevelopment - I support the proposed plan because I would rather have the retail and restaurant footprint be active with an onsite customer base (i.e. the new residential) and more traffic than another mostly empty large retail center like the one across the street from it or at University and Dry Creek
Cynthia	Drew	Aug 12 2021 09:43 AM	We can all agree that the vast empty parking lot and the closed Sears store are an eyesore, but the proposed apartment building would be an eyesore as well. Picture a building totally out of character for the area. Surely there is a way forward for the developers to meet the neighbors' concerns somewhere in the middle.

Debbie	Richards	Aug 12 2021 01:44 PM	Austin, this ordinance has been approved and will bring in more traffic along University. <a href="https://www.centennialco.gov/Residents/Have-Your-Say-Centennial/University-Corridor">https://www.centennialco.gov/Residents/Have-Your-Say-Centennial/University-Corridor</a> <input type="checkbox"/> At least they will come and go. Streets of Southglenn already has 214 units and adding what they are requesting is way too much for this area.
Randall	Isaacs	Aug 12 2021 09:59 AM	Why take away our ability to enjoy the site of the mountains everyday. I live and have lived in Colorado my entire life because of the majestic beauty of the mountains. It would be a shame to lose that. <input type="checkbox"/> Also, I don't believe there is nearly enough space for parking for 1125+ people without some over flow into surrounding neighborhoods. There is no guarantee all of the new apartments would be filled especially with the cost of renting these days. <input type="checkbox"/> We need the space for retail as the economy comes back to life. Which was the primary idea behind the original development plan. <input type="checkbox"/> Along with these issues there would likely be a problem with water availability for the new residences which could impact the cost of water for all of us in this area. <input type="checkbox"/>
shirley	Munsey	Aug 12 2021 10:27 AM	I have lived this community for 35 years. We do not want high rise living, it is inappropriate for this area. University and surrounding streets cannot serve the amount of people and cars that is proposed.
Jane	Mataich	Aug 12 2021 10:36 AM	Can you explain the criteria "The amendment will provide public benefits to the project and the City as a whole". Does the city have a definition for "public benefit"? Are there guidelines for "public benefit"? Is there a legal definition for "public benefit"? Who decides what constitutes "public benefit"?
Jane	Mataich	Aug 12 2021 10:42 AM	The criteria "The amendment is compatible with or will not materially and adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties". Who decides if the changes are compatible with adjacent properties? If residents believe we will be adversely impacted, what do we do?
Michael	Gradis	Aug 13 2021 12:28 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Jane, thank you for your additional questions regarding the approval criteria. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> •"The amendment will provide public benefits to the project and the City as a whole". Does the city have a definition for "public benefit"? Are there guidelines for "public benefit"? Is there a legal definition for "public benefit"? Who decides what constitutes "public benefit"? <input type="checkbox"/> •The criteria "The amendment is compatible with or will not materially and adversely affect existing development on adjacent properties". Who decides if the changes are compatible with adjacent properties? If residents believe we will be adversely impacted, what do we do? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> As a part of the review of the Applicant's proposal, the City take all of the information available (applicant's proposal and provided traffic, drainage, financial studies, public comments, etc.) to conclude on how to apply the criteria. As Staff is only in the first review of the Applicant's proposal, Staff does not have a response at this time. The criteria would ultimately be evaluated and noted in the staff report and recommendation provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. Once complete, the public will be able to review the report and recommendation. <input type="checkbox"/>
Sharon	Hill	Aug 12 2021 10:43 AM	I agree with so many of my neighbors who have already posted their comments. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> NO to 75 feet height to the buildings. NO to increasing the number of units. <input type="checkbox"/> Unless you live in this area, you have NO idea what the traffic is like, especially at University and Arapahoe. The council members would most likely not want this congestion in their neighborhood. That is something for them to consider. The idea of affordable housing is a good one and should be considered. <input type="checkbox"/>
Jane	Mataich	Aug 12 2021 10:45 AM	"The amendment is to not present the likelihood ... of any financial obligations concerning the project." Who evaluates the financial viability of the project in relation to paying back the TIF money owed? When will the financial evaluation be prepared?
Michael	Gradis	Aug 13 2021 12:08 PM	On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Hello Jane. Thank you for your question. The Developer is required to provide a financial scenario that shows how the proposed development scenario could hypothetically impact the financial obligations of the Centennial Urban Renewal Authority and the SouthGlenn Metropolitan District. Staff is still working with the Applicant on what the final scenario should include. Staff does not have a firm date of when this will be completed by the applicant, but it must be completed before the City's final review and recommendation of the Master Development Plan amendment to both the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.
Jan	Mumma	Aug 12 2021 11:43 AM	I strongly disagree about changing the original intent of the master plan for Southglenn. The integrity of the neighborhood and view of the mountains should be maintained. Also increasing the amount of apartments, cars and people would destroy the integrity of the neighborhood and cause traffic problems in and around Southglenn.

Thomas	Osieczanek	Aug 12 2021 12:20 PM	My family moved to SouthGlenn in January 1986 (35 1/2 years ago). We did so because Littleton (Unincorporated Arapahoe County) was a quiet place in the suburbs where there was almost no crime no tall buildings and a great place to raise our children then ages 16 and 15 years old. The reason I am writing this is because so much has changed and is changing, so much of it not so good, crime shooting up enormously. I truly object to what is trying to be done at the Streets of SouthGlenn. First of all I would like to say the two management companies involved knew what the rules were when they purchased these properties and from the start knew they were going to ask for more than was allowed. We should not bend for them because as you can see the neighborhood is against what they are proposing. Fifty feet is high enough to take away the views of the mountains and we do not need anything higher than that. Tripling the number of apartments I believe was always in their plans. The number of cars each family will have will be at least two and if there are high school or adult children it will be more even if the children go to Arapahoe High School as we know kids can't walk that far to school. that means parking will be a problem as many of the cars will probably be parked in business slots outside of the parking garage. Water, sewer and electricity are another problem. Xcel Energy is already controlling our use of power during high usage times if we use their Energy Hub. Where are they getting more water from also. Every year seems to be more and more of the drought we are fighting just to have enough water for drinking and cooking. Traffic is another problem. It is already bad on both Arapahoe Road and University Blvd and now Easter Avenue will be included in this traffic mess. Along with Easter Avenue we who live on S Franklin Street will see people cutting through our neighborhood to use Dry Creek to avoid Easter Avenue being plugged up during the morning rush. We already see traffic jams during the morning and afternoons when school is either starting or ending. The last thing I want to mention is the setbacks which should remain at 50 feet not be moved to 20 feet. If we wanted the setbacks to look like New York we would live in New York. Thank you for taking the time (as you should) to listen to my thoughts about the Streets of SouthGlenn, Remember your constituents voted you in to protect their interests so please do the right thing.□
Mary Jo	Lagesse	Aug 12 2021 12:42 PM	I agree with the comments from the League of Women Voters that the City of Centennial require this development to include affordable housing.
Liz	Martin	Aug 12 2021 01:46 PM	Since the proposed apartment buildings do not have retail/commercial on the ground floor, seems like the developer should be able to get by with 50 ft tall apartments. This would appease most residents. Can you mention this to the developers?
Patricia	Schaff	Aug 12 2021 02:06 PM	I have lived in the SouthGlenn area since 1986. The proposed Redevelopment Plan (PRP) formalized by Centennial City Council on July 20, 2021 should not be approved and rezoning should not be allowed, as it will lead to increased urbanization of this area.□ □ The Streets of SouthGlenn was not designed with many multi-family dwellings in mind. The 2006 Master Development Plan (MDP) specifies only 350 (max) multi-family units with the express intent to NOT provide for high density properties in the Street of SouthGlenn complex. The current MDP should not be changed to allow for 1125 multi-use units or 5-storey apartment buildings in such a small space as that was not the original intent or purpose of the Streets of SouthGlenn.□ □ The PRP should be amended to provide for a height of no more than 50 feet (as currently designated in the MDP) and a setback of 75 feet from the streets of Easter Avenue and Race Street to counter the inconvenience of extra traffic, noise and dirt.□ □ These developers knew the requirements of the MDP, but care very little about our type of community. They want to fill this small space with as many high density units as possible, with inadequate parking. This will infringe on retail, business and neighborhood parking, impacting our residential neighborhoods in a negative way.□ □ The results of the traffic study done were grossly under-stated. This study was done during the summer, not taking into consideration parents and children driving to and from local schools (possibly more than 3000 vehicles). Plus approximately 2000 more vehicles from the 1125 multi-family units, traffic on the local streets will be an absolute nightmare. It would be expected that some of these vehicles would cut through local neighborhoods to use residential through streets to access Arapahoe Road, Dry Creek Road, University Blvd. and Broadway. This would be unsafe and dangerous for the many pedestrians and walkers that frequent our local neighborhoods.□ □ It is the duty of the City of Centennial Council members to be representative of their community members. This PRP is definitely NOT what the citizens of SouthGlenn residential neighborhoods want for the Streets of SouthGlenn or their community.
KC	Tebow	Aug 12 2021 02:17 PM	I do NOT support the increase of building height or of more apartments being added.
Larry	Strohl	Aug 12 2021 02:17 PM	I have previously followed the redevelopment of The Streets of Southglenn. Previously, a major issue was the traffic patterns created by the new residents. O do not see that addressed in the latest update. The other obvious problem is raising the height of the buildings and the large increase in the number of units. There appears to be no timeline for the buildout. Many issues to address. When will we know about the City Council meeting that will address the latest proposals?

ann	yuds	Aug 12 2021 03:00 PM	I feel like posting anything here will be futile and you will just do whatever you want to get more \$ from...vs protecting the quality of life of our citizens. The traffic at Univ./Arap heading so is already horrific. We have become a drive-through suburb. I would have not bought my house if it was like it is now let alone what you have in mind. There is no shopping w/i all the empty retail spaces to people will be driving not only to work, but out of the area to shop=more traffic. The addition of unhealthy fast food restaurants already approved will undermine health and increase strangers w/i no vested interest in our area. When I bought my property Highlands Ranch was still a ranch. Now we are getting sucked into the vortex of Univ-generated platforms for urbanization and increased density, inner city life we worked all our lives to not be in. 11 of my neighbors including native-borns left very recently to go out of state to Republican states w/i small towns for a better environment for their children. Dare I mention Republican? Can't even begin to imagine the hell it will be w/i all the additional people and cars just trying to go to the post office and Whole Foods. I've noted that alot of people who did buy in here recently are those that have come from horrid places like Chicago that had BLM destruction going on where they lived...NOT people moving from nice areas. For these people coming from inner cities it is an upgrade. For those that have lived in the best places as well here it is a constantly eroding decline in the quality of life. Think of the traffic noise and air pollution increase. I do not believe you had an adequate traffic assessment. There is absolutely NO commonality of the so-called city of Centennial between our area and the eastern borders and never will be. Do you think that because we are on the fringe that we are expendable? Let's look at the people behind the Streets of SoGlenn and Centennial gvt and note they themselves would never be living in this area as it is now. Lots of us being older are stuck here and have to live out our days in this suburban area. I resent the hell out of the changes being made. The no of units and potential inhabitants and cars just on the Sears land is overwhelming, let alone the future Macy's property. There is absolutely NOTHING that will benefit us from this project. It's like a bunch of money-grubbing parasites going for everything they possibly can bleeding us dry of the quality of life we've had. Also increased population will put a strain on medical offices and appointment availability which is already a problem. Let's remember that people will be visiting all the occupants of these units increasing more strangers in the area. What will happen to crime? It has already increased w/i cars being stolen out of driveways and at Sts of SG in broad daylight. There is NOTHING that will increase aesthetics, character or charm to draw people into this area, just low-class fast restaurants and high density living in a box. I have no reason to believe that these units will be more upscale and remain that way. Hmmm social justice, subsidized units, delayed rental payments . What's the history of these developers w/i similar units and how well-maintained they are after 10-20 yrs. Look at Sts SG mall that was supposed to be so up-scale and a draw. Yeah- only thing decent is the hanging flower baskets and a few stores that meet the needs of us living closeby and certainly no draw for increased revenues wi the other stores that aren't empty. These temporarily huge increases in house value sales and inflated taxes for nothing- are already putting a burden on the high % of residents who are on fixed incomes and at the same time destroying the quality of life and making it more difficult to navigate the area. The only reason you've gotten away with it so far is most people have been in the dark. The occasional Cent. glossy newsletter has not
ann	yuds	Aug 12 2021 03:07 PM	Didn't know there was a limit on words and my comments were cut off. Why? Very difficult to type in the tiny little box, unlike here where it is easy to read.
Linda	Sartori	Aug 12 2021 03:04 PM	I disagree with the proposed changes for the Southglenn redevelopment plan. The increased height and the increase in number of units should not be allowed.
Timothy	Eff	Aug 12 2021 03:17 PM	I moved away from downtown to get away from my he congestion and be around homeowners that took pride in their community. Adding a 1000 apartments is only going to congest the area with people that have no long term stake in taking care of the area. This can already be observed with how the parking areas around Cherry Knolls Park look each morning after intermural sports events. <input type="checkbox"/> The traffic increase will also adversely affect the area. The long term citizens get nothing while the developers ruin another part of town. I strongly oppose this!
Sara	Hamann	Aug 12 2021 03:20 PM	Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. In reviewing the amendment, it appears it does not support and is not consistent with Centennial NEXT. Specifically, packing an additional 911 new units, a 260% increase from current levels, does not support the Community Values of "small-town feel, neighborhood, quality of life, open space, parks and recreation, family friendly character", etc. The addition of potentially 8 story high rises does not create "remarkable places" and certainly doesn't uphold community character. The addition of 911 high-density housing units does not fit with the existing neighborhood design and is not consistent with the current neighborhood feel. This is a suburban, not urban neighborhood. The original MDA had a 50 foot limit. The developers knew this going in. Please do not allow the variance to 75 feet. This is a 50% increase and is only in the best interest of the developers and could potentially destroy the uniqueness of the neighborhood and surrounding areas. There are limited benefits to this amendment, basically tax revenue. There are many negatives to this amendment. Specifically increased traffic, congestion, noise, potential crime, pollution, etc. Please do not support the developers proposed amendment to increase housing units 260% in the same footprint and increase building height by 50%. This has the potential to ruin the uniqueness of the Southglenn area and does not support the city's long-term strategic view. To support the city's core values, perhaps creating a park or entertainment destination would be more appropriate. There are many philanthropic individuals who have created/endowed such efforts in surrounding neighborhoods (MOA in Greenwood Village). Centennial can do much better than what these developers are proposing. Based on the comments I read, it appears the vast majority of residents do not support the amendment. Please listen to the Centennial citizens who have elected you to represent them. Thank you!
Lisa	Stennes	Aug 12 2021 03:26 PM	Very well said. Thank you. <input type="checkbox"/>
Tom	Goody	Aug 12 2021 03:27 PM	Having moved to Cherry Knolls for its mountain views and lower density population. I oppose the building height increase and density increase.

Maud	Naroll	Aug 12 2021 04:23 PM	<p>I support Amendment 8 to the Streets at SouthGlen Master Development Plan, with two caveats: It should include some affordable housing, and enough new parking. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I live a mile's walk from the proposed apartments, and support a prosperous SouthGlen mall with small shops, eateries, and other businesses busy with foot and drive-in traffic. Currently the mall is in decline. A dying mall can drag down local property values, an adverse effect. I think the proposed additional housing could tip the mall toward bustling, a benefit to the mall, to the surrounding neighborhoods, and to the City as a whole. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Affordable Housing: These additional businesses will require more restaurant wait staff and store clerks, who will need someplace to live. What is likely the least expensive one-bedroom apartment near Streets of SouthGlen, at SouthGlen Place, rents for \$13,500/year, nearly half the gross wages of someone working full-time at \$15/hour. That's significantly pricier than the federal definition of affordable, 30% or less of income going to rent plus utilities. I do not want to see the folks helping make SouthGlen a good place to eat and shop forced to couch surf, or worse, sleep in their car or a tent, their children added to the already 172 homeless students in Littleton Public Schools. Please support requiring some affordable housing in the project. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Parking: The project will replace a closed Sears and existing parking lot. The apartment residents will need places to park their cars, and their visitors' cars. Page 15 of Amendment 8 has, in the legend, a white arrow for pointing to proposed entry for lower level parking - but no arrows appear on the connectivity plan, so there is no evidence of parking in the amendment. Please ensure that the project includes one new parking space for each studio and at least two new parking spaces for each one or more bedroom homes, not counting spaces in the existing parking garage. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Bill	Lane	Aug 12 2021 04:31 PM	Wow, that is a big change. Too many people, too tall a structure. This plan will totally change the feel (and value) of the surrounding neighborhoods. Please maintain the 50 foot max height and the lower number of units.
Kim	Carver	Aug 12 2021 04:34 PM	Have the developers tried to drive around here lately!? With the high school in session in particular it's almost impossible to get anywhere in a "normal" amount of time. Plus is love having Macy's there. That many apartments will be a complete menace to existing traffic. Please. No.
Elizabeth	Lovato	Aug 12 2021 04:44 PM	I live a couple of minutes from Southglenn and am concerned about the updated proposal to increase the number of apartments and height of the buildings in the redevelopment plan. It is already difficult to find parking in Southglenn, and I'd hate to see that much more traffic. Southglenn is surrounded by residences so the 50-foot height is more than sufficient.
Gerry	Rasel	Aug 12 2021 05:05 PM	I oppose the proposed modification request of increasing apartments from 350 to 1,125 and increasing the building height from 50 to 75'. Have you gone through that area? Even now traffic in the area is challenging. Can't imagine it with another 1,000 vehicles....
Lyn	McCarter	Aug 12 2021 05:14 PM	Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed developer amendments for the SouthGlenn redevelopment. I strongly oppose the amendments, namely, the building height of 75 ft should not be approved. And increasing the number of apartments so dramatically should also not be approved. The increase in traffic is a strong reason to oppose these changes. It would also adversely affect the community's look and feel. Please do not allow these changes to go through. Thank you.
Heather	Davis	Aug 12 2021 05:17 PM	Please do not allow a change to the 50 foot height limit. This is a suburban neighborhood. Also, increasing the number of apartments will cause major parking problems.
Julie	Dillon	Aug 12 2021 05:36 PM	Am I reading this correctly: The developer is requesting it to go from 350 to 1,125 units. This increase is way too excessive and should not be allowed. Packing that many units in this small space, I'm afraid to say, is seething with greed and the opportunity for money. I failed to see the benefit of packing lots of people near my neighborhood as a benefit to me. I envision excessive traffic and an over populated community. I see this as a huge and massive disadvantage for me and my family and lots of financial gain for this developer and even the city of Centennial if they allow this. But this increase tax revenue is at the expense of my current standard of living. DO NOT ALLOW THIS! I would be OK with a modest increase but not this large. Thank you!
Meaghan	Perry	Aug 12 2021 06:08 PM	I also agree with Yvonne. I am opposed to the increase in residential apartments. It's outrageous that this could even be possible. My family and I have enjoyed the charm of southglenn restaurants and shops for years and years and this is going to destroy what is left. The, Traffic, congestion and air quality in this area are not good to begin with and this will exasperated that even more. The last thing this community needs is more traffic and pollution. If this happens it will be absolutely devastating.
Jan	Fourman	Aug 12 2021 06:17 PM	<p>I have grown up in the Centennial/ Southglenn Mall area since the 1980's. I have seen the growth of the area and renewed mall from an indoor space to an outdoor space and love the design, outcome and new restaurants, shopping,etc. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I don't mind limited housing, but I am against having higher buildings from 50-75ft, and 350 units to 1125 units. I believe we do need to have affordable housing in the area, but not more! I worry about traffic, parking and the effect on the neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please listen to the communities comments and about over growth in the Southglenn Mall area.</p>
SusanOD	Rihn	Aug 12 2021 06:30 PM	Do not want 75 foot buildings. How many of the apartments will be for seniors on a limited income. If there is no shopping other than small boutique shops, I don't believe there will be enough foot traffic. You need the big anchor stores to draw people there to start with.

Kim	Glunz	Aug 12 2021 06:50 PM	This development should be done on a small scale!!! No more than 300 apartments- preferably less & the height of the buildings only 50 feet. This area is congested enough, I can't imagine the traffic it will create. I've lived in this area for a very long time & like the convenience of the mall. The neighborhoods are quiet, but adding more apartments in this area would not be a benefit to the existing residents.
Matt	Whitcomb	Aug 12 2021 07:23 PM	If the developer is in need of additional revenue, they should consider filling one of the dozen or more already vacant commercial spaces they have available. How can we trust you to add more spaces when you cant effectively manage the ones you have? All this in a vibrant thriving local economy. Many units have sat vacant for 4 years or more. We've lost countless businesses who all left for the same reason of outrageous rent hikes. Smashburger, Blue Sushi Sake Grill, etc. I think a few additional residential units would be good for the economics of the neighborhood, but 1,125 units is way too many. The proposal to construct buildings up to 75 feet will block our views of the mountains and sunset. These decisions are being made by people who don't live here and the consequences will not effect them.
Dennis	Brown	Aug 12 2021 08:38 PM	I do not agree with the request by the developers to increase the height of the buildings proposed for South Glenn redevelopment. That extra 25 feet in height would be WAY our of character for that area. <input type="checkbox"/> Allowing an additional 775 units, basically tripling the number of units would significantly increase traffic on University and Arapahoe Road which is not good. <input type="checkbox"/> I call upon ALL Centennial council members to REJECT the proposed change to the original proposal. The developer KNEW going into the proposal the rules and restrictions. They should live by the original plans.
M JOAN	LINK	Aug 12 2021 08:50 PM	I am opposed to: <input type="checkbox"/> -the increase of the number of apartments from 350 to 1125 <input type="checkbox"/> -increasing the allowable building height from 50-75 feet <input type="checkbox"/> -decreasing the amount of retail space... a major reason for the purchase of my condo in GlenOaks was that I could walk to everything... grocery, clothes shopping, dining, movie theater, ice cream store, library and streets with beautiful hanging flowers in the spring, summer and fall and ice skating in the winter. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Please keepn the 50 ft maximum building height (not 75') so that we can: <input type="checkbox"/> -maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood, <input type="checkbox"/> -reduce the number of apartments, cars and people <input type="checkbox"/> -see the mountains <input type="checkbox"/> <u>-maintain the original intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood</u>
Tanner	Chik	Aug 12 2021 09:13 PM	This is a horrible proposal not only will it increase traffic around Southglenn making the roads surrounding it more congested, but it will be overcrowded with people even more than it already is which is to say Colorado is turning into California which isn't good because with the new apartments it will increase the cost of living. And not to mention how much parking space is needed.
Tanner	Chik	Aug 12 2021 09:28 PM	And not to mention Centennial is a suburban area for a reason because it is outlying outside the city district and with the proposal of the apartment buildings it would no longer be considered a suburban area. Not to mention there are several schools nearby and if these apartments were to be built all of the residents would be walking into the nearby schools, and parks therefore raising the number noise complaint calls and with that comes more discrepancy between locals and the new residents.
Barbara	Nicholas	Aug 12 2021 09:16 PM	The recent changes are not in line with what is best for our community. Preserve our mountain views <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/> The developers knowingly purchased property with a 50 foot height limit. This is a steep change that is just not appropriate or best for our community. SouthGlenn is in the middle of a suburban residential neighborhood and preserving this should be a Priority.
Lori	Hemesath	Aug 12 2021 09:39 PM	I am opposed to such a huge increase in the number of apartments. Traffic is terrible already. I am scared to walk across the street because a lot of drivers do not pay attention. It will not be/feel safe with such a huge increase. Please listen to the people that live here. No on the increase of apartments.
Jim	Wolstenholm	Aug 12 2021 09:59 PM	University is already heavy with traffic. Increasing the units from the current 214 all the way to 1125 is too many for this residential area already with a high concentration of condos and townhomes plus Arapahoe HS less than a mile away. I also would not want the 50 foot max increased to 75 but compromise of 700 units with a 60 foot height might keep everyone happy. Please consider this alternative.
Erika	Foster	Aug 12 2021 10:03 PM	I do not agree with this proposal, as it will drastically change the look and feel of our suburban area. Please reject the requests of these developers.
Linda	Embree	Aug 12 2021 10:09 PM	I am opposed to the entire development. This change will affect the quality of life for all the citizens of Centennial. We dont need more apartments, we need more green areas to help with global warming. And, we are already on water restrictions...Don't add more users. When is someone going to speak up for our environment? Tell the developer NO to 75' NO to more units. This is American Greed.
Beth	Casteel	Aug 12 2021 10:21 PM	While I support the evolution of the neighborhood in response to current trends, I too would like to voice my opposition to a waiver of building height.

Lorraine	Gallick	Aug 12 2021 10:42 PM	<p>Comment on expanded development at Streets of Southglenn</p> <p>I don't think anyone wants to see the area turn into a dustbowl of tumbleweed, but the requested exemption to the current limits is over the top ridiculous. Basically, it all seems to benefit the developers not the existing taxpayers. The developers will pocket the money and run and we will be left holding the bag.</p> <p>Simply, there is no way to shoehorn so many new residents into such a small space without it having detrimental impact. Keeping the maximum height at 50 feet limit with the corresponding number of residences should be the maximum along with an appropriate number of parking spaces per unit. One per one bedroom is not it. There needs to be two for at least half of those one bedrooms occupied by couples of whom each will have two cars. There also needs to be parking for delivery services, service providers, overnight guests and emergency vehicles. Parking should not be expected to spillover onto adjacent streets. It should be planned otherwise. This means taking into consideration where snow will be placed during the more frequent extreme weather events that are predicted.</p> <p>Another issue of sustainability is recycling and trash pickup. I've read many comments from apartment dwellers who do not have the option of recycling due to apartment methods of trash collection. It should not be made difficult for people to do the right thing.</p> <p>If this is going to be made into a congested urbanized area, the City of Centennial needs to anticipate what kinds of public safety services will be needed. Not just for more crime, because that will be a given, but for the type of crime – more drug sales, more property thefts, more sexual assaults. And, in a paradoxical way, the building of more units will probably make homelessness more common as workers in the immediate area will not be able to afford these new places. The residents of the new places will have better paying jobs in the Tech Center. What kind of homeless services are the developers going to pay for as part of contributing to this existing problem? What percentage of cost should they be held accountable for to go to the new city services needed?</p> <p>Some other actions that need to be planned for and the cost borne by the developers is to build any new parking garages with suicide prevention safety features as well as adapt the existing garage as needed. They need to be solid, integrated and esthetically pleasing. Not just so-so.</p> <p>I miss the old Southglenn. Have lived here for over 40 years. Even worked at the mall. Customers would drive past Park Meadows to come to Southglenn. Once the parking becomes miserable, the stores few and far between and especially with worsening traffic on University, my other option is to not shop along University, but drive over to Broadway for shopping. How does that help Centennial coffers to drive its residents to shop elsewhere? Without some strict pushback from the City as to what is needed in order to be part of this community, I think the developers are going to walk all over us and laugh all the way to the bank.</p>
Peter	Smith	Aug 12 2021 10:49 PM	<p>Little has changed in the new proposal for the Streets of Southglenn. Developers need to honor the original master plan - 350 apartments and 50' height limits - and the City Council needs to listen to the voices of the people who have chosen to live here. The traffic study is a sham since the developer paid for it. Preserve our views of the mountains; maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood; or put it to a vote. Having invited comments, the City Council needs to categorize and publish a summary of the emails pro and con asap.</p> <p>On a related note, we should all commend Tammy Mauer, Centennial Councilwoman, for her lone "no" vote on more drive thrus on University.</p>
A	V	Aug 13 2021 12:01 AM	<p>I agree with Peter Smith's comments and all others who have expressed that the 50' height limit and 325 apartment limits be honored. It is suspicious that suddenly a new proposal is being pushed through, perhaps in the hopes that no one is paying attention.</p> <p>No need to patronize with a "Thank you for your comments", just listen to the wishes expressed.</p>
Sara	Hamann	Aug 13 2021 11:40 AM	<p>Yes, thank you Tammy Mauer.</p>
Debbie	Bevans	Aug 13 2021 07:15 AM	<p>I am opposed to the increase in height from 50 ft to 75 ft that the developer has proposed. I am also opposed to increasing the number of apartment units from its present number. We do not need additional traffic nor congestion of people.</p>
Yvette	Nejo	Aug 13 2021 07:17 AM	<p>I understand that we need to replace old structures with new and to include livable space. This should not include the sardine method. These streets are older and no room for expansion. The sheer volume of traffic add will make this already busy area a nightmare. We do not want to see the beauty of Colorado especially west views obstructed. Please reconsider a proposal to enhance this area no scar it.</p>
Linda	Heyburn	Aug 13 2021 07:23 AM	<p>I live across the street in the Knolls Townhomes. I agree with Yvonne that the cost to our neighborhood is visual esthetics and congestion. I understand that the developers have their investment to consider but I am asking that the height of the new apartments be limited to three stories. Congestion for this area will affect schools, libraries, parks, trails, gyms and traffic. Increasing traffic brings noise, increased emissions, and significant fiscal burdens to tax payers for street maintenance and public transport.</p>
Stephanie	Vajda	Aug 13 2021 07:48 AM	<p>I am also strongly against to this. What they are proposing is excessive, does not fit with the neighborhood, and will bring further traffic issues and congestion. Building heights and the residential/retail allotment needs to remain as per the original plan. Inappropriately tall buildings, small setbacks, and packed in people are a detriment to a suburban area. This is not downtown or DTC and should not be developed as such. Do not allow them to needlessly destroy this area.</p>
Chad	East	Aug 13 2021 08:01 AM	<p>I have concerns that increasing the units from 350 to 1125 will negatively impact an already busy intersection with increased traffic. I also have concerns regarding the building height. 75 feet is too tall for the suburban area. Please keep it at the original proposed 50 feet</p>

Vickie	Humes	Aug 13 2021 08:17 AM	I have lived near Southglenn Mall for almost 25 years, and seen all its good and bad iterations. Although I agree something needs to be done to refurbish it, this plan is not it. As many have said, traffic in that area and the surrounding neighborhoods is already terrible, and parking in certain sections of Southglenn can be a nightmare. The thought of almost quadrupling the amount of apartments there is mind-boggling. If there was a light rail station within walking distance of this project, then perhaps I could be supportive of it, but overall I am opposed to this latest "redevelopment" of the mall.
Paul	Bailey	Aug 13 2021 08:32 AM	No on increasing the number of residential units. No on increasing the height of buildings. The developers are greedy and do not care about the quality of life
Tom	Smedley	Aug 13 2021 08:48 AM	I do not support the the updated proposal for the redevelopment of the Sears and Macy's parcels. I believe that several significate changes to the Master Development Plan are unwise. Those are: <input type="checkbox"/> - Increase the number of apartments from 350 to 1125 <input type="checkbox"/> - Increase the allowable building height from 50 to 75 feet <input type="checkbox"/> - Decrease the amount of retail space <input type="checkbox"/> Not making theses changes will: <input type="checkbox"/> - Will preserve our mountain views <input type="checkbox"/> - Maintain the suburban character of our neighborhood No- Slightly reduce the number of apartments, cars and people <input type="checkbox"/> - Maintain the intent of the original master plan and surrounding neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> The developers knowingly purchased property with a 50 foot height limit. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for helping us stay within the guidelines of our Master Plan <input type="checkbox"/>
Jason	Derr	Aug 13 2021 08:54 AM	Please do not increase height limits. Keep the area the way it is.
Joan	Dienst	Aug 13 2021 09:24 AM	We do not need to ruin anymore of our mountain views with 75ft tall buildings in residential areas. We do not have enough water or schools to sustain growth projects of 1100 plus apartment complexes. Centennial streets, including Arapahoe Road and University Blvd are too crowded now for residential areas. We really don't need this type of growth to sustain our city. We do, however, need additional retail establishments in the Southglenn complex to keep our citizens shopping in Centennial instead of other areas or on Amazon. The additional retail tax base from retail would be a help without having to sacrifice water, city amenities and having to try to deal with additional residential traffic such a large complex would bring to our city.
Patrick	Santana	Aug 13 2021 09:27 AM	I love the proposal. I urge the city to approve it unconditionally. Centennial and all of Arapahoe County need more housing -- and denser development. This is exactly the kind of infill residential project which will help meet our housing needs. A wholehearted YES on this from me.
Raymond	Anthony	Aug 13 2021 09:38 AM	simply put... <input type="checkbox"/> No to the new plan, I oppose...!!! The new plan will bring too much traffic, and more congestion across the board to an already congested area. <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe add a couple more shops and or places to eat,...so the current residence can enjoy the area more than what they already do... <input type="checkbox"/> ...and we welcome visitors all day, everyday,....
lisa	chik	Aug 13 2021 09:50 AM	this is horrible, how can the numbers change so dramatically? Seems very sneaky. Glenn oaks townhome residents DO NOT WANT THIS. We will have too much traffic and other issues that go along with new housing.
Cindy	Maurer	Aug 13 2021 09:53 AM	Please do not allow the increase in building height for the added apartments at Southglenn shopping center. That is just too high for the neighborhood and it will contaminate the view of the mountains while traveling east to west. The citizens of Centennial moved down here because it wasn't an urban tall buildings sprawl. Please keep the integrity of our beautiful city. Thanks.
Rebekah	McCall	Aug 13 2021 09:57 AM	I strongly disagree with the request by the developers to increase the height of the buildings proposed for South Glenn redevelopment. That extra 25 feet in height is out of character for that area and the developer knew that from the beginning. I also strongly disagree with allowing an additional 775 apartment units. That will triple the number of units significantly increasing traffic on University and Arapahoe Road which is already congested. I call upon all Centennial council members to reject the proposed change to the original proposal. The developer knew going into the proposal the rules and restrictions. They should live by the original plans. I also think reducing the retail space currently at Southglenn is not in the city's best interests.
Diane	Smith	Aug 13 2021 10:00 AM	Keep the 50 foot height limit that the developers agreed to in the first place!!



Randall	Isaacs	Aug 13 2021 10:00 AM	I talked to an employee at Macys a while back when I heard they were closing and were planning to build a bunch of apartments above their store. She told me they couldn't because the lack of water to supply all of the new apartments. Also there would be no parking for all the extra cars. Why take away our rights as people of this community to add all of this? If it has to happen, and I pray it does not then please keep the height to 50 ft.
Betty	Gravgaard	Aug 13 2021 10:03 AM	<p>□ Dennis Brown • Foxridge□ I wrote:□ I do not agree with the request by the developers to increase the height of the buildings proposed for South Glenn redevelopment. That extra 25 feet in height would be WAY our of character for that area.□ Allowing an additional 775 units, basically tripling the number of units would significantly increase traffic on University and Arapahoe Road which is not good.□ I call upon ALL Centennial council members to REJECT the proposed change to the original proposal. The developer KNEW going into the proposal the rules and restrictions. They should live by the original plans. I agree with Dennis completely. Traffic on University and all of the streets is a nightmare during rush hour and most of the day. Please stay within the guidelines of the original design for Southglenn. We also need affordable stores for shopping. Not all the fancy high priced stores that can afford the retail space.</p>
Rebekah	McCall	Aug 13 2021 10:05 AM	One other comment. Retail needs to be changed as we have learned from COVID. Space can be used for additional restaurants, other entertainment type venues and even office space. An add to housing is okay, but the density is far too much for the area.
Mandy	Narum	Aug 13 2021 10:10 AM	Please keep the building height limits the same. Southglenn will lose its appeal if it is over built. All the existing homes in the area shouldn't lose their views to greedy developers.
Shannon	Lewien	Aug 13 2021 10:23 AM	I am adamantly opposed to adding 25feet of height to the 50 foot limit at Streets of Southglenn. It will dramatically change the character of our neighborhood & limit Mountain views.
Sue	Jonas	Aug 13 2021 10:38 AM	<p>I do not agree with the request by the developers to increase the height of the buildings proposed for South Glenn redevelopment. That extra 25 feet in height would be WAY our of character for that area.□ Allowing an additional 775 units, basically tripling the number of units would significantly increase traffic on University and Arapahoe Road which is not good.□ I call upon ALL Centennial council members to REJECT the proposed change to the original proposal. The developer KNEW going into the proposal the rules and restrictions. They should live by the original plans.</p>
Margaret	Heinen	Aug 13 2021 10:39 AM	I am urging you in the strongest possible terms to reject the SouthGlenn developer's request to increase the height of buildings going in there. The beauty and character of this area will be destroyed by tall urban style buildings. The current height limitations keep this a neighborhood. Adding the additional height, number of apartments and congestions will be very destructive of what has been created here. Please retain the agreed upon limits and do not cave in to greed. Thank you.
Dennis	Brown	Aug 13 2021 11:21 AM	<p>The developers appear to be doing a "BAIT AND SWITCH" approach to the redevelopment of the Sears and Macy's property at Streets of Southglenn. Agree to all the restrictions of the area, then petition to change those restrictions to increase their profit.□ 1. I moved here because I did not want the tall buildings and traffic congestion line is in Denver.□ 2. I liked the low tax rate prior to Centennial incorporation. That went away with incorporation.□ 3. Traffic on University, Arapahoe Road and down to Dry Creek is bad now and will worsen.□ 4. City council needs to listen to residents. Looks like 95% to at best 5% against the proposal.□ 5. Contractors need to stick to their plans.□ 6. The Rayhall deal on East Arapahoe was not supported by residents. Neither is this.□ 7. If council members disagree with the VAST majority or residents, update your resume and leave your elected position.□ <u>As a 36 year resident of the area dating back prior to the formation of Centennial, my wife and I strongly oppose the request.</u></p>
Katie	Rinehart	Aug 13 2021 11:35 AM	We are opposed to the new developers request to increase the height of South Glenn as well as increasing the number of apartments. First, adding 25 feet will completely change the look of the complex and our community. It also will affect our views of the mountains (one of the main reasons people choose to live around here). Increasing the number of units will significantly increase traffic in our community, particularly on Arapahoe and University. We have enough traffic as it is! Also, the crime will increase as well. We enjoy the retail and restaurant space at South Glenn and do not want it to be decreased. We implore you to please reject the new developers plans for South Glenn and require them to stick to the original plans. Thank you for reading our comments and taking our thoughts into account. We have an amazing community, and we would like it to stay close, personal, and beautiful!

Linda	Kirchhofer	Aug 13 2021 11:36 AM	<p>I agree with these thoughts posted from many: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Lets preserve our mountain views and maintain the character of our neighborhood by keeping the maximum building height at 50 feet. Please say NO to 75 feet. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Keep height at 50 - keeps within the integrity of community/neighborhood feel <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Provide for low income/affordable housing <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Consider the safety/traffic issues involved when adding extra residents with additional rental units - THIS location is a suburb not city, close to elementary school students walking to school and blocks away from high school students driving and walking to school; Traffic is bad enough now, the additional cars, usually 1-2 per household, will be significant <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>*Lower retail/restaurant rent to bring in revenue in other ways to make up for fewer apartment rentals. Will also help make Streets a walking destination spot again for neighboring community members</p>
Marcus	Porter	Aug 13 2021 11:54 AM	<p>I would like to see affordable housing in this development. I hope SouthGlenn can be a location for everyone. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I support the height increase. I like the economic benefits housing density brings. With more people in mind, is the public transit or bike infrastructure going to be upgraded? With an increase of people in the area, alternative transportation becomes more important. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In regards to the traffic, I live on E Easter west of SouthGlenn. Will the developer support community members going through the NTMP program? With the large increase in development requested, I think community members, the developer, and the city working together will yield us the best solutions.</p>
Sam	Gamlen	Aug 13 2021 12:07 PM	<p>I do not agree with the request by the developers to increase the height of the buildings proposed for South Glenn redevelopment. That extra 25 feet in height would be WAY our of character for that area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Allowing an additional 775 units, basically tripling the number of units would significantly increase traffic on University and Arapahoe Road which is not good. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I call upon ALL Centennial council members to REJECT the proposed change to the original proposal. The developer KNEW going into the proposal the rules and restrictions. They should live by the original plans.</p>
Deana	Schneider	Aug 13 2021 12:32 PM	<p>Development of the Southglenn area should be kept to fifty feet in height in order to preserve the feel of the suburban neighborhood.</p>
Linda	Lemmer	Aug 13 2021 12:49 PM	<p>We're totally against the increase of apartment units and of height. This is a very residential area and this will put incredible, negative, stress on roads, etc. Outrageous that developers can put in 1 plan and then later change it to maximize profit at expense of neighborhood.</p>
Katie	Murphy	Aug 13 2021 12:58 PM	<p>**We signed up for notifications via e-mail re: the redevelopment, and never received any. No one I know got an e-mail re: the 8/13 deadline either.</p> <p>Why is that? - We of the Southglenn area want to maintain the quiet quality of life that the area provides. Adding 1000s of new residents will destroy this adding congestion, stress, pollution, noise and crime to our lives.</p> <p>Caving to 'this is where progress is headed' is a cop-out. If you want to live downtown, move downtown. Keep our neighborhoods safe, quiet and suburban.</p> <p>Adding the unreasonable proposed number of apartment units to this area is not feasible within the parameters of existing roads and parking alone. 'Traffic mitigation' and 'improving traffic flow' is mere lip-service- current residents agree that our traffic is already at an 'unacceptable LOS.' 1000s more cars means too much congestion- easy math.</p> <p>Apartment buildings should not rise higher than existing height limits of 50 ft., and should be limited to 2-50 ft. buildings of 200 units each- again- with underground parking (and swimming pools, if applicable, enclosed or indoors.) Construction should match Portola as closely as possible- we agree- no steel and glass.</p> <p>Police are not being adequately supported in the Denver metro area and many are quitting the force as a result, likely to increase crime in this relatively low-crime area should the residents numbers increase to the proposed degree.</p> <p>We do not welcome an exponential increase in crime.</p> <p>Allotting one parking space per bedroom isn't remotely realistic. The plan should provide a minimum of 2/bedroom underground parking for all residents else:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) outsiders will not come to shop/visit due to inadequate mall parking, and</li> <li>b) residents and shoppers/visitors will spill into surrounding neighborhoods to park.</li> </ul> <p>No thank you!</p> <p>We have ample traffic congestion at the major intersection as well as all along University to the south due to Arapaho H-School traffic building up one block south of the mall, and commuters traveling further to C470. This influx will make rush hours unbearable.</p> <p>The traffic 'study' did not extend further East, West, and North to reflect the bottlenecks that will result there.</p> <p>Nearby shopping areas/parking lots will be far too congested as well.</p> <p>The plan does not provide ample areas for outdoor open space or for dog-walking, which means new residents will spill into our surrounding neighborhoods leaving their <del>dog faces and trash behind</del></p>

Ryan Thompson	Neighborhood Services Manager	Aug 13 2021 01:04 PM	<p>On Behalf of Centennial Community Development: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Hi Katie, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I apologize that you did not receive any notifications. Here is a link to our website that allows you to select what notifications you do and do not receive. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><a href="https://www.centennialco.gov/Government/Departments/Communications/Notifications?BestBetMatch=notify%20me bc531387-5732-4aba-9bcd-1971029240b7 d629baf0-1c1d-43ad-9519-84ddb3b92982 en-US">https://www.centennialco.gov/Government/Departments/Communications/Notifications?BestBetMatch=notify%20me bc531387-5732-4aba-9bcd-1971029240b7 d629baf0-1c1d-43ad-9519-84ddb3b92982 en-US</a> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to comment on Have Your Say. Your comments have been noted and will be added to the rest of the communications received for this</p>
Lisa	Dutkiewicz	Aug 13 2021 01:00 PM	<p>We live in the Knolls Townhomes across the street. My son is a spinal cord injury in a power wheelchair. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>We purchased here because of the cherry knolls park, close proximity to fantastic grocery stores, movie theater, library, unique small retail shops and restaurants. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please ... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Decrease the number of apartments from 1125 to less than 600. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Decrease the allowable building height from 75 feet to 50 ft. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Increase the amount of retail and restaurant space and consider incentives for these businesses. We want them to stay and be successful. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Streets of Southglenn is wonderful development. The character, architecture, fireplace, skate pond, trees, stunning flowers hanging from the lights, access, what's not to like. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please keep the character that Southglenn is now. Keep with the stone and brick as much as possible. Don't make it look like university of denver developments with modern apartments. Create setbacks and plant trees. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Don't create extra traffic on university. Your tenants will likely cross university to go to cherry knolls park and university can be scary to cross, especially in a wheelchair. Personally, University needs an illuminated cross walk. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please build sustainable homes, mindful of energy savings and maybe eventually solar. Make this area a place people want to come as a destination. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Build the area to survive an economic downturn, make it diverse. Create more open grass areas and make it friendly for children. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Thank you <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
Deb	Armbruster	Aug 13 2021 01:10 PM	<p>Comments Regarding Amendment 8 to Streets at SouthGlenn Master Development Plan <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I urge the Centennial Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to not approve the proposed redevelopment plan in its current form. I have two primary concerns – the lack of any affordable housing in the project, and the extreme increase in housing density being proposed. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Centennial has a severe shortage of affordable housing. High housing prices and rental costs, and the COVID pandemic's impact on the finances of many who live and work in Centennial have made the need for low income and affordable housing even more critical. The proposed redevelopment plan for the Sears and Macy's parcels in the Streets at SouthGlenn should be revised to either include low income and affordable housing units in the project or provide funding for alternative affordable housing efforts elsewhere in Centennial. We need to make it possible for low- and middle-income workers to live and work in our community. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The requested increase in the allowed number of residential units from the current 350 units to a total of 1125 units should be scaled back. Adding another 900 residential units to the current 214 units in the Portola will dramatically change the character of this relaxed suburban neighborhood. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Maintaining both the highly livable suburban atmosphere of our community and increasing the supply of affordable housing are not mutually exclusive goals. Both are critical to the long term success of Centennial and the Streets at SouthGlenn. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Marsha	Adams	Aug 13 2021 01:10 PM	<p>Hi, been in this area for 25 years and I love it here. Please do Not allow the Streets of Southglenn build above 50 feet. I do not want our city to become a major city like Denver.</p>

Steven	Litt	Aug 13 2021 01:11 PM	I am Ok with everything but the height requirement. <input type="checkbox"/> 50 ft high should remain the limit. This suburbia! Alberta is always trying to screw zoning. Don't let them add more stories!!!!!!!
Tiffany	Harimon	Aug 13 2021 01:13 PM	I am a native of Colorado and have lived by the Streets of Southglenn for 47 years. Definitely don't want to see this space turned into Downtown Denver. Please keep at the 50. I feel like developers are great at giving us information that we want to hear, but then changing it when comes it to what they want. Elected officials need to stop being greedy and to look out for their constituents How does this benefit the existing residents?
Don	Filarowicz	Aug 13 2021 01:26 PM	Keep the building height at 50' and the number of residences to 325. There's already too much congestion in western centennial, especially at Arapahoe and unit!
Barbara	Figley	Aug 13 2021 01:31 PM	It would be nice for developers to adhere to plans that were initially projected. 50 ft is more than enough for maximum height. It is important as residents that we not ruin the existing integrity of the suburban feel. Developers love to get their foot in the door and than change plans to their liking and pocket books.
Nancy	Mangen	Aug 13 2021 01:44 PM	In the Centennial City's comprehensive plan you state that the planning process was "designed to help ensure the community values align with the City's." You state you want to "preserve and enhance the neighborhoods in a way that promotes quality of life." You state that you "turn to the residents who know the city the best." In that case I assume you will faithfully listen to and REPRESENT the overwhelming feedback you have received about adding over 1000 residential units to the Streets of Southglenn. This aggressive plan will have a negative impact on all of the surrounding residential neighborhoods you want to protect. I support only the original plan of 350 units. This will most likely mean 700 new residents and 700 cars to add to the increasing traffic problem in these major roadways. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I have lived here for 40 plus years. My husband and I raised our family here. Our children walked to the schools and recreational facilities here. We have invested a huge sum of money into remodeling our home and landscaping. We plan to stay here indefinitely. I welcome new and younger and diverse families into the area, which I see you do as well. I read the entire redevelop plan and support many of the ideas in the plan. The major two that I oppose are the high density housing for the Streets of Southglenn and the new internal proposed steets that will cut though the areas behind the northwest corners of Arapahoe and University. The street proposal that connects Arapahoe to Panama would be a disaster for this residential area. It would increase bypass traffic flow right though a residential area that contains Franklin Elementary School, the Tot Lot, and the Franklin Swimming Pool. Children, which you say you want more of play in all these areas and in the streets. These cut through streets will greatly impact us with increased traffic, noise and pollution. Talk about a neighborhood killing plan. This one takes the cake. I encourage and pray that you will revisit and revise this specific aspect of the broad plans that the City is proposing. You are a representative government body. I trust that you will do just
Yvonne	Reicheneder	Aug 13 2021 01:44 PM	I do not agree with the proposal submitted for Southglenn Mall to increase apartment and building height as well as decrease retail space. That is not what was agreed upon when the site was purchased and does not fit in well with our community. Please don't allow this.
Uriel	Akiva	Aug 13 2021 01:51 PM	Hello, <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I'm a resident of Southglenn and also the Co-Editor of the Southglenn Living Newsletter. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I can state as a fact that the vast majority of feedback we have received from residents is that they DO NOT FAVOR this modification to the original development agreement. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Additionally, several other issues have arisen as part of the discussion around this development. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Looking at data from the Denver Metro area it appears that there is a high correlation between lower homeowner rates (HR) and crime. For example, Centennial has a HR of 82% according to datausa.io. Our violent crime rate is 1.75 per 100000 and property crime rate is 17.1 per 100000. Englewood has a much lower HR of 48% and its violent crime rate is 2.06 with a property crime rate of 52.78. Lakewood has a HR of 58% and a violent crime rate of 6.74 and a property crime rate of 47.3. Denver has a HR of 50% with a violent crime rate of 7.52 and a property crime rate of 37.85. Is Council aware of this correlation? Does Council understand that residents will consider voting for more rental housing, such as apartments, could be understood as a vote in favor of higher crime? <input type="checkbox"/> (2) Reducing retail development robs future Council's of future sales tax revenue. Does City Staff provide Council with Net Present Value estimate of future tax revenues depending on different development scenarios? As citizens we have to evaluate our Council Members on their performance and "stepping over a dollar to pick up a dime" is a performance issue. For example, apartments generate less tax revenue for the city than retail establishments who pay not only property tax, but also collect sales tax. <input type="checkbox"/> (3) I noticed that someone mentioned the Southglenn Metropolitan District in this discussion. I have a question about that, has City Staff checked to ensure that the Board of the Southglenn Metropolitan District is serving lawfully? A recent example from the Willow Bend Metro District (see the Colorado Politics Article by Michael Karlik and Liam Adams from March 16th) demonstrates how these Districts are subject to developer abuse. I'm certain that the high visibility of this project will lead to discussions
George	Sullivan	Aug 13 2021 01:58 PM	Keep the height at 50 feet.

Samantha	Byrnes	Aug 13 2021 02:00 PM	<p>When the original proposal was read out at the community meetings in November 2019 it was met with a number of concerns that the developer(s) said they would take back and use to amend their proposal. Has the proposal been amended as they committed? Glancing over it my husband and I aren't seeing any of the changes they committed to. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>One of the primary concerns raised at the time (and subsequently raised here) involved increased parking needs and daily trips. The study provided in 2019 was conducted while school was not in session and assumed (1) vehicle per two-bedroom unit and (1) trip per two-bedroom unit. Those numbers seem rather optimistic considering most prospective tenants would either have a roommate or a partner living with them for a variety of reasons including cost of rent. The same inaccuracy is</p>
Torry	Larsen	Aug 13 2021 02:02 PM	<p>Please don't approve the Streets of Southglenn proposal to add more apartments/condos and please keep the current height limits. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>This is not downtown Denver.</p>
Cindy	Jenkins	Aug 13 2021 02:15 PM	<p>We are strongly against the amended MDP for Streets at Southglenn. Increasing the number of residential units to 1125 would have negative impacts on traffic congestion, noise, safety and our community as a whole. The traffic study submitted by the developers is not adequate. Many people already take the neighborhood side streets to avoid the Arapahoe/University intersection. Revising the 50 foot building limits would have an adverse effect on the character and landscape of the neighborhood. We don't want to become an area like DU. The developers state in their letter that this redevelopment would "enhance our sense of community". The</p>
Barbara	Hunt	Aug 13 2021 02:27 PM	<p>The redevelopment of Southglenn should not include raising the building height to 75 feet. This will negatively effect the views available from surrounding neighborhoods. I have lived here long enough to remember how raising the allowable building height to 50 feet negatively effected views. Additionally, the last thing we need is more apartments and the traffic that will bring. 1125 apartments is an outrageously large number of apartments to squeeze into that area. All of this development will only benefit the developer - nobody else. Let them go somewhere else to wreck the view and jam the roads.</p>
Cheryl	Scher	Aug 13 2021 02:27 PM	<p>We strongly object to the proposed increased density and allowable building heights. The original site development plan established limits to both in accordance with the same procedures and metrics available now. There has been no change to the character of the surrounding neighborhoods, availability of transit, or other necessary services that would support either increase. These changes will negatively effect the area and the only benefit appears to be profit to the developers. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sincerely <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Susan P Mizuno, P.E. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2629 E Geddes Ave <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Cheryl Scher, homeowner <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2779 E. Fremont Place <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Centennial, CO 80122 <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Dale	Rottschafer	Aug 13 2021 02:38 PM	<p>I certainly understand the desire for in-filling with housing in the area, and I'm in support of it. That said, the number of units is very high for the area, giving it more of an urban feel when we all prefer the suburban character of our neighborhood and what exists at the Streets currently. The number of units translates into a lot of people - and a lot of cars. I am not convinced by the traffic studies that any negative affects can be addressed by changing the timing of light signals. Anyone traveling west from the area will not try to go out on University or Arapahoe. They will go west on Easter, putting significant additional traffic on Easter, Franklin, Clarkson and Washington in school and park zones. Similarly, anyone traveling east will also utilize Easter through Cherry Knolls. I know it is what I would do. I also think it is not necessary to increase the height from 50 feet in the original master plan to 75 feet. This increase would also jeopardize the suburban character that brought most of us to this area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I'd like to reiterate - I am not opposed to the developers redeveloping the area and adding dwelling units in excess of the original master plan. But they are seeking to do this in high density, urban-type manner in a suburban area. It's just too much. Keep the allowable building height at the current 50 feet, and it will alleviate most people's concerns with regard to density and traffic.</p>
Susan	Yablans	Aug 13 2021 03:01 PM	<p>Southglenn does not need more units. The traffic congestion along Arapahoe Rd is already bad. Adding more cars to this intersection will not make for happy commuters. Southglenn is already congested and adding 25ft building heights ruin our suburban feel. I moved out of Denver to get out of the congestion and now this. What's next? Build a casino at SG? Developing is one thing. OVERDEVELOPING IS ANOTHER.</p>

Richie	Grysiewicz	Aug 13 2021 03:41 PM	I am opposed to the change in height restrictions to allow for more concentrated residential units at and around Southglenn. As a newer member of this community, this is something I just don't want to see. I came to this community for the existing benefits and also understand the change of the times. I would rather this see this land be utilized within the current building and construction limitations. I would like to see more small family homes, affordable housing or townhouses included in the plans to draw more long term residents to our community.
Marti	Pratt	Aug 13 2021 03:51 PM	I have lived in this area my entire life-watched Southglenn Mall be built and demolished and SOSG built. I have seen the level of traffic in this area increase exponentially, not just due to SOSG but as a main thoroughfare down to Highlands Ranch. The last thing our area needs, without significant traffic improvements, is 1125 new apartments. I understand the developers purchased the property to make money and in doing so, did their due diligence and agreed to the current zoning. Allowing the increase in building height from 50' to 75' and adding more than 3 times the number of apartments is just wrong. That is not what this neighborhood wants and why we live here. By allowing the zoning variance to pass, the City of Centennial Council members will show that they don't care about what their citizens want and only are driven by the increase in property taxes and fees they will get with the additional height concessions and the multiple times increase in apartment units. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Please do not vote to allow this zoning variance.
Megan	Kennedy	Aug 13 2021 04:09 PM	My husband and I are concerned about this proposal. Overall it appears the owners will reap substantial benefits to the detriment of the community. Our concerns include the number of units, the proposed height of the buildings, inadequate parking and increased traffic in the area - all of which will create unwelcome issues for the community with no real upside for the residents of the area. Additionally, this will decrease the amount of retail space leaves the community with fewer retail options in the area. This proposal is vastly different from the original intent and promises from the owners.
Hildegard	Frichtel	Aug 13 2021 04:10 PM	Please keep the 50 foot maximum building height (instead of 75 ft) for the upcoming Southglenn Sears and Macy space for apartments.
Erin	Lamb	Aug 13 2021 04:12 PM	Please keep the height limit of 50 feet so the area continues to feel like a neighborhood.
Henry B	Lacey	Aug 13 2021 04:15 PM	Good afternoon. I have previously commented but want to add a few thoughts about the imperative of avoiding "NIMBY-ism" when considering proposed developments because I have seen many comments that basically amount to a sentiment of "don't change anything."  I recognize that many people who live in Southglenn, or near it, enjoy their mountain views. I also recognize that the existing 50-foot height limit at the Streets of Southglenn were the zoning limit when the developer first proposed the redevelopment project and executed it. It's simply not realistic to expect those conditions to be kept for everyone in this area for the indefinite future.  Centennial's leadership should not lose sight of the reality that population growth on the Front Range has been explosive. It is likely to continue to rapidly grow. These new residents need housing. If Centennial says "we won't accommodate high-density housing," then the pressure will grow on other municipalities on the Front Range to do that or we will see even more sprawl, which has obvious destructive environmental impacts.  In the former circumstance, the city would lose an opportunity present right now to grow its property tax base by over 1,000 homes. That is a significant chunk of annual revenue for the city that can help finance infrastructure improvements, recreational facilities, and municipal services. Those taxpayers will also contribute to the Littleton School District's coffers and to the library district. That will benefit all of us. In the second instance - sprawl elsewhere - our city would be contributing to more use of vehicles, more use of land for low-density, single-family homes, more air pollution, and more difficulty addressing the region's water needs. That serves no one and it should be kept in mind that Centennial is part of a larger community - the Denver urban area - and should work collaboratively to achieve the regional council of governments goals and regional environmental quality. I think it's also critical to keep in mind that the retail sector has fundamentally changed with the rise of online shopping. Even before the pandemic, trends in that industry indicated that fewer people buy in retail stores. That is especially true when it comes to traditional department stores like Sears (now defunct), Macy's, etc. Even small retail shops face difficulty from online competition. The reality, which is evident from the ample empty retail space in western Centennial, is that a developer simply cannot reasonably expect significant profit if it depends excessively on retail outlets for rental revenue. Nor are those tenants likely to be stable for the long-term. It is reasonable, then, for a developer to look instead to residential sources of revenue on its property. This proposal cannot fairly be evaluated on the basis of expectations held by people who moved to the Southglenn area years or decades ago. City leadership cannot grow the local economy and accommodate increased housing demand if they are never allowed the discretion to change zoning laws to address changing economic and social circumstances. I have absolutely no connection to this project or to the developer. I do live near SouthGlenn and I do think the project will benefit the community, particularly if the city planning commission and city council require developer set-asides of ample open space, parks, and additional recreation and library facilities on the site and appropriate accommodation of modern transportation needs, including mass transit, bicycles, and electric vehicles.

Karen	Hannon	Aug 13 2021 04:30 PM	I am very concerned about the traffic that will result from so many new units. Please restrict to 350. It's difficult now to navigate the intersection of University Blvd. and E. Easter Place with no turn signal. I have seen several near misses because of people turning in front of oncoming traffic. I am also concerned about the density of units in such a suburban residential area of town. You're completely changing the feel of the neighborhood especially if you increase the height from 50 to 75 feet. I was glad to see that you are planning some open space area, but you'll need to plant an awful lot of trees to offset the carbon emissions from all those cars on the road that will result from the new units you are proposing.
Michelle	Spadavecchia	Aug 13 2021 04:47 PM	<p>it appears that perhaps there is a bit of bait and switch on the developer's behalf with the increase in units (from 350 to 1125) and the change in building height (50 to 75 feet). There have been comments made that retail will not be occupying the current empty space, however, I have not noticed any kind of notices of available space (specifically, but not only, Sears) on the building to attract potential retail tenants. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A 50 foot maximum building height and limits on the quantity of units is appropriate to maintain the suburban character of the area. Changing the master plan midstream would not maintain the character of the area. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regarding both issues (density and building height), those of us who choose to live in the suburbs (even close proximity to the shopping center) do so because we are not interested in living in a densely populated, noisy city center. We are not downtown Denver, DTC, or even BelMar (another mixed use development that is currently experiencing financial hardship). The area should not be overdeveloped in such a way that causes additional problems if and when the economy turns. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The additional traffic has been discussed, and I will add to it that there will be additional parking needs for visitors to the units (1 space per bedroom, but what are the allowances for visitor parking). Some of my neighbors will be directly impacted in a negative way on Easter Avenue with the added volume of traffic as their parking lot entrance/exit is on Easter and there is not an option for an additional entrance/exit. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Julie	Holt	Aug 13 2021 05:53 PM	<p>I do think the 50 ft height limit is reasonable suburban anesthetic request. Economies of scale should not be the only factor.....their original plans were based on 50 ft. Don't let developers greed win. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Love to see a mix of retail and residential in plans. Creating a community environment is key to success of the development</p>
Margaret	Smith	Aug 13 2021 07:20 PM	<p>Dear Centennial, <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Help! The plans to redevelop the Streets of SouthGlenn are outrageous. Traffic will be impossible. The developers seem to have reneged on the agreement for lower buildings and less apartments. Please do not allow the developers to alter this lovely area.</p>
Roger	Veach	Aug 13 2021 07:53 PM	There will be many motor vehicle accidents on University with the significant increase in traffic volume. The grocery stores, post office, and other stores will be overwhelmed with the increased traffic. The side streets will become used at a much higher frequency and as a result more injuries to pedestrians especially small children. This is a very poor idea for this area. A dangerous idea just to make money that will negatively affect the entire area.
Susan	Paulsen	Aug 13 2021 08:31 PM	I am totally opposed to the increased height and increased number of apartments. The height should remain at 50 feet and the number of apartments should remain at 350.
Andrea	Suhaka	Aug 13 2021 08:37 PM	I do believe more bike racks are needed for the park because parking is not allowed on the streets along the park.
Margaret	Moore	Aug 13 2021 08:50 PM	Please keep the current 50' building height limit for potential new development at Southglenn
Jim	O'Donnell	Aug 13 2021 09:05 PM	The developers purchased the property knowing full well what the publicly available zoning is, now they want it changed? I wish every time I made an unwise financial investment that I could get bailed out by my city. The only thing that seems wrong with the current zoning is that it no longer matches the profitability margins of the developers. I'm fully against any zoning changes to the area and will voice my opposition with my election vote should my representative vote differently on this portant issue and my spending frequency directly at Southglenn. If the current owners can't make the current zoning parameters work, I'm sure another can.

R	M	Aug 13 2021 09:30 PM	<p>At this time, there have been about 300 responses to the request for feedback regarding the SoS plan, particularly regarding the requests for a waiver to the height limit of 50 feet, and for an increase in the number of housing units to be built. Of those responses, I counted a total of less than ten individuals who have expressed support for either a part or all of those requests. (This does not include people who have posted multiple times on this comments thread, nor does it include people who have only posted questions for clarification or who have not expressed a clear opinion about what their preference is.) This translates to about 3% of people who have responded to this 'Have Your Say' request. If our representatives are TRULY going to represent the community's interest, then the result should be overwhelmingly clear and obvious. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I am adding my voice to the opposition to both aspects of the request for changes to be made to the SoS Master Development Plan. I am opposed to the proposed height increase that is being requested by the developers; they knew what that limit was when they bought the property and their effort to do an end-around regarding the Master Plan is unreasonable for the location, and it will set a problematic precedent for other projects that will come along in Centennial. Others have put forth additional arguments as well regarding the lack of wisdom regarding that idea, and I won't repeat them, but they are all salient. Similarly, I am opposed to the increased number of housing units that have also been proposed, for all of the reasons that others have put forward over the last three weeks. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I am in favor of building more greenspace into the plan, finding a way to create a degree of affordable housing into the proposal moving forward, keeping the amount of retail space as is or increasing it, and looking to find ways to keep retail space occupied. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I also think that this is a good time for those impacted by the development plan around the Streets of Southglenn to read the Master Development Plan to become familiar with the more long-term plan, so as to become aware of the additional plans and changes that are being suggested. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I would also remind the members of our city government, particularly the people who represent the people who are most affected in the area of Southglenn, to keep foremost in mind that this is a representative government, and you are supposed to act on the expressed interests of the people you are representing. I know that I, among others who have posted here, will be paying attention to how well my representatives do so, and will take that into account at our next city elections. It's not a close call. <u>as reflected in the 97% to 3% split that is reflected in these responses.</u></p>
Susan	Wheeler	Aug 13 2021 10:03 PM	<p>I agree with others' comments regarding keeping the number of residences to 350, and not allowing the increase to over 1,125. An increase to 1,125 is 3 times the original number of units, and that does not even take into account the increase in the number of people in these residences. I also agree that building height should be limited to 50', especially considering that this location is surrounded by residential neighborhoods consisting of single family homes. An extra 350 units will already substantially increase the number of vehicles in the area. Considering that nearly every adult has a vehicle, that is potentially 700 additional vehicles. That will contribute to extra noise and pollution to the area and surrounding neighborhoods. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>I also agree with others' comments that some percentage of units be available as affordable housing. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Thank you</p>
Matt	Gundersen	Aug 13 2021 10:24 PM	<p>I am against both the increase in the number of residential units and increased height. It will increase traffic in an already constrained area. Downtown is a better location for high capacity units and tall buildings. This area would be better suited as a large outdoor park or community center if retail does not work out.</p>
Jill	Kroeker	Aug 13 2021 10:36 PM	<p>Please limit the height of any new developments to 50' max to preserve the suburban neighborhood.</p>
Susan	McKenzie	Aug 13 2021 10:41 PM	<p>Please keep the 50' building height and limit the number of residents permitted to live in the streets at southglen. Over a thousand new apartments in an area already at maximum capacity for student to teacher ratios in the schools is going to put a burden and strain on our community.</p>
Cassandra	Papp	Aug 13 2021 11:42 PM	<p>Please don't develop Sears!</p>
Alyssa	Boettcher	Aug 13 2021 11:43 PM	<p>As a resident living a few blocks from SoS for 29 years, I concur with the neighbors asking to deny the proposed changes. The company that invested in this property knew the zoning restrictions at purchase and should abide by them. Centennial should honor the longtime residents who moved to the area for its quiet, suburban neighborhood. Building 1125 housing units will increase the traffic and overall congestion of the surrounding neighborhoods. Children moving into these units will create enrollment issues for our schools. Elementary students moving into SoS, who would normally attend the school a few blocks west, will have to be bussed to other schools since this one is closing next year. The additional height of the proposed buildings will aesthetically change our area to look more like Denver, and will ruin the mountain views of many residents. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please deny these requested zoning changes! 350 units is plenty.</p>
Sharyl	Whitaker	Aug 16 2021 12:56 PM	<p>Please do not allow all the extra apartments to the Streets of Southglenn. This area is crowded enough with too much traffic already on University especially and also Arapahoe Rd. People drive way too fast and there are too many accidents and it is a hazard just to walk in the area, or to ride a bicycle. It greatly diminishes our quality of life, and also adds much additional noise and increasing the heights will greatly block what mountain views are left. Thank you.</p>